122 h 8

A GENERAL DICTIONARY, Hiſtorical and Critical:

IN WHICH

A New and Accurate TRANSLATION of that of the Celebrated

Mr. BAYLE,

WITH THE

CORRECTIONS and OBSERVATIONS printed in the late Edition at *Paris*, is included; and interſperſed with ſeveral thouſand LIVES never before publiſhed.

The whole containing the Hiſtory of the moſt illuſtrious Perſons of all Ages and Nations, particularly thoſe of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*, diſtinguiſhed by their Rank, Actions, Learning and other Accompliſhments.

With Reflections on ſuch Paſſages of Mr. BAYLE, as ſeem to favour *Scepticiſm* and the *Manichee* Syſtem.

By the Reverend Mr. JOHN PETER BERNARD;
The Reverend Mr. THOMAS BIRCH, M.A. and F.R.S.
Mr. JOHN LOCKMAN;
And other HANDS.

And the Articles relating to ORIENTAL HISTORY
By GEORGE SALE, Gent.

VOLUME IV.

LONDON,
Printed by *James Bettenham*,
For G. STRAHAN, J. CLARKE, T. HATCHET in *Cornhill*; J. GRAY in the *Poultry*; J. BATLEY and J. WOOD in *Pater-Noſter-Row*; J. SHUCKBURGH in *Fleetſtreet*; J. WILCOX, A. MILLAR in the *Strand*; T. OSBORNE in *Grays-Inn*; J. BRINDLEY in *New Bond-ſtreet*; C. WARD and R. CHANDLER at the *Ship* without *Temple Bar*, and ſold at their Shop in SCARBOROUGH; J. BETTENHAM near, and E. CAVE at St. *John's* Gate.
MDCCXXXVI.

A NEW AND ACCURATE TRANSLATION OF THE

HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL

DICTIONARY

OF

TO

His GRACE

CHARLES,

DUKE of *Queensberry* and *Dover*, &c.

This FOURTH VOLUME of the

GENERAL DICTIONARY,

Hiſtorical and Critical,

Is dedicated by

His GRACE's moſt obliged and moſt

Obedient Humble Servants,

The Authors.

GENERAL DICTIONARY,

DUKE of Marlborough and Duke, &c.

CHARGE,

TO

A GENERAL DICTIONARY Hiſtorical and Critical.

C.

CÆSALPINUS (ANDREAS), was a man of very great ability, both in Philoſophy and Phyſick. He was of Arezzo; he was Profeſſor at Piſa a long time; after which he became firſt Phyſician to Pope Clement VIII. He died at Rome February the 23d 1603 (*a*), at the age of eighty four (*b*). He left the common road of the Peripateticks in many things [*A*]; and to ſay the truth, he was a very bad Chriſtian with regard to opinions. He is ſaid to have believed that the firſt men were formed after the manner, which many Philoſophers fancied, that frogs are ingendred [*B*]. We ſhall examine whether this opinion ought to be attributed to him. His

(*a*) *Ex* Thuano, lib. 129. pag. m. 1003.

(*b*) Witte, *Diat. Biograph.*

[*A*] *He left the common road of the Peripateticks, in many things.*] Do not imagine that he invented different principles from thoſe of Ariſtotle; for, on the contrary, he paſſes for an innovator, only becauſe he ſticks to the ſenſe of Ariſtotle. He has gone to the bottom of the Peripatetick Syſtem, and has maintained it according to the true ſenſe of the Founder, and not like the Schoolmen, who whilſt they profeſſed themſelves Diſciples of Ariſtotle, taught any thing but his opinions. The fault is, that Cæſalpinus ſet himſelf principally to unfold this ſyſtem, in the articles that were moſt oppoſite to Religion. As he unravels the doctrine of his Maſter relating to the *Primum Mobile*, he not only ſets aſide Providence, but alſo the true diſtinction between Creator and the creature: and yet, his book (1) was never cenſured by the Inquiſition. He had indeed the cunning to declare at the end of his Preface, that if Ariſtotle is in ſome things not conformable to the Scripture, he gives him up, and that there is a fallacy in his reaſonings, but that he leaves the examination of it to thoſe who profeſs a higher Divinity (2). One might quote againſt him the maxim of the Civilians, *Proteſtatio facto contraria non valet*; i. e. "A Proteſtation in contradiction to a "fact is of no force." Doctor Samuel Parker has very well explained the doctrines and artifices of Cæſalpinus: he ſays that he is the firſt and almoſt the laſt of the moderns that have underſtood the meaning of Ariſtotle: *Quem quid velit recentiorum hic primus & pene poſtremus cepiſſe viſus* (3). What we ſhall ſay in the remark [*B*] will confirm what I have elſewhere (4) related of the conformity of Spinoza to Ariſtotle.

(1) I mean his *Quæſtiones Peripateticæ.*

(2) *Sicubi ab iis quæ in ſacris diviniori modo revelata nobis ſunt, diſcedat, minime cum illo ſentio, fateorque in rationibus deceptionem eſſe: non tamen in præſentia meum eſt hæc aperire, ſed iis qui altiorem Theologiam profitentur.*

(3) Parkerus, *Diſput. de Deo*, Sect. 14. pag. 64.

(4) In the article ARISTOTLE, citation (*k*).

[*B*] *He believed that the firſt men were formed after the manner . . . that frogs are engendred.*] Read the following words of Mr. Saldenus: *Referendus huc* .. Andreas Cæſalpinus, *Medicus Romanus qui primos & vetuſtiſſimos homines, inſtar murium & ranarum, ex putri materia factos eſſe, pronunciavit: adoptato procul dubio eo errore ex* Democriti Abderitæ *hypotheſibus, cui ex aqua limoque primum viſum eſt homines procreatos eſſe. Non multum abludente etiam* Epicuro, *qui credidit, limo calefacto uteros neſcio quos radicibus terræ increviſſe, & infantibus ex ſe editis ingenuum lactis humorem, naturâ miniſtrante, præbuiſſe, hoſque, ita educatos & adultos, hominum genus procreaſſe* (5). i. e. "Hither may be "referred .... Andreas Cæſalpinus, a Roman Phyſi"cian, who pronounced that the firſt and original men "aroſe from putrefaction like mice and frogs: having without doubt adopted that error from the hypo"theſes of Democritus of Abdera, who imagined "that men were at firſt produced from water and mud. "And not much differing from Epicurus, who thought, "that upon the warming of the mud, I know not "what wombs grew to the roots of the earth, and with "the aſſiſtance of nature afforded milk to the new"born infants, and that theſe being ſo educated and "brought up procreated mankind." He might have added to Democritus and Epicurus two other great Philoſophers, Anaxagoras and Archelaus (6): which would have ſerved indeed to ſhew more reading, but no more juſtice. Honeſt Mr. Saldenus had not well conſulted the originals, and probably he had ſeen what related to Cæſalpinus far from the ſource. I have ſought in the writings of this Philoſopher what could have given room to impute this opinion to him, and have found a great miſrepreſentation. I have found that in reaſoning upon the principles of Ariſtotle, he lays down, that all that ariſe from ſeed may be produced without ſeed, *quæcunque ex ſemine fiunt, eadem fieri poſſe ſine ſemine*; this is the title of the firſt queſtion of the fifth book: but he declares at firſt that he does not believe that the ſoul either of man or beaſt can have a corrupted ſubſtance for its principle. A little after, he diſtinguiſhes between the firſt production of animals and other beings, and their ſucceſſion. He ſuppoſes that the firſt production flowed from the firſt cauſe at the beginning, and that afterwards the ſpecies preſerved themſelves by ſucceſſive generations, and that the production of the individuals, whether it comes from ſeed, or from a corrupted matter, belongs to this ſucceſſive preſervation of the ſpecies, and not to their primitive formation: ſo that if he has ſometimes ſaid that the perfect animals were ingendred from a worm at the beginning, we muſt not underſtand it of a firſt production properly ſo called; it is only a renovation of the individuals, as it may happen in the courſe of an infinite time that all the individuals of a ſpecies may die, in which caſe no new ones can ariſe by an univocal generation, we muſt ſeek therefore for a new beginning in ſome corrupted matter. This I take to be the true ſenſe of the following Latin Text. *Præterea cum alia ſit prima omnium animalium & cæterorum entium creatio, quæ a primo ente in principio efluxit: alia eorundem ſucceſſio: dicimus ortum ex putredine ſimilem eſſe ei, qui fit ex ſemine, ad ſucceſſionem ſcilicet inſtitutum, non ad primam ſpecierum dependentiam atque productionem: Niſi enim hæc præceſſiſſet, nequequam*

(5) Saldenus, *in Otiis Theolog.* pag. 64.

(6) See the remark [*B*] of the article ARCHELAUS the Philoſopher.

His principles did not differ much from thoſe of Spinoza [C]. You may ſee below the titles of his writings [D]. A modern Author has reckoned him among the greateſt genius's that ever lived (c).

(c) *Bibliographia Curioſa, apud* Teiſſier, *Éloge. de Hommes Savans*, tom. 2. pag. 330.

It would be robbing Cæſalpinus of a very great honour, to paſs over in ſilence that he knew the circulation of the blood [E]; the proofs of which are ſo

quicquam neque ex ſemine neque ex putredine ortum eſſet. Quod ſi aliquando meminerim primam perfectorum animalium generationem ex verme fieri, ſic intelligimus primam, quia in tempore infinito, quod ſupponitur à Peripateticis, deficientibus in aliquo tempore omnibus ſingularibus alicujus ſpeciei, primum aliquod ex putredine oriri poteſt, ex cujus ſemine propagetur ſpecies, nec quibuſdam contingit ex putredine tantum propagari (7). And obſerve that Cæſalpinus not ſuppoſing that all men ever periſhed, one cannot impute to him the having pretended that the firſt men were engendred of a corrupted matter. He would have according to Ariſtotle's hypotheſis all ſpecies to be eternal (8), and their eternity to be a ſufficient cauſe of reſtoring the individuals, if there ſhould happen an interruption to their ordinary generations; if, I ſay, this interruption happened by the death of all the individuals. *Non eſt timendum ne aliqua ſpecies unquam deficiat, quamvis omnia ſingularia contingat aliquando corrupta eſſe: remanet enim in agente æterno virtus æterna omnium ſpecierum* (9). I acknowledge that he ſhews this interruption poſſible in the human ſpecies (10); but this is not ſaying what Saldenus imputes to him. Beſides it was the current opinion of antiquity, that all the ſpecies of animals might be renewed without the aid of male and female. Ovid, who has only reported the common tradition of the Greeks, ſuppoſes that after the deluge the ſtones were the matter from which new men were formed, and that the heat and moiſture of the earth reſtored the other animals, and formed even ſpecies unknown to the firſt world (11).

(7) Cæſalp. *Quæſt. Peripateticar.* lib. 5. cap. 1. folio 104. *verſo* edit. 1593.

(8) *Species æternæ ſunt, generantur autem & corrumpuntur iſta ſingularia.* Idem, ibid. folio 105.

(9) Idem, ibid. fol. 109.

(10) Ibid. folio 108.

(11) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 1. *ver.* 400.

Cætera diverſis tellus animalia formis
Sponte ſua peperit; poſtquam vetus humor ab igne
Percaluit ſolis, cœnumque udæque paludes
Intumuere æſtu, fœcundaque ſemina rerum
Vivaci nutrita ſolo, ceu matris in alvo,
Creverunt, faciemque aliquam cepere morando (12).

That is,

" All other creatures took their numerous birth
" And figures, from the voluntary earth.
" When that old humour with the ſun did ſweat,
" And ſlimy mariſhes grew big with heat;
" The pregnant ſeeds, as from their mother's womb
" From quickning earth both growth and form aſ-
" ſume. Sandys.

(12) Ibid. ver. 416.

Ergo ubi diluvio tellus lutulenta recenti
Solibus æthereis altoque recanduit æſtu;
Edidit innumeras ſpecies, partimque figuras
Reddidit antiquas, partim nova monſtra creavit (13).

That is,

" So, earth by that late deluge muddy grown,
" When on her lap reflecting Titan ſhone,
" Produc'd a world of forms; reſtor'd the late;
" And other unknown monſters did create.
Sandys.

(13) Ibid. ver. 434.

A Commentator ſaid upon this, that Avicenna thought the human ſeeds, being reanimated by the ſun in the bodies of thoſe who had periſhed in deluges gave new men. *Sed quis ferat Avicennam? qui lib. de Diluviis aſſerit ex reliquo cadaverum humanorum ſeminio a ſole animato, homines poſt immenſas terrarum inundationes natos* (14).

(14) Farnab. *in Ovid.* ibid. ver. 416.

We muſt obſerve one thing more for the better underſtanding of Cæſalpinus's doctrine, founded upon the principles of Ariſtotle, as he pretends. He would have this maxim, *man and the ſun engender man* (15), to ſignify, not that the adjunction of the Sun is neceſſary to the production of man, but that the Sun without the aid of man is a ſufficient cauſe of the production of man. He pretends that the matter of all ſublunary beings is only a paſſive power, which acquires all its actuality by the motion of the heavens (16). He gives to the moving Intelligence of the heavens the firſt formation of beings as the principal cauſe, and to the heavens as the inſtrumental cauſe (17). All this might eaſily agree with the doctrine which the ſect of the learned in China has embraced, that there is no *other first principle than the material heaven, or the moſt ſubtile of its parts, which are as its efficient vertue.* See what Father Aleoneſſa (18) has repreſented to the Pope.

(15) Cæſalp. *Quæſt. Peripateticar.* folio 105.

(16) Ibid. folio 105.

(17) Ibid. folio 109 *verſo.*

[C] *His principles did not differ much from thoſe of Spinoza.*] He admitted with Ariſtotle moving intelligences in the celeſtial ſpheres; but he reduced them all to one only ſubſtance: he admitted alſo Angels, or Dæmons; but he ſaid they were only particles of God united to a very ſubtil matter. Further, he pretended that the ſoul of man, and the ſoul of beaſts were portions of the ſubſtance of God: ſo that he acknowledged ſeveral Dæmons, and ſeveral ſouls, it was only with regard to the matter; for without matter he did not admit the plural number. Therefore, according to him, there was but one ſoul, but one human intelligence, which multiplied itſelf in proportion as men multiplied (19). The unity, which the Scotiſts acknowledged in the genus's and ſpecies, is at the bottom the ſame chimæra with that of Cæſalpinus (20): and it requires but little of a methodical genius to form thereupon the ſyſtem of Spinoza. Beſides, if Cæſalpinus had been a perfect Spinoſiſt, and yet had admitted, Dæmons in the manner they commonly are admitted, I ſhould not have wondered. I do not think there is any ſyſtem, which by following only the ideas of reaſon, can leſs avoid owning what is ſaid of good and bad angels amongſt the people, than the ſyſtem of Spinoza. Perhaps I may make a diſſertation thereon, ſome time or other, wherein I ſhall ſhew that by reaſoning conſequentially the Spinoziſts muſt lean more towards the owning than the not owning rewards and puniſhments after this life.

(19) *See* Voſſius, *de Origine & Prog. Idololatriæ*, lib. 2. cap. 40. pag. 531. edit. Francof. 1675.

(20) See the remark [C] of the article ABELARD.

[D] *You may ſee below the titles of his writings.*] Κάτοπτρον, *ſive Speculum Artis Medicæ Hippocraticum. De plantis Libr. XVI* (*). *De Metallicis Libr. III. Queſtionum Medicarum Libr. II. De Medicamentorum facultatibus Libr. II. Praxis Univerſæ Medicinæ. Dæmonum Inveſtigatio. Peripatetica. Quæſtionum Peripateticarum Libr.* V. Nicholas Taurel a Phyſician of Montbeliard has written againſt this laſt work (21), and has intitled his Book, *Alpes cæſæ, hoc eſt Andreæ Cæſalpini monſtroſa dogmata diſcuſſa & excuſſa* (22).

(*) See the note [A] of the additional article.

(21) It was printed at Venice by the Juntas, in 4to, in 1571, and afterwards in 1593. The Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated at Piſa, June 1, 1569.

(22) Teiſſier, *Elog.* tom. 2. pag. 330.

[To this Catalogue of his writings we muſt add the *Appendix* to his Books *de Plantis*. This little piece was printed at Rome, in 1603. The Preface is dated; *Romæ. Die* 19. *Januarii.* 1603. It is exceeding ſcarce. Bocconi has reprinted it, without Dedication or Preface, in his *Muſeo di Piante Rare, p.* 125, *& ſeq.* But this Author has added a few remarks at the end, which are contained in a letter to Sig. Battiſta Scarella, and in Scarella's anſwer.] ADDIT. REM.

[E] *He knew the circulation of the blood.*] Thus he ſpeaks in a paſſage in his works. *Idcirco pulmo per venam arteriis ſimilem ex dextro cordis ventriculo fervidum hauriens ſanguinem, eumque per anaſtomoſim arteriæ venali reddens, quæ in ſiniſtrum cordis ventriculum tendit, tranſmiſſo interim aere frigido per aſperæ arteriæ canales, qui juxta arteriam venalem protenduntur, non tamen oſculis communicantes, ut putavit Galenus, ſolo tactu temperat. Huic ſanguinis circulationi ex dextro cordis ventriculo per pulmones in ſiniſtrum ejuſdem ventriculum optimè reſpondent ea quæ ex diſſectione apparent. Nam duo ſunt vaſa in dextrum ventriculum deſinentia, duo etiam in ſiniſtrum: Duorum autem unum intromittit tantùm, alterum educit, membranis eo ingenio conſtitutis* (23). i. e. " The lungs drawing the warm " blood thro' a vein [*the Pulmonary Artery*] like the " arteries out of the right ventricle of the heart, " and returning it by an anaſtomoſis to the venal ar- " tery, [*the Pulmonary Vein*] which goes to the left " ventricle of the heart, the cool air being in the " mean time let in thro' the canals of the aſpera ar- " teria, which are extended along the venal artery, " but do not cummunicate with it by inoſculations, as " Galen imagined, cools it only by touching. To " this circulation of the blood out of the right ven- " tricle of the heart thro' the lungs into its left ven- " tricle what appears upon diſſection anſwers very well. For

(23) Cæſalp. *Quæſt. Peripatetic.* lib. 4. cap. 7. folio 125 *verſo.*

ſo clear, that they cannot be eluded by any evaſion.

" For there are two veſſels, which end in the right " ventricle, and two in the left: but one only carries " the blood in, the other ſends it out, the membranes " being contrived for that purpoſe." What he ſays elſewhere (24) and which I content my ſelf with referring to, is no leſs particular. [The curious reader may find what Cæſalpinus has ſaid on this ſubject brought together in Dr. Douglas's *Bibliographiæ Anatomicæ Specimen*, Printed at London, in 1715. See the Article HARVEY [WILLIAM]. ADD. REM.

(24) Idem, *Quæſt. Medicar.* lib. 2. cap. 17. folio 234. edit. 1593.

☞CÆSALPINUS. To this account of Cæſalpinus by Mr. Bayle may be added, that he was one of the capital writers in Botany [*A*], and carried that Science to a greater degree

[*A*] *He was one of the capital writers in Botany.*] His ſixteen Books *de Plantis*, printed at Florence in 1583, in one volume 4to, are ſo ſcarce, and ſo little underſtood, that it may not be improper to give the reader ſome account of them. In the firſt Book he treats of Plants in general, of the ſtructure of their parts, of their generation and nutrition. He compares the ſeed of a Plant to the egg of an animal (1), and obſerves, that, as in an egg there is contained a little part, in which is a ſort of delineation of the future animal, the reſt ſerving only for nouriſhment: ſo in the ſeeds of Plants that part is the principal, whence the root and ſhoot proceed; for it is a ſort of little heart, and the reſt of the ſeed ſerves only to furniſh it with nouriſhment (2). He very plainly deſcribes the ſeed-leaves in theſe words; *Reliqua ſeminis corpulentia in plurimis ex ſuo cortice tamquam ex ovo in lucem prodit, quæ in duo foliola pulpoſa explicata particulam oſtendit, unde germen erupturum eſt.* Dr. Blair (3) aſcribes the diſcovery of this part to Joſephus de Aromatriis, who wrote above forty years after Cæſalpinus (4).

To this Author we owe the diſtribution of Plants into a regular method: for I cannot reckon thoſe methods which were taken from the time of year in which the Plants flowered, or from the order of the alphabet to deſerve that name. Geſner indeed, who was contemporary with Cæſalpinus, gives ſome hints, that he choſe to diſtinguiſh Plants by their flowers and ſeeds. *Si ramulum*, (ſays he (5), *ficcum habes cum floribus, aut fructum etiam, cum opportunum fuerit, mitte. In ſeminibus enim & floribus* ἀκριβέστατα *pingendis valde ſum curioſus.* And again, *Molucca vel Conſtantinopolitana herba videtur ad Lamium vel Urticam mortuam quodammodo accedere, ſeminis tamen (unde ego maximè cognationes ſtirpium judicare ſoleo) figura differt, utpote triquetri* (6). But whatſoever Geſner's intentions were, it is certain he went no farther, ſo that we muſt look upon Cæſalpinus as the Author of method in Botany. " That method, *ſays he* (7), which is formed on the " natural ſimilitude of Plants, is the moſt eaſy, the " moſt ſafe, and the moſt uſeful, both to help the memory, and to diſcover the virtues of Plants. It is " the moſt eaſy, becauſe thoſe diſtinctions which ariſe " from nature, are the moſt ſenſible and manifeſt; " and do not fail, like accidental differences, which " are not perpetual. It is of uſe to the memory, " becauſe by this means the almoſt immenſe number " of Plants is contained in a ſhort compaſs under regular claſſes, ſo that even thoſe, which were never " ſeen before, may eaſily be reduced to their proper " claſſes, and if they have not been named already, " may be called by the proper name of their family. " Laſtly, even the vertues, about which Phyſicians " are moſt ſollicitous, are pointed out by the knowledge of their ſtructure: for thoſe, which are of " the ſame claſs, for the moſt part have the ſame vertues." *Qui autem ſecundum naturarum ſocietatem aſſignatur, omnium facillimus reperitur, tutiſſimus, utiliſſimuſque tum ad memoriam, tum ad facultates contemplandas: facillimus quidem, quoniam differentiæ ex ipſamet natura prodeuntes maximè ſenſibiles ſunt, & unicuique manifeſtæ: neque fallunt, ut adventitiæ conditiones, quæ non ſunt perpetuæ. Ad memoriam autem pollet, quoniam in compendio ſub generibus ordinatis clauditur penè immenſus plantarum numerus, adeo ut, & quæ antea nunquam viſæ ſunt, unicuique liceat in ſuam claſſem redigere, &, ſi innominata ſit, nomine ſui generis appellare. Tandem & facultates, quas Medici maximè quæruntur, tamquam proprietates innoteſcunt ex naturarum cognitione: quæ enim generis ſocietate junguntur, plerumque & ſimiles poſſident facultates.* Let us ſee now what ſort of method this learned Author propoſed. His principal diviſion is into trees and herbs: the ſhrubs being joined with the trees; and the under ſhrubs with the herbs. The ſecond book contains thoſe trees which have the heart in the upper part of the ſeed; and the third thoſe which have it at the bottom, that is, where the ſeed is joined either to the foot ſtalk, or to the ſeed-veſſel. Having explained the trees and ſhrubs, he proceeds to the under-ſhrubs and herbs, and in the fourth Book, treats of thoſe which have only one ſeed to each flower, and this ſeed is either naked or covered either with a pulp, or a membranaceous ſubſtance, which eaſily comes off; and theſe are ſubdivided according to the poſition of the heart of the ſeed. Then he ſpeaks of thoſe which have ſeveral ſeeds to each flower; and theſe ſeeds are contained in one ſingle veſſel, which is either pulpy or of a drier ſubſtance. The fifth book contains thoſe which have a pulpy veſſel, and theſe are ſubdivided according to the poſition of the flower, which in ſome grows at the top, in others at the bottom of the veſſel. In the ſixth Book he treats of thoſe which have dry veſſels, and firſt of thoſe whoſe ſeeds are diſpoſed in oblong, cartilaginous veſſels, called pods, and hang only to one ſide of the pod, being connected by that part where the heart is, theſe are called Pulſe: ſecondly of thoſe, whoſe ſeeds are placed in the middle of the veſſel. The ſeventh Book contains thoſe which have two ſeeds to each flower. The flowers of theſe ſit on the top of the ſeeds, and their heart is in the upper part. In the eighth Book he places thoſe which have two veſſels to each flower; and thoſe which have three veſſels in the ninth. The tenth Book contains thoſe which he calls Bulbaceous. Theſe have leaves proceeding only from the root, without any foot-ſtalk, and naked, ſimple ſtalks. To theſe he adds the Aſphodels, Lilies, Flags, Satyrions &c. In the eleventh Book he ſpeaks of thoſe which have four ſeeds to each flower, without any common covering, except that which before covered the flower; and theſe are ſubdivided according to the poſition of the heart: which is placed in the upper part in Bugloſs, Borage, &c. and in the lower part, in Sage, Clary, Betony &c. Then follow thoſe which have ſeveral ſeeds of an uncertain number adhering to one bottom, and not covered with any veſſel, except that which covers the flower. The twelfth Book contains the *Anthemides*, under which name he comprehends the Wormwood, Tanſy, Colts-foot, Chamomile, Elecampane, &c. In the thirteenth Book he places the Cichoraceous Tribe, ſuch as Succory, Endive, Lettuce &c. to which he adds the Thiſtle kind. Thoſe of the twelfth and thirteenth book have the flower on the top of the ſeed; but in the fourteenth are contained thoſe which have their flowers at the bottom of the ſeeds. In the fifteenth book he treats of thoſe which have ſeveral ſeeds incloſed in veſſels; and in the ſixteenth and laſt of thoſe which are ſuppoſed to have no ſeeds at all. Such was the method laid down by this great man, which he had not only conceived, but actually made uſe of in diſpoſing plants. And yet, which is very ſurprizing, it was not followed, or even underſtood for near a hundred years. The Reſtorer of Method was Robert Moriſon, the firſt Profeſſor of Botany at Oxford. But this title would not ſatisfy Moriſon; he would be accounted nothing leſs than the inventor of it. *Methodum*, ſays he (8), *me obſervaſſe fateor. Eſtque omnium, quæ unquam adhuc fuerunt exhibitæ præſtantiſſima & certiſſima: eſt quippe a natura data, a me ſolummodo (citra jactantiam) primum obſervata.* And again, *Nunquam ego legi de tali methodo apud Authores: ergo non eſſet nova; etiamſi fuit ab incunabilis mundi; ſed nemini adhuc detecta ante me* (9). And in the Preface to his *Umbelliferæ*, he ſays, *Hic eſt ordo a natura ipſa ſtirpibus ab initio datus, à me*

(1) Cæſalp. *de Plantis*, lib. 1. cap. 5.

(2) Idem, ibid. cap. 6.

(3) *Botanick Eſſays*, pag. 332.

(4) His book, according to Dr. Blair, was printed in 1625.

(5) Geſn. *Epiſt. ad Occonem*, pag. 64. edit. Wolph.

(6) Idem, ibid. pag. 65.

(7) Cæſalp. *Præfat. ad Lib. de Plantis.*

(8) Moriſ. *Prælud. Bot.* pag. 464.

(9) Ibid. pag. 485.

(c) Micheli, *in Syllabo Auctorum Novis Plantarum Generibus, præfixo.*

degree of perfection, than any who had gone before him. We are informed by Signior Micheli (c), that the *Hortus Siccus* of Cæſalpinus is ſtill in being, and that it conſiſts of 266 large pages, on which are paſted 768 dried ſpecimens.

a me primo jam obſervatus. Nay at the beginning of the Preface to his *Plantarum Hiſtoria Univerſalis Oxonienſis*, he places Cæſalpinus amongſt the *Authores de Re Botanica confuſe & ſine ordine ac methodo ſcribentes.* But it is very plain that Cæſalpinus invented the claſſing of Plants, and that Moriſon borrowed moſt of his claſſes, or (as he calls them) ſections from that Author, and that whereſoever he has varied from the rules laid down by Cæſalpinus it has been for the worſe. We are indeed obliged to Moriſon for having firſt diſtinguiſhed the ſubaltern *Genera*, or families, by characteriſtic notes. See the article MORISON [ROBERT].

CÆSAR (CAIUS JULIUS) firſt Emperor of Rome, was endowed with all the eminent qualities, which are requiſite in a great Conqueror, and it would be wrong to think his ſucceſs was owing to fortune rather than to his conduct. He did not gain battles only to give employment to the couriers, who were to carry the news of his victories, but he made the beſt advantage of them that was poſſible, and this diſtinguiſhes him from a great many warlike Princes, who knew how to vanquiſh, but not how to improve their victory [*A*]. I don't doubt but he met with ſome circumſtances at Rome, which favoured

[*A*] *His conduct . . . . diſtinguiſhes him from thoſe Princes, who know how to vanquiſh, but not how to improve their victory.*] Theſe Princes may comfort themſelves, by conſidering, that one of the greateſt Warriors in the world (1) laboured under the ſame defect. Another conſideration, which may afford them ſome conſolation, is, that there are a great many Warriors ſubject to the ſame fault; for few victories are, as to their conſequences, like that which Guſtavus gained near Leipſic. We meet with ſuch victories now and then ſcatter'd here and there thro' the hiſtories of all ages and nations. We muſt except the wars waged by the firſt ſucceſſors of Mohammed, as thoſe of a Tamerlan, a Cingis-Can, and ſuch other Founders of great Empires, who appear three or four times within the ſpace of a thouſand years or thereabouts. Theſe being excepted, no battles can, by the advantages they procure, decide the diſputes of News-Writers. Each party claims the whole victory, or at leaſt pretends to enjoy the fruits of it. When one party cannot diſown that they loſt the field, yet they maintain that they had but few people killed, and that the dead and wounded on the enemy's ſide are numberleſs. The party, who routed the enemy are not ſatisfied with what is thus left to their ſhare; the vanquiſhed yield to them indeed the ſinging of the *Te Deum*, the pomp of triumphs, and the glory of bonfires; but they pretend that after all, this is nothing but ſmoke and an empty noiſe, without any real advantage; that they have more cauſe to ſing the *De profundis*, than the *Te Deum*; and that if they gain another victory at the ſame rate, they are loſt without retrieve. I ſay it again, they who remained maſters of the field of battle are not in the leaſt ſatisfied with this ſhare allotted to them by the vanquiſhed; they pretend that the whole advantage is every way on their ſide. The true means to determine theſe diſputes between the News-Writers would be, to act as conquerors after the battle. If they who renounce the name, but claim the reality of the victory, went immediately with fire and ſword into the enemy's country, the queſtion would be decided in their favour; but it would be determined to their ſhame, if the party, who claim both the name and reality of the victory, fell like a torrent upon their country, and made themſelves maſters of ſeveral ſtrong holds. In a word, we muſt apply to this, what an Apoſtle (2) ſays upon another ſubject, *Faith without works is dead.* You believe, that you have gained the victory; but what does that faith profit without works? Shew your faith by your works. It muſt be obſerved that neither party can ſay to the other, *Thou haſt faith, and I have works, ſhew me then thy faith without thy works, and I will ſhew thee my faith by my works.* It would be making a very wretched apology for thoſe Generals, who gaining the honour of the day, and the field of battle, taking the enemies Artillery, and making a great many priſoners, yet do not improve theſe advantages; to ſay, that they act with a wonderful generoſity; that they are ſatisfied with the *honeſtum*, without caring for the *utile*; that they do not make war like Merchants, in order to grow rich, but like Heroes, to gain a reputation, *præter laudem nullius avari* (3); this I ſay, would be a wretched apology; for in theſe matters, the *utile* is not different from the *honeſtum*, nothing is honourable but what is uſeful; nor can any thing better advance the glory of a great Warrior, than the diligence, ſpeed, and ſkill, with which he knows how to make an advantage of the enemy's overthrow, and to perform ſome great action, whilſt the enemy is ſtill frighten'd and amazed at his defeat. At Rome, where they had a perfect knowledge of the qualities belonging to a Warrior, they made a great difference between thoſe who only gained victories, and thoſe who put an end to a war (4). They who enter'd the city in triumph with the effigies of ſeveral Provinces, or of ſeveral cities they had conquered, were much more honoured than they, who could only boaſt that they had killed a great many men. The policy of the Romans, tho' defective in ſome particulars, was yet very wiſe; they did not, generally ſpeaking, continue their Generals for two or three years in their poſt; but almoſt every year the new Conſul went to relieve the Conſul of the foregoing year; ſo that the General did all that lay in his power to put an end to the war, leſt his ſucceſſor ſhould have the honour of finiſhing the taſk (5); they all aimed at the glory of the *debellare*. But when a General is certain that he ſhall command the armies to the end of the war, he is not always diſpoſed to haſten the concluſion of it; he puts off the peace as long as he can, and regulates his conduct according to this maxim, viz. *that one muſt make a golden bridge for a vanquiſh'd enemy*. This is no proof of ſuch a General's generoſity, or that he does not care for the *utile*; on the contrary, it is his private intereſt that obliges him to give the vanquiſhed enemy an opportunity of retrieving their affairs, and continuing the war a great while longer (6). A King, who commands his own armies in perſon, and does not make the beſt advantage of his victories, has not the ſame reaſon; and it may be ſuppoſed, that he commonly does what lays in his power. But a Cæſar, an Alexander, a Prince, in a word, who knows how to improve his victories, is a very ſcarce thing; and ſuch Generals, who gain victories, the whole profit of which is for the dealers in crapes and black-cloth, are found in every country.

The great Captain, whom I mentioned at the beginning of this remark, is Hannibal. Here follows what Adherbal told him. *Dubium deinde non erat, quin ultimum illum diem habitura fuerit Roma; quintumque intra diem epulari Annibal in Capitolio potuerit, ſi (quod Pœnum illum dixiſſe Adherbalem Bomilcaris ferunt) Annibal, quemadmodum ſciret vincere, ſic uti victoria ſciſſet* (7). i. e. "This would, no doubt, have been the "laſt day of Rome, and Annibal would have ſupped "in the Capitol within five days, had he known "how to improve his victory, as he knew how to van-"quiſh, as is reported, that Adherbal, the Carthagi-"nian and ſon of Bomilcar, told him." In Livy it is Maherbal, who ſeeing that Hannibal would not go directly to Rome, as he was adviſed to do, and tho' they aſſured him, that within five days he would ſup in the Capitol, told him, *non omnia nimirum eidem Dei dederunt, vincere ſcis, Annibal, victoriâ uti neſcis* (8). i. e. "The Gods have not favoured the ſame "men with all kinds of eminent qualities; thou know-"eſt how to vanquiſh, Hannibal, but not how to make "the beſt of thy victory." Antigonus obſerved the ſame fault in Pyrrhus (9).

(1) Hannibal; ſee the end of this remark.

(2) St. James ii. 20.

(3) Horat. *De Art. Poet.* ver. 324.

(4) That is, between *vincere*, and *debellare*.

(5) *Finis habet laudem, meta coronat opus.*

(6) This is generally the reaſon why battles are uſeleſs. The General of the victorious army being afraid of a peace, will not put the enemy under a neceſſity of ſuing for it.

(7) Florus, lib. 2. cap. 6.

(8) Livius, lib. 23. cap. 51.

(9) Plutarch. *in Pyrrho*, pag. 400. A. I quote his own words below, quotation (14).

ed his ambitious views; yet ſuch were his natural qualities, that he could procure to himſelf the neceſſary opportunities to accompliſh his deſigns [B], I mean, that he was capable of making an advantage even of ſuch circumſtances, which did not naturally favour his undertakings, or would have made thoſe of any other miſcarry. That activity, that vigilance, and that kind of eagerneſs which does not permit a man to grow remiſs, as long as there remains the leaſt thing to be done, were natural to him, and very proper to raiſe him to that pitch of glory at which he arrived [C]. The battle of Pharſalia, which was a deciſive ſtroke, and if I may ſay ſo, a decree from heaven pronounced upon the

[B] *He could procure to himſelf the neceſſary opportunities to accompliſh his deſigns.*] It would be a great error to think, that Alexander owed his conqueſts only to the circumſtances of time and place, in which he happened to be, and that a great many other men would not have done leſs than he did, had they been in the like circumſtances (10). Here follows what Pâquier thought upon this ſubject. "I believe, *ſays he* (11), that Pope "Nicholas I deſerved the title of *very-great*, not be- "cauſe he had more wit than the Popes Leo I and "Gregory I (12), but becauſe his qualities both na- "tural and acquired were as eminent as theirs, and he "could ſucceed as well as they in what he attempted. "And beſides, he found himſelf in ſuch opportunities "as favoured the execution of his deſigns, and it is "that, which makes us appear great in the eyes of "men. For we ought not to think, that Pyrrhus or "Hannibal had leſs bravery or conduct than Alexan- "der of Macedonia, or Julius Cæſar. But when the "two firſt attacked the Commonwealth of Rome, it "was not yet in a proper condition to be ſhaken by "the blow, for a great many reaſons, as it was in "Cæſar's time, and as the Kingdom of Aſia was, "when Alexander conquered it; nor do I doubt in "the leaſt, but if Leo and Gregory had lived in the "time of Pope Nicholas, when the affairs of the "Church were in a wretched condition, they had "done what he did; and he in their time had done "what they did, and nothing more." If Pâquier had treated only of the general theſis, what he ſays would have been as certain, as any mechanical aphoriſm. Suppoſe on the one hand two men endowed with the ſame qualities, and on the other the ſame circumſtances concurring, it is evident, that what will be the reſult on one ſide, will be the like on the other. When I ſay, the ſame qualities, and the ſame circumſtances, I do not mean, things, which are the ſame in number, but things, which all compenſations being allowed, are equivalent. This being ſuppoſed, it is as neceſſary for Pyrrhus to ſubdue Rome in the ſame manner Cæſar did, as it is, that two weights be in equilibrium, when the one being three times leſs than the other, is alſo three times more diſtant from the point which ſupports the ſcale, or leaver. The general theſis therefore is certainly true, but the hypotheſis or application of it to the caſe of Pyrrhus and Cæſar, and of Pope Leo and Pope Nicholas is doubtful; becauſe we do not exactly know the proportions there were between their natural qualities, and between the opportunities they had. The hints we meet with in Hiſtory will rather confute than confirm Pâquier's aſſertion. The compliment paid to Hannibal is well known, namely, that the Gods granted him the gift of gaining victories, but refuſed him that of making the beſt advantage of them (13). It is known alſo, that when this was ſaid to him, he had juſt neglected to improve the moſt favourable opportunity he could have of taking Rome. It is known, that Pyrrhus, in the opinion of a great Warrior, was like thoſe gameſters, who by chance have a fine game, but do not know how to play it (14). Here then we have two great Captains, who were both inferior to Alexander and Cæſar; theſe laſt knew perfectly well how to make the beſt advantage of the opportunities they met with; the event witneſſes for them; and we have in favour of the others nothing but bare conjectures, which even are greatly weakened by the faults they committed. We are not therefore to think, that Pâquier reaſoned well.

I believe that there are men unknown, who if they were in the place of a Prime-Miniſter, would perform greater actions than he does; and that a Prime-Miniſter, who does not ſucceed in one age, would have done wonders in another (15); and yet I am perſuaded, that if Pyrrhus or Hannibal had ventured to ſay, that Alexander would not have done in Italy, what he did in Aſia, the beſt anſwer that would have been made to them, is, that they would not have done in Aſia what he did there. A certain inhabitant of Seriphus told Themiſtocles once, *You are become famous not by your ſelf, but by the glory of your Country. It is true*, anſwered Themiſtocles, *I had not become famous, had I been born at Seriphus, but you would not have become famous, tho' you had been born at Athens* (16). Such an anſwer may be made to thoſe, who find no other difference between Cæſar or Alexander, and any Prince they may meet with in hiſtory, but that ſuch a Prince had not an opportunity of conquering a great Empire, as Cæſar or Alexander had. Theſe perſons muſt be told, *Without ſuch an opportunity neither Cæſar nor Alexander had conquered an Empire; but the Prince you name would not have conquered one, even with ſuch an opportunity.* See in the following remark ſome other of Cæſar's warlike qualities.

[C] *Activity, vigilance and a kind of eagerneſs . . . were natural in him . . . and very proper to raiſe him to that pitch of glory to which he arrived.*] Theſe great qualities occaſioned that great encomium, which we meet with in one of Tully's Orations. That encomium indeed is ſomewhat hyperbolical, but yet is not entirely ill-grounded. Here follows what that celebrated Orator ſaid to that great warrior. *Soleo ſæpe ante oculos ponere, idque libenter crebris uſurpare ſermonibus, omnes noſtrorum imperatorum, omnes exterarum gentium, potentiſſimorumque populorum, omnes clariſſimorum Regum res geſtas, cum tuis nec contentionum magnitudine, nec numero prœliorum, nec varietate regionum, nec celeritate conficiendi, nec diſſimilitudine bellorum poſſe conferri; nec vero diſjunctiſſimas terras citius cujuſquam paſſibus potuiſſe peragrari, quam tuis non dicam curſibus, ſed victoriis illuſtratæ ſunt* (17. i. e. "I often conſi- "der by myſelf, and even mention it with pleaſure "in my diſcourſes, that none of the actions of our "Generals, nor thoſe of foreign countries, nor of "the moſt powerful nations, nor thoſe of the moſt "famous Kings, can be compared to yours, either "conſidering the great wars in which you were en- "gaged, the number of battles you fought, the dif- "ferent countries in which you made war, the diſ- "patch with which you put an end to them, or the "different kinds of the wars themſelves. Nor could "any one travel over diſtant countries faſter than "you have, I do not ſay, run over them, but ren- "dered them famous by your victories." Never did any warrior underſtand better than Cæſar, how neceſſary it is for a General to be quick (18). How often did he owe his victories to his ſpeedy marches? He did not give the enemy time to come to themſelves, nor to take any meaſures againſt him; he run like lightning, prevented fame itſelf, and fell upon the enemy like thunder, before they knew his army had marched. *Acie triplici inſtructa, & celeriter octo millium itinere confecto prius ad hoſtium caſtra pervenit, quam quid ageretur Germani ſentire poſſent. Qui omnibus rebus ſubito perterriti, & celeritate adventus noſtri, & diſceſſu ſuorum, neque conſilii habendi, neque arma capiendi, ſpatio dato, perturbantur, copiaſne adverſus hoſtem ducere, an caſtra defendere, an fugâ ſalutem petere præſtaret* (19). i. e. "Having divided his army "into three bodies, and march'd eight miles in a very "ſhort time, he arrived at the enemy's camp, before "the Germans could know what paſſed; who being "terrified by all this, by our ſudden arrival, and by "the retreat of ſome of their party, and having no "time either to ſummon the Council, or to take up "arms, they did not know, whether they had better "march out againſt the enemy, or defend themſelves "in

(10) See the remark [B] in the article of MACEDONIA.

(11) Pâquier, *Recherches de la France*, lib. 3. chap. 11. pag. 198.

(12) Theſe two Popes had the ſirname of *Great*.

(13) See above, quotation (7).

(14) Ὅθεν ἀπίκαζε αὐτὸν ὁ Ἀντίγονος κυβευτῇ, πολλὰ βάλλοντι καὶ καλὰ, χρῆσθαι δὲ οὐκ ἐπισταμένῳ τοῖς πίσυσι. i. e. "Hence Antigonus compares him to a gameſter, who throws very good dice, but does not know how to make a good uſe of the throw." Plutarch. *in Pyrrho*, pag. 400.

(15) *Quantum intereſt in quæ tempora, cujuſque virtus inciderit.* i. e. "It is of great conſequence at what time a man's qualities do appear," this is what Metellus ſaid of Scipio Africanus.

(16) Plutarch. *in Themiſt.* pag. 121.

(17) Cicero *Oratione pro Marcello.*

(18) *Ut celeritate reliquas res conficeret, quæ plerasque erat conſecutus.* Cæſ. *de Bell. Gall.* lib. 7. cap. 15. *Unum communi ſalutis auxilium in celeritate ponebat; venit magnis itineribus in Nerviorum fines.* Idem, ibid. lib. 4.

(19) Idem, ibid.

the civil wars of Rome, did not fill him with joy to ſuch a degree, as to make him forget that Pompey, the head of the oppoſite party, was ſtill alive, and that there would not be ſo ſoon an end of the war, if he gave his enemy time to gather his diſperſed forces together again: his firſt care therefore was to purſue his flying enemy, which was the cauſe of Pompey's tragical death; for in all probability they would not have killed him, if they had not been certain that Cæſar purſued him. When we take a general view of the many

" in their camp, or fly to ſave their lives." Nothing could ſtop Cæſar's march; the mountains covered with ſnow deceived thoſe, who thought they would be a ſafe bulwark againſt his approaches. *Etſi Mons Gebenna* (α) *Arvernos ab Helviis diſcludit, duriſſimo tempore anni altiſſima nive iter impediebat; tamen diſcuſſa nive ſex in altitudinem pedum, atque ita viis patefactis ſummo militum labore ad fines Arvernorum pervenit; quibus oppreſſis inopinantibus, quod ſe ſic Gebenna ut muro munitos exiſtimabant, ac ne ſingulari quidem unquam homini eo tempore anni ſemitæ patuerant &c.* (20). i. e. " Tho' Mount Gebenna, which ſeparates the Arverni " (β) from the Helvii (γ), and was covered with ſnow " very deep, it being in the midſt of winter, ſtopt his " journey, yet he had the ſnow ſwept on both ſides, " tho' it was ſix foot high, and having thus made a " way with the utmoſt difficulty, he arrived upon the " borders of the Arverni, and falling unawares upon " them, he routed them entirely; for they thought " themſelves ſecure behind Mount Gebenna, over which " even a ſingle man could not paſs in that ſeaſon." Being thus arrived upon the borders of Auvergne, he continued there but two days, and went with the ſame ſpeed to another place, in order to prevent the deſigns of Vercingetorix from taking effect. *His conſtitutis rebus, omnibus ſuis inopinantibus, quam maximis poteſt itineribus Viennam pervenit, ibi nactus recentem Equitatum, quem multis ante diebus ei præmiſerat, neque diurno, neque nocturno itinere intermiſſo, per fines Heduorum, in Lingones contendit, ubi duæ Legiones hyemabant, ut ſi quid etiam de ſua ſalute ab Heduis iniretur conſilii, celeritate præcurreret. Eò cum perveniſſet, ad reliquas Legiones mittit, priuſque in unum locum omnes cogit, quam de ejus adventu Arvernis nunciari poſſet* (21). i. e. " Having given " theſe orders, he greatly ſurprized his army, by going with the utmoſt ſpeed to Vienne (δ), where " meeting a freſh body of horſe, which ſeveral days " before he had ſent there, he continued his march " thro' the borders of the country of *Hedui* (ι), reſting " neither day nor night, and came into the country " of the Lingones (ζ), where two legions were left in " winter quarters, that in caſe the Hedui had any " deſign againſt his life, he might prevent them by his " ſpeedy marches. Being arrived there, he ſent for " the other legions, and had them all aſſembled in " one place, before the Arverni could hear of his arrival." Plutarch relates a very ſurprizing circumſtance of Vercingetorix's defeat; the city of Alexia being beſieged by Cæſar, the inhabitants expected with the utmoſt impatience that Vercingetorix at the head of three hundred thouſand men would come to raiſe the ſiege; they did not know that Cæſar was in full march to engage that great army; nor did he hear any thing of it, but when from their walls they perceived him returning to the ſiege in triumph; and it was their loud cries and heavy complaints which firſt acquainted the ſoldiers, who were left to guard the intrenchments, with Cæſar's victory (22). This laſt circumſtance is ſtill more ſurprizing as Plutarch obſerves. He is alſo in the right, when he ſays, that Vercingetorix's (ν) great Army vaniſhed away like a dream and a ſhadow (23). This expreſſes extremely well the diſpatch, with which Cæſar performed the greateſt undertakings: he marched if there was occaſion, a hundred miles a day; he ſwam over rivers, or croſſed them upon leather budgets, and thus arrived before the enemy was acquainted with his march. *Longiſſimas vias incredibili celeritate confecit expeditus, meritoriâ Rhedâ centena paſſuum millia in ſingulos dies: ſi flumina morarentur, nando trajiciens, vel innixus inflatis utribus, ut perſæpè nuncios de ſe præ-venire* (24). If I have compared him to the lightning, it is after the example of Florus: *Hunc* (Pharnacem) *Cæſar aggreſſus*, ſays he (25), *uno, & ut ſic dixerim, non toto prælio obtrivit*, MORE FULMINIS, *quod uno eodemque momento venit, percuſſit, abſceſſit. Nec vana de ſe prædicatio eſt Cæſaris, ante victum hoſtem eſſe quam viſum.* i. e. " Cæſar having attacked him " (Pharnaces) ſlew him in one, and if I may ſay ſo, " even not compleat battle; and LIKE LIGHTNING, " in one and the ſame moment he came, routed, and " retired. So that what Cæſar ſaid of himſelf was " not ill grounded, viz. that the enemy was vanquiſhed " before he was ſeen." Suetonius ſpeaks thus of the quickneſs with which Pharnaces was defeated. *Pontico triumpho inter pompæ fercula trium verborum prætulit titulum*, VENI, VIDI, VICI, *non acta belli ſignificantem ſicut cæteri, ſed celeriter confecti notam* (26). i. e. " In his triumph over Pontus, there were carried a- " mongſt the triumphal ornaments a bill in which " theſe words were written, I CAME, I SAW, I VAN- " QUISHED; which did not expreſs the actions per- " formed in that war (the Pontic) but that it was fi- " niſhed with the utmoſt expedition." According to Plutarch, Cæſar wrote theſe three words, *veni, vidi, vici*, to a friend, to let him know in how ſhort a time that war was finiſhed (27). Cicero, even when he ſpoke of Cæſar like an enemy, yet conſidered him as a man of prodigious diſpatch and vigilance, *ſed hoc τέρας horribili vigilantia, celeritate, & diligentia eſt* (28). Let me beg leave to tranſcribe in this place the fine encomium he paſſed upon him in his Oration againſt Piſo. He ſays that Cæſar's great actions will for the future render uſeleſs and ſuperfluous thoſe bulwarks, with which nature had ſurrounded Italy. I wiſh he had rather ſaid this of Cæſar's courage and diſpatch: *Dicam ex animo, Patres conſcripti, quod ſentio, & quod vobis audientibus ſæpè jam dixi, ſi mihi nunquam amicus C. Cæſar fuiſſet, ſemper iratus, ſi aſpernaretur amicitiam meam, ſeſeque mihi implacabilem inexpiabilemque præberet, tamen ei, cum tantas res geſſiſſet, gereretque quotidie, non amicus eſſe non poſſem: cujus ego imperio non Alpium vallum contra adſcenſum, tranſgreſſionemque Gallorum, non Rheni foſſam gurgitibus illis redundantem, Germanorum immaniſſimis gentibus objicio & oppono; perfecit ille, ut, ſi montes reſediſſent, amnes exaruiſſent, non naturæ præſidio, ſed victoria ſua, rebuſque geſtis Italiam munitam haberemus* (29). i. e. " I ſhall ſay freely what I think, Conſcript Fathers, " and what I have often ſaid before you; tho' Cæſar " had never been my friend, tho' he had always been " exaſperated againſt me, tho' he had deſpiſed my " friendſhip, and ſhewed himſelf my implacable ene- " my, yet could I not forbear being his friend, for " the great actions he has done, and ſtill does every " day. Under his government I think we have no " occaſion for the Alps as a bulwark againſt the inva- " ſion of the Gauls; nor for the Rhine with all its " falls to prevent the incurſions of the fierce Ger- " mans. Though the mountains ſhould ſink to a le- " vel, and the rivers ſhould be dried up, Cæſar's vic- " tories and great actions are alone ſufficient to guard " Italy."

That great activity of Cæſar was not a fire which ſoon exhauſted his ſtrength; it was attended with a conſtant application. He reckoned for nothing what he had done, as long as there remained any thing to be done; he would not leave unfiniſhed the wars which he undertook, thinking it would be giving fortune an opportunity of deſtroying what he ſhould thus leave incomplete. This is nobly expreſſed in the following lines.

At nunquam patiens pacis, longæque quietis
Armorum, nequid fatis mutare liceret,
Aſſequitur, generique premit veſtigia Cæſar.
Sufficerent aliis primo tot mœnia curſu
Rapta, tot oppreſſæ dejectis hoſtibus Arces,
Ipſa caput mundi, bellorum maxima merces,
Roma capi facilis; ſed Cæſar in omnia præceps,
Nil actum credens, dum quid ſupereſſet agendum (30).

That is,

" But Cæſar never patient long in peace,
" Nor truſting in his fortune's preſent face,

" Cloſely

(α) In Grævius's edition of Cæſar's *Commentaries* it is written *Cebenna*. They are the Mountains of the *Sevennes*. CRIT. REM.

(20) Idem, ibid. lib. 7. cap. 8.

(β) The Averni lived in that part of France now called *Auvergne*. CRIT. REM.

(γ) The *Helvii* inhabited the country, were the Albigenſes afterwards lived; it is in the *Upper-Languedoc*. CRIT. REM.

(21) Idem, cap. 9.

(δ) In Dauphiné.

(ι) Their capital city was *Anguſtodanum*, now called *Autun*, in the Dutchy of Burgundy.

(ζ) Their capital city was *Andomatrinum*, now *Langres* in Champaign.

(22) Plutarch, *in Cæſar.* pag. 721.

(ν) Plutarch writes *Veſcingentorix*, but in Cæſar it is *Vercingetorix*.

(23) Ὄυτως ἐξέπεσε ἡ τοσαύτη δύναμις ὥσπερ ἔνδωλον, ἢ ὄνειρον ἠφάνισε καὶ διεσκέδασε.

(24) Suetonius *in Cæſar*, cap. 57.

(25) Florus, lib. 4. cap. 2. n. 63.

(26) Sueton. *in Cæſare*, cap. 37.

(27) Plutarch. *in Cæſare*, pag. 73, E.

(28) *Cic. Epiſt. ad Attic.* lib. 9. 8.

(29) Cicero, *in Piſon.* fol. 225, C.

(30) Lucan. *Pharſ.* lib. 2. ver. 650.

many wars which he gloriously finished, it is impossible not to admire him; but when we reflect upon the prodigious number of men, whose poverty, slavery, or death he occasioned, it is difficult not to abhor him [*D*]. The greatest crime there is in all this, is, that to be revenged of his private enemies, which nothing but his too ambitious conduct raised him, he oppressed his own country with those very arms, with which his superiors had intrusted him in order to subdue the enemies of his country. We cannot but regret, that a man, who was endowed with so many excellent qualities, should have been guilty of such an enormous attempt. He was not less qualified for intrigues than for the field [*E*], nor

" Closely pursues his flying son behind,
" While yet his fate continued to be kind.
" Such towns, such fortresses, such hostile force,
" Swept in the torrent of one rapid course;
" Such trains of long success attending still,
" And Rome herself abandon'd to his will;
" Rome the contending party's noble prize,
" To every wish, but Cæsar's, might suffice.
" But he with Empire fired and vast desires,
" To all, and nothing less than all, aspires;
" To all, and nothing less than all, aspires;
" He reckons not the past, while ought remain'd
" Great to be done, or mighty to be gain'd.
ROWE.

He thought that the enemy was to be closely pressed in those happy moments, when fortune smiled upon him.

(31) Idem, lib. 7. ver. 34.

Dum fortuna calet, dum conficit omnia terror (31).
That is,
" —While his glowing fortune yet was warm,
" And scatt'ring terror spread the wild alarm.
ROWE.

Hence it happened, that he never gained a battle, but he made himself master of the enemy's camp; *Nullum unquam hostem fudit, quin castris quoque exueret; ita nullum spatium perterritis dabat* (32), never giving the enemy time to recover from their fright. He did not imitate Pompey, who to spare the blood of his soldiers, lost the opportunity of finishing the war (33). Nothing could stop him. An enemy half subdued did not less raise his courage, than one who still could fight with all his forces. The reader will see his character in the following verses.

(32) Suetonius, *in Cæsare*, cap. 40.

(33) *Dolet tuus, semperque dolebit; Quod scelerum Cæsar prodest tibi summa tuorum, Cum genero pugnasse pio.* Lucan. lib. 6. ver. 303.

. . . . *Sed non in Cæsare tantum*
Nomen erat, nec fama ducis; sed nescia virtus
Stare loco, solusque pudor non vincere bello.
Acer & indomitus; quò spes, quoque ira vocasset,
Ferre manum, & nunquam temerando parcere ferro.
Successus urgere suos: instare favori
Numinis: impellens quicquid sibi summa petenti
Obstaret: gaudensque viam fecisse ruina (34).
That is,
" But Cæsar's greatness, and his strength, was more
" Than past renown, and antiquated pow'r;
" 'Twas not the fame of what he once had been,
" Or tales in old Records and Annals seen.
" But 'twas a valour, restless, unconfin'd,
" Which no success could sate, nor limits bind;
" 'Twas shame, a soldier's shame, untaught to yield,
" That blush'd for nothing but an ill-fought field.
" Fierce in his hopes he was, nor knew to stay,
" Where vengeance or ambition led the way;
" Still prodigal of war whene'er withstood,
" Nor spar'd to stain the guilty sword with blood;
" Urging advantage he improv'd all odds,
" And made the most of fortune and the Gods;
" Pleas'd to o'erturn whate'er withheld his prize,
" And saw the ruin with rejoicing eyes. ROWE.

(34) Idem, lib. 1. ver. 143.

[*D*] *When we reflect upon the prodigious number of men, whose . . . death he occasioned, it is difficult not to abhor him.*] He fought in Gaul against three millions of men, of whom one million only escaped: for he killed a million of them, and took a million of prisoners, according to Plutarch's account (35). We meet with the same account in Appian, with regard to the number of the slain and of the prisoners, but not with regard to the number of the enemies; for they were four millions, according to him (36); he adds, that Cæsar took above eight hundred towns in Gaul. Plutarch says the same. But Cæsar, in the Oration, which Julian the Apostate makes him deliver (37), mentions but three hundred towns taken, and two millions of men vanquished. Velleius Paterculus, who designed to extol rather than to lessen this Conqueror's glory, reckons however but four hundred thousand men killed (38). It is true that in the foregoing chapter he had said, that the slain and the prisoners were innumerable. *Cum deinde immanes res vix multis voluminibus explicandas C. Cæsar in Gallia ageret, nec contentus plurimis ac felicissimis victoriis, innumerabilibusque cæsis & captis hostium millibus* (39). That is,
" Whilst Cæsar performed in Gaul such wonderful
" Actions, that they could hardly be recorded in a
" great many volumes, he being not satisfied with the
" many and happy victories he had gained, nor with
" the innumerable thousands of men slain or taken
" prisoners." Pliny goes beyond any another writer; for he makes the number of the slain to be one million one hundred ninety two thousand; but then he takes into the account all Cæsar's wars, except the civil war. Let us transcribe his own words, we find in them, that Cæsar fought fifty battles. *Signis collatis quinquagesies dimicavit; solus M. Marcellum transgressus, qui undequadragesies dimicaverat. Nam præter civiles victorias undecies centena & XCII M. hominum occisa præliis ab eo non equidem in gloria posuerim, tantam etiam coactam humani generis injuriam, quod ita esse confessus est ipse, bellorum civilium stragem non prodendo* (40). Salmasius pretends that these words are unintelligible, and that they must be thus corrected, *tanta etiam coacta, in humani generis injuria* (41); Pliny's meaning according to him is this; *I am so far from thinking it is glorious for Cæsar, to have slain such a vast number of men, that I rather believe, it would have been a great prejudice to mankind, if such a number of persons had been gathered together from several parts of the world.* F. Hardouin did not think proper to mention this piece of criticism; he only observed that there is no difficulty in the passage before us. " Pliny, *says he*, means, that " he did not think, that a slaughter so prejudicial to " mankind added any thing to the glory of Cæsar, " tho' it might seem perhaps, that the injuries Cæsar " received, obliged him to destroy such a multitude " of men (42)." It is plain that the Jesuit's explication is infinitely better than that of Salmasius. Yet I cannnot believe, that Pliny intended to hint the excuse, which Father Hardouin mentions in behalf of Cæsar. For Cæsar could not make use of that excuse but with regard to his war with Pompey, and to the other wars, which were the consequence of this. But Pliny says expressly, that the million and hundred ninety two thousand men, which Cæsar killed in his battles, were different from those he slew in the civil wars: it is not probable therefore, that Pliny hinted at what F. Hardouin supposes. I should rather think, that Pliny's sense is this. *The slaughter of one million one hundred ninety two thousand men is so considerable a loss for mankind, that I could not think it glorious, even tho' it were done out of necessity, as it is in defensive wars. And since Cæsar suppressed the slaughter occasioned by the civil wars, he must have acknowledged the truth of my proposition.* This thought is very much to the honour of Pliny, and I could name several great Warriors who upon their death-bed dreaded the judgment of God, when they considered how much blood had been spilt in the religious wars, which they thought very just, and of which they had the direction (43). The necessity under which Princes are of doing certain actions must make us think them unhappy rather than loaded with honour.

(35) Plutarch. *in Cæsare*, pag. 714, 715.
(36) Appian. *in Celticis.*

(37) Julian. *in Cæsarib.* See Spanheim's edit. 4to, pag. 172.

(38) *Per hæc, insequentiaque & quæ prædiximus tempora, amplius quadringenta millia hostium a C. Cæsare cæsa sunt, plura capta.* Velleius Paterc. lib. 2. cap. 47. Lipsius reads *octingenta* instead of *quadringenta*, and P. Hardouin *in Plin.* lib. 7. cap. 25. pretends that Paterculus spoke of forty thousand only. *Amplius xl millium hominum a C. Cæsare cæsa esse.*

(39) Paterc. lib. 2. cap. 46.

(40) Plin. lib. 7. cap. 25.

(41) Salmas. *in Solinum*, pag. 49.

[*E*] *He was not less qualified for intrigues than for the field.*] No man could on occasion make a better use of hypocrisy and flattery (44) than Cæsar. He knew so well how to make an interest for the Office of Pontifex Maximus, that he carried it against two very illustrious competitors (45), who were much older than he, and

(42) *Quærit Salmasius*, pag. 49. *qui hæc verba sibi explanet; non opus est vate in re planissima. Ait Plinius minime se in laude aliqua positurum occisa tot hominum millia, ob tantam humani generis cladem: licet ad hanc inferendam coactus videri fortassis aliena injuria queat.* Harduinus, *in Plinium*, lib. 7. cap. 25.

(43) See in the article of the Duke of Weimar what we shall say of William I Prince of Orange. *N. B. Mr. Bayle has not given that article of the Duke of Weimar.*

(44) Appian. lib. 2. *Belli Civil.* p. m. 227.

(45) Q. Lutatius Catulus, and P. Servilius Isauricus.

(a) Plutarch. *in Cæſare*, pag. 708. Sueton. *in Cæſare*, cap. 55.
(b) See the titles of them in Sueton. *in Cæſare*, cap. 55, 56.

nor had he leſs wit than courage [*F*]. He was very learned, and ſo eloquent, that nothing but the eager deſire he had of being the firſt in the government of the State, could prevent his diſputing the firſt rank amongſt the moſt famous Orators (*a*). Two of his works are ſtill extant [*G*]: the reſt, which were pretty numerous, are loſt (*b*). If he was an Epicurean, it was only in practice, for tho' he indulged himſelf in ſenſual pleaſures (*c*), yet he performed ſeveral religious acts, and it would be wronging of him to conſider him as an

(c) *See* Sueton. *in Cæſare*, cap. 49, *& ſeq.*

and more commendable for the good they had done their country. His high ſpirit and natural pride became ſo pliable, that he could ſtoop to the moſt unworthy flatteries towards thoſe, who were capable of ſerving him (46), and the better to compaſs his deſigns, he bethought himſelf of a very good expedient, which was to borrow large ſums of money, in order to buy the people's votes. By which means he won the poor as well as the rich; the former, becauſe they thought themſelves under an obligation to ſupport the intereſt of one, who had given them ſo much money; and the latter becauſe they feared, that they ſhould never be paid, if Cæſar's deſigns happen'd to miſcarry (47). And indeed he would have been obliged to leave the city, and to break, had he not been choſen Pontifex Maximus; wherefore he told his mother, when he went to the place of election, *You ſhall ſee me to day either Pontifex Maximus or baniſhed* (48). Can there be a more cunning device than that, which he made uſe of, in order that his abſence might not be prejudicial to him? He chained down, if I may ſay ſo, thoſe who were choſen to fill up the employments in the State; for by his intrigues and by his credit, he found means to have all them excluded, who would not promiſe to ſupport him in his abſence. So that the only means to obtain any poſt by his recommendation, was to eſpouſe his cauſe, and to promiſe him, in a manner, a blind ſubmiſſion. Nor was he always contented with a verbal promiſe; for he required from ſome an oath, and a promiſe in writing. Was it difficult to foretel, that a Commonwealth, in which ſuch diſorders reigned, could not ſubſiſt long? *Ad ſecuritatem ergo poſteri temporis in magno negotio habuit, obligare ſemper annuos magiſtratus, & e petitoribus non alios adjuvare, aut ad honorem pati pervenire, quam qui ſibi recepiſſent propugnaturos abſentiam ſuam, cujus pacti non dubitavit a quibuſdam jusjurandum atque etiam ſyngraphum exigere* (49). Sylla had a good foreſight, when yielding to the repeated ſollicitations of ſeveral perſons of quality, he repreſented to them, that they would one time or other repent, for having prevailed with him not to diſpatch that young man, who concealed in his breaſt a great many Marius's. *Satis conſtat Syllam cum deprecantibus amicis & ornatiſſimis viris aliquamdiu denegaſſet, atque illi pertinaciter contenderent, expugnatumque tandem proclamaſſe, (ſive divinitus, ſive aliqua conjectura) vincerent, ac ſibi haberent; dummodo ſcirent eum, quem incolumem tanto opere cuperent, quandoque optimatium partibus, quas ſecum ſimul defendiſſent, exilio futurum; nam Cæſari multos Marios ineſſe* (50).

(46) Dio, lib. 37.
(47) Appian. lib. 2. *Bell. Civil.*
(48) Plutarch. *in Cæſare*, pag. 710. D. Suetonius ſpeaks thus in Cæſar's Life, cap. 13. *Pontificatum maximum petiit, non ſine profuſiſſima largitione, in quâ reputans magnitudinem æris alieni cum mane ad Comitia deſcenderet, prædixiſſe Matri oſculanti fertur, Domum ſe niſi Pontificem non reverſurum.*
(49) Sueton. *in Cæſare*, cap. 23.
(50) Idem, ibid. cap. 1.

[*F*] *Nor had he leſs wit than courage.*] I ſhall quote Pliny's words to repreſent the vaſt extent and activity of that great genius. *Animi vigore præſtantiſſimum arbitror genitum Cæſarem Dictatorem. Nec virtutem conſtantiamque nunc commemoro, nec ſublimitatem omnium capacem, quæ cœlo continentur; ſed proprium vigorem celeritatemque quodam igne volucrem. Scribere aut legere, ſimul dictare & audire ſolitum accepimus. Epiſtolas verò tantarum rerum quaternas pariter librariis dictare, aut ſi nihil aliud ageret, ſeptenas* (51). That is, "In my opinion Cæſar the Dictator had a very great "ſtrength of mind: I do not ſpeak now of his cou"rage and conſtancy, nor of his exalted genius, which "could comprehend all heavenly things; but of his "extended and ſprightly genius quick like fire. He "was uſed, as we have been told, to write or read, "and at the ſame time to dictate to others or hear "them read: he alſo could dictate four different Let"ters at once upon the moſt important affairs, or even "ſeven, if he was not otherways buſy." With regard to his courage and intrepidity ſee Suetonius (52).

(51) Plinius, lib. 7. cap. 25.
(52) Sueton. *in Cæſare*, cap. 60, *& ſeq. See alſo* Val. Max. lib. 3. cap. 2. num. 19.

[*G*] *Two of his works are ſtill extant.*] Namely ſeven Books of the War in Gaul, and three Books of the civil War. They are properly only Memoirs; but they are written in a very clear ſtyle, and with all thoſe unaffected beauties, with which a man, of Cæſar's happy genius, could adorn a work of this kind; which he compoſed in haſte (53), and without much care. We might eaſily take for a flattering elogium, what Hirtius ſays of it, if we did not meet ſuch an elogium in a work, in which Cicero did not deſign to write a panegyric upon Cæſar, as he has done in ſome of his Orations (54). *Conſtat inter omnes nihil tam operoſe ab aliis eſſe perfectum, quod non horum elegantia Commentariorum ſuperetur; qui ſunt editi ne ſcientia tantarum rerum geſtarum ſcriptoribus deſit, adeoque probantur omnium judicio, ut præcepta non præbita facultas ſcriptoribus videatur.* i. e. "It is confeſſed that "the elegancy of theſe Commentaries is far beyond "all that others have written with the utmoſt care and "labour; they have been publiſhed, that other wri"ters may not be ignorant of ſo many glorious ac"tions; but they are ſo generally eſteemed, that they "ſeem calculated rather to deter other writers from "ſpending their labours upon the ſame ſubject, than "to afford them matter for their lucubrations." Theſe are Hirtius's words (55). Thoſe of Cicero are as follow. *Commentarios quoſdam ſcripſit rerum ſuarum, valde ... probandos: nudi enim ſunt, recti, & venuſti, omni ornatu orationis tanquam veſte detracta: ſed dum voluit alios habere parata, unde ſumerent, qui vellent ſcribere hiſtoriam, ineptis gratum fortaſſe fecit, qui voluntillacalamiſtris inurere; ſanos quidem homines à ſcribendo deterruit: nihil enim eſt in hiſtoria pura & illuſtri brevitate dulcius* (56). i. e. "He wrote ſome "Commentaries of his own actions, which are very "valuable; for they are plain, faithful, and elegant; "free from all the borrowed ornaments of eloquence; "but whilſt he would afford materials to thoſe, who "intended to write hiſtory, he has perhaps done a "kindneſs to ſuch impertinent authors, as would af"fect to write in a bombaſtic ſtyle; but at the ſame "time he has deterred men of ſenſe from writing; "for there is nothing more agreeable than a clear, no"ble, and conciſe ſtyle." The opinion of Cicero and Hirtius concerning Cæſar's Commentaries, has not been generally received; for we learn from Suetonius, that Aſinius Pollio found too great a careleſneſs, and ſeveral untruths in theſe Commentaries, either becauſe Cæſar believed the falſe accounts that were given him, or becauſe ſelf-love or want of memory made him relate ſeveral falſhoods with regard to thoſe actions, which he had performed himſelf. Pollio added, that he thought, Cæſar intended to correct his Commentaries. *Pollio Aſinius parum diligenter parumque integra veritate, compoſitos putat; cum Cæſar pleraque & quæ per alios erant geſta temere crediderit, & quæ per ſe vel conſuliò vel etiam memoria lapſus, perperam ediderit, exiſtimatque reſcripturum & correcturum fuiſſe* (57). A modern Critic (58) has found fault with Pollio's opinion. But the Author of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* declared himſelf againſt that Critic. *It would be difficult*, ſays he (59), *to convince Aſinius Pollio of having falſly aſſerted that Cæſar's Commentaries contained ſeveral untruths: for why ſhould we not believe, that a contemporary Author, and who every way was of Cæſar's own profeſſion, being a Captain, an Hiſtorian, and an Orator as well as he, was acquainted with a thouſand things, which ſhewed that Cæſar related a great many falſe fables. For the reſt it is certain that this Conqueror's Memoirs are written too careleſly; and if the Prince of Condé has ever a mind to write an account of the wars in which he commanded, after the ſame manner, he may be ſure, that men of taſte will not admire his performance; but we may be certain, that he would write much better than Cæſar.* I am perſuaded, that few of the greateſt admirers of antiquity are prepoſſeſſed in its favour to ſuch a degree, as to maintain, that the Duke de la Rochefoucault's Memoirs are not preferable to Cæſar's. See Voſſius (60), who ſhews, 1, that Cæſar is really the author of the Commentaries, which go under his name; 2, that they contain a great many falſhoods (61). See below the remark [*S*].

(53) *Cæteri quam benè atque emendatè, nos etiam quam facilè atque celeriter eos confecerit ſcimus.* Hirtius, *Præf. in* lib. 8. *de Bello Gallico.*
(54) In thoſe *pro Marcello*, *pro Ligario*, *pro Dejotaro Rege.*
(55) In *Præf.* lib. 8. *de Bello Gall.*
(56) Cicero *in Bruto*, cap. 74.
(57) Suet. *in Cæſare*, cap. 56.
(58) Morhofius, *de Patavinitate Liviana*, pag. 45.
(59) June 1685, pag. 629.
(60) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 62, 63.
(61) See the remark [*D*] of the article METELLUS (Lucius.)

an Epicurean in ſpeculation, with regard to Providence [*H*], from a paſſage in Salluſt, and another in Lucan. We muſt not believe that he was the firſt who leaped from his ſhip upon the ſhore of Britain; he is repreſented as ſaying that in an Oration (*d*), but he ſays quite the contrary in his writings. He might probably have enjoyed the ſovereign power,

(*d*) Julianus, *in Cæſaribus*, p. m. 170.

[*H*] *It would be wronging him to conſider him as an Epicurean in ſpeculation, with regard to Providence.*] This is liable to three objections. The Iſt from this paſſage in Salluſt: *De pœna, poſſum equidem dicere id, quod res habet, in luctu atque miſeriis mortem ærumnarum requiem, non cruciatum eſſe, eam cuncta mortalium mala diſſolvere, ultra neque curæ neque gaudio locum eſſe* (62). Cæſar ſpoke thoſe words in the Senate, when he delivered his opinion concerning the puniſhment, which Catiline's accomplices were to ſuffer. He declared plainly, and without the leaſt exception, that death puts an end to all our happineſs and our miſery; which is a flat denial of the immortality of the ſoul: We may juſtly wonder that a Senator durſt venture to ſpeak thus before that auguſt aſſembly: Cato did not fail to make ſome reflections upon this doctrine of Cæſar; but he did it indirectly, and with a great deal of moderation. *Bene, & compoſite C. Cæſar paulo ante in hoc ordine de vita & morte diſſeruit, credo falſa exiſtimans, quæ de inferis memorantur, diverſo itinere malos a bonis loca tetra, inculta, fœda, atque formidoloſa habere* (63). i. e. "Cæſar ſpoke very well and elegantly in this "aſſembly, concerning life and death; thinking, I "believe, that what is ſaid concerning hell, is falſe; "namely that good men go to a place different from "that, which is deſigned for the wicked, and which "is a horrid and frightful habitation." The IId objection is grounded on a paſſage in Lucan; The Poet relates, that Cæſar, having beſieged Maſſilia (*a*) commanded his ſoldiers to cut down a wood, which was conſecrated to a certain Divinity, whom the inhabitants dreaded ſo much the more, as they knew it leſs (64). The ſoldiers durſt not obey; each feared that the ax would rebound againſt himſelf; at laſt Cæſar himſelf was forced to begin the work, and to encourage them not only by giving the firſt ſtroke to theſe conſecrated trees, but alſo by declaring, that he took upon his own head the whole crime and impiety, they would be guilty of by that action. At laſt they obeyed him; not ſo much becauſe they feared no more, as becauſe after all they choſe rather to expoſe themſelves to the wrath of heaven than to Cæſar's.

(62) Saluſt. *De Bell. Catilin.* cap. 51.

(63) Idem, ibid. cap. 52.

(*a*) Now *Marſeille.*

(64) *Non vulgatis ſacrata figuris*
Numina ſic metuunt: tantum terroribus addit
Quos timeant non eſſe Deos. Lucan. *Pharſ.* lib. 3. ver. 415.

Sed fortes tremuere manus, motique verenda
Majeſtate loci, ſi robora ſacra ferirent,
In ſua credebant redituras membra ſecures.
Implicitas magno Cæſar terrore cohortes
Ut vidit, primus raptam vibrare bipennem
Auſus, & aëriam ferro proſcindere Quercum,
Effatur merſo violata in robora ferro:
Jam ne quis veſtrum dubitet ſubvertere ſilvam,
Credite me feciſſe nefas? Tum paruit omnis
Imperiis non ſublato ſecura pavore,
Turba, ſed expenſa Superorum & Cæſaris Ira (65).

That is,

"But lo! the bolder hands, that ſhould have ſtruck,
"With ſome unuſual horror trembling ſhook;
"With ſilent dread and rev'rence they ſurvey'd
"The gloom majeſtic of the ſacred ſhade:
"None dares with impious ſteel the bark to rend,
"Leſt on himſelf the deſtin'd ſtroke deſcend.
"Cæſar perceiv'd the ſpreading fear to grow,
"Then eager, caught an ax, and aim'd a blow.
"Deep ſunk within a violated oak
"The wounding edge, and thus the warrior ſpoke.
"Now let no doubting hand the taſk decline,
"Cut you the wood, and let the guilt be mine.
"The trembling bands unwillingly obey'd,
"Two various ills were in the ballance laid,
"And Cæſar's wrath againſt the Gods was weigh'd. ROWE.

(65) Idem, ibid. ver. 429.

If all that I want from Lucan's narration did not conclude here, I would add that he obſerves, that the habitants of Marſeilles, far from lamenting the loſs of their ſacred wood, rejoiced extremely at it, imagining that ſo great a ſacrilege ſhould not be long unpuniſhed. But, adds Lucan, they found that

—"Too oft ſucceſs to guilt is given,
"And wretches only ſtand the mark of heaven (66). ROWE.

(66) *Muris ſed clauſa Juventus*
Exultat: quis enim læſos impune putarret
Eſſe Deos? Servat multos fortuna nocentes,
Et tantum miſeris iraſci numina poſſunt. Ibid. ver. 446.

This is too profane a manner of ſpeaking; it is charging Providence with a fault, with which the earthly judges are charged when we ſay, that the gallows is made only for the unfortunate. The IIId objection is grounded on a paſſage in Suetonius, who ſays that Religion, that is the bad omens from the victims, or ſuch other heavenly warnings, never deterred Cæſar from beginning or continuing his undertakings. *Ne religione quidem ulla a quoquam incepto abſterritus unquam vel retardatus eſt. Cum immolanti aufugiſſet hoſtia, profectionem adverſus Scipionem & Jubam non diſtulit* (67). He gave a good proof of this the day he was killed, for he went to the Senate, tho' the victims, which he offered, portended nothing but evil (68): Here then we have three objections againſt what I aſſert in the text of this Remark, I ſhall endeavour to anſwer them.

(67) Sueton. *in Cæſare*, cap. 59.

(68) *Dein pluribus hoſtiis cæſis cum litare non poſſet, introiit Curiam ſpreta Religione.* Ibid. cap. 81.

I ſay with regard to the firſt objection, that it is of no force, becauſe it proves too much. If the paſſage in Salluſt is a good argument that Cæſar did not believe the Providence of the Gods, we muſt alſo ſay, that Cicero did not believe it, ſince he aſſerted as clearly as Cæſar and in a full Senate, that death puts an end to all our miſeries, and ſince he mentions whatever was ſaid of Hell-torments, as ſo many fables and wild fancies. *Huic mortem maturabat inimicus, quod illi unum in malis perfugium erat calamitatis? Qui ſi quid animi ac virtutis habuiſſet, (ut multi ſæpe fortes viri in ejuſmodi dolore) mortem ſibiipſi conſciſſet: huic quamobrem id vellet inimicus offerre, quod ipſe ſibi optare deberet? Nam nunc quidem, quid tandem illi mali mors attulit? Niſi forte ineptiis ac fabulis ducimur, ut exiſtimemus, illum apud inferos impiorum ſupplicia perferre, ac plures illic offendiſſe inimicos, quam hic reliquiſſe: à Socrus, ab uxorum, à fratris, à liberorum pœnis actum eſſe præcipitem in ſceleratorum ſedem atque regionem. Quæ ſi falſa ſunt, id quod omnes intelligunt, quid ei tandem aliud mors eripuit, præter ſenſum doloris* (69). i. e. "His enemy haſtened his death, which "was the only remedy left him in his misfortunes. "And if he had had the leaſt courage (as ſeveral "brave men often had under ſuch afflictions) he would "himſelf have put an end to his life; ſince an ene"my intended what he himſelf ſhould have wiſhed "for. And now, what evil has death brought upon "him? Unleſs by giving credit to nonſenſical fables, "we ſhould believe that he ſuffers now in hell the "puniſhment of the wicked, and that he met with "more enemies there, than he left here, and that being "delivered of what he ſuffered from his mother-in-law, "from his wives, from his brother, and from his chil"dren, he only exchanged thoſe miſeries for the tor"ments which fill the place deſigned for profligate "men? But if all this be falſe, as it is by all be"lieved to be, what elſe has he been deprived of "by death, but the ſenſe of evil?" It would be very wrong to infer from this paſſage that Cicero believed neither another life, nor the Providence of the Gods, ſince the contrary appears evidently from his writings. Beſides, all men do not agree, that there is a neceſſary connection between the immortality of the ſoul, and the Providence of God; the Sadduces denied the former of thoſe doctrines, and admitted the latter. I make much the ſame anſwer to the ſecond objection. Sylla was as far as any man from being an Atheiſt; he thought that a great regard was to be paid to ſuch orders as God conveys to man by the means of dreams; he aſcribed his victories to the favours of fortune, much more than to his own conduct (70); he put a great faith in preſages (71): he conſecrated part of his eſtate to the Gods; and performed very exactly all the ceremonies preſcribed to him by the Prieſts (72). And yet when he wanted timber and money at the ſiege of Athens, he did not ſcruple to have the ſacred trees cut down,

(69) *Cicero pro Cluentio*, cap. 61. Obſerve that Cicero ſpeaks quite in another ſtrain in his *Orat. pro C. Rabirio.*

(70) Plutarch. *in ejus vita*, pag. 454.
(71) Ibid.
(72) Ibid. pag. 474.

power, which he uſurped, for a longer time, could he have renounced the name and pomp of a Sovereign. His friends, who ought to have ſupported him in ſo dangerous a circumſtance, ruined him, by the eagerneſs with which they would procure him the royal ornaments. He and they ſhould have conſidered, that a free people do eaſily ſubmit to ſlavery, provided it be not named ſlavery, and that having ſuffered without concern the loſs of their real privileges, they are frightened at a title, and will revolt rather than ſuffer an unuſual ornament upon the head of him, who ſubdued them. If any thing could oblige the conſpirators to haſten the execution of their deſign, it was the fear they had that Cæſar would openly take upon him the title of King; nor was their fear ill grounded [*I*]. Obſerve, that though he had always been very couragious, and fortune had

down, nor to take all the riches he found in the temples, and even in that of Delphi (73), and was very merry with his meſſenger's ſcruples. Let us ſay therefore, that Cæſar's bold attempt againſt the ſacred wood of Marſeilles does not prove, that he denied a Providence; it proves only, either that he laughed at this particular ſuperſtition of the inhabitants of Marſeilles, or that he had no regard for religious duties, when they obſtructed his moſt important deſigns. The Chriſtian Princes, who in caſe of neceſſity ſeize upon the eſtate of the Church, know very well that they do wrong, but they chooſe rather to commit that crime, than to be vanquiſhed by the enemy, juſt as they chooſe to break through the laws of chaſtity againſt their own conſcience, rather than to ſubdue their paſſions. The third objection has no more ſtrength in it than the two former; it ſhews only, that we muſt ſay of Cæſar, what we ſay of the Chriſtians, who have faith and not charity, who believe the Goſpel and do not practiſe the Chriſtian duties, in a word, who have faith without works. Cæſar believed what his Religion taught of omens, but did not regulate his conduct according to what was portended, when his prudence or his paſſions adviſed him to the contrary. Thus Chriſtians behave themſelves with regard to their ghoſtly-fathers, who have the direction of their conſcience; they conſult them, but do not follow their advice. But as the care they take to conſult them, ſhews that they are perſuaded of the doctrines of Religion, ſo it muſt be ſaid, that Cæſar's conſulting the entrails of victims (74), and the other oracles depending upon augury, is a good argument of his faith in that reſpect. The day he was killed, he was in a ſuſpence whether he ſhould go out or not, tho' ſeveral affairs of the utmoſt importance were to come before the Senate that day. His irreſolution was occaſioned by an ominous dream his wife had had; that dream raiſed doubts in his mind, yet not ſo far as to make him take a firm reſolution to ſtay at home: he did not take that reſolution becauſe the victims which had been ſacrificed by his orders, portended no good. This determined him not to go to the Senate (75); nor would he have been there, had not one of the conſpirators known how to take him by his blind-ſide; he told him amongſt other things, *what will your enemies ſay, when they ſhall hear that you defer ſettling the moſt weighty affairs of the ſtate till your wife has a lucky dream?* Ἐι δὲ φράζοι τίς αὐτῆς καθεμένοις, νῦν μὲν ἀπαλλάττεσθε, παρῆναι δὲ ἄνθις ὅταν ἐντύχοι Βελτίοσιν ὀνείροις Καλπυρνία, τίνας ἴσεσθε λόγους παρὰ τῶν φθονούντων (76). " If now " they are ſitting, ſome body was to tell them (from " you) that they may riſe, and that they will be ſummoned to meet again, when Calpurnia ſhall have " had a fine dream, what would be the diſcourſes of " thoſe who envy you?" Here then we ſee that Cæſar believed preſages: we know alſo that he wrote ſeveral Books upon the auſpices (77), and it was a prodigy, which encouraged him to paſs the Rubicon. *Eatur*, ſaid he (78), *ubi Deorum oſtenta & inimicorum iniquitas vocat; jacta eſt alea.* i. e. " Let us go where " the ſigns of the Gods and the wickedneſs of our " enemies call us; the die is caſt." We know that he offered up prayers to the Gods, before he began the deciſive battle againſt Pompey: περιχαρὴς γενόμενος ἐ ἐυξάμενος τοῖς Θεοῖς παρίταττε τὴν φάλαγγα (79). i. e. " Being become cheerful, and having prayed to " the Gods, he drew out his army in order of battle." We know that he put a great confidence in his good fortune, as appears by what he ſaid to his pilot; *Quid times? Cæſarem vehis.* i. e. " Why are you afraid? " you carry Cæſar (80)." His expreſſions in Plutarch are ſtronger (81). We know, that he thought fortune

preſided over every thing, but more particularly over the affairs of war. *Multum cum in omnibus rebus, tum in re militari fortuna poteſt* (82). *Fortuna, quæ plurimum poteſt tum in reliquis rebus, tum præcipue in bello, parvis momentis magnas rerum commutationes efficit, ut tum accidit* (83); i. e. " Fortune, who governs all " kind of affairs, but eſpecially the affairs of war, " employs ſometimes very inconſiderable circumſtances, " to procure a great alteration in publick affairs, as " it then happened." There is no occaſion to obſerve that nothing is more inconſiſtent with Epicurus's ſyſtem, than the doctrine of preſages and the influence of fortune. Speak as ill of fortune as you pleaſe, ſuppoſe her blind, inconſtant, unjuſt, whimſical, you do nevertheleſs admit a principle different from mere atoms, capable of will and conduct, and which takes cognizance of our affairs (84).

I forgot to mention a religious action of Cæſar, which is remarkable. The Arverni boaſted that they had Cæſar's ſword; and ſhewed it ſtill hung up in one of their temples, in Plutarch's time. Cæſar ſaw it, and only laughed at it; and yet he forbad his men to take it again, becauſe he conſidered it as a ſacred thing (85).

I don't mention as a ſcruple of conſcience the regard he had for a certain monument. He durſt not deſtroy a trophy, which Mithridates had raiſed after the defeat of Triarius (86). He durſt not, I ſay, throw it down, conſidering it was a monument conſecrated to the Gods of War (87); but he raiſed another trophy oppoſite to that, when he had vanquiſhed Pharnaces. He contented himſelf with raiſing trophy againſt trophy, yet ſo that his trophy darkened, and in a manner, deſtroyed the other. Καθέλειν μὲν γὰρ τὸ τοῦ βαρβάρου οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν, ὡς ἐ οἷς ἐμπολεμίοις θεοῖς ἱερώμενον· τῇ ὃ ὀὴ τοῦ ἰδίου παφασάσι, ἐ ἐκείνῳ συνεσκίασε, καὶ τρόπον τινὰ καὶ κατέστρεψε (88). He may indeed have been afraid of provoking the Gods of War; but perhaps alſo he laughed in his ſleeve at this article of Religion; let us not therefore lay any ſtreſs upon this argument; let us give any one leave to think, that without having had any regard from his heart for Mars, Bellona, or Minerva, &c. he like a true Politician, forbore offending the vulgar. But here follows a fact, which muſt perſuade us that he was ſuperſtitious. He had a form of prayers, which he uſed to repeat three times as ſoon as he was got into his Chariot, in hopes that this would procure him a good journey: he did not begin to make uſe of this kind of devotion, till he eſcaped being overturned in his Chariot. *Cæſarem Dictatorem poſt unum anciſitem vehiculi caſum, ferunt ſemper, ut primum conſediſſet, id quod pleroſque nunc facere ſcimus, carmine ter repetito ſecuritatem itinerum aucupari ſolitum* (89). I conclude from all this that he could not be an Epicurean but in practice (90).

[*I*] *The fear they had that Cæſar would openly take upon him the title of King . . . . was not ill grounded.*] Cæſar's moſt intimate friends were more eager and unſatiable in proportion than himſelf: they laboured to procure him the title of King, only becauſe they hoped to have a greater ſhare of power under that new conſtitution of the Government. The firſt device they employed was a religious pretence. In order to diſcover the inclination of the people, they ſpread abroad, that it was expreſly declared in the Sibylline Oracles, that if the Romans ſent an army commanded by a King againſt the Parthians, they would certainly vanquiſh them, but that otherwiſe they would always prove invincible. After this Cæſar's friends tried whether the people were ſufficiently prepared for a King; for as Cæſar was one day returning to town, they complimented him with the title of King. But the peo-

(73) Ibid. pag. 459.

(74) *Dein pluribus hoſtiis cæſis, cum litare non poſſet.* Sueton. *in Cæſare*, cap. 81.

(75) Ὡς δὲ καὶ πολλὰ καταθύσαντες οἱ μάντεις ἔφασαν αὐτῷ δυσιερεῖν, ἔγνω πέμψας Ἀντώνιον ἀφεῖναι τὴν σύγκλητον. Plutarch. *in ejus vita*, pag. 738. B.

(76) Idem, ibid. C.

(77) Macrobius, *Saturn.* lib. 1. cap. 16. p. m. 267. quotes book the 16th.

(78) Sueton. *in Cæſar.* cap. 32.

(79) Plutarch. *in Cæſare*, pag. 728. E.

(80) Florus, lib. 4. cap 2. n. 37.

(81) Πιςεύων τῇ τύχῃ γνὺς ὅτι Καίσαρα κομίζεις, i. e. " Truſt to " fortune ſince " you know that " you carry Cæſar."

(82) Cæſar. *de Bell. Gall.* lib. 6.

(83) Idem, *de Bell. Civ.* lib. 3.

(84) See the article TIMOLEON. Remark [*I*] and [*K*].

(85) Plutarch. *in Apoph.* p. 720, E.

(86) Dio, lib. 42. p m. 234.

(87) See above, the article of AURELIANUS, remark [*D*].

(88) Dio, lib. 42. pag. 234.

(89) Plin. lib. 18. cap. 2.

(90) We muſt even except the pleaſures of the table. *See* Suet. *in ejus vita*, cap. 53. where he relates what Cato ſaid. *Unum ex omnibus Cæſarem ad evertendam Rempublicam, Sobrium acceſſiſſe.* i. e. " Of all " thoſe who " have attempted to over- " throw the " Common- " wealth, Cæſar " alone was a " temperate " man" *See alſo* Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 41.

had always been favourable to him, yet he became at last very cautious, as though he had been afraid that the inconstant Goddess should take him for an insatiable and troublesome petitioner, who deserved to suffer some mortification (*e*). The last victory he gained (*f*) cost him dearer than any of the former [*K*]; he saw himself upon the point of losing it, and began already to think of killing himself, that he might not fall into the hands of his enemies; however he gained the day during the Feast of the Bacchanalia (*g*), which circumstance calls to my mind four verses, which the reader will find in the Remark [*K*].

(*e*) *Nec nisi tempore extremo ad dimicandum cunctantior factus est. Quo sæpius vicisset, hoc minus experiendos casus obstinatæ: nihilque se tantum acquisiturum victoria, quantum auferre calamitas posset.* Suet. *in Cæsare*, cap. 60. i. e. "It was only in the latter part of his life that he began to decline fighting. The more victories he had gained, the more did he think it improper to venture again; being of opinion, that he could not gain so much by a victory, as he could lose by being vanquished." See below the words of Florus, in the remark [*K*] quotation (96).

(*f*) That of Munda in Spain, against the sons of Pompey.

(*g*) Plut. *in Cæsare*, pag. 734. A.

Sallust is perhaps the Author who succeeded best in drawing the Character of Cæsar, which he opposed to that of Cato of Utica. He says among other things, that Cæsar was fond of high employments, and great undertakings, and loved to command armies, that he might have opportunities of displaying his shining qualities; but that Cato was content to distinguish himself by his modesty and his eminent virtues, choosing rather to be than to appear an honest man [*L*], gaining thus a true reputation so much the more infallibly,

(91) Compare this with what is related of Cromwell in the *Histoire des Ouvrages de Savans*. Jan. 1699. pag. 7. in the account of Ludlow's *Memoirs*.

ple murmuring at this, Cæsar had policy enough to reject the title (91), but he went home being extremely vexed, that the people had not contradicted him, when he refused the title with which his flatterers saluted him. Yet these were not discouraged at this; for during the *Lupercalia*, Mark Anthony, who was Consul, came to him, and would put the crown on his head; a few men, hired on purpose, clapt their hands, but the rest of the people did not follow their example: whereupon Cæsar repulsed Mark Anthony, and then only the people's loud acclamations were heard on every side. The same attempt was made some time after, but with the same success. What did not succeed in Cæsar's person, was tried upon his statues; his friends put crowns upon the heads of these statues; but two Tribunes had them taken away, informed against those, who had given the title of King to Cæsar, and imprisoned them; for which the people blessed the Tribunes, and followed them with loud acclamations; Cæsar on the contrary deprived them of their office (92); so that all those who had still a drop of Roman blood remaining in their veins (93) thought that they had no more time to lose, and entreated Brutus to remember he bore the name of him, who expelled Tarquin. See in Suetonius how low Cæsar had brought the liberty of the Commonwealth (94): It is certain that liberty was then nothing but an empty sound, a dead corps, a skeleton; as some pretend that Cæsar himself said. *Nec minoris impotentiæ voces propalam edebat, ut T. Ampius scribit, nihil esse Rempublicam, appellationem modo, sine corpore ac specie. Syllam nesciisse litteras, qui Dictaturam deposuerit, debere homines consideratius jam loqui secum, ac pro legibus habere, quæ dicat* (95). i. e. "Nor was he less arrogant in his "discourses, as T. Ampius writes; for he said publickly, that the Commonwealth was no more, that "it was only an empty name without any reality, a "mere shadow; that Sylla was a dunce for having "abdicated the Dictatorship; that men ought now to "speak to him more respectfully, and take all that he "said for law."

(92) Plutarch. *in Cæsare*, pag. 736.

(93) It may be suppos'd that they ask'd one another, *Hæc fierent si testiculi vena ulla paterni Viveret in nobis?* Persius, Sat. 1. ver. 103.

(94) Sueton. *in Cæsare*, cap. 76.

(95) Idem, cap. 77.

[*K*] *His last victory cost him dearer than any of the former.*] Fortune seemed wavering in his conduct, one would have thought, that she was consulting, whether she would except Cæsar from the general rule she is used to follow, and which is, to forsake her friends, after she has raised them, and to make them pay dear in one day, for all the happiness she made them enjoy for a great many years. Let us quote Florus. *Omnium postrema certaminum Munda. Hic non pro cætera felicitate, sed anceps & diu triste prælium; ut plane videretur nescio quid deliberare fortuna. Sane & ipse ante aciem mœstior non ex more Cæsar, sive respectu fragilitatis humanæ, sive nimiam prosperorum suspectam habens continuationem; vel eadem timens, postquam idem esse cœperat, quod Pompeius* (96). i. e. "The last battle was fought near Munda (*a*); here Cæsar did not "meet at first with his wonted happiness; for the "battle was doubtful, and for a long while he had "the worst; so that fortune seemed plainly to deliberate something. Nay, Cæsar himself appeared "more sad before the battle, than he used to be either "out of that weakness, which is natural to man, or "because he thought that prosperity had till then too "constantly attended him, not to forsake him at last; "or perhaps he feared that he should meet with the "same fate as Pompey did, after he had been raised "as high as he." Florus relates afterwards how Cæsar's troops began to lose ground. *Novissime illud inusitatum Cæsaris oculis (nefas) post quatuordecim annos, probata veteranorum manus gradum retro dedit. Quod etsi nondum fugerat, apparebat tamen pudore magis quàm virtute resistere. Itaque ablegato equo, similis furenti, primam in aciem procurrit. Ibi prensare fugientes, confirmare; per totum denique agmen oculis, manibus, clamore, volitare. Dicitur in illa perturbatione & de extremis agitâsse secum, & ita manifesto vultu fuisse, quasi occupare manu mortem vellet* (97). i. e. "Lastly, Cæsar's eyes beheld, (it is dreadful to mention it) what "he never saw before; after fourteen years service his "old experienced band of soldiers began to lose ground; "and tho' they did not yet fly away, it appeared "that shame rather than courage made them still resist. Therefore Cæsar, leaping off his horse, run "furiously into the first rank, took hold of those who "ran away, raised their spirit, and with his eyes, "hands and voice, was in a manner present thro' the "whole army. It is said, that in this perplexity he "began already to take the most desperate resolution, "and that it plainly appeared by his looks, that he "was determined to kill himself."

(96) Florus, lib. 4. cap. 2. num. 78.

(*a*) Now *Monda*, a town of the Kingdom of Granada in Spain.

(97) Florus, *ubi supra*, n. 88.

The four verses I promised to quote were written by Monsieur Pelisson. I take them from his Dialogue with Pegasus; they are as follow:

Mais ce fameux Cesar, qui presque sans combattre,
Venoit, voyoit, vainquoit, ne le suivois tu pas?
Jamais il n'eut quitté la belle Cleopatre,
Pour aller prendre Dole un jour de mardigras.

That is,

"But that famous Cæsar, who almost without striking "a blow, came, saw, and vanquished, did you not "imitate him? He would never have left the beautiful Cleopatra, to go and take Dole on a Shrove-"Tuesday."

Why should he not have left her on such a day to take a town, since on such a day he fought a battle, which was a thousand times more dangerous, than the siege of any city whatsoever would have been.

[*L*] *Sallust . . . opposed Cæsar's character to that of Cato . . ., who chose rather to be than to appear an honest man.*] I shall transcribe the words of that Historian. *His*, (Cæsari & Catoni) *genus, ætas, eloquentia prope æqualia fuere: magnitudo animi par, item gloria; sed alia, alii; Cæsar beneficiis, ac munificentia magnus habebatur; integritate vitæ Cato. Ille mansuetudine & misericordia clarus factus; huic severitas dignitatem addiderat. Cæsar dando, sublevando, ignoscendo; Cato nihil largiendo gloriam adeptus est; in altero miseris perfugium, in altero malis pernicies; illius facilitas, hujus constantia laudabatur. Postremo Cæsar in animum induxerat, laborare, vigilare, negotiis amicorum intentus sua negligere, nihil denegare, quod dono dignum esset, sibi magnum imperium, exercitum, bellum novum exoptabat, ubi virtus enitescere posset. At Catoni studium modestiæ, decoris, sed maxumæ severitatis erat. Non divitiis cum divite, nec factione cum factioso; sed cum strenuo virtute, cum modesto pudore, cum innocente abstinentia certabat; esse, quam videor, bonus malebat; ita, quo minus gloriam petebat, eo magis assequebatur* (98) i. e. "They (Cæsar and Cato) were almost equal as to "their extraction, age and eloquence: they had both "an exalted mind, and they acquired equally a great "glory,

(98) Sallust. *de Bell. Catilin.* cap. 54.

infallibly, as he leſs appeared to hunt after it. I muſt not omit an obſervation, which I met with in an ancient Hiſtorian; it relates to Cæſar's exceſſive care of heaping up riches, and of procuring money at any rate, and under any pretence whatſoever [*M*]. The Senate decreed ſuch exorbitant honours to him (*b*), that we cannot be too much aſtoniſhed, when we conſider the ſpirit of ſlavery, which at firſt view appears to be in that conduct. But we muſt obſerve that it was very much owing to a Republican policy; for when the Senators had found that he exceedingly delighted in theſe honourable and glorious marks of diſtinction which they conferred upon him, they invented an infinite number of new ones, in order to render him the more odious, and to haſten his downfall (*i*). This was the view of the greateſt part of the Senators: ſome other perſons acted really from a ſpirit of flattery; nor were there wanting thoſe, who intended only to ridicule Cæſar. Some propoſed to give him leave to enjoy all the women he pleaſed, ſince he ſtill enjoyed many, tho' he was above fifty years old (*k*). He did not diſcover the bait, and ſuffered himſelf to be enſnared by the honourable decrees of the Senate: he forgot himſelf too much, and even once he did not vouchſafe to riſe when the Senate brought him the decree, by which they greatly increaſed his honour; this incivility was one of the chief cauſes of his ruin [*N*]. All the world knows

(*b*) *See* Dion Caſſius, lib. 44. *circa initium.*

(*i*) Idem, ibid. pag. 176. See the remark [*N*] quotation (110), and Plutarch. *in Cæſ.* pag. 734. where he obſerves, that Cæſar's enemies were not leſs than his flatterers the promoters of the Senate's decree. Οἷς οὐδὲν ἧττον ὄντας συναγωνίσασθαι σὺν πελαπυόντων Καίσαρα τὸς μισόντας.

(*k*) Plutarch. *in Cæſare*, pag. 754.

" glory, tho' by different ways. Cæſar was eſteemed " for his generoſity, Cato for his integrity: the former made himſelf famous by his ſweet and compaſſionate temper, the latter gained authority by " his ſtrictneſs. Cæſar gained a great reputation " by his gifts and preſents, and by forgiving his " enemies; but Cato without making any preſents. The former was a ſupport to the miſerable, the latter a terror to the wicked; as the " eaſy temper of the one was praiſed, ſo was the reſolution of the other. Laſtly, Cæſar was determined to employ the utmoſt application and vigilance, to neglect his own affairs, in order to mind " thoſe of others, never to deny what was worth granting; he loved to command, to be at the head of " an army, to wage war, that he might have an " opportunity to diſplay his ſhining qualities. But " Cato laboured to be modeſt, honeſt, and auſtere. " He did not ſtrive to outdo the rich by the ſplendor " of his eſtate, nor the factious by a ſpirit of contention; but to ſurpaſs the couragious in his ſtrength " of mind, the modeſt in moderation, and the honeſt " in temperance. He choſe rather to be than to appear good, acquiring thus ſo much the more glory, " that he did leſs ſeek after it." Any man, who amongſt theſe different kinds of elogies, ſhould chooſe Cæſar's ſhare rather than Cato's, would diſcover a very bad taſte. There is no good judge, but who, all compenſations made, would preſer before a thouſand other good qualities, that which Cato had, who took a greater delight in the real poſſeſſion of virtue, than in the reputation of being virtuous (99). This was alſo the character of Ariſtides, and the encomium which an excellent Poet paſt upon Amphiaraus the Soothſayer. I have made ſome reflections upon this in another article of this Dictionary (100), and I have there examined a maxim aſcribed to Socrates, and which agrees pretty well with the following words of a Latin Poet,

Tu recte vivis, ſi curas eſſe quod audis (101).

That is,

" Live well, if you take care to be what you paſs for."

Poſtellus has made a very good reflection upon that verſe in one of his Dedications (102) which for the reſt is full of nonſenſical bombaſt.

[*M*] *Cæſar's exceſſive care of procuring money under any pretence whatſoever.*] Sometimes he demanded ſums of money, under pretence that they had been promiſed to Pompey. He ſeized upon the treaſure in the Temple of Hercules at Tyre, pretending that the Tyrians had received Pompey's wife and ſon into their city. He as conqueror procured golden crowns to be given to Kings and Princes (103); in a word, when one reaſon or pretence would not do, he knew very well how to invent another. This conduct and theſe extortions were not owing to ill-nature, if we may believe Dion Caſſius (104), but to the exorbitant expence he was obliged to be at. The only reaſon why he laboured to get money was, that he was ſenſible, that in order to acquire power, to maintain it, and to encreaſe it, two things were requiſite, which ſupport each other, money and an army. Armies are kept together when they are provided with all neceſſaries, and it is not difficult for one at the head of an army to procure money; but if either of theſe two things fails the other is loſt of courſe. If Dion thought this was a good excuſe for Cæſar, he reaſoned more like a Warrior, and a Politician, than like a good Citizen. Here follow his own words: Τό, τε σύμπαν εἰπεῖν, χρηματοπειὸς ἀνὴρ ἐγένετο, ὀὺο τε εἶναι λέγων τὰ τὰς δυναστίας παρασκευάζοντα, καὶ φυλάσσοντα, καὶ ὑπάυξοντα, στρατιώτας καὶ χρήματα. καὶ ταῦτα δ' ἀλλήλων συνεχόντοιν. τῇ τε γὰρ τροφῇ τὰ στρατεύματα συνέχεται, καὶ ἐκείνη ἐκ τῶν ὅπλων συλλέγεται· καὶ θάτερον ὁποτερουοῦν αὐτῶν ἐυδὺς ἢ καὶ τὸ ἕτερον συσκαταλυθήσεται (105). This Hiſtorian obſerves, that Cæſar being returned into Italy, after Pharnaces's defeat, continued his extortions, ſometimes by way of preſents, ſometimes by way of loan. He borrowed from private men and from cities, never intending to return the money, and forced them to reckon as tho' he required from them the payment of a debt (106).

(105) Idem, ibid.

(106) Idem, ibid. pag. 235.

[*N*] *Once he did not vouchſafe to riſe before the Senate . . . which was one of the chief cauſes of his ruin.*] Two paſſages, one from Suetonius, and the other from Dion Caſſius will prove this. *Præcipuam & inexpiabilem ſibi invidiam hinc maxime movit: adeuntes ſe cum pluribus honorificatiſſimiſque decretis univerſos patres conſcriptos ſedens pro æde Veneris genetricis excepit. Quidam putant retentum a Cornelio Balbo cum conaretur aſſurgere, alii ne conatum quidam omnino, ſed etiam admonentem Cajum Trebatium, ut aſſurgeret minus familiari vultu reſpexiſſe* (107). i. e. " He drew upon him " an implacable hatred chiefly by the following action. " When the Senate went in a body to carry him the " moſt humble Decrees they had lately paſt in his favour, he received them ſitting before the temple of " Venus. Some think that he intended to riſe up, " but was prevented by Cornelius Balbus; others pre- " tend that he did not ſo much as offer to riſe, and that " he look'd coldly upon Caius Trebatius, who adviſed " him to do it." Dion Caſſius relates the whole affair, with all its circumſtances. The Senate, *ſays he* (108), conſulting one day concerning ſeveral of the greateſt honours, which were propoſed to be decreed to Cæſar, all the votes of the Senators, except thoſe of Caſſius and a few others, were for the Decree; after which the houſe roſe to go in a body to acquaint the Emperor with it; he was ſitting in the porch of the temple of Venus, where he had ſtaid, that nobody might ſay his preſence in the Senate had deprived the members of the liberty of voting. He did not riſe when the Senate came, and heard ſitting what they had to ſay. This exaſperated not only the Senators, but alſo the other Romans to ſuch a degree, that it became one of the chief pretences of them, who conſpired againſt his life. The Hiſtorian does not know, whether this piece of incivility was a fatal ſtroke of Providence, an abſence of mind procured from above, or an effect of Cæſar's being overjoyed. Καθήμενος σφᾶς εἴτε ὑπ' ὀλιγωρίας τινὶ, εἴτε καὶ περιχαρείᾳ προσεδέξατο (109). But he obſerves, that no credit was given to thoſe who endeavoured to excuſe Cæſar, by ſaying, that he had at that time a loſeneſs, which made him fear that by riſing he ſhould put the retentive faculty to a *non-plus*. This excuſe was not admitted for good, becauſe it was known that ſoon after he returned home on foot. The poſture in which he received the Senate was therefore imputed to his pride. They themſelves had made

(107) Sueton. *in Cæſare*, cap. 77.

(108) Dion. Caſſ. lib. 42. pag. 255.

(109) Idem, ibid.

(99) *See* Lucan. *Pharſ.* lib. 2. ver. 380, &c. I have read in the *Mercure volant*, printed in 1705, pag. 93. that it has been ſaid of Cato, *Nunquam rectè fecit, ut facere videretur, ſed quia aliter facere non poterat.* i. e. " Cato never " did good, that " he might appear doing it, " but becauſe he " could not do " otherwiſe.

(100) Remark [*H*] of the article AMPHIARAUS.

(101) Horat. Epiſt. 16. lib. 1. ver. 17.

(102) That of his *Hiſtoires Orientales*, printed at Paris in 1575, and dedicated to the Duke of Alençon brother of Henry III.

(103) *See* Dion Caſſ. lib. 42. pag. 234.

(104) Τοῦτο δὴ ἐχ' ὑπὸ κακίας ποιῶν. Idem, ibid.

knows that he was murdered in the Senate March the 15th, in the year 710 [O], ſince the building of Rome. I have obſerved in another place (*l*), that though we ſhould grant that there was ſome juſtice in this murder, yet it muſt be confeſſed, that it was very ill-

(*l*) Above Rem. [F] of the article BRUTUS (Marcus Junius).

him proud, by the honours they conferred upon him, and then they hated him becauſe he was proud. Here follow Dion's words: Ἔλεγον μὲν γὰρ ἀπολογούμενοί τινες ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μετὰ ταῦτα, ὅτι τῆς τε κοιλίας ἀκρατὴς ὑπὸ διαῤῥοίας ἐγεγόνει, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ἵνα μὴ ἐξοιδήσῃ κατίμησιν, ὃ μέντοι καὶ πιθανὸν τὸν πολλοὺς ἐδύνατο, διὰ τὸ μετ' ὀλίγον ἐξεγερθέντα αὐτὸν αὐτοπροαίρετον οἰκεῖόν κομισθῆναι. ἀλλ' ὑπετόπουν γὲ αὐτὸν ὑπερφυχεῖν, καὶ διεμίσουν ὡς ὑπερήφανον ὃν αὐτοὶ ταῖς ὑπερβολαῖς τῶν τιμῶν ὑπερήφανον ἐπεποιήκεσαν (110). The Hiſtorian ſhews in theſe laſt words the ſame inclination for cenſuring the Senate, which he had already diſcovered before. He had ſaid, that with regard to thoſe things, which drew upon Cæſar that hatred and cruel envy, which ruined him at laſt, the fault of the Senators was greater than even Cæſar's (111). They decreed new and exorbitant honours to him, and then they cenſured him for being pleaſed with them, and becauſe they encreaſed his pride. He was certainly to blame for not refuſing ſome of theſe honours, and for believing that the Senate was really perſuaded he deſerved them (112). But then the Senators were ſtill more to blame, ſince by conferring theſe honours upon him, they opened a precipice before him: for if he had declined theſe honours, it would have been taken for ſcorn; and by accepting of them he expoſed himſelf to the temptation of vanity, ſince the moſt humble perſons are eaſily ſpoiled by that poiſon, and fancy they really are, what they are ſaid to be (113). Τὸ γὰρ ὑπερβαλλειν τῶν τε τιμῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπαίνων χαυνοτέρους πὼς καὶ τοὺς πάνυ σώφρονας, ὥστε καὶ' ὧν ἐπαίνων ἀληθῶς γίγνεσθαι δοκῶσι, ποιεῖ (114).

(110) Dion Caſſ. lib. 42. pag. 277.

(111) Idem, ibid. pag. 274.

(112) Idem, ibid.

(113) See the *Nouv. de la Rep. des Lett.* June 1686, Art. 1. pag. 631. You will find there the following words of Juvenal's 4th Sat. *Nihil eſt, quod credere de ſe Non poſſit, cum laudatur Diis æqua poteſtas* See alſo Horat. Ep. 16. lib. 1. *Sed vereor ne cui dote pluſquam tibi credas &c.*

(114) Dion, lib. 44. pag. 274.

Let us examine the reaſon, why ſome will not believe, that Cæſar continued ſitting for fear his looſeneſs ſhould play him ſome foul trick. That reaſon does not appear to me to be well grounded; for does it follow from his going home on foot, that he could not have been taken with a violent cholic the very moment the Senate approached? A looſeneſs is not always equally troubleſome. But if this excuſe was well grounded, it would afford us matter to admire, how fantaſtically things will ſometimes happen; we might ſay that the moſt important and moſt fatal events are linked to mere trifles, and that the moſt inconſiderable ſprings bring them about. Cæſar would have haſtened his ruin by not being able to put himſelf in a civil poſture, becauſe of a little diſorder in his bowels, which in any other circumſtance would have been a trifle, was at that time of the greateſt importance. The accident, which Cæſar feared in caſe he ſtood up, would have had terrible conſequences. It would have expoſed him to ridicule from the whole people at Rome, and his enemies would have put the worſt conſtruction upon it; what a contempt of Religion and of the whole Senate is this! would they have cried: What! do ſuch an action in the very temple of Venus, and before the moſt auguſt Aſſembly in the world! Such an accident could be miſrepreſented in an odious manner ſo many different ways, that it was ſufficient to determine any perſon not to riſe, tho' he ſhould have had the moſt lively ſenſe of all the ill conſequences, which might attend his incivility. Was not Conſtantine ſurnamed Copronymus branded with that odious and deſpicable title, which ſtill purſues his memory? did he not become the object of a thouſand invectives, and injurious reflections, becauſe he happened to ſoil the baptiſmal font, tho' innocently and without his knowledge? *Impio patri ſceleſtiſſima ſucceſſit proles Conſtantinus cognomento Copronymi, quod infans baptiſmi lavacro admotus, mediis ſacris alimonii excrementis aquam polluerat* (115). i. e. "The impious father was ſucceeded "ed by the moſt profligate ſon Conſtantine, ſurnamed "Copronymus, becauſe in his infancy, being brought "to the baptiſmal font, he defiled the water during the "holy ſervice." It would have been much worſe, if ſuch an accident had happened to him in a Church, when he oppoſed the protectors of images. An accident like that has always been conſidered as a proof of the utmoſt ſcorn, or as a ſubject for banter and rallery (116). However, they who pretended to excuſe Cæſar might be confuted by a better reaſon, than that, which Dion gives. They might be told, that if ſuch a bodily infirmity had been the cauſe of Cæſar's not riſing, he would have declared it, to excuſe himſelf before the Senators; and ſince he did not mention it, it ſhews that he very little cared whether people thought or not, that he was guilty of a great incivility towards that venerable body. We may eaſily imagine, that the Senators would have admitted the excuſe. Laban, tho' he was in a great paſſion, was ſatisfied with an excuſe of much the ſame nature, when his daughter received him without riſing up (117). Here follows another manner of excuſing one's ſelf (118). "It "happened once that Cardinal Du Perron was in a "great perplexity, when he was to ſpeak at the head "of the Clergy to the late Queen, the King's mother. "For being troubled with the gout, he was obliged to "ſit in a chair before a Queen, ſo full of Majeſty, "and intending to excuſe himſelf by a compliment, for "which he was not prepared beforehand, *Madam*, "ſays he, *I am upon my knees in my heart, tho' you "ſee me ſitting* . . . Here obſerving that it was not "reſpectful to name that part upon which he was ſit"ting, he was a good while a thinking, how he "might find ſome more modeſt expreſſion, but finding "none, he added at laſt *upon my legs* (119)."

(115) Jo. Bapt. Egnatius, *in Ro. Principibus.*

(116) Καὶ βύλομαι ἀντωπουρήσαι τοῖς βρόντας. i. e. "I will . . . "againſt your "thunders." Ariſt. *in Nubib.* Act. 1. Sc. 4. *Vin' tu curtis Judæis oppedere?* Horat. Sat. 4. lib. 1. See the *Catholicon d'Eſpagne*, where it mentions the Sittings of the Deputies from the States, pag. 37. edit. 1699.

(117) *Rachel ſaid to her father, let it not diſpleaſe my Lord, that I cannot riſe before thee; for the cuſtom of women is upon me.* Gen. xxxi. 35.

(118) Cæſar might have ſaid, I am ſtanding in my heart, tho' I ſit &c.

(119) Coſtar, *Suite de la Défenſe de Voiture*, pag. 189.

I have juſt now read ſomething, which may make us queſtion Dion's judgment. Plutarch obſerves, that Cæſar was extremely vexed at his uncivil behaviour towards the Senate, and at which the people was very much diſpleaſed (120). "However, *adds Plutarch* "(121), it is ſaid, that he ſince pretended to have "laboured under a kind of ſickneſs, (*epilepſy*) in "which a man has not the full uſe of his ſenſes, when "he is to ſpeak ſtanding in publick, but is eaſily "diſturbed and confounded by a giddineſs and ſwim"ming in his head, which comes upon him; but "this was a falſe pretence." Dion had read Plutarch, we muſt at leaſt believe it for his credit; why then does he not ſay a word of this excuſe, and yet mentions one which is much leſs probable, and even in a manner ridiculous?

(120) Plutarch. *in Cæſare*, pag. 736.

(121) Ibid.

[O] *He was murthered in the Senate March the 15th 710.*] Authors do not agree in this point of Chronology, concerning the year of Cæſar's death, ſome, as Sigonius, Calviſius, &c. ſay that Cæſar was killed in the year 709. I have followed their opinion in the article of Brutus (122) and perhaps alſo in ſome other places. But I think that Petavius's opinion is better grounded; he maintains that Cæſar was killed in the year 710, and this is now the common opinion. Cæſar was then about fifty ſix years old: he received twenty three blows (123); each of the conſpirators making haſte to wound him, in the hurry they wounded one another (124). They had imagined that the people would approve their action, but the very next day they had reaſon to queſtion it; for when they gave an account of what they had done, the people kept a deep ſilence: the Senate however encouraged them; for if on the one hand they decreed divine honours to Cæſar; on the other hand they alſo granted great favours to the conſpirators. But the funeral pomp of Cæſar confounded all again. Mark Anthony made a diſcourſe, which exaſperated the people to ſuch a degree, that they went immediately to ſet fire to the conſpirators houſes; and ſearched for them thro' the whole city in order to tear them in pieces. What affected the audience moſt was, that Anthony diſplay'd before them Cæſar's veſt pierced thro' and bloody (125). Plutarch and Appian, who copy after him, tell us this circumſtance, but the other Hiſtorians do not mention it. Cicero, who upbraided Mark Anthony with the whole proceeding of that day, ſays not a word of that particular. *Etſi tum, cum optimum te putabant, me quidem diſſentiente, funeri tyranni, ſi illud fucus fuit, ſceleratiſſime præfuiſſe. Tua illa pulcra laudatio, tua miſeratio, tua cohortatio, tu illas faſces incendiſti, & eas, quibus ſemiuſtulatus ille, & eas, quibus incenſa L. Bellieni domus deflagravit. Tu illos impetus perditorum hominum, & ex maxima parte ſervorum, quos nos vi manuque repulimus, in domus noſtras immiſiſti* (126). i. e.

(122) See the Article of BRUTUS (Marcus Junius) in the text, where I fix the battle of Philippi in the year 711.

(123) Sueton. *in Cæſare*, cap. 83.

(124) Plutarch. *in Cæſare*, pag. 739.

(125) From Plutarch, ibid. pag. 740.

(126) Cicero, *Philip.* 2. cap. 36.

ill-timed. Seneca ſeems to have had ſome very ſtrong reaſons to condemn the Uſurper, ſince there were amongſt his enemies two men, who were the greateſt ornament to the Stoick Sect (*m*); yet he blames the murderers, and cenſures them for having been ſo blind, as not to perceive, that conſidering the circumſtances of affairs (*n*) the cauſe of liberty was irretrievably loſt. It was ſo long ſince ambition and luxury had rendered Rome a ſcene of confuſion and violence (*o*), that a monarchical Government was become a neceſſary evil. The wiſeſt men amongſt the Romans had foreſeen, that ſuch a corruption of the morals of the people, and ſuch a contempt of the Laws would end at laſt in a total overthrow of the Commonwealth. Seneca alſo obſerves, that Cæſar had ſo cloſely united, and if I may ſay ſo, incorporated himſelf with the Commonwealth, that they could not be ſeparated, without deſtroying both [*P*]. It is certain that he only was capable of retrieving the State from the misfortunes it had ſuffered; and if any one would maintain that Cicero did not believe what he ſaid, when he affirmed this, it muſt be owned, that he ought to have believed it on this occaſion [*Q*]. We ſhall ſay ſomething of Cæſar's family, and againſt thoſe who did not well know why he was called thus [*R*]; we

(*m*) Cato Uticenſis, who died before Cæſar, and Brutus who killed him, and died ſoon after in defence of his party.

(*n*) See the Article of BRUTUS (Marcus Junius) quotation (14).

(*o*) See the deſcription of it in Lucan. *Pharſal.* lib. 1. ver. 160. and compare with this the quotation (35) in the article of CATULLUS.

i. e. "Tho' when men had the beſt opinion of you, "(I was not of the ſame mind,) you preſided, moſt "wickedly over the Tyrant's funeral, if it was not "all affectation (*a*). It is your fine panegyric, your "lamentations, your exhortations, it is your ſelf, who "lighted thoſe firebrands, by which he was half burnt, "and which burnt down L. Bellienus's houſe. It is "you, who ſent into our houſes that gang of profli"gate men, moſt of them ſlaves, whom we ourſelves "have repelled by main force." Obſerve that Suetonius is ſo far from mentioning the circumſtance of the veſt, that he even hints, that Mark Anthony made no funeral Oration. *Laudationis loco Conſul Antonius per præconem pronunciavit S. C. quo omnia ei divina ſimul atque humana decreverat; item jusjurandum, quo ſe cuncti pro ſalute unius adſtrinxerant; quibus perpauca a ſe verba addidit* (127). i. e. "Inſtead of a panegyric, "he notified by the public Crier the Senate's Decree, "by which all honours divine and human were de"creed to Cæſar; and the oath, by which they had "all bound themſelves for the ſecurity of one; to all "which he added a few words of himſelf." Is it not ſtrange that Suetonius ſhould ſeem to doubt of a fact, which Cicero affirmed before the whole Senate, when the thing was ſtill freſh in every one's memory? One might make a thouſand obſervations upon the different accounts we meet with in ſeveral Hiſtorians. I wonder very much, that Caſaubon (128) pretended to confirm Suetonius's account by the teſtimony of Appian, who affirms that Mark Anthony made a very long ſpeech (129).

(*a*) Perhaps the Latin words ſhould be, *ſi illud funus fuit*. i. e. If this may be called funeral. Obſerve that theſe words are wanted in Freigius's edit. of Cicero's Oration, printed at Francfort, in 1592, 8vo.

(127) Sueton. *in Cæſare*, cap. 84.

(128) Caſaub. *de Suet. in Cæſare*, cap. 84.

(129) Appian. *de Bell. Civil.* lib. 2. p. m. 285.

[*P*] *Seneca obſerves that Cæſar had ſo cloſely united and incorporated himſelf with the commonwealth, that they could not be ſeparated, without deſtroying both.*] Here follow his own words. *Olim ita ſe induit Reip. Cæſar, ut ſeduci alterum non poſſit, ſine utriuſque pernicie: nam ut illi viribus opus, ita & huic capite* (130). He obſerves here, that as Cæſar had occaſion for forces, ſo the Commonwealth wanted a head. Theſe words are the concluſion of ſeveral very good maxims, which he had propoſed, concerning the obedience which the ſubjects owe to thoſe, who govern. Theſe maxims were quoted in a Book, which a Royaliſt publiſhed in France againſt the leaguers in the year 1593. *Non ſolum propter iram, id eſt, metu pœnæ illis obediendum eſt, ſed propter conſcientiam, quia nimirum omnes ſcire oportet, id ex divina voluntate, & conſtitutione fieri debere. Quod etiam Ethnici agnoverunt; inter quos illo ſæculo, quo Paulus ſcripſit, hæc ſapiens Philoſophus dicebat.* "Principes Regeſque, & quocunque alio nomine "ſunt, tutores Status publici amandos etiam ultra pri"vatas neceſſitudines, & olim, *inquit*, ita ſe induit "Reip. Cæſar .... (131). Ille enim eſt vinculum, "per quod Reſpubl. cohæret, ille ſpiritus vitalis, quem "hæc tot millia trahunt, nihil ipſa per ſe futura, niſi "onus & præda, ſi mens illa imperii ſubtrahatur." i. e. "They muſt be obeyed not only for wrath, but "alſo for conſcience ſake; for all muſt know, "that this muſt be done according to the divine will "and appointment. This has been acknowledged "even by the Heathens themſelves, amongſt whom "an eminent Philoſopher, who was contemporary with "St. Paul, has the following words. *Princes and "Kings, and they who govern under any title whatſoever, being the guardians of the State, muſt be beloved, "even before our particular relations.* Formerly, adds

(130) Seneca, *de Clementia*, lib. 1. cap. 4.

(131) Obſerve that in Seneca this precedes what is ſaid of Cæſar.

"he, *Cæſar had ſo cloſely united himſelf &c.* .... "*For he (the Sovereign) is the knot which keeps the "whole State together, he is the enlivening air, which "ſo many thouſands breath, who would be nothing by "themſelves, but a burthen and a prey, if that ſoul "of the Empire was taken away.*" Theſe words are found in page 75 of a work, intitled, *Vindiciæ ſecundum libertatem Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ, & Regii Status Gallo-Francorum, ſub Henrico IV Rege Francorum & Navarræ. L. S. A. R.* It is thought, that theſe four letters ſignify *Ludovicus Servinus Advocatus Regius.*

[*Q*] *He only was capable of retrieving the State. Cicero .... who affirmed it, ... ought to have believed it on this occaſion.*] Let us quote ſome paſſages from his oration for Marcellus. *Quis eſt omnium tam ignarus rerum, tam rudis in republica, tam nihil unquam nec de ſua, nec de communi ſalute cogitans, qui non intelligat tua ſalute contineri ſuam, & ex unius tuâ, vitam pendere omnium? .... Si ad humanos caſus, incertoſque eventus valetudinis, ſceleris etiam accedat inſidiarumque conſenſio; quem Deum, etiamſi cupiat, opitulari poſſe Reip. credamus? Omnia ſunt excitanda tibi, C. Cæſar, uni, quæ jacere ſentis, belli ipſius impetu, quod neceſſe fuit, perculſa, atque proſtrata, conſtituenda judicia, revocanda fides, comprimendæ libidines, propaganda ſoboles; omnia, quæ dilapſa jam defluxerunt, ſeveris legibus vincienda ſunt. Non fuit recuſandum in tanto civili bello, tantoque animorum ardore, & armorum, quin quaſſata Reſp. quicunque belli eventus fuiſſet, multa perderet & ornamenta dignitatis, & præſidia ſtabilitatis ſuæ, muttaque uterque Dux faceret armatus, quæ idem togatus fieri prohibuiſſet. Quæ quidem nunc tibi omnia belli vulnera ſananda ſunt,* QUIBUS PRAETER TE MEDERI NEMO POTEST. i. e. "Who is there, "ſo ignorant of every thing, ſo little acquainted with "the Commonwealth, or ſo unconcerned for his own "preſervation and for that of the State, but muſt "know, that his ſafety is connected with yours, and "the lives of all depend upon yours alone? .... "And if to the dangers which men may run, and "the natural uncertainty of health and life, be added "the fear of conſpiracies, what God, tho' he were "willing, could protect the State? You, Cæſar, muſt "retrieve, whatever the war, tho' neceſſary has de"ſtroyed; you muſt make juſtice flouriſh again, re"ſtore fidelity, reſtrain lewdneſs, and promote mar"riages; in a word, the licentiouſneſs, which is now "come to a head, muſt be repreſſed by ſevere laws. "It cannot be denied, but that the Commonwealth, "after ſuch a confuſion occaſioned by ſo great a civil "war, and ſuch an animoſity of the citizens againſt "one another, muſt have loſt a great deal of her dig"nity and ſtrength; and that both the heads of the "parties have connived at or permitted a great many "things during the war, which they would have for"bidden in time of peace. All theſe wounds occaſi"oned by the wars you muſt now heal, NOR CAN "THEY BE CURED BUT BY YOU." If Cæſar had lived ten years longer, he would in all likelihood have done the greateſt things in the world, for the glory and happineſs of the Romans: he was ſnatched away in the midſt of the moſt noble projects, which an exalted genius and heroic mind could form (132).

(132) *See* Sueton. *in Cæſare*, cap. 44. *and* Plutarch. *in Cæſare*, pag. 735.

[*R*] *We ſhall ſay ſomething concerning Cæſar's family and againſt thoſe, who did not well know, why he was called thus* (133).] He was of the family of the *Julii*, who

(133) Theſe words of Pliny, lib. 7. cap. 9. have miſled them. *Auſpicatius enecta parente gignuntur: ſicut Scipio Africanus prior natus, primuſque Cæſarum à cæſo matris utero dictus.* i. e. "They are born "to greater "luck, who are "born after their "mother's death, "as was Scipio "Africanus, the "firſt of that "ſurname: and "the firſt of the "Cæſars was "called thus, "becauſe he had "been cut out of "his mother's "womb." They applied to Cæſar the Dictator, what Pliny only meant of the firſt, who was ſurnamed *Cæſar*. Obſerve that Solinus did not well underſtand all this; he thought that Pliny ſaid, that Scipio Africanus was the firſt who was called *Cæſar*.

we ſhall alſo add a ſupplement concerning his Commentaries [S]; we have mentioned

who pretended they were deſcended from Venus, by Æneas the ſon of Anchiſes and of that Goddeſs. We ſhall ſee in another place (134), with how much care that tradition of Cæſar's origin was maintained. The deſcendants of Aſcanius, ſon of Æneas and Creuſa, and ſirnamed Iulus, lived at Alba, till that city was ruined by Tullus Hoſtilius King of Rome, who carried them to Rome, where they flouriſhed. We do not find that they produced more than two principal branches; the firſt bore the ſurname of *Tullus*, the other that of *Cæſar*. The perſons of the firſt branch, who begin to make ſome figure in Hiſtory, are Caius Julius Tullus, and Vopiſcus Julius Tullus: The former was Conſul in the year 265 ſince the building of Rome, and Decemvir in the year 300. The latter was Conſul in the year 271. The moſt ancient of the Cæſars we meet with, are thoſe who were in public employments the eleventh year of the firſt Punic war, that is, A. U. 546. Since that time we find that there was almoſt always ſome of that family who enjoyed public offices in the Commonwealth, till the time of Caius Julius Cæſar the Emperor's father. He was the ſon of another Caius Julius Cæſar, whoſe Hiſtory is unknown: We know only that he was married to Morcia, who was deſcended from King Ancus Marcius's family (135). He had two ſons, and one daughter, who was married to Marius. The two ſons, Caius Julius Cæſar and Lucius Julius Cæſar were not raiſed to a higher poſt than that of Prætor, for they died in the prime of their age, and in a very ſingular manner: for they both expired whilſt they were putting on their ſtockings in the morning, Caius at Piſa, and Lucius at Rome, where he was then a *Prætor*. *Nullis evidentibus cauſis obiere, dum calciantur matutino, duo Cæſares, Prætor, & præturâ perfunctus Dictatoris Cæſaris Pater, hic Piſis exanimatus, ille Romæ* (136). Caius was married to Aurelius, by whom he had a ſon, and ſome daughters. The ſon is he, who is the ſubject of this Article. He was born at Rome, the 12th of the month *Quintilis* (137). A. U. 653, and loſt his father in the year 669. I have borrowed this from a book, which contains a great many particulars relating to the family of the Julii (138). You will not meet there with the paſſage in Suetonius, which ſhews, how much they of that family valued themſelves upon their noble extraction, and how elegantly Cæſar could expreſs this. The paſſage is as follows. *Quæſtor Juliam amitam, uxoremque Corneliam defunctas laudavit e more pro Roſtris. Sed in amitæ quidem laudatione, de ejus ac patris ſui utraque origine ſic refert. Amitæ meæ Juliæ maternum genus ab Regibus ortum, paternum cum Diis immortalibus conjunctum eſt. Nam ab Anco Marcio ſunt Marcii Reges, quo nomine fuit Mater. A Venere Julii, cujus gentis familia eſt noſtra. Eſt ergo in genere, & Sanctitas Regum, qui plurimum inter homines pollunt, & ceremonia Deorum, quorum ipſi in poteſtate ſunt Reges* (139). i. e. "When he was Quæſtor he delivered "publickly a funeral Oration in praiſe of Julia his "aunt by his father's ſide, and of Cornelia his wife, "who were both dead. In the panegyric of his aunt "he ſpoke of her and his father's extraction on both "ſides in the following manner. My aunt Julia is "by her mother's ſide deſcended from Kings, and "by her father's from the immortal Gods, for from "Ancus Marcius came the Kings ſirnamed *Marcii*, "of whoſe family was my aunt's mother. From Ve"nus are deſcended the Julii, of whom our family is "a branch. We unite therefore in our family the "Majeſty of Kings, who are in a great eſteem amongſt "men, and the ſanctity of the Gods, in whoſe power "the Kings themſelves are." Suetonius mentions here Cornelia Cæſar's wife. Let us take this opportunity, to ſay ſomething of this Emperor's marriages. He had been betrothed to a very rich virgin, called Coſſutia. He wore ſtill the *Prætexta* of child's gown (a), and it was not long, before he diſmiſſed this bride. He married afterwards Cornelia, daughter of Lucius Cornelius Cinna, nor would he ever divorce her, notwithſtanding the great danger he run by refuſing to comply with Sylla's repeated intreaties (140). He had a daughter by her, who was married to Pompey. His third wife was Pompeia (141), who revenged upon him the injuries he did to a great many huſbands. Clodius fell in love with her, and ſhe loved him; But Cæſar, and Aurelia his mother, a woman of eminent virtue, obſerved her ſo cloſely, that Clodius was obliged to take the opportunity of the myſteries of the *Good Goddeſs* (Ceres) which were celebrated in Cæſar's houſe, to meet with Pompeia. He diſguiſed himſelf in women's apparel, and mixing with the crowd, he entered Cæſar's houſe, but was diſcovered. This affair made a great noiſe. Cæſar divorced his wife, becauſe, as he was pleaſed to ſay (142), he would not have his family ſo much as ſuſpected; yet after all, he did not doubt but ſhe went the utmoſt length with Clodius (143). Ὅυτος (Κλώδιος) ἦρα Πομπηίας τῆς Καίσαρος γυναικος, οὐδὲ αὐτῆς ἀκούσης. ἀλλὰ φυλακαὶ τε τῆς γυναικωνίτιδος ἀχριβεῖς ἦσαν, ἥ τε μήτηρ τοῦ Καίσαρος, Αὐρηλία, γυνὴ σώφρων, περιέλυσε τὴν νύμφην ἀεὶ, χαλεπὴν, καὶ παρακινδυνεύσαι ἀνάγκην αὐτοῖς ἐποίησε τὴν ἔντευξιν (144). i. e. "He (Clodius) loved Aurelia, Cæſar's wife, and not againſt her will. But Cæſar "guarded her ſo cloſely, and Aurelia his mother, a "woman of great ſenſe, kept always by her ſide, ſo "that it was difficult, and even dangerous for them "to meet." Cæſar married afterwards Calpurnia Piſo's daughter, and died before her.

Servius has been guilty of a great miſtake in his Commentary upon the following verſes of Virgil. *Naſcetur* (145) *pulchra Trojanus origine Cæſar. . . . Julius a magno demiſſum nomen Iulo* (146). He thought, that the ſirname of Cæſar was given to Caius Julius the Dictator, either becauſe he had been cut out of his mother's womb, by a Chirurgical operation, or becauſe his grandfather had killed an Elephant in Africa which is called *Cæſar* in the Punic language. *Vel quod avus ejus in Africa manu propria occidit Elephantem, qui Cæſar dicitur Pœnorum lingua* (147). Neither of theſe reaſons can be admitted, ſince there was a family ſurnamed Cæſar, and the anceſtors of the Dictator, at Rome as ſoon as the firſt Punic War. Obſerve that Cedrenus, the Author of the Alexandrine Chronicle, Malala, Suidas, Glycas, and Conſtantinus Manaſſe, aſſert, that to get Cæſar out of his mother's womb, it was neceſſary to cut her open. Zonaras has confuted that falſhood (148). How was it poſſible for them not to know, that Cæſar's mother was ſtill alive, when he was married to Pompeia? Had they not read what he told her the day, on which the High-Prieſt was choſen (149)? Did they not know that ſhe took a great care of his education (150)? for ſhe was a learned and eloquent woman (151). She died when her ſon was in the war againſt the Gauls (152). I have pointed out the origin of that blunder (153).

[S] *A ſupplement concerning his Commentaries.*] In the firſt edition of this Dictionary I had only obſerved (154), that Voſſius has proved that Julius Cæſar, is the true Author of the Commentaries, which are aſcribed to him, but now I will enlarge a little more upon that ſubject. Francis Floridus maintained, that the three books of the civil war were not written by Cæſar (155). Another maintained the ſame concerning the ſeven Books of the Gallic War (156). Voſſius obſerves that Lewis Caduccus (157) aſcribed them to Suetonius. But theſe are all ill-grounded opinions, which we can entirely confute by the authority of the ancient Authors, without being obliged to the anſwer that could be made, namely that theſe books of Cæſar have been loſt, ſince the ancient writers quoted them. They who think, that beſides his Commentaries, which are extant, Cæſar alſo wrote *Ephemerides*, which are loſt, are much more in the right; they contained a journal of his life. Servius has quoted from them a very remarkable circumſtance. *Cujus Cæſar*, ſays he (158), *cum dimicaret in Gallia, & ab hoſte raptus equo ejus portaretur armatus, occurrit quidam ex hoſtibus, qui eum noſſet, & inſultans ait*, Cecos Cæſar, *quod Gallorum lingua*, dimitte *ſignificat; at ita factum eſt ut dimitteretur. Hoc autem ipſe Cæſar in Ephemeride ſua dicit, ubi propriam commemorat felicitatem.* i. e. "When Cæſar was waging war in Gaul, "it happened that he was taken by the enemy, and "being carried on horſeback, armed, he was met by "one of the enemies, who knew him, and ſaid in "an inſulting manner, *Cecos Cæſar*; that word ſigni"fying

(134) In one of the remarks of the article TROY. N. B. *Mr. Bayle has not given that article.*

(135) See below a paſſage from Suetonius, quotation (139).

(136) Plinius, lib. 7. cap. 53. pag. 88.

(137) Which was afterwards called *Julius (July)* in honour to Cæſar.

(138) It was written by Joannes Glandorpius, and is intitled, *Familiæ gentis Juliæ . . . concinnatæ*, it was printed at Baſil in 1576, 8vo, by the care of Ambroſe Glandorpius, the Author's ſon. It was afterwards inſerted in 1589, into the *Onomaſticon Hiſtoriæ Romanæ* of the ſame Author.

(139) Suetonius *in Cæſare*, cap. 6.

(a) A long Gown which children wore till they were ſeventeen years old.

(140) Suetonius, *ubi ſupra*, cap. 1.

(141) Daughter of Quintus Pompeius Rufus.

(142) Plutarch. *in Cæſare*, pag. 712.

(143) Sueton. *in Cæſare*, cap. 6.

(144) Plut. *in Cæſ.* pag. 711. D. See alſo, *in Ciceron.* pag. 874.

(145) Virg. Æn. lib. 1. ver. 286.

(146) That is, Aſcanius, Æneas's ſon. For Virgil has ſaid (ibid. ver. 267.) *At puer Aſcanius, cui nunc cognomen Iulo Additur.*

(147) Servius, *in An.* lib. 1. ver. 286.

(148) *See* Dr. Bentley's Notes upon the *Chronicle of Malala*; *See alſo* Grævius's *Suetonius*, the 2d edit. 4to.

(149) See the remark [E] quotation (48).

(150) Tacit. *de Orat.* cap. 20.

(151) Glandorp. *Onomaſt.* pag. 426.

(152) Suetonius *in Cæſ.* cap. 26.

(153) In the marginal notes, num. (133).

(154) See the cloſe of the remark [G].

(155) Fr. Floridus Sabinus, *Subciſivar. Lect.* lib. 1. cap. 3. & lib. 2. *apud* Voſſium, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 62.

(156) Ludov. Carrio, *apud* Voſſium, ibid.

(157) He ſhould have ſaid *Caduceus*. See below quotation (165).

(158) Servius *in Æn.* lib. 11. ver. 743.

tioned in another place (*p*) ſomething concerning his *Apotheoſis*.

(*p*) See the remark [*D*] of the article DOLABELLA, and the *Penſées diverſes ſur les Comètes*, num. 82, 83.

" fying in the language of the Gauls, *let him go*, Cæ-
" ſar was thereupon diſmiſſed. This is what Cæſar
" himſelf relates in his journal, when he gives an ac-
" count of his good luck." It is very probable that when Plutarch quoted Cæſar's Ephemerides (159), he did not mean the Commentaries, but the ſame work, to which Servius refers us. I know that what he relates in that paſſage, is to be found in the fourth book of Cæſar's Commentaries. But that warrior muſt needs have mentioned often the ſame things, both in his Journal, and in his Commentaries. We may therefore affirm, that Plutarch meant the Ephemerides, and that if he had quoted the Commentaries, he would have made uſe of the word ὑπομνήματα, as Strabo has done (160). Let us remark alſo, that Appian has quoted the ſame Ephemerides, in the following words. Καίσαρ ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀναγραφαῖς τῶν ἰφημερίων ἔργων φησὶ (161). It is beſides very probable that Polyænus had peruſed them, for he relates ſeveral of Cæſar's ſtratagems, which are not mentioned in the Commentaries. The ſame may be ſaid of Frontinus. See Dionyſius Voſſius's remarks (162), printed in 1697, with Cæſar's Commentaries, and with a book, to which they have given the title of *Julius Celſus de Vita & Rebus geſtis C. Julii Cæſaris* (*a*), and which had been printed in the year 1473. It was grown ſo ſcarce, that the Author, who wrote the Commentary upon Julius Cæſar's work for the Dauphin could not find one at Paris. Grævius is of opinion, that this Author lived in the twelfth or even in the thirteenth Century (163). Obſerve, that there are ſome perſons, who imagine, that Oroſius aſcribes Cæſar's Commentaries to Suetonius, when he makes uſe of theſe expreſſions. *Hanc hiſtoriam* (De Cæſaris bello Gallico) *Suetonius tranquillus pleniſſime explicuit, cujus nos competentes portiunculas decerpſimus* (164). i. e. " Suetonius Tranquillus has given a full " account of this Hiſtory (of Cæſar's wars in Gaul), " of which we have tranſcribed the neceſſary paſſages." This was Savaro's opinion, as appears by the manner in which he explains thoſe words of Sidonius Apollinaris. *Quis opera Suetonii, id eſt*, ſays Savaro (165), *Vitam Julii Cæſaris, & Libros de Bello Gallico, quos Suetonio aſſerit Oroſius, lib. 6, cap. 7, & ex eo, Hiſt. Miſcella. l. 6. ita viſum eſt Ludovico Caduceo, mihi propter eruditionem, & humanitatem amiciſſimo, in cujus commilitio multum me profeciſſe libere fateor*. It would perhaps be better to ſay, that Suetonius had wrote a particular work concerning Cæſar's wars in Gaul, and that it was from ſuch a work Oroſius made his collections. Honeſt Mr. de Marolles has quoted wrong what he had read in Voſſius, from whom however he tranſcribes faithfully the blunder which I have obſerved (166). *Lewis Caduceus . . . . maintains that* the ſeven Books of the Gallic War *were written by Suetonius, which he proves by theſe words in the ſeventh Chapter of his ſixth Book*; Suetonius, *ſays he*, has related this at length in his Hiſtory of Cæſar's Wars in Gaul (167). Does he not inſinuate hereby that his pretended Lewis Caduceus publiſhed a work, which contains at leaſt ſix books? Is not this the way to put Bibliographers a hunting to no purpoſe?

I am acquainted with only three French tranſlations of Cæſar's Commentaries, that of Stephen de l'Aique, that of Blaiſe de Vigenere, and that of Mr. d'Ablancourt. The firſt was printed in 1531 (168), the ſecond in 1575, with a learned Commentary, it was reprinted in 1609, with ſome marginal Notes of Anthony de Bandole, who added alſo to it his Compariſon between Cæſar and Henry IV. Mr. d'Ablancourt's Tranſlation was printed for the firſt time about the year 1651, if I am not miſtaken.

(159) Plutarch. *in Cæſare*, pag. 718, D.

(160) Strabo, lib. 4. *init.*

(161) Appian. *in Excerpt. Legat.* pag. 159.

(162) pag. 3.

(*a*) See the new *Menagiana*, tom. 3. pag. 137, &c. CRIT. REM.

(163) See the Preface to Cæſar's *Commentaries*, edit. 1697.

(164) Oroſius, lib. 6. cap. 7. folio m. 246. *verſo*.

(164) Oroſius, lib. 6. cap. 7. folio m. 246, *verſo*.

(165) Savaro, *in Epiſt.* 14. lib. 9. Sidonii Apollin. pag. 606.

(166) Above, quotation (157).

(167) Mr. De Marolles, in his *Life of J. Cæſar*, prefixed to the 2d vol. of his *Augmentation de l'Hiſtoire Romaine*, pag. 289, &c.

(168) See the remark [*B*] of the article AQUÆUS.

CÆSARIUS (JOHN) a Phyſician and Philoſopher born at Juliers, lived in the ſixteenth Century. He read Lectures at Cologne (*a*), and publiſhed ſeveral Authors. He was very zealous, and ſpared no pains for the advancement of learning; but he was ſo far from getting any pecuniary advantage by his labours, that he fell into the utmoſt poverty in his old age, and would have died for want, had not his friends aſſiſted him [*A*]. Being ſuſpected of favouring the Lutheran Religion he was baniſhed from Cologne in 1543 (*b*), and retired into the houſe of the Count of Nuwenar and Meurs, where he died in 1550, being above fourſcore and ten years old. Some ſay, that he returned at laſt to the Roman Catholic Religion, and that dying at Cologne in 1551, he was buried in the church of the Convent of the Hieronymites near the great altar (*c*); they put a long epitaph (*d*) upon his tomb, in which it was ſaid among other things, that he had never been married. Alexander Hegius, whoſe ſcholar he had been at Deventer, having refuſed, on account of his great age, to take upon him the direction of the ſchool, which was founded at Munſter (*e*) towards the latter end of the fifteenth Century, propoſed Cæſarius for that employment (*f*). He propoſed alſo ſome other learned men, and amongſt them Timanus Camener, who was choſen.

(*a*) See the remark [*A*].

(*b*) Chytræus *in Saxoniâ*, lib. 16. *initio*.

(*c*) Valer. Andreas, *Bibl. Belg.* pag. 479.

(*d*) It is to be ſeen in Valer. Andreas, *Bibl. Belg.* pag. 479.

(*e*) Chytræus *in Saxonia*, pag. 80.

(*f*) Idem, ibid.

[*A*] *He would have died for want, had not his friends aſſiſted him.*] This is no doubt the ſenſe, which we may put upon the following Latin words of John Sturmius. *Floruerunt aliquando in hac civitate* (Coloniæ) *literæ, cum in ea Sobius, & Cæſarius, & Phryſemius docerent, . . ſimulque cum Magiſtris atque Doctoribus vetus frequentia diſcipulorum ſublata eſt. Sobium vis morbi nobis abſtulit: Phryſemius, quoniam nullum refugium in noſtris ſtudiis eſſe videbat, ad Juriſprudentiæ portum confugit, & juris quam ſapientiæ conſultus eſſe maluit. Senex adhuc ibi eſt, atque omnium noſtrûm tanquam parens Cæſarius: qui in hâc affectâ ætate, poſt tot tantorumque laborum defunctionem, niſi ab amicis ſuſtentaretur, viderent eum literæ egentem, quas ipſe ſemper ornavit, ſemperque maximi fecit* (1). i. e. " The ſciences flouriſhed for ſome " time in this city (*Cologne*), when Sobius, Cæſa-
" rius, and Phryſemius taught there. . . . But the an-
" cient concourſe of Scholars vaniſhed away with the
" Maſters and Doctors. Sobius died of ſickneſs:
" Phryſemius finding that there was nothing to do
" in our way of learning, applied himſelf to the ſtu-
" dy of the Law, and choſe to be verſed in that ra-
" ther than in Philoſophy. There is ſtill an old
" man living there, I mean, Cæſarius, who is as the
" father of us all; but who in his old age, after ſo
" many and ſo great labours, and notwithſtanding his
" application to the ſciences, which he always im-
" proved and highly eſteemed, would want the neceſ-
" ſaries of life, were he not aſſiſted by his friends."

(1) Joannes Sturmius, *Epiſt. Dedicat.* tom. 2. *Orationum Ciceronis.* It is not dated; but we muſt ſuppoſe, it was written in 1540.

CAIN, the eldeſt ſon of Adam and Eve, was an Huſband-man. He offered to God the fruits of the earth, at the ſame time that his brother Abel, who was a Shepherd, offered up the firſtlings of his flock. God was well-pleaſed with the offerings of Abel, but had no regard for thoſe of Cain; upon which the latter was ſo highly exaſperated, that without having the leaſt reſpect for the remonſtrance, which God made to him, he killed his brother. By the ſentence, which God pronounced againſt him, he was condemned to baniſhment and a vagabond ſtate of life; which made him apprehenſive, that

every one who found him ſhould kill him [*A*]. But to calm this fear, God had the goodneſs to ſet a mark on him, to prevent thoſe who ſhould find him from killing him [*B*]. Cain retired to the land of Nod on the Eaſt of Eden, and built a city, to which he gave the name of his ſon Enoch. This is all that can be ſaid of him with any certainty, there being no more concerning him in the Book of Geneſis (*a*). The other things which are related of him in abundance are no other than conjectures, or imaginary fancies, or traditions of the utmoſt uncertainty. We have elſewhere (*b*) mentioned ſeveral things of this nature which relate to him; but we ſhould never have

(*a*) In the 4th Chapter.

(*b*) In the articles of ABEL, ADAM and EVE.

EXAMINATION of ſome difficulties concerning PRÆADAMITES.

[*A*] *He was afraid leſt every one who found him ſhould kill him.*] This language ſeems to ſuppoſe, that Cain was perſuaded there were inhabitants throughout the whole earth; for a man who believed that the human ſpecies was wholly comprehended in the family of Adam, would have found no better means of avoiding being killed, than to remove far off from that family: but on the contrary, here is Cain, who ſeems to fear no murtherer, provided he removes not from them; he is afraid of being ſlain only in caſe he be *a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth* (1). I own this difficulty is not a very great one; but we ought not to take it amiſs that libertines make the moſt of it, ſince it is certain that there is no ſect of Chriſtians, who would not urge it vigorouſly againſt the others, if they differed from the others in that point. I hardly meet with one, who, to refute this objection of the Præ-Adamites, has not recourſe to the fecundity of Eve, and does not calculate how many children might come as well from her as from her daughters in the ſpace of a hundred years; but methinks this is not going to the point, becauſe it is to ſuppoſe that Cain was afraid of his brothers and nephews. But this was not what he was afraid of; for, as I have already ſaid, if it had been the foundation of his fear, he would have deſired no better than to baniſh himſelf, and he would not have looked on the exile to which God condemned him as a puniſhment greater than he could bear (2). They were the inhabitants of diſtant countries, therefore, whom he was afraid of; unknown people, and engaged by no tie of kindred to him. I ſhould therefore be apt to ſay, that the remorſe of his conſcience, and the fearful idea he had formed to himſelf of his baniſhment, made him forget what his father had, without doubt, ſeveral times told him concerning the origin of mankind. And perhaps he only feigned an apprehenſion of meeting with aſſaſſins every where in far countries: perhaps, I ſay, he only feigned it, in order to obtain a revocation, or commutation, of the puniſhment which God had inflicted on him. Men act in the ſame manner every day towards their Judges: they ſtrive to move their compaſſion, and to obtain ſome favour by exaggerating the rigour of their ſentence: they ſay more of it than they believe. And let me not be told that Cain was not ignorant enough to think he could conceal the bottom of his heart from God; for why ſhould we think him incapable of imitating his father, who had endeavoured to eſcape the eye of God, by hiding himſelf among the trees of the garden? Nay more; what means this anſwer of Cain's to God, *I know not; am I my brother's keeper?* Is it not the language of a man who thinks he is ſpeaking to another man, and that he may hide from him what he does not confeſs? Was it not an errant lie? God at that time made uſe of the behaviour of man, to accommodate himſelf to our weakneſs, and they anſwered that behaviour in ſuch a manner, that they ſeem to have taken him for a man in reality. But a ſtronger objection may be made me, which is to ſay that God, very far from diſabuſing Cain of the falſe ſuppoſition that there were men every where, ſeems to have confirmed him in it. And indeed, he does not give him this anſwer, *Thou haſt no need to fear murderers in diſtant countries, for there is no body at all in thoſe places:* he quiets his apprehenſions by giving him a mark to hinder thoſe who ſhould find him from killing him; which plainly ſuppoſes, that Cain might find people wherever his vagabond and fugitive life ſhould conduct his ſteps. I anſwer, that God contented himſelf with remedying what was moſt preſſing, that is the fear which this fratricide ſhewed of being ſlain by the firſt that met him. Now the ſhorteſt way to quiet the fear of a trembling ſoul who believes his life will become the prey of the firſt who can lay hands on him, is not to tell him that his relations are the only men in the world; it is to tell him in general, that none of thoſe who ſhall find him ſhall kill him. It is not my intention, however, to omit backing the foregoing anſwers by this other conſideration. Men in thoſe days lived ſeveral Centuries, and multiplied exceedingly. Cain without doubt had already ſeen proofs of this fecundity: there muſt neceſſarily therefore be a great number of people on the earth before he died: ſo that the mark which God gave him, when he ſent him into a country as yet uninhabited, was no ſuperfluous thing. I ſay nothing of the age he might be of when he made away with his brother; having ſpoken of it elſewhere: thoſe who ſuppoſe him to be no more than thirty or forty years old (3), and who ſay that neither he nor Abel were yet married (4), are not perhaps much miſtaken; but, according to this hypotheſis, it would be more ſurprizing that Cain ſhould ground his apprehenſions on the men whom he knew. Adam was not a man to put one of his ſons to death, to revenge the death of another of his children; and it was not to be preſumed that the other children of Adam would kill one brother, to revenge the death of another brother. There is no conſiderate family in which they would act in that manner; and this ſeems to be the reaſon why God would take immediate cognizance of this cauſe, and content himſelf with baniſhing the criminal. He thereby accommodated himſelf to our nature: in ſuch a caſe, families chuſe to be neither judges nor proſecutors, and content themſelves with not ſeeing the murderer. The children of Abel only, if he had any, could inſpire any fear; but, once more, it was not his relations that Cain was afraid of: he was afraid of the firſt who ſhould meet him in a ſtrange country: he would appear there deſtitute of all ſupport, without relations, without friends, without knowing the roads or places: he imagined that ſuch a ſtate would inſpire every one with the boldneſs to attack him, and the hopes of killing him with impunity. He ſaw not the ſame reaſons of fear in a country which he knew, and in the midſt of his kindred. There lies the knot of the affair.

(1) Gen. iv. 14.

(2) Ibid. ver. 13.

(3) Cunæus, *de Republic. Hebræor.* lib. 1. cap. 1. puts 100 years between the death of Abel and the birth of Seth, which happened in the 130th year of Adam's life.

(4) See Remark [*F*] of the Article ABEL.

[*B*] *God ſet a mark on him, to prevent thoſe who ſhould find him from killing him.*] Opinions differ vaſtly on this head. Some imagine that God imprinted a letter on Cain's forehead, and that this print was the paſſport by means of which that vagabond might go through the whole earth, without fear of being ſlain. This letter was taken either from the name of Abel (5), or from the ineffable name of God (6), the *Tetragrammaton* which was of ſo great efficacy. But others will have it to have been taken from the word *Repentance*, that every one might ſee that Cain had repented. Others ſuppoſe that this mark conſiſted in the three letters which compoſe the name of the Sabbath day, or in the ſign of the Croſs (7). Others ſay that the dog which guarded Abel's flock was given to Cain, for a conſtant companion in his travels (8); either that every one might know by that ſign that he muſt not attack Cain, or elſe that by following ſuch a guide Cain might never take any dangerous road (9). Others ſay that the leproſy covered all his forehead, and his whole face (10). Others imagine that this mark was no other than a wild aſpect, with bloody eyes, which rolled in a horrid manner (11). Others ſay that he became ſubject to ſuch a trembling of body, that he could ſcarce get his meat and drink to his mouth (12). The Verſion of the Septuagint favours this opinion; for they have tranſlated, not *thou ſhalt be a fugitive and a vagabond*, but *thou ſhalt be lamenting and trembling*, στένων καὶ τρέμων. There are ſome, who ſay, that wherever

(5) *Veteres Hebræi, apud* Genebrardum.

(6) *Vide* Salden. *Ot. Theol.* pag. 345.

(7) Ibid.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Cornel. a Lapide, *in Geneſ.* cap. 4.

(10) Salden. *Ot. Theol.* pag. 345.

(11) *Apud* Salian. tom. 1. pag. 192.

(12) Procopius, *in Geneſ.* cap. 4. *See likewiſe* St. Jerom, Epiſt. 125. *ad Damaſum.*

have done, if we were to ſet down the reſt. What has there not been ſaid as to the reaſons for which it is pretended his offering was rejected by God [C]? Who would believe Joſephus capable of giving this reaſon, viz. that Cain offered not, as his brother did, things which are produced naturally, that is to ſay animals, but things which the labour and avarice of man cauſe to be produced forcibly, that is to ſay grain and fruits (c)? Does not a Jew, who reaſons in this manner, ſeem to have forgotten the grounds of his Religion? Were not the offerings of the firſt-fruits ordained by the Law of Moſes? If the reaſons alledged by Philo (d) were a fact well ſupported, they would be preferable to the reaſon given by Joſephus. This laſt Author tells one thing which is very probable; that Cain did not amend his life in his exile, but on the contrary grew more wicked (e): he ſatisfied his paſſions at the expence of others, and enriched himſelf by the ſpoil of his neighbour with a thouſand acts of violence. Joſephus attributes to him the invention of meaſures, weights, and boundaries. All this was very ſeaſonable among people whom Cain's example accuſtomed to all ſorts of injuſtice [D]. We cannot tell preciſely how many brothers and ſiſters he had, when he killed Abel; however it is not to be doubted but thoſe who ſay there were then no more than four perſons in the world, are miſtaken [E]; for though it were true,

(c) Joſeph. *Antiquit.* lib. 1. cap. 2.

(d) See the Remark [C].

(e) Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. 1. cap. 2.

ever he ſtopped, there was an earthquake all around him (13). What ſtrange fancies! To conclude, there are ſome who ſay he had a horn grew on his forehead (14), not of the nature of thoſe metaphorical horns, which ſucceeding Ages have attributed to huſbands diſhonoured by their wives infidelity, but a horn properly ſo called, which ſerved as a ſignal to other men, that they ſhould not come near him: *Fœnum habet in cornu, longè fuge* (15). Metaphorical horns could only have aggravated his puniſhment; they were anciently wiſhed to malefactors, as appears from a paſſage of Job (16); but Cain's mark was given him as a benefit; it was to ſerve him for a ſafe-guard.

(13) *Apud* Saldenum, *Ot. Theol.* pag. 345.
(14) *Apud* Salianum, tom. 1. pag. 192.
(15) Horat. Sat. 4. lib. 1.
(16) Cap. 31. ver. 10. *Vide* Druſium, *Quæſt. Ebraic.* 38. lib. 2. See the Remark [B] of the Article ÆGIALEA.

[C] *What has there not been ſaid as to the reaſons for which it is pretended that his offering was rejected by God?*] It is gueſs-work only, and beating the air, to ſpend one's time in ſeeking after the outward defects which might be in the offerings of Cain. Perhaps nothing was wanting in them in that reſpect (17): perhaps he forgot only the good diſpoſitions of the heart, which are principally regarded by God. We ſee that St. Paul attributes to the faith of Abel alone the ſuperiority which he had over his brother (18). However it be, three great defects have been reckoned up in Cain's oblation. I, That he was very ſlow in making it; II, That he offered not the firſt fruits; III, That he choſe not the beſt. It is Philo who has given this cenſure. The ancient Fathers have had a good deal of regard to it; for to ſay nothing of St. Ambroſe, who has been a great follower of Philo, I obſerve that St. Cyrill (19) accuſes Cain of having reſerved for his own eating and pleaſures all the fineſt fruits which the earth yielded him, and having deſigned the worſt only for God, ſuch as the thinneſt ears of corn, and the moſt worm-eaten apples (20); for our Author has deſcended to theſe minute particulars. How many times in books and ſermons have they been compared to Cain, who ſend to the Nunneries only the ugliеſt and ſtupideſt girls, and keep thoſe who have any wit and beauty for the world? And yet, is there any thing leſs certain than what St. Cyril advances? Is it not evident that Philo is miſtaken in reſpect to the firſt defect, ſince the Scripture takes notice that Abel did not offer the firſtlings of his flock, but at the ſame time that Cain preſented of the fruits of the earth? I ſhall obſerve, by the way, that this retrograde Latin verſe,

(17) *See* Fagius *in Geneſ.* cap. 4.
(18) Heb. xi. 4.
(19) *Apud* Salianum, pag. 186.
(20) Biſſelius, *Illuſt. Ruin. Decad.* 1. pag. 220.

Sacrum pingue dabo, nec macrum ſacrificabo,

is Politian's. Theſe words are to be ſeen in a picture which repreſents the ſacrifice offered by theſe two brothers to God; they are to be ſeen, I ſay, in that picture in the firſt cloiſter of Madonna la Novella at Florence. The two brothers are ſituated, in reſpect to the Inſcription as they ſhould be, that each may find his proper ſenſe (21).

(21) Mabillon, *Muſeum Ital.* tom. 1. pag. 162.

[D] *The example of Cain accuſtomed people to all kinds of injuſtice.*] Joſephus aſſerts that Cain was a voluptuous man, and a robber, and that his deſcendants only grew worſe and worſe. Add to what he has ſaid of them the deſcription which Methodius has left of the manners of that race of mortals (22), and you will find it was not without reaſon that the city of Enochia, built by Cain, has been compared to that which a King of Macedon cauſed to be built for the reception of all ſorts of profligate people: on which account he gave it the name of *Poneropolis*, or *the City of wickedneſs*. Lewdneſs made ſo horrid a progreſs among the deſcendants of Cain, that not contented with robbing one another of their matrimonial rights, and enjoying their miſtreſſes in public, and in the ſight of every one who had a mind to be witneſs of it, they leaped over all the bounds of nature, and abandoned themſelves, as well men as women, to the ſin of Non-Conformity. *Furere mortales ac ruere lymphatis ſimiles in quicquid dictu ſcriptuque fœdum eſt, ac non ſufficientibus ad probra noctium tenebris aut cubiculorum ſolitudinibus, connectere turpitudini dierum ſpatia, populique præſentiam & oculos infandâ conſuetudine fœdare . . . . Sed illius temporis longius adhuc multò ſunt abrepta dedecora, quam quæ finibus limitibuſque naturæ continerentur. Superaret fidem, niſi Methodius affirmaret, auctor ſanè gravis ac ſanctus, cœpiſſe jam tum quod poſtea divinus Paulus deploravit in idololatris*, ut in maſculos maſculi turpitudinem exercerent, & in fœminas fœminæ, *Leſbiis flammis exardeſcerent* (23). All theſe things were done before the world had laſted more than ſix hundred years. The Author whom I have juſt quoted gives us (24) the very words of Methodius, as he found them in the notes of his brother Jeſuit Raderus on the Alexandrian Chronicle. I ſhall here take notice of a thing which is but too common: no ſooner has a man rendered himſelf infamous by his ill actions, but even the good things which he has done are condemned. Cain is an example of this. Nothing was more neceſſary in ſo diſorderly a city as his, than the uſe of weights and meaſures; yet is not Joſephus inconſiderate enough to make it a crime in him to have introduced the uſe of them? He has confounded things which it was eaſy to diſtinguiſh. He thought, becauſe weights and meaſures ſavour not of ſimplicity or honeſty, that he who had invented them had corrupted the ancient candour of mankind, and had taught them cunning, and new methods of cheating. But who ſees not, on the contrary, that corruption had preceded the uſe of weights and meaſures, and that their introduction was neceſſary as a remedy for fraud? Cain acted herein as thoſe tyrants do, who having occaſioned a thouſand diſorders, do for all that make good laws to ſtop the progreſs of them. In a word, Joſephus minded nothing leſs than what he was ſaying.

(22) The book which goes about under his name concerning theſe matters, is ſuppoſititious.
(23) Biſſelius, *Ruin. illuſtr. Dec.* 1. pag. 258.
(24) Idem, ibid. pag. 277.

[E] *Thoſe who ſay there were . . . . but four perſons in the world, when he killed Abel, ... are in a miſtake.*] This miſtake is a very old one: St. Auguſtin refutes it in the VIIIth chapter of the XVth book of the City of God, and in the firſt Queſtion on Geneſis. But St. Ambroſe, far from refuting it, runs into it headlong, in this apoſtrophe which he makes to Cain. *Cur neſcis ubi eſt frater tuus? Soli eratis cum duobus parentibus, inter paucos frater te latere non debuit* (25). i. e. "Why knoweſt thou not where thy brother is? "Ye were alone with your two parents; among "ſo few thy brother could not well be concealed from "thee." A figure of Rhetoric void of all truth. Several moderns have fallen into the ſame miſtake.

(25) Ambroſius, lib. 2. *de Abele*, cap. 9.

true, as ſome ſuppoſe (*f*), that Cain was but thirty years old when he committed that murder, there would be no room to doubt but that Eve had already lain in ſeveral times. I ſhall conclude with an old tradition concerning Cain's death. Being decrepit and blind, ſay they, he ſate down one day among ſome very thick buſhes (*g*); Lamech (*b*), who was then hunting, having notice that ſomething ſtirred in that place, ran thither, and thinking that a wild beaſt was lying there, let fly an arrow, and ſlew Cain. Some (*i*) place this event about the year of the world 701; and others in the year 875. Salianus the Jeſuit (*k*) embraces this laſt opinion, which he ſays is that of Pererius and Torniellus; whence we conclude, by the way, that Moreri is in the wrong to ſay, that according to Torniellus and Salianus, the murder of Cain by Lamech happened in the 688th year of the world. Toſtatus (*l*) makes Cain to have lived near eight hundred years. There are ſome who place his death under the year 931, and pretend that he was buried under the ruins of a houſe (*m*). Paulus Burgenſis (*n*), who makes him periſh in the deluge, did not mind what he was ſaying: this is to make him live almoſt 1656 years. There are ſome alſo who ſay he ſlew himſelf (*o*); and have the impertinence to conclude from thence, that God did not keep his word with him; becauſe he had promiſed him, ſay they, that no man ſhould kill him. It is falſe that God's promiſe was ſo expreſſed; it regarded only thoſe whom Cain ſeemed to be ſo much afraid of, that is to ſay, the men who ſhould light on him in his baniſhment.

(*f*) Cunæus, *de Republ. Hebr.* lib. 3. cap. 1.

(*g*) Rabbi Gedaliah *in Shalſh.* pag. 92. *apud* Heidegger. tom. 1. pag. 211.

(*b*) We ſhall ſpeak of this more amply under the word LAMECH.

(*i*) *Apud* Salianum, pag. 214.

(*k*) Pag. 216.

(*l*) *Apud* Salianum, pag. 214.

(*m*) St. Romuald, *Abregé Chronol.* citing Cedrenus.

(*n*) *Apud* Pererium, *in Geneſ.* cap. 4. ver. 23, 24.

(*o*) Armeni *apud* Guidonem Carmelitam, *citante* Prateolo *in Elencho Hæreſ.* pag. m. 63.

(26) *Eccleſiæ primæ incunabula mundus vidit recens natus, cum in quatuor capitibus ſtaret humanum genus. Confeſtim enim impurus genius cui ex malis noſtris jucunda voluptas eſt, Caïnum a recta pietatis ſemita tranſverſum egit in omne nefas. . . . Gregem oppido exiguum hoc eſt quatuor oves in tantâ mundi vaſtitate agebat magnus ille paſtor: unum ex his lupus hic abſtulit.* That is, "The new born "world ſaw the infancy of the firſt Church, when mankind conſiſted of four "perſons. For immediately the impure Spirit, who takes high delight in "our miſeries, drove Cain aſide out of the ſtrait path of piety into all ſorts of "wickedneſs. . . . . The great ſhepherd, when there was ſuch vaſt room in "the world, drove an exceeding ſmall flock, of four ſheep only: and one of them "this wolf carried off." Cunæus, *de Rep. Hebr.* l. 3. cap. 1.

(27) *In Comment. Belgico ad Geneſ.* cap. 4. pag. 65. *apud* Saldenum, *Ot. Theol.* pag. 339.

Cunæus (26), and Burman are of that number. It is true, the laſt ſeems to have kept a back-door open, having ſaid (27) that Cain, by ſlaying Abel, had killed the fourth part of mankind who had a name in the world. If he is preſſed, he will ſay, that he has not excluded thoſe people whom the Scripture does not name. The ſubterfuge would be a weak one, and much leſs worthy of an ingenious man than this reflection of the ſame Author: *As vaſt*, ſays he, *as the world was, it was too little for theſe two brothers.* The following verſe of Juvenal might be applied here.

Unus Pellæo juveni non ſufficit orbis,
That is,
"One world ſuffic'd not the Pellæan youth,"

and ſeveral ſuch thoughts; but they will be more properly in their place in the article of ALEXANDER. The French Poet Malherbe ought to make his appearance on this occaſion: he has alſo been caught in the error I am refuting. *He had*, ſays his Hiſtorian, *a great contempt for all men in general; and after relating the ſtory of Cain's ſin, and the death of Abel his brother, he ſaid to this effect; Behold a fine beginning, there were but three or four in the world, and one of them goes and kills his brother. What hopes could God entertain of mankind after this? Would he not have done better to have extirpated the race of them for ever from that very hour?*

CAINITES [*A*], a Sect of Heretics which appeared in the ſecond Century, and had this name by reaſon of their great reſpect for Cain (*a*) [*B*]. Theſe people had drawn their abominable dogms out of the ſinks of the Gnoſtics (*b*), and were the ſpawn of Valentinus, of Nicolaus, and of Carpocrates. They admitted a great number of Genii, which they called Virtues, and which they ſaid were ſome of them more and others leſs powerful. They pretended that the Virtue which had produced Abel was of an Order much inferior to that which had produced Cain (*c*), and that this was the reaſon why Cain had the victory over Abel, and killed him [*C*]. They made profeſſion of honouring all thoſe

(*a*) Auguſt. *de Hæreſ.* cap. 18.

(*b*) Epiphan. *Hæreſ.* xxxviii.

(*c*) Tertul. *de Præſcr.* cap. 47.

[*A*] CAINITES.] They may alſo be called *Cainians*. Tertullian calls them *Caïnæos* (1), and *Caïanam hæreſim* (2). Several of the Fathers called them *Caïanos* (3), before St. Epiphanius made uſe of the word Καϊανοὶ. Wherefore Danæus (4) is in the wrong to think that St. Auguſtin, by calling them *Caïanos*, has retained the fault which the Copiers have ſuffered to ſlip into St. Epiphanius. Danæus, finding no analogy in the formation of Καϊανοὶ, ſuppoſes that St. Epiphanius had made uſe of the term Καϊνιανοὶ, or Καϊνοὶ, of which the tranſcribers, ſays he, have by miſtake made Καϊανοὶ. But all this criticiſm falls to the ground, ſo ſoon as one conſiders that the term *Caïani* was current before St. Auguſtin and St. Epiphanius wrote. I here, therefore, give my reader notice, that theſe heretics are alſo named *Caïans*.

(1) *De Præſcript.* cap. 47.
(2) Ibid. cap. 33.
(3) *See* Voſſius, *Harmon. Evangel.* pag. 218.
(4) *In Auguſt. de Hæreſ.* cap. 18.

[*B*] *A Sect . . which had this name by reaſon of their great reſpect for Cain.*] Theſe people were mad enough to believe that the Divinity, which commands in heaven and earth, having reſolved to puniſh Cain for the murder of Abel, could never catch him; and had neither ſtrength nor ſwiftneſs ſufficient for that purpoſe: at length, there were ſome etherial Powers, which protected him from the purſuit of this avenging God, and tranſported him to the firmament, hiding him in a place of ſafety in the age above, *in ſuperno ſæculo* (5). This was their language. The Author whom I cite, cites nobody.

(5) Biſſelius, *Ruin. Illuſt.* Dec. 1. pag. 269.

[*C*] *They pretended that the Genius . . . of Abel was . . . inferior to that . . . of Cain, and that this was the reaſon why Cain had the victory over Abel.*] This is conformable enough to the Pagan Doctrine concerning the particular Genius of each man. This ſort of genii were chiefly called Dæmons (6). It was pretended that the happineſs and fortune of a man depended on his tutelary Genius. A man was fortunate when his Genius had a very great power: on the contrary, a man was unfortunate when his Genius was weak, and incapable of withſtanding the Genius of other men. Every Genius did his beſt for the intereſts of his client; and if a man was beaten, it was a ſign that the ſtrength of his Genius had been forced to yield to that of the conqueror's Genius. One of theſe Genii proved to be of an order inferior to the other; and this was governed by chance: for as lots were appointed to be caſt for the ſouls which were ſent into the world, ſo the tutelary Genii of each perſon were to be drawn by lot (7). There were Genii whoſe aſcendant over others were ſuch, that they entirely diſconcerted them by their preſence. This is what the Genius of Auguſtus did to that of Mark Antony (8); and hence it comes to paſs that we ſee certain perſons have wit, ſpeak well, and rally genteely, in the abſence of ſome others, and appear much confounded when they have thoſe others to engage. People were perſuaded, no doubt, that thoſe) who attained the Empire, had a Genius of an eminent order; and from thence the great honours which were paid to ſuch Genii had their riſe (9). Nations

(6) *See* Dodwell, *Prælect.* 2. *ad Spart. Hadrian.* pag. 175.

(7) Idem, ibid. pag. 176.

(8) Ὁ σὸς δαίμων τὸν τούτου φοβεῖται, καὶ γαυρὸς ὢν καὶ ὑψηλὸς ὅταν ᾖ καθ' αὐτὸν, ὑπ' ἐκείνου γίνεται ταπεινότερος ἐγγίσαντος καὶ ἀγενέστερος. Hujus genium formidat genius tuus, qui erectus & celſus ubi ſolus eſt, illo appropinquante demiſſior redditur & ignavior. *Aſtrologus Ægyptius ad M. Antonium, apud* Plutarch. *in Antonio*, pag. 930.

(9) Dodwell. *Prælect. II. ad* Spartiani Hadrian. pag. 175, *& ſeq.*

thoſe who carry in Scripture the moſt viſible marks of reprobation; as the inhabitants of Sodom, Eſau, Corah, Dathan, and Abiram. They had in particular a very great veneration for the traytor Judas, under colour that the death of Jeſus Chriſt had ſaved mankind: for they imagined I know not what powers, enemies of our ſalvation, who would have hindred Jeſus Chriſt from ſuffering, if Judas had not prevented the effects of their malice, by delivering up his maſter to the Jews, who condemned him to death, whence proceeded the ſalvation of mankind (*d*). They carried their boldneſs ſo far as to condemn the Law of Moſes, and to regard the God of the Old Teſtament as a Being who had ſown tares in the world, and ſubjected our nature to a thouſand diſaſters; ſo that, to revenge themſelves, they did the direct contrary of what he had preſcribed. There was no carnal uncleanneſs into which they did not plunge themſelves, no crime wherein they did not believe they had a right to participate; for, according to their abominable principles, the way of ſalvation was diametrically oppoſite to the precepts of Scripture. They imagined that every ſenſual pleaſure was preſided over by ſome Genius: for which reaſon they failed not, when they prepared themſelves for any ill action, to invoke by name the Genius who had the ſuperintendance over the pleaſure they were going to taſte. When one reads theſe things in the Fathers of the Church, one can ſcarce help thinking that the ſame thing happened to them with regard to Heretics, as happened to the Pagans with regard to the Chriſtian Religion. The Pagans have imputed to them a hundred extravagances, and a hundred abominations, which had not the leaſt foundation. The firſt who forged theſe calumnies were without doubt guilty of the blackeſt malice; but the greater part of thoſe who related them after they had been maliciouſly ſpread abroad, were only guilty of too much credulity: they believed the common report, without being willing to take the pains to examine it. Is it more credible that the Fathers had all the patience which was neceſſary to inform themſelves exactly of the real ſentiments of a Sect, than it is credible that the ſame people, who taught that the death of Jeſus Chriſt had ſaved mankind, ſhould have taught that the moſt filthy pleaſures are the way to Paradiſe? Let who will decide this; I ſhall here act the relator only. But it muſt be remembred, that there is no abſurdity of which the mind of man is not ſuſceptible; and that in particular the dogm of a number of Genii, good and evil, ſome ſuperior to others, and ſet over divers charges, is ſufficiently within the reach of reaſon [*D*]. I add that the Cainites had forged a pretended Scripture (*e*): they

(*d*) Idem, ibid.

(*e*) *Vide* Baronium, *ad ann.* 145. num. 16. & Danæum *in Auguſtin. de Hæreſib.* cap. 18.

tions and Cities had alſo their Genii (10). Now as theſe tutelary Dæmons were ſaid to preſide at the birth of him who was to be under their direction, there was no need to go far to paſs from this opinion to that of the Cainites. The latter added only, that the Genius formed the body of him whoſe protector he was to be. The Platoniſts, I think, might eaſily have been brought to believe this article, if it had been ſtrongly repreſented to them that the formation of a human body requires the direction of a very ſkilful intelligence. Concerning theſe tutelary Genii ſee Barthius's Notes on Rutilius Numatianus (11). If this hypotheſis is not abſolutely neceſſary to account for an infinite number of hiſtorical phænomena (give me leave to call human events by that name) it is at leaſt the moſt convenient, and the eaſieſt to comprehend. The reader will be leſs ſurprized to find here a Remark which ſavours too much of digreſſion, and a foreign ſoil; he will, I ſay, be leſs ſurprized, if he examines attentively the drift of the following Remark.

(10) Ibid. pag. 180.

(11) *Ad* lib. 1. *Itinerarii*, ver. 328. pag. m. 238, *& ſeq.*

[*D*] *The dogm of a number of Genii . . . . is ſufficiently within the reach of reaſon.*] We turn to ridicule the ſyſtem of the old Pagans, their Naiads, their Oreads, their Hamadryads, &c. and we go upon very ſure grounds when we condemn the worſhip which was paid to thoſe beings; for we know from Scripture, that God forbad all religious worſhip which was not directed immediately and ſolely to himſelf. But when we conſider human reaſon left to itſelf, and deprived of the aſſiſtance of the Scriptures, we may eaſily comprehend, methinks, that it ought to conceive this vaſt univerſe as penetrated throughout by a moſt active power, which knew what it did. Now to account for ſo many effects differing from one another, and even contrary to one another, which are ſeen in nature, it was neceſſary to imagine either a ſingle Being which diverſifies its operation according to the diverſity of bodies, or elſe a great number of Souls and Intelligences, each of them provided with a certain employment, and appointed to preſide ſome over the ſprings of rivers, others over mountains, others over woods &c. There were ſome people among the Pagans, who in the worſhip of Ceres and Bacchus profeſſed to honour the Supreme Being only, as the producer of corn and wine. Others profeſſed to worſhip the particular Intelligence which, in the diſtribution of the charges of the great Univerſe, had been intruſted with the ſuperintendance of the corn fields and vineyards. This foundation once laid, one knows not where to ſtop: the number of Gods becomes multiplied without end and without ceaſing; ſacrifices are offered to ſear, and to the ſeaver, to favourable winds, and to ſtorms (12): A Hierarchy ariſes, the degrees of which are innumerable; the combinations of intereſts are diverſified infinitely among theſe Intelligences which are not ſeen, and yet are admitted as cauſes exceedingly active. If I am aſked what I intend by this far fetched reflection, I anſwer, that I am clearing the way for thoſe who have a mind to defend the Fathers, accuſed of having imputed to heretics a hundred extravagant notions which no body ever taught. It is much more probable than one imagines, that people who think they reaſon well, may have admitted ſeveral principles, ſome good, and others bad, and a perpetual contraſt among Beings of unequal power, and ſubject to different inclinations. It is a great error, I own; but it preſents itſelf in ſeveral views, and it is very poſſible to fall into it. I am willing to believe that the Gnoſtics, and thoſe who reſemble them, explained themſelves ſo confuſedly, that one might happen to impute to them very candidly what they had not admitted as an article of their belief: yet I make no difficulty to believe that they did in the main admit thoſe Virtues and Principles which are attributed to them. By reaſoning conſequently, after having eſtabliſhed the agency of ſeveral Virtues, they might lay it down in particular that the Jewiſh nation had been directed by a miſchievous Being, and thence paſs into all the abominable impieties which are attributed to them with reſpect to the God of Abraham, of Iſaac, and of Jacob. Since I am got ſo far, I may as well make an end. The belief of Intelligences preſiding over divers charges in the univerſe, is of as great an extent as the belief of God: for I do not think that ever any people had a religion, without acknowledging ſome intermediate Intelligences. The moſt ſubtle Philoſophers, he who is called the Genius of nature (13), the Carteſians of the greateſt penetration, have acknowledged them. The followers

(12) *Taurum Neptuno, taurum tibi, pulcher Apollo, Nigram hiemi pecudem, Zephyris felicibus album.* Virg. *Æneid.* lib. 3. ver. 119.

(13) Ariſtotle.

they had, among other books, a *Goſpel of Judas*, and an *Aſcenſion of St. Paul*. They pretended to have in this Book the unſpeakable things, which that great Apoſtle had ſeen and heard, when he was rapt into the third Heaven.

REFLECTION on the ſubſtantial form of the Peripatetics.

EXPLICATION of the doctrine of ſome Carteſians concerning the formation of bodies.

of Ariſtotle place ſome of them every where, even at this day, without well perceiving it; for they place in all bodies a ſubſtantial form, which has for its portion a certain number of qualities, with which it accompliſhes its deſires (14), repels the enemy, and preſerves itſelf in the beſt manner it is able in its natural ſtate. Is not this to admit an intelligence in plants appointed to make a part of the univerſe vegetate, and acting for that end under the directions of the Supreme Being? So far are thoſe who deny the creation, ſo far are the Spinoziſts, from being able to deny theſe intelligences, that there is no ſyſtem, which introduces them more neceſſarily or more unavoidably than theirs. It would not be difficult to prove it to them; but this is not a matter proper for ſuch a book as this. In the ſyſtem of the creation, it is a great difficulty to admit intelligences which love evil, or which according to the idle imaginations of our Cainites, have the ſuperintendance of ſenſual pleaſures, as the Pagan Venus had the ſuperintendance of the pleaſures of love, even by the confeſſion of an Epicurean Poet (15). But in the ſyſtem, which denies the creation, it is a neceſſary conſequence, that there muſt be evil in the univerſe, altogether as ſoon as good, and miſchievous Genii, altogether as ſoon as beneficent.

(14) The term *appetitus, exigentia*, and the like, are of the ordinary ſtyle of the Peripatetics, when they ſpeak of the natural effects of bodies, either animate, or inanimate.

(15) See the Invocations of Venus at the beginning of *Lucretius's Poem*.

Leſt I ſhould be ſuſpected of having raſhly advanced what I have ſaid concerning the moſt able Carteſians, I deſire it may be obſerved, that the perſon among them, who has attributed the moſt to the ſimple and general volitions of God (16), very plainly inſinuates in ſeveral paſſages of his books, that there are a great number of occaſional cauſes, which we are ignorant of. Now theſe occaſional cauſes are nothing elſe but the wills and deſires of certain intelligences. They muſt neceſſarily be admitted wherever the laws of the communication of motion are not capable of producing certain effects. This goes a great way; one cannot conceive them ſufficient for the building of a ſhip; no man makes a difficulty of acknowledging that motion would never produce a clock, without the direction of a particular intelligence. Conſequently, thoſe laws are incapable of producing the leaſt plant, or the leaſt fruit: for there goes more artifice to the conſtruction of a tree, or of pomegranate, than to that of a ſhip. We muſt have recourſe therefore to the particular direction of an intelligence for the formation of vegetables, and much more for the formation of animals. As much of the laws of motion, figure, reſt, ſituation of particles, as you pleaſe. This will do ſo long as we have not ſeen forty: after which you find the moſt excellent Carteſians boldly acknowledge, that they begin to doubt of the ſufficiency of their principles. They then underſtand their Categories (17) as they ſhould do. It is true, ſay they, this is ſufficient to make a tree, or a clock, be what they are: but as motion alone by the general laws has not made, nor can make the pieces of a clock acquire the figure and ſituation which they have, never believe that the parts of a tree have acquired their ſituation and figure by the mere laws of motion. Once more, this goes a great way, and leads us to a Genius who preſides over the formation of animated machines. But are minerals and meteors very eaſy to produce? Is there not a great deal of artifice in their conſtruction? More than is imagined. The ſchool-men, inſtead of genius, or intelligence, make uſe of the words *ſubſtantial form*, *plaſtic virtue*, &c. but words do nothing.

(16) The Author of *la Recherche de la Verité*.

Bodinus has ſaid a thing, which ſhews that he admitted preſiding Genii, not only to preſerve, but alſo to produce all ſublunary Beings. There is ſome conſequence in this ſuppoſition: for the beſt means of intereſting an intelligence in the protection of a corporeal creature, is to give that intelligence the office of forming it, I mean of applying motion according to the ideas, which it has of the form of that creature, as Clock-makers and Architects do. Let us ſet down the words of Bodinus. *Quemadmodum in republicâ benè conſtitutâ non minus ſunt neceſſarii Carnifices, Lictores, Veſpillones quam Magiſtratus, ac Judices, & Curatores, ſic in hac republicâ mundanâ Deus ipſe ad rerum generationem, procurationem, ac tutelam, Angelos locis omnibus cœleſtibus, elementaribus, animantibus, ſtirpibus, foſſibilibus, civitatibus, provinciis, familiis, ſingulis hominibus principes ac moderatores collocavit; neque hoc tantum, ſed etiam miniſtros, lictores, vindices, ultores locis omnibus diſpoſuit, qui nihil injuſſi faciunt nec pœnas ullas de hominibus conſceleratis ſumunt, niſi rebus judicatis & plenè cognitis* (18). i. e. "As in a "well ordered Commonwealth, Executioners, Serjeants, and Carriers out of the dead, are no leſs neceſſary than Magiſtrates, Judges, and Guardians; "ſo in this mundane republic God himſelf for the "generation, converſation, and defence of things, has "appointed Angels as Princes and Governors in all "places cœleſtial and elementary, over animals, vegetables, foſſils, cities, provinces, families, and "ſingle men: nor this only, but he has alſo conſtituted inferior Miniſters, Serjeants, Vindicators, and "Avengers in all places, who do nothing without "bidding, nor puniſh wicked men, till things are "judged and fully examined."

(17) They are comprized in theſe two verſes. *Mens, menſura, quies, motus, poſitura, figura, Sunt cum materiâ cunctarum exordia rerum.* i. e. "Mind, meaſure, reſt, motion, poſition, figure, and matter, are the principles of all things." You ſee the ſpiritual nature, *Mens*, at the head of all. It muſt be conſidered as a tranſcendental nature, which runs thro' all the categories, *quæ vagatur per omnes categorias*.

(18) Bodin. *in Univerſ. Naturæ Theatro*, lib. 5. pag. 631, 632.

CAIUS or KAYE (JOHN), a learned Phyſician in the XVIth Century, and famous for his writings [*A*], eſpecially his Book upon *the Antiquity of the Univerſity of Cambridge*, was born in the city of Norwich in the year 1510 (*a*). His father, Robert Caius, was born in Yorkſhire, as we are informed by Dr. Fuller in his *Hiſtory of the Univerſity of Cambridge ſince the Conqueſt* (*b*). He began his ſtudies at Norwich, and then went to Cambridge to continue them, where he ſtudied Phyſic (*c*), and took the degree of

(*a*) Bale, *Illuſt. Scriptor. Major. Brytanniæ, Catal.* p. 715. *and* Pits, *de illuſtrib. Angliæ Scriptor.* pag. 755. edit. Paris 1619; *and* Niceron, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſt. des Hommes Illuſt.* tom. 11. pag. 12. edit. Paris 1730.

(*b*) Pag. 133. §. 45. edit. London 1655, in fol.

(*c*) Pits, *ubi ſupra*.

[*A*] *Famous for his writings.*] We ſhall give a catalogue of them. I. *De medendi Methodo ex Cl. Galeni, & Joannis Baptiſtæ Montani Veronenſis, principum Medicorum ſententiâ Libri duo. Baſileæ* 1544 in 8vo. *Lovanii* 1556 in 8vo. *Baſileæ* 1558 in 8vo, with the *Opuſcula* of Montanus. Caius wrote this work in 1542, while he reſided in Italy. He follows in it entirely the principles of Galen and John Baptiſta Montanus, Profeſſor of Phyſic at Padua, under whom he had ſtudied for ſome time (1). II. *Cl. Galeni Pergameni Libri aliquot Græci, partim hactenus non viſi, partim a mendis, quibus ſcatebant, innumeris ad vetuſtiſſimos codices repurgati, & integritati ſuæ reſtituti, annotationibuſque illuſtrati.* Baſil 1544, in 4to. He reviſed theſe treatiſes in Italy, and publiſhed them after his return to England. Our Author in his Tract *de Libris propriis* applauds himſelf on account of the corrections, which he had made in Galen, and the edition which he had publiſhed of ſome of his works, and tells us, that it was extremely ſought after, and that his obſervations were tranſcribed almoſt word for word in the edition at Lyons 1551 (2). III. *Galeni Liber de Sanitate tuendâ.* Baſil 1549 in 12mo. There is no Commentary in this edition. Our Author wrote one afterwards, which he ſent to Baſil in 1563, to be printed there, but this edition never appeared. IV. *De Ephemerâ Britannicâ Liber.* London 1551 in 12mo. This is a Treatiſe upon the Engliſh Sweating-Sickneſs, which proved fatal to a great number of Perſons in this year 1551. Our Author call'd it *Ephemera*, becauſe the diſeaſe continued but for one day. He wrote this book *ex tempore*, but he afterwards made conſiderable additions to it, and divided it into two books. It was printed in that form at London 1721 in 8vo, and in the following collection of his Tracts. V. *Opera aliquot & Verſiones, videlicet, de Medendi Methodo Libri*

(1) Niceron, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſt. des Hommes Illuſtres*, tom. 11. pag. 13. edit. Paris 1730.

(2) Idem, pag. 13, 14.

of Doctor in that Faculty (*d*), and wrote ſeveral pieces, while he was young. He afwards travelled into Italy in order to perfect himſelf in his ſtudies, and at Padua attended the lectures of John Baptiſta Montanus of Verona, a very celebrated Phyſician of that time; and by means of an uncommon application added to the ſtrength and vivacity of his genius, he made ſo great a progreſs in the ſtudy of Phyſic, that he might juſtly be ranked with the greateſt Phyſicians of that age. The greateſt part of thoſe Tracts, which he had written in his youth, were loſt in England, during his reſidence in Italy; but he makes ſome mention of them in his Book *de Ephemerâ Britannicâ* (*e*). He ſearched a great number of Libraries, and diſcovered the writings of ſeveral Authors, which were almoſt deſtroyed, and publiſhed them with his emendations (*f*). Upon his return to England, he was made ſucceſſively Phyſician to King Edward the VIth (*g*), Queen Mary, and Queen Elizabeth (*h*). He had ſo great zeal for the intereſts of learning, that he improved the ancient Hall of *Gonvil* into a new College, which was afterwards called *Gonvil and Caius College*, and gave a perpetual allowance for twenty three ſtudents (*i*). Pits informs us (*k*), that he was not conſtant in his ſentiments of Religion, but that in the ſeveral revolutions, which happened in his time in England, he always conformed himſelf to the Religion of the reigning Prince. Dr. Fuller obſerves that he was reported by ſome perſons to have continued a Papiſt in his heart; which that Writer obſerves to be no crime in him, conſidering the time when he was born, and the foreign places, wherein he was educated. However, he never mentions Proteſtants but with due reſpect, and ſometimes occaſionally condemns the ſuperſtitious credulity of Popiſh Miracles (*l*). Beſides, after he had reſigned the Maſterſhip of his College to Dr. Thomas Legg, he lived as a Fellow-Commoner there, and having built himſelf a little ſeat in the Chapel, was conſtantly preſent at Proteſtant Prayers (*m*). However Mr. Strype aſſures, that his Religion was very juſtly ſuſpected [*B*]. He died in the

(*d*) Niceron, *ubi ſupra.*

(*e*) Pits, *ubi ſupra.*
(*f*) Idem, ibid.

(*g*) Niceron, *ubi ſupra.*
(*h*) Fuller, pag. 133, 134.

(*i*) Camden's *Annals of Elizabeth, ad ann.* 1573.

(*k*) Pag. 756.

(*l*) *Hiſt. Cantabrig. Academ.* lib. 1. pag. 8. *Quanquam illius ævi Cæcitas admirationem, &c.*

(*m*) Fuller, pag. 134.

Libri duo. De Ephemerâ Britannicâ. Galenus de Libris ſuis & Librorum Ordine Libri duo. De Ratione Victûs Hippocratis in morbis acutis. De Placitis Hippocratis & Platonis. Lovain 1556 in 8vo. VI. *Galeni Libri de Oſſibus, de Ptyſſanâ &c.* Baſil 1557 in 8vo. VII. *De Canibus Britannicis Liber unus, De rariorum Animalium & Stirpium Hiſtoria Liber unus. De Libris propriis Liber unus.* London 1570 in 12mo. The Treatiſe *de Canibus Britannicis* has been reprinted with Chriſtian Francis Paullinus's *Cynographia curioſa ſeu Canis deſcriptio*, at Nuremberg 1685 in 4to, and in the Collection of Authors, which have written upon Hunting, publiſhed at Leyden 1728 in 4to (3). And the Tracts mentioned in this and the following number were publiſhed by Samuel Jebb M. D. at London 1728 in 8vo. VIII. *De Pronuntiatione Græcæ & Latinæ Linguæ cum Scriptione novâ.* London 1574 (4) in 4to. IX. *De Antiquitate Academiæ Cantabrigienſis Libri duo.* London 1568 in 8vo, and 1574 in 4to. When Queen Elizabeth viſited the Univerſity of Cambridge in 1560, the public Orator made a ſpeech to her, in which among other things he aſſerted, that this Univerſity was more ancient than that of Oxford. This Speech made a great deal of noiſe at Oxford, and Mr. Thomas Key, Maſter of Univerſity-College there, wrote a Tract againſt it, intitled, *Aſſertio Antiquitatis Oxonienſis Academiæ*, printed at London 1568 in 8vo. Upon this our Author Caius reſolved to confute Mr. Key's Book, and publiſhed the firſt edition of the Treatiſe abovementioned under the feigned name of *Londinenſis*. This provoked Mr. Key to write a Reply, which he communicated to ſeveral of his friends under the title, as Biſhop Nicholſon tells us (5), of *Examen Judicii Cantabrigienſis cujuſdam, qui ſe Londinenſem dicit, nuper de Origine utriuſque Academiæ lati*; or, as Father Niceron obſerves (6), under the title of *Animadverſiones aliquot in Londinenſis de Antiquitate Cantabrigienſis Academiæ Libros duos.* But Mr. Key did not live to publiſh this Tract, he dying in 1572; however this manuſcript having paſſed thro' ſeveral hands, came at laſt into thoſe of Mr. Thomas Hearne, who publiſhed it at Oxford 1731 8vo, with ſeveral other pieces. Our Author Caius put his name to the ſecond edition of his Book in 1574 in 4to; in which he endeavours to eſtabliſh the aſſertion of the Antiquity of the Univerſity of Cambridge, from the Charters of King Arthur and King Cadwallader, together with thoſe of the Popes Honorius and Sergius. He then proceeds to confute the arguments urged in favour of the Seniority of the Univerſity of Oxford (7). Biſhop Nicholſon (8) tells us, that he ſeems to have intended a much larger Hiſtory of the Univerſity of Cambridge, than is given in this Book; for ſpeaking of the frequent depopulations and miſeries of the town during the wars between the Saxons and Danes he concludes thus; *De quibus in Libris noſtris* de Hiſtoria Cantabrigienſis Academiæ *explicatius egimus*: i. e. "Of which we have treated "more amply and particularly in our Treatiſe con- "cerning *the Hiſtory of the Univerſity of Cambridge.*" And Biſhop Nicholſon is very confident, that a good part of the Collections, which he made for this purpoſe, are ſtill in Sir John Cotton's Library, where we are told of a volume of *Collectanea ex Antiquis Rotulis & variis Auctoribus de Academiâ Cantabrigienſi, ejus Antiquitate & Privilegiis, cum multis Literis Originalibus ejuſdem Academiæ ad Regem Henricum VIII, Thomam Cromwellum, &c.* i. e. "Collections from the "antient Rolls and various Authors concerning the U- "niverſity of Cambridge, its Antiquity and Privileges, "with many original Letters of that Univerſity to "King Henry VIII, Thomas Cromwell, &c." From this paſſage it appears, that Biſhop Nicholſon did not know, that our Author's *Hiſtory of the Univerſity of Cambridge* was ever actually printed, as it was at London 1574 in 4to under the following title (10); *Hiſtoria Cantabrigienſis Academiæ ab urbe conditâ, duobus Libris.* He wrote a great many other books, which are either loſt, or have never been publiſh'd; and Pits in his book *de illuſtribus Angliæ Scriptoribus* (11) informs us, that he corrected Cornelius Celſus's works in many places, where they were corrupt, and added Notes and Arguments to them, and tranſlated all Galen's Works from the Greek into Latin; and wrote a Treatiſe *de Thermis Bathonienſibus.* Mr. Gibſon, now Biſhop of London, in his edition of *Cambden's Britannia*, publiſhed at London in 1695 tells us, that Dr. Fuller reports, that our Author wrote the *Antiquities of Norwich.* "But I ſuſpect, *ſays Biſhop Nicholſon* (12), "there is ſome miſtake in that matter, ſince Fuller "in the (*e*) place, where he ſhould eſpecially have "noted ſuch a thing, ſays nothing of it."

[*B*] *However Mr. Strype aſſures us, that his Religion was very juſtly ſuſpected.*] That Hiſtorian in the *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, Archbiſhop of Canterbury* (13), informs us that in December 1565 there was a caſe referred to the Archbiſhop between Dr. Caius and the Fellows of the College, of which he was both Maſter and Founder; and that the Maſter had in a fit of anger taken ſome advantage againſt three of the Fellows, Dethike, Spencer, and Clerk, for ſome breach of the Statutes, and expelled them, charging them alſo with perjury. They appealed to the Archbiſhop, but not in ſo regular a manner as they ought to have done. His Grace ſaw that Dr. Caius had been to blame as well as the Fellows; upon which he reprimanded them both, but the Maſter moſt ſeverely, who was however willing to commit the final iſſue to the Archbiſhop's deciſion. But the Fellows refuſed,

(3) Idem, pag. 14, 15.

(4) Niceron, pag. 15. erroneouſly ſays 1674.

(5) *Engliſh Hiſtorical Library*, Part 2. pag. 211. edit. London 1697, in 8vo.
(6) Tom. 20. pag. 7. edit. Paris 1732.

(7) Nicholſon, pag. 220.
(8) pag. 220, 221.

(9) *Bibl. Cotton. Fauſtina*, cap. 3.

(10) *See* Niceron, tom. 11. p. 16.

(11) Pag. 756. edit. Paris 1619, in 4to.

(12) *Engliſh Hiſtorical Library*, Part 1. pag. 50.
(*e*) *Worthies in Norwich*, pag. 275.

(13) Book 3. cap. 4. pag. 199, *& ſeqq.* edit. London 1711, in fol.

(n) Camden's *Annals of Elizabeth, ad ann.* 1573.

the year 1573 aged ſixty three years (*n*), and lies buried in the Chapel of his College under a plain tomb, with this inſcription, *Fui Caius* (*o*). Pits tells us (*p*), that he deſerved extremely well of Phyſic and the Profeſſors of that Faculty, and procured himſelf an immortal honour by his learned Writings.

(o) Idem, ibid. and Fuller, *ubi ſupra.*

(p) pag. 756.

and appealed to the Lord Burleigh, Chancellor of the Univerſity. The Fellows therefore drew up Articles againſt the Maſter, ſome of which made a great impreſſion upon the Archbiſhop, *as not ſounding to a favouring Atheiſm*, ſays Mr. Strype, *but plainly expreſſing the ſame, with further ſhew of a perverſe ſtomach to the profeſſors of the Goſpel.* Upon this the Archbiſhop declared, that if he were credibly perſuaded of theſe things, he would conſider Dr. Caius *tanquam Ethnicum & Publicanum*, and *would not vouchſafe him within his houſe*, whither he reſorted. And he aſſured the Chancellor of the Univerſity, that if the Articles could be well teſtified, he could wiſh a better Maſter in his place, and that Dr. Caius might hold himſelf in his Founderſhip, if he would; *for he liked not*, as he ſaid, *ſtones builded by ſuch impiety.* Mr. Strype obſerves upon this, that it is probable, that our Author thought proper to cover his former inſtability in Religion, by throwing out expreſſions occaſionally, whereby he would pretend to have had little zeal for any Religion; or that his aim might be to conceal his ſecret affection for the old Popiſh Religion. "For that he "had a kindneſs for it, *ſays Mr. Strype*, appeared in "his private reſervation of abundance of Popiſh trum-"pery, which he might think would come in play "again; and ſo out of good huſbandry preſerved them "to ſave the College the charge of buying new fur-"niture for the chapel." But in 1572 the whole affair was diſcovered; for the report of it coming to the ears of Dr. Edwin Sandys Biſhop of London, he wrote to Dr. Byng, Vice-Chancellor of the Univerſity, to ſee that thoſe ſuperſtitious monuments might be aboliſhed. Dr. Byng could ſcarce be perſuaded that ſuch things had been reſerved by Dr. Caius. However cauſing Dr. Caius's own company to make ſearch in that College, *he received an inventory of much Popiſh ware, as veſtments, albes, tunicles, ſtoles, manicles, &c. with ſuch other ſtuff as might have furniſhed divers Maſters at one inſtant.* It was thought proper, with the conſent of all the Heads of the Houſes, to burn the books and ſuch other things, as ſerved moſt for idolatrous uſes, and to cauſe the reſt to be defaced; which was done on December 13th 1572. "But however Dr. "Caius ſtood affected this way, *ſays the Hiſtorian a-"bove quoted*, he laboured to diſſemble his good will "to it, and would be thought a good Proteſtant." This appeared from the following inſtance. There was one *Depup*, a ſcholar of his College in his time, who was greatly ſuſpected to be inclined to the Popiſh Religion, and well known to be extremely vicious. The Founder therefore at his death gave orders, that this ſcholar ſhould never be elected a Fellow, though Dr. Legg, his ſucceſſor, ſoon after he came to the College, brought Depup into a Fellowſhip. *Theſe*, concludes Mr. Strype, *were ſome of Dr. Caius's defects, and others might be named; as that he too much affected ſuperiority over his Fellows, and was obſerved to be the firſt, that made the innovation of preferring a junior Fellow to be Preſident; whereas before, in that College the Senior Fellow was always Preſident; and that only in the Maſter's abſence. This was the cauſe of much ſtrife and contention afterwards in the College. . . . But the ſaid perſon having merited ſo much of that College by his noble benefactions, and of the whole commonwealth of learning, 'tis pity that theſe or any other frailties in him ſhould now, after ſo long a time, riſe up in judgment againſt him.* T.

☞CALAMY (EDMUND), an eminent Preſbyterian Divine in the XVIIth Century, was born at London in February $1\frac{599}{600}$, and admitted into Pembroke Hall in Cambridge July the 4th 1616, in which Univerſity he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1619, and of Bachelor of Divinity in 1632 (*a*). His inclination to the Anti-Arminian Party, hindered his preferment there at that time, tho' he was at laſt choſen *Tanquam Socius* of the College [*A*], and Dr. Felton Biſhop of Ely afterwards took notice of him, and made him his Chaplain (*b*). In this ſtation he purſued his ſtudies with great vigour [*B*]. He was firſt preſented to the Vicarage of St. Mary's in Swaffham-Prior in Cambridgeſhire by the Biſhop (*c*), after whoſe death in 1626 he was choſen Lecturer at St. Edmund's Bury in Suffolk (*d*), where he had Mr. Burroughs for his Collegue (*e*). Here he continued ten years (*f*), and is ſaid by ſome Writers to have been a very ſtrict Conformiſt [*C*]; but his grandſon, Dr. Calamy, aſſures us, that Biſhop Wren's ARTICLES and the *Book of Sports* obliged him and thirty other Miniſters to leave the Dioceſe. After Mr. Fenner's death he was preſented by Robert Earl of Warwick to the Rectory of Rochford in Eſſex (*g*); but

(a) From the Regiſter of the Univerſity of Cambridge.

(b) *An Account of the Miniſters, &c. who were rejected or ſilenced after the Reſtoration in* 1660, *by or before the Act for Uniformity.* By Edmund Calamy, D. D. vol. 2. pag. 5. 2d edit. London 1713, in 8vo.

(c) *Continuat. of the Account, &c.* vol. 1. pag. 8.

(d) Dr. Calamy's *Account, ubi ſupra, and* Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 281. 2d edit. London 1721.

(e) Dr. Calamy's *Account, ubi ſupra.*

(f) Idem, ibid. and Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(g) Dr. Calamy's *Account,* pag. 5. *and* Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

[*A*] *Tho' he was at laſt choſen* Tanquam Socius *of the College.*] Dr. Henry Sampſon in a MS. relating to the Hiſtory of the Non-Conformiſts, in the hands of the late Dr. Edmund Calamy, informs us of this particular, and obſerves, that this was a place peculiar to that College, and firſt erected upon a competition between thoſe two great perſons, who afterwards proved ſo eminent in the Church, Biſhop Andrews and Biſhop Dove (1); where the former carried the Fellowſhip, but the Society being unwilling to part with the latter, and yet having no Fellowſhip vacant, founded this place of *Tanquam Socius*, who was to hold it for three years only, unleſs re-elected. His privileges were, beſides the Society of the Fellows, to have *poma, pupilli, pileus*; that is, his dividend in the Garden, leave to take pupils, and the honour of capping; but he was not allowed any ſhare of the government of the College, nor any other profits except a certain ſtipend.

(1) See the article of Biſhop ANDREWS, note [*A*], vol. 1. pag. 695.

[*B*] *In this ſtation he purſued his ſtudies with great vigour.*] He ſtudied at the rate of ſixteen hours a day; by which means he read over the controverſial writings of Bellarmin, with all his anſwerers, viz. Chamier, Whitaker, Reynolds and others, who by parts had undertaken to confute that Champion of the Church of Rome. He read likewiſe many of the ſchoolmen; and eſpecially St. Thomas Aquinas, in whom he was exactly verſed, being able to manage moſt of his numerous diſtinctions. He read over St. Auguſtin's works five times, and many other eminent Authors ancient and modern, beſides his daily ſtudy of the Scriptures, and peruſal of the Commentators on them (2).

(2) Dr. Calamy's *Account of the Miniſters, &c. who were ejected or ſilenced after the Reſtoration in* 1660, *by or before the Act for Uniformity,* vol. 2. pag. 5. edit. London 1713, in 8vo.

[*C*] *Where he is ſaid to have been a very ſtrict conformiſt.*] The Author of a piece, intitled, *Sober Sadneſs, or Hiſtorical Obſervations upon the Proceedings, Pretences, and Deſign, of a prevailing party in both Houſes of Parliament, &c.* printed at Oxford 1643 in 4to tells us (3), "that he complied with Biſhop Wren the "Dioceſan, preached frequently in his ſurplice and "hood, read prayers at the rails; bowed at the name "of Jeſus, and undertook to ſatisfy and reduce ſuch "as ſcrupled at thoſe ceremonies." But Mr. Calamy himſelf in his *Juſt and neceſſary Apology againſt an unjuſt invective publiſhed by Mr. Henry Burton in a late book of his, intitled,* Truth ſtill Truth, though ſhut out of doors, *&c.* printed at London 1646 in 4to, aſſures us (4), that while he continued at St. Edmund'sbury, "he never bowed to or towards the altar, "to or towards the Eaſt, never read that wicked "*Book of Sports* upon the Lord's Day, never read "prayers at the high altar placed at the upper end of "the

(3) Pag. 32. *See* Wood's *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 281. 2d edit. London 1721.

(4) Pag. 8.

but the unwholſomneſs of the air had a very ill effect upon his health, and occaſioned a dizzineſs in his head, which he complained of all his life after (*b*). Upon the death of Dr. Stoughton, he was choſen Miniſter of St. Mary Aldermary in London in 1639 (*i*), and was followed by his Patron the Earl of Warwick to London. In July the ſame year he was incorporated into the Univerſity of Oxford (*k*). Upon the opening the long Parliament in November 1640, he diſtinguiſhed himſelf in defence of the Preſbyterian Cauſe [*D*], and had a principal hand in writing the celebrated *Smectymnuus* [*E*]; and in 1641 was appointed one of the Divines, who met by order of Parliament in the Jeruſalem-Chamber with ſeveral Biſhops and Doctors for the accommodation of Eccleſiaſtical Affairs; "in which, ſays Dr. Calamy (*l*), things were brought into a very hopeful "poſture; but the whole deſign was ſpoiled by bringing into the houſe the bill againſt "Biſhops &c." He was afterwards an active Member of the *Aſſembly of Divines* (*m*), and preached ſeveral times before the Parliament [*F*]. He was likewiſe one of the Lecturers

(*b*) Dr. Calamy's *Account*, ibid.

(*i*) Idem, ibid. *and* Newcourt's *Rupertorium Eccleſiaſticum Parochiale Londinenſe*, vol. 1. pag. 918. edit. London 1708, in fol.

(*k*) Wood, col. 281.

(*l*) Pag. 6. *Account*.

(*m*) Idem, ibid.

"the church, where the people could not hear. I "have often, *continues he*, preached againſt In- "novations, and once I did it at a publick viſi- "tation, and was called in queſtion for my la- "bour, &c. I never juſtified the oath *ex officio*, "nor ever proſecuted any man or woman at the "High-Commiſſion. I never (to my beſt re- "membrance) at any time preached for the juſtifi- "cation of any of the innovations. In ſome few "things I did, I confeſs, conform, according to the "light I then had, out of the uprightneſs of my "heart, not to avoid ſufferings for the truth, &c." However Mr. Wood (5) affirms that he complied in the manner abovementioned, and that *Robert, the Puritanical Earl of Eſſex, uſually ſaid*, He would be loſt, if he were not taken off, *and ſo removed him to Rochford in Eſſex*. Mr. Calamy tells us in his *Juſt and neceſſary Apology* quoted above, that he went to Bury, and there made in a Sermon a *Recantation* and *Retractation* of what he had done, in the hearing of thouſands; "and this, *ſays he*, I did before the times turned a- "gainſt Epiſcopacy, not out of diſcontent; nor be- "cauſe I was diſappointed of my expected preferment "at Court."

(5) *Ubi ſupra.*

[*D*] *He diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the Presbyterian party.*] In his *Juſt and neceſſary Apology* he obſerves, that his houſe was a receptacle for *godly Miniſters in the worſt of times. Here*, ſays he, *was the remonſtrance framed againſt the Prelates; here were all Meetings. I was the firſt, that openly before a Committee of Parliament did defend, that Biſhops were not only not an order diſtinct from Preſbyters, but that in Scripture a Biſhop and Preſbyter were all one.*

[*E*] *Had a principal hand in writing the celebrated* Smectymnuus.] The Authors of this Tract were five, the firſt Letters of whoſe Chriſtian and Surnames compoſe the word *Smectymnuus*. viz. *Stephen Marſhal, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurſtow*. It was publiſhed at London 1641 in 4to, and intitled, *An Anſwer to a book, intitled*, An Humble Remonſtrance; *in which the Originall of Liturgy and Epiſcopacy is diſcuſſed, and Queries propounded concerning both; the parity of Biſhops and Preſbyters in Scripture demonſtrated; the occaſion of their Imparitie in Antiquitie diſcovered; the Diſparitie of the ancient and our moderne Biſhops manifeſted; the Antiquitie of Ruling Elders in the Church vindicated; the Prelatical Church bounded. Written by* Smectymnuus. It is addreſſed to the *moſt honorable Lords* and to the *Knights, Citizens, and Burgeſſes of the Honorable Houſe of Commons*. The *Humble Remonſtrance*, to which this was deſigned as an Anſwer, was written by Dr. Joſeph Hall, Biſhop of Exeter, who publiſhed a *Vindication*, to which the Authors of *Smectymnuus* wrote a Rejoinder. Smectymnuus is written, as moſt of the polemical works of the laſt age are, with great vehemence and acrimony of ſtyle, and full of the ſtrongeſt exaggerations to inflame the paſſions of the Reader, as will appear from the following inſtance. Biſhop Hall in his *Humble Remonſtrance* (6), had uſed theſe words; *Certainly, except all Hiſtories, all Authors fail us, nothing can be more certain than this truth*. Upon which the Authors of *Smectymnuus* make the following animadverſion (7): "*Os durum!* Nothing more cer- "tain! What is it not *more certain* that there is a "God? Is it not more *certain*, that Chriſt is "God and Man? Is it not more certain that Chriſt "is the only Saviour of the world? Nothing more "certain? Muſt this then be an article of our Creed, "the corner-ſtone of our Religion? Muſt this be of "neceſſity to ſalvation? Nothing more certain! O "that men ſhould not only forget themſelves, but God "alſo; and in their zeal for their own honour utter "words bordering upon blaſphemy?" In the *Poſtſcript* the Authors give us *an hiſtorical Narration of thoſe bitter fruits, pride, rebellion, treaſon, unthankfulneſs, &c. which*, ſay they (8), *have iſſued from Epiſcopacy, while it ſtood under the continued influences of ſovereign goodneſs*; and particularly mention (9) *the deficiency of zeal and courage even in thoſe Biſhops, who afterwards proved martyrs*, and the *ſharp contention of Ridley againſt Hooper for the ceremonies; and the importunate ſuit of Cranmer and Ridley for a toleration of the Maſs for the King's ſiſter, which was rejected by the King's, not only reaſons, but tears, whereby the young King ſhewed more zeal than his beſt Biſhops*. They conclude with theſe words, "What the practices of "the Prelates have been ever ſince from the beginning "of Queen Elizabeth to this preſent day, would fill a "volume, like Ezekiel's roll, with lamentation, "mourning, and woe to record. For it had been their "great deſign to hinder all further Reformation; to "bring in doctrines of Popery, Arminianiſm, and Li- "bertiniſm; to maintain, propagate, and much en- "creaſe the burden of human ceremonies; to keep "out, and beat down the preaching of the word; to "ſilence the faithful Preachers of it; to oppoſe and "perſecute the moſt zealous Profeſſors; and to turn "all Religion into a pompous outſide; and to tread "down the power of Godlineſs. Inſomuch as it is "come to an ordinary proverb, that when any thing "is ſpoiled, we uſe to ſay, *The Biſhop's foot hath been "in it*. And in all this (and much more which might "be ſaid) fulfilling Biſhop Bonner's Prophecy, who "when he ſaw, that in King Edward's Reformation "there was a reſervation of Ceremonies and Hierar- "chy, is credibly reported to have uſed theſe words: "*Since they have begun to taſte of our broth, it will "not be long e'er they will eat of our beef.*." Mr. Calamy in his *Juſt and neceſſary Apology* having obſerved, that after his coming to London at the beginning of the Parliament of 1640 *he was one, who joined in making* Smectymnuus, tells us, that *this was the firſt deadly blow to Epiſcopacy in England of late years*.

(6) Pag. 21.

(7) Sect. 3. pag. 18.

(8) Pag. 85.

(9) Pag. 93.

[*F*] *And preached ſeveral times before the Parliament.*] Mr. Wood (10) tells us that he was a *frequent Preacher* before them; and Mr. Echard in his *Hiſtory of England* (11) aſſerts, that *he was ſo much an incendiary and promoter of the grand rebellion, that his actions cannot be vindicated, but only palliated, under the venerable name of an Houſe of Commons*; and "that the Houſe of Commons either miſled him, "or were miſled by him, he being a *frequent* "*Preacher* before them, and one of the Authors "of the celebrated *Smectymnuus*." This paſſage was animadverted upon in *A Letter to Mr. Archdeacon Echard, upon occaſion of his* Hiſtory of England, *wherein the true principles of the Revolution are defended; the Whigs and Diſſenters vindicated; ſeveral perſons of diſtinction cleared from aſperſions; and a number of hiſtorical miſtakes rectify'd*. By Edward Calamy, D. D. 3d ed. London 1718 in 8vo. In this Letter Dr. Calamy obſerves (12), that Mr. Calamy was no Chaplain in the army, no enemy to a Liturgy freed from paſſages liable to juſt objections; and was rather for reforming Epiſcopacy according to Archbiſhop Uſher's platform, than eradicating it; and was a bitter enemy to all mobs. "And if he had, *continues he*, a reſpect to "the

(10) *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 281.

(11) Vol. 3. pag. 178.

(12) Pag. 85.

turers at Cornhill. He was a great enemy to the Sectaries, who afterwards gained so great an ascendant, but of known moderation to those of different sentiments. No Minister in the city was more followed, and his week-day Lecture was attended not only by his own parish, but by other eminent Citizens, and many persons of the highest quality (*n*). At the time when the King was brought from the Isle of Wight, he endeavoured to the utmost of his power to prevent his Majesty's ruin [*G*]. In Oliver's time he kept himself as private as possible (*o*), but had a considerable hand in causing things afterwards to return into their proper channel [*H*]. He preached before the Parliament the day they voted the King's Restoration (*p*), and was one of those Divines, who were sent over to him into Holland (*q*). He was made one of his Majesty's Chaplains (*r*) in June 1660, and offered the Bishoprick of Coventry and Lichfield, which he refused [*I*]. He was likewise one of the Commissioners for the *Conference* at the Savoy. He was ejected out of his Cure of St. Mary Aldermanbury on St. Bartholomew's day in 1662 for Non-Conformity, and imprisoned for preaching afterwards occasionally in that Church, but soon released [*K*]. He lived to see London reduced to ashes by the great fire; and the sight of that dreadful desolation struck him with so keen a sorrow, that he died within

(*n*) Idem, ibid.

(*o*) Idem, ibid.

(*p*) *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ, or Mr. Richard Baxter's Narrative of the most memorable passages of his Life and Times*, Part II. pag. 217. edit. London 1696, in fol.

(*q*) Idem, ibid. pag. 218.

(*r*) Ibid. pag. 229

" the House of Commons at their first setting out, for " a good while after, before they were so modelled as " no longer to be the Representatives of the Commons " of England, he did but therein concur with all that " part of the Nation, that were unwilling to make a " sacrifice of the liberty of the subject to the prerogative of the Prince." He tells us then (13), that it is true that he preached before the House of Commons, but not that he was a *frequent Preacher before them*, since there are but three Sermons of his preached before that House. The first is entitled, *England's Looking-Glass on Jerom* xviii. 7, 8, 9, 10. Preached on a solemn Fast December 22d 1641. Printed at London 1642 in 4to. The design of which Sermon is to shew, that national repentance will divert, and national sins draw down national judgments. The second was intitled, *God's Free Mercy to England* on *Ezek.* xxxvi. 32. at a solemn Fast Febr. 23d 1641. Printed at London 1642 in 4to. The intent of which is to represent England's Mercies as a motive and means of England's Humiliation and Reformation. His third was intitled, *England's Antidote against the Plague of civil War*, on *Acts* xvii. 30. Preached October 22d 1644, and printed at London 1645 in 4to (14). Mr. Wood (15) mentions two other public Sermons of his, one, intitled, *The Nobleman's Pattern of true and real Thankfulness*. Preached at a solemn Thanksgiving June 15th 1643 on *Joshua* xxiv. 15. and printed at London 1643 in 4to; and the other intitled, *An Indictment against England because of her self-murdering divisions*. Preached before the House of Lords at their Fast, December 25th 1644 on *Matth.* xii. 25 latter part; printed at London 1645 in 4to. Dr. Calamy stiles the three Sermons mentioned by him *plain practical Sermons*, by which it does not appear, that our Author could be justly charged *with misleading the House of Commons*. " For tho', *says he* (16), there are some complaints in- " termingled of several hardships, which many worthy persons met with before this Parliament, and " motions made for further rectifying things, that " were amiss; yet there is nothing tending to inflame " and widen the differences between King and Parliament; no pushing them on to rigour and severity; " no inclination discovered to have the constitution altered, or any of our foundations overthrown."

(13) pag. 87.

(14) Idem, ibid. *and* Wood, *ubi supra*, col. 282.

(15) Col. 282.

(16) pag. 87.

[*G*] *At the time when King Charles I was brought from the Isle of Wight, he endeavoured to the utmost of his power to prevent his Majesty's ruin.*] Dr. Sampson in the manuscript above quoted, tells us, " that not a " man more detested the unlawfulness of those pro- " ceedings than himself. He prayed, he preached, " he travailled to persuade the ringleaders of those " wicked designs to desist, almost to his own ruin. " He was a principal man in the petition and declara- " tion to the army from the London-Ministers to have " dissuaded them from their attempts on his Majesty's " life; which stands as an impregnable and irrefragable " testimony of the loyalty of the then London-Ministry.

[*H*] *Had a considerable hand in causing things afterwards to return into their proper channel.*] This we are informed of by Dr. Calamy (17): and Mr. Baxter tells us in the *Narrative of his Life and Times* (18), that our Author, with the Earl of Manchester, and other Presbyterians, *encouraged and persuaded General Monk to bring in King Charles II*; and in another place (19) he observes, that the chief men, who turned the General's resolution to restore his Majesty, were Mr. Clarges, and Sir William Morrice, his kinsman; and *the petitions and affections of the city principally moved by Mr. Calamy and Mr. Ash, two ancient, leading, able Ministers, with Dr. Bates, Dr. Manton, Dr. Jacomb, and other Ministers of London, who concurred; and these were encouraged by the Earl of Manchester, the Lord Hollis, the late Earl of Anglesey, and many of the then Council of State.*

(17) *Account*, &c. pag. 6.

(18) Part 1. pag. 105.

(19) Part 2. pag. 214.

[*I*] *Offered the Bishopric of Coventry and Lichfield, which he refused.*] Mr. Baxter (20) informs us of this, and tells us, that the Bishopric of Hereford was offered to himself, and that of Norwich to Dr. Edward Reynolds, which he afterwards accepted (21). The rumour of this affair came abroad, " and the voice " of the City, *says Mr. Baxter*, made a difference; " for though they wished that none of us should be " Bishops, yet they said, Dr. Reynolds and Mr. Bax- " ter being known to be for moderate Episcopacy, " their acceptance would be less scandalous. But if " Mr. Calamy should accept it, who had preached, " and written, and done so much against it (which " were then at large recited) never Presbyterian would " be trusted for his sake; so that the clamour was very " loud against his acceptance of it; and Mr. Matthew " Newcomen, his brother-in-law, wrote to me ear- " nestly to dissuade him, and many more." Dr. Calamy tells us (22), that he had been credibly informed, that Bishop Wilkins had such an opinion of our Author's insight into the controversy about Church-Government, that he heartily wish'd, *that he could have conformed, that he might have confronted the bold and confident assentors of the* Jus Divinum *of Episcopacy in the Convocation, in which he was not allowed to sit, tho' he was chosen one of the Clerks for the City.*

(20) Ibid. pag. 281. *See likewise* Bishop Burnet's *History of his own Times* vol. 1. pag. 185. *and* Wood, *ubi supra*, col. 282.

(21) Baxter, pag. 283.

(22) *Account*, &c. pag. 6.

[*K*] *Imprisoned for preaching afterwards occasionally in that Church, but soon released.*] Mr. Wood informs us (23), that he preached there on the 28th of December following, " when, *says he*, among other danger- " ous passages, he said *the Ark of God was lost, and* " *the Glory was departed from Israel.* For which con- " tempt of the then late Act of Parliament for Uni- " formity he was by virtue of the Lord Mayor's *Mit-* " *timus* committed prisoner to Newgate on the 6th of " January 1662, where continuing for some time, Dr. " Robert Wild the Presbyterian Poet made and pub- " lished a Poem on his Imprisonment, as did the Au- " thor called *Hudibras*." Mr. Baxter relates the affair in the following manner (24): *It fell out one day in Mr. Calamy's Church in Aldermanbury, that the Preacher failed, and the people desired Mr. Calamy to preach; which he did upon confidence, that the Act did not extend to such an occasional Sermon; some Lawyers had told him so. But for this he was sent to Newgate Jail, where he continued in the Keeper's lodgings, many daily flocking to visit him, till the Lord Bridgman (as is said) had given it as his judgment*, that his Sermon was not within the penalty of the Act. *And O! what insulting there was by that party in the News-Book, and in their Discourses*, that Calamy, that would not be a Bishop, was in jail. *And when his Sermon was printed, an invective came out in language like an inquisitor, that*

(23) *Ubi supra*, col. 282.

(24) *Ubi supra*, pag. 386.

in a month after in October 1666 (s). We ſhall give an account of his writings in the note [L]. He was twice married, and by his firſt wife he had a ſon and a daughter, and by his ſecond ſeven children. Dr. Henry Sampſon, a Phyſician, in a Manuſcript *Hiſtory of the Aſſembly of Divines at Weſtminſter*, tells us, that his preaching was plain and ſeemingly unlearned, as moſt adapted to the capacities of the common people; but that his converſation ſhewed him to be a man of profound learning, and that he was thoroughly verſed in controverſial and caſuiſtical Divinity.

(1) Dr. Calamy's *Account*, pag. 7. Wood, *ubi ſupra*, col. 182.

that ſhewed a vehement thirſt of blood. In a marginal note upon that paſſage we are informed, that he was impriſoned January 4th, not the 6th, as Mr. Wood ſays; and releaſed January 15th. Biſhop Kennet in his *Complete Hiſtory of England* (25) repreſents his preaching as *ſeditious*; but Dr. Calamy (26) tells us, that it was purely occaſioned by a diſappointment as to the Preacher expected; that the diſcourſe was unpremeditated; and that he was ſoon releaſed from his confinement, when it was ſeen what a reſort of perſons of all qualities there was to him in Newgate, and how generally the ſeverity was reſented.

(25) Vol. 3. pag. 243.
(26) *Account*, &c. pag. 7.

[L] *We ſhall give an account of his writings in the note.*] Beſides thoſe already mentioned, he publiſhed a Sermon intitled, *The great Danger of Covenant-refuſing and Covenant-breaking* &c. preached before the Lord Mayor, Sheriffs, Aldermen, Miniſters &c. of London, on 2 *Tim.* iii. 3. printed at London 1646 in 4to; another preached before the Lord Mayor, intitled, *The Monſter of ſelf-ſeeking anatomized*; Sermon at St. Giles's Morning Exerciſe, on Acts xxvi. 8. Funeral Sermons upon Dr. Samuel Bolton, Robert Earl of Warwick in 1658; Mr. Simeon Aſhe in 1662; a Sermon to the native Citizens of London, intitled, *The City Remembrancer*; a Farewell-Sermon on 2 Sam. xxiv. 14. to his Pariſh of St. Mary Aldermanbury, Auguſt the 17th in 1662; and five Sermons, intitled, *The Godly Man's Ark; or a City of Refuge in the Day of his Diſtreſs*, the 8th edition of which was printed at London 1683 in 12mo (27). He had a hand in drawing up the *Vindication of the Preſbyterial Government and Miniſtry*, printed at London 1650, and the *Jus Divinum Miniſterii Evangelici Anglicani*, printed in 1654. Since his death there was *a Treatiſe of Meditation* printed in a clandeſtine way, not by his ſon, nor from his manuſcript, but from ſome imperfect Notes taken by an Auditor (28). H.

(27) Wood, col. 282. *and* Dr. Calamy's *Account*, pag. 7.

(28) Dr. Calamy's *Account*, ibid.

☞CALAMY (EDMUND) eldeſt ſon of the preceding, was born at St. Edmund's-Bury in Suffolk about the year 1635, and admitted into Sidney College in Cambridge March the 28th 1651 (a), where he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in 165⅘ (b), and afterwards removed to Pembroke-Hall in that Univerſity, and took the Degree of Maſter of Arts in 1658 (c). He was likewiſe Fellow of Pembroke-Hall, and ejected out of his Living of Moreton in Eſſex, (to which he had been preſented April the 20th 1659) on St. Bartholomew's Day, after which he retired to London, where he preached amongſt the Non-Conformiſts, and died of a conſumption in May 1685 (d) at Totteridge. He had one ſon and four daughters, two of which are ſtill living. It is remarkable, that he never took the Covenant. H.

(a) From the Regiſter of that College.
(b) From the Regiſter of the Univerſity.
(c) From the ſame Regiſter.

(d) Dr. Edmund Calamy's *Account of the Miniſters, Lecturers, &c. who were ejected or ſilenced after the Reſtoration in 1660, by or before the Act for Uniformity*, vol. 2. pag. 301.

☞CALAMY (BENJAMIN) a very eminent Divine and excellent Preacher in the ſeventeenth Century, was ſon of Mr. Edmund Calamy, B. D. and Miniſter of St. Mary Aldermanbury, by a ſecond venter. He was educated at St. Paul's School in London (a), and afterwards ſent to Katherine Hall in the Univerſity of Cambridge, where he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in 166⅘, of Maſter of Arts in 1668, and Doctor of Divinity in 1680 (b). He was Fellow of that Hall (c), and an eminent Tutor there; and we are informed in the *Life of James Bonnel Eſq;* (d), that that Gentleman was one of our Author's pupils. April the 25th 1677 he was choſen Miniſter of St. Mary Aldermanbury in the room of Dr. Simon Ford (e); which Living he reſigned upon his admiſſion to the Vicarage of St. Laurence Jewry with St. Mary Magdalen Miſk-ſtreet annex'd, to which he was collated in July 1683, by the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, as Patrons of the latter, in the room of Dr. Benjamin Whichcot (f). June the 8th 1685, he was inſtalled into the Prebend of Harleſton in the Cathedral of St. Paul's upon the deceaſe of Dr. John Wells (g). His *Diſcourſe about a ſcrupulous Conſcience* [A] preached at St. Mary Aldermanbury on Luke xi. 41. and dedicated to Sir George Jefferies, was ſoon after

(a) *Life of Dr. John Colet, Dean of St. Paul's, by Samuel Knight, D. D. Appendix*, pag. 412. *and* Echard's *Appendix* to the three volumes of his *Hiſtory of England*, pag. 21. edit. London in fol. 1720.

(b) From the Univerſity Regiſter.
(c) Echard, *ubi ſupra*.
(d) Pag. 10.
(e) Newcourt's *Repertorium Eccleſiaſticum Parochiale Londinenſe*, vol. 1. pag. 919. edit. London 1708.
(f) Idem, pag. 388.
(g) Idem, ibid. pag. 155.

[A] *His* Diſcourſe about a ſcrupulous conſcience.] In this diſcourſe he endeavours by ſeveral arguments to reduce the Diſſenters to the Communion of the Church of England, and offers ſeveral Chriſtian Rules and Directions for that purpoſe; amongſt which are the following (1). *When any private Chriſtian is troubled and perplexed with fears and ſcruples, that concern his duty in the worſhip of God, he ought in the firſt place to have recourſe to the public Guides and Miniſters of Religion, who are appointed by God, and are beſt ſuited to direct and conduct him; I ſay, to come to them, not only to diſpute and argue with them, and partly to oppoſe them, but with all modeſty to propound their doubts, meekly to hearken and receive inſtruction, humbly begging of God to open their underſtanding, that they may ſee and embrace the truth, taking great care that no evil affection, love of party, or carnal intereſt, influence or biaſs their judgment. We do not by this deſire men to pin their faith upon the Prieſt's ſleeve, or to put out their own eyes, that they might be better guided and managed by them; but only diligently to attend to their reaſon and arguments, and give ſome due regard and deference to their authority; for it may not be ſo abſurd, as may by ſome be imagined for the common people to take upon truſt from their lawful teachers, what they are not competent judges of themſelves. But the difficulty here is, how ſhall a private Chriſtian govern himſelf, when the very Guides and Miniſters of Religion determine differently concerning theſe matters in queſtion amongſt us, ſome warranting and allowing them, others as much diſapproving them? By what rule ſhall he chooſe his Guide?* " As for thoſe, who ſcruple at con-
" formity, and are tolerably able to judge for them-
" ſelves, let not ſuch rely barely upon the authority ei-
" ther of one or the other: all we deſire of them is, that
" they would equally hear both ſides; that they would
" think the Miniſters of the Church of England have
" ſome ſenſe and conſcience too, as well as other
" men, and are able to ſay ſomewhat for what they
" do themſelves, or require of others; and laying a-
" ſide all prejudices, favour to, or admiration of men's
" perſons, they would weigh and conſider the argu-
" ments, that may be propounded to them, being dif-
" fident of their own apprehenſions, and indifferent
" to either part of the queſtion; that they would think
" it no ſhame to change their mind, when they ſee
" good reaſon for it. Could we thus prevail with the
" people diligently to examine the merits of the cauſe,

(1) pag. 24, 25.

after the publication of it attacked by Mr. Thomas De Laune, in his *Plea for the Non-Conformists* [*B*], for which he was impriſoned, though Dr. Calamy endeavoured to procure his releaſement, but in vain. Notwithſtanding our Author had very high notions with reſpect to the doctrine of Non-Reſiſtance, yet the death of Alderman Corniſh, who was his pariſhioner at St. Laurence Jewry, and with whom he had a ſtrict friendſhip, affected him in a very ſenſible manner [*C*], and he did not long ſurvive it; for he died of a pleuriſy in the beginning of January 168⅘ [*D*], and was interred in the Church of St. Laurence Jewry. Dr. William Sherlock preached his Funeral Sermon, in which he has drawn an excellent character of him [*E*]. There are in print ſeveral Sermons of his

" our Church would every day gain more ground " amongſt all wiſe men; for we care not how much " knowledge and underſtanding our people have, ſo " they be but humble and modeſt with it; nor do we " deſire men to become our Proſelytes any further " than we give them good Scripture and reaſon for " it."

[*B*] *In his* Plea for the Non-Conformiſts.] The whole title of the 2d Edition of it printed at London 1704 in 4to, is as follows: De Laune's *Plea for the Non-Conformiſts; ſhewing the true ſtate of their caſe, and how far the* Conformiſt's *ſeparation from the Church of Rome for their Popiſh Superſtitions, &c. introduced into the ſervice of God, juſtifies the* Non-Conformiſt's *ſeparation from them for the ſame. In a Letter to Dr.* Benjamin Calamy, *upon the Sermon, called,* Scrupulous Conſcience, *inviting hereto. To which is added,* A Parallel Scheme of the Pagan, Papal, and Chriſtian Rites and Ceremonies. *With a Narrative of the remarkable tryal and ſufferings underwent for writing, printing, and publiſhing hereof.* By Thomas de Laune, *who died in Newgate during his impriſonment for this Book. Printed twenty years ago; but being ſeized by the Meſſenger of the Preſs, was afterwards burnt by the common hang-man; and is now reprinted from the Author's original copy, and publiſhed by a* Proteſtant Diſſenter, *who was the Author's fellow-priſoner at the time of his death, for the cauſe of* Non-Conformity. The *Narrative* ſubjoined to the Plea is intitled, *A Narrative of the Tryal and Sufferings of* Thomas de Laune *for writing, printing, and publiſhing a late Book, called,* A Plea for the Non-Conformiſts, *with ſome modeſt Reflections thereon. Directed to Dr. Calamy; in obedience to whoſe call that work was undertaken. By* Thomas de Laune. *Printed for the Author* 1683; *and reprinted* 1704. In this Narrative he informs us, that he was apprehended by Mr. Robert Stephens, a Meſſenger of the Preſs, November the 29th 1683, and carried before Sir Thomas Jenner, Recorder of London, who committed him to the Compter in Wood-ſtreet, and the day following he was ſent to Newgate, from whence he wrote a letter to Sir Thomas Jenner, and another to Dr. Calamy dated December the 8th 1683, who returned this anſwer, that *if Mr.* De Laune *had been impriſoned upon the account of anſwering his Book, he would do him any kindneſs, that became him.* January the 9th, Mr. de Laune wrote another letter in Latin to Dr. Calamy, who anſwered, that he looked upon himſelf as unconcerned, ſince he was not mentioned in the ſheet, which he ſaw with the Recorder. To ſatisfy this doubt Mr. de Laune ſent him a third letter, dated January the 14th, with the firſt ſheet of the Book, for which he was impriſoned; but he tells us, that tho' he had reaſon to expect ſome returns to theſe applications, he had none to any purpoſe, and that too but in a few words by his wife. " I had ſome thoughts, ſays he " to the Dr. that you would have performed the office of " a Divine in viſiting me in my place of confinement, " either to argue me out of my doubts, which your " promiſed *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, not a *Mittimus* and " *Newgate*, could eaſily do. To the former *I can* " *yield*, to the latter, it ſeems, *I muſt*." On the 10th of December a bill was found againſt him by the Grand-Jury, and on the 17th of the ſame month he was tried at the Seſſions-Houſe in the Old-Baily, and the day following received ſentence, to be fined 100 marks, and to be kept priſoner till he had paid his fine, and to find ſecurity for his good behaviour for one whole year afterwards; and that the Books and ſeditious Libels by him publiſhed ſhould be burnt at the Royal Exchange. We are informed in the Preface of the Publiſher of his *Plea*, and in the *Obſervator* (z), that he not being able to pay his fine, himſelf with his wife and children all died in Newgate; and *no body thought fit*, ſays the Obſervator, *to raiſe ſo ſmall a ſum for one of the beſt ſcholars in Europe.* However we are aſſured by good authority, that tho' Dr. Calamy was at firſt zealous for conformity, and very intimate with Sir George Jefferies, when common Serjeant and Recorder of London, and dedicated to him his diſcourſe about a *Scrupulous Conſcience*, aſcribing to him his ſettlement and encouragement in the pariſh of Aldermanbury, of which Sir George was an inhabitant; yet he took all imaginable pains with Sir George to procure the diſcharge of Mr. De Laune, and was extremely troubled, that his ſollicitations proved ineffectual.

(2) Vol. 2. num. 95.

[*C*] *The death of Alderman Corniſh, who was his pariſhioner at St. Laurence Jewry, and with whom he had a ſtrict friendſhip, affected him in a very ſenſible manner.*] He appeared in the Court for that Gentleman at his trial, and viſited him at Newgate; and being earneſtly preſſed to attend him to the place of execution, was not able to do it, but freely told Mr. Corniſh, that *he could as well die with him, as bear the ſight of his death in ſuch circumſtances as he was in,* tho' he waited upon him the very morning of his death. He uſed all his intereſt with Sir George Jefferies, that the Alderman's life might be ſpared, and often renewing his application, he received an anſwer in theſe words, *Dear Doctor, ſet your heart at reſt, and give yourſelf no further trouble, for I can aſſure you, that if you could offer a mine of gold as deep as the Monument is high, and a bunch of pearls as big as the flames at the top of it, it would not purchaſe his life.*

[*D*] *Died of a pleuriſy in the beginning of January* 168⅘.] We have no certain account of the day, on which he died; but Newcourt in his *Repertorium* (3), mentions his being ſucceeded in his Prebend of Harleſton by Zach. Iſham January the 28th 1685, according to the computation of the Church of England, and in the Vicarage of St. Laurence-Jewry by Dr. John Mapletoft Jan. 28, 1686 (4), by which it is to be preſumed he means according to common computation. But what will help to fix the time nearer is the date of the Sermon, which was preached at his funeral by Dr. William Sherlock, viz. January the 7th 168⅘.

(3) Vol. 1. pag. 155.

(4) Vol. 1. pag. 388.

[*E*] *Dr. William Sherlock preached his Funeral Sermon, in which he has drawn an excellent character of him.*] He tells us (5), that he took care to inform himſelf, and to furniſh his own mind with all uſeful knowledge; and that his conſtant way of preaching, though without any vain affectation of learning, which ſerves only to amuſe, not to inſtruct, ſufficiently diſcover'd both his natural and acquired abilities. That he had a clear and diſtinct apprehenſion of things, an eaſy and manly rhetoric, ſtrong ſenſe conveyed to the mind in familiar words, good reaſons inſpired with a decent paſſion, which did not only teach, but move and tranſport the hearers, and at the ſame time gave both light and heat. *For indeed he was a good man, which is neceſſary to make a good Preacher. He had an inward vital ſenſe of Religion, and that animated his diſcourſes with the ſame divine paſſions, which he felt in himſelf.* Dr. Sherlock then obſerves (6), that he did not entertain his hearers with ſchool-ſubtilties or a conjectural Divinity, with ſuch thin and airy ſpeculations, as can neither be ſeen, nor felt, nor underſtood; but his chief care was to explain the great Articles of Faith and Rules of Life, what we muſt believe, and how we muſt live, that we may be eternally happy. And he did, as a faithful ſervant ought to do, as he declared a little before his death, that he never preached any thing, but what he himſelf firmly believed to be true. Dr. Sherlock afterwards tells us (7), that at a time, " when a prevailing faction threatned both " Church and State, and the fears of Popery were " thought a ſufficient juſtification of the moſt illegal " and irreligious methods to keep it out; when it was " ſcandalous

(5) pag. 29.

(6) pag. 29, 30.

(7) pag. 30.

his [F], and two *Cases againſt the Diſſenters*, publiſhed in the Collection of them, viz. Caſe IX. *The Diſcourſe about a ſcrupulous Conſcience* abovementioned, and Caſe X. intitled, *Conſiderations about the Caſe of Scandal, or giving offence to weak brethren.* The Sermons, which he left in manuſcript, fell into the hands of his brother Mr. James Calamy M. A. who ordered them, together with his own, to be burnt after his deceaſe. Mr. Wood (*b*) ſtiles him *a loyal Perſon, an excellent Preacher*, and *a zealous Man for the Church of England.* The Editor of the *Critical Works* of Father Rapin, ſpeaking in his Preface of the Preachers, who have been celebrated ſince the Reſtoration, takes particularly notice of the *clear vein of Argument and excellent Spirit of Dr. Calamy.* Biſhop Burnet in the *Hiſtory of his own Time* (*i*) ranks him among thoſe, whom he repreſents *as an honour both to the Church and to the Age, in which he lived.* And Archdeacon Echard (*k*) tells us, that "his Sermons ſeemed to have been compoſed for the generality of "mankind, in which there is both ſtrength and perſpicuity, and diſcover a Genius able "to penetrate into the ſecret receſſes of human nature; for which he was particularly ob-"ſerved by King Charles's Court, when he preached at Newmarket. Wherefore it is "pity, that we have no more of them in print."

(*b*) *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 282. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*i*) Vol. 1. pag. 462.

(*k*) *Ubi ſupra.*

"ſcandalous to ſpeak a word either for the King or "the Church; when cunning men were ſilent, and "thoſe, who affected popularity, ſwam with the "ſtream; then this great and good man durſt reform "ſchiſm and faction, durſt teach men to conform to "the Church, and to obey and honour the King, "durſt vindicate the deſpiſed Church of England, and "the hated doctrine of Paſſive Obedience, tho' one "was thought to favour Popery, and the other to in-"troduce ſlavery. But he was above the powerful "charms of names, and liked truth never the worſe, "becauſe it was miſcalled. His publick Sermons "preached in thoſe days, and printed by publick Au-"thority, are laſting proofs of this; and yet he was "no Papiſt neither, but durſt reprove the errors of "Popery, when ſome others, who made the greateſt "noiſe and outcry about it, grew wiſe and cautious. "This was like a truly honeſt and faithful ſervant, to "oppoſe the growing diſtempers of the Age, with-"out any regard either to unjuſt cenſures, or apparent "danger." *And yet he did not needleſſy provoke any man; he gave no hard words, but thought it ſevere enough to confute men's errors without upbraiding or reproaching their perſons. His converſation was courteous and affable to all men, ſoft and eaſy, as his principles were ſtubborn. He could yield any thing but the truth, and bear with any thing but the vices of men. He would indeed have been the wonder of his Age, had he not lived in ſuch an Age, as, thanks be to God, can ſhew many ſuch wonders; and yet in ſuch an Age as this he made an illuſtrious figure. Though he had his equals, he had not many ſuperiours. Thus he lived, and thus this good man died, for thus was he found doing when his Lord came.*

[F] *There are in print ſeveral Sermons of his.* I. A Sermon preached at Guild-Hall on *Tit.* iii. 8, 9. London 1673 in 4to. II. A Sermon preached at Guild-Hall on *John* v. 14. before the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, May 29th. London 1682 in 4to. III. *A Diſcourſe about a ſcrupulous Conſcience*, preached at St. Mary Aldermanbury on *Luke* xi. 41. London 1683 in 4to, 2d edit. IV. A Sermon preached before the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen at Guild-Hall Chapel, September 30th 1683 on *Rom.* iii. 8. London 1683 in 4to. V. A Sermon preached at St. Mary le Bow before the Artillery Company on *Matt.* xxvi. 52. London 1684 in 4to. VI. A Sermon preached at St. Mary le Bow before the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen Sept. 2d 1684, being the Anniverſary Faſt for the Fire of London, on *Iſa.* lvii. 21. VII. A Thankſgiving-Sermon on *Eccleſ.* x. 20. Beſides theſe Sermons, publiſhed by himſelf, we have a volume of poſthumous Sermons, in number *thirteen*, publiſhed by his brother James Calamy M. A. together with Dr. Sherlock's Funeral Sermon upon him. This volume has paſt thro' at leaſt ſix editions. H.

☞CALAMY (JAMES), younger brother of the preceding, was educated at Katherine-Hall in the Univerſity of Cambridge, where he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1672, and of Maſter in 1676 (*a*). He ſucceeded Dr. Edward Fowler, afterwards Biſhop of Gloceſter, in the Rectory of Northill in Bedfordſhire, in which he continued till Dr. Offspring Blackall, his intimate friend, being made Biſhop of Exeter in 1707, preſented him to the Living of Cheriton-Biſhops in Devonſhire, and made him Prebendary of the Cathedral of Exeter. He was never married; and died ſuddenly December 14, 1714 (*b*). We have nothing of his writing in print except the Dedication of his brother Dr. Calamy's Sermons. H.

(*a*) From the Univerſity Regiſter.

(*b*) From Memoirs communicated to us.

☞CALAMY (EDMUND) D. D. grandſon of Mr. Edmund Calamy, B. D. and ſon of Mr. Edmund Calamy, formerly Miniſter of Moreton in Eſſex, was born in Aldermanbury in the City of London April 5th 1671, and having made conſiderable progreſs in Grammar-learning at ſeveral private Schools, and at Merchant-Taylors School [A] under Mr. Hartcliffe, Author of the *Compleat Treatiſe of Moral and Intellectual Virtues*, who favoured him with particular helps in private, and offered him his aſſiſtance in the Univerſity, if his inclination had led him that way; he removed to a private Academy at Wickam-Brook in Suffolk [B], where he went through a courſe of Logic, Natural Philoſophy, and Metaphyſics, under the tuition of Mr. Samuel Cradock, who had been Fellow of Emanuel College in Cambridge, and an eminent Tutor there (*a*). In March 1688 he went over to Utrecht in Holland [C], and paſſed thro' a courſe of Philoſophy under the celebrated Profeſſor De Vries,

(*a*) *Funeral Sermon upon the Death of Edmund Calamy, D. D.* by Daniel Mayo, M. A. *With ſome Account of his Life and Character*, pag. 20, 21. edit. London 1732, in 8vo.

[A] *At Merchant-Taylors School.*] He was here in the ſame form with Mr. Hugh Boulter, the preſent Archbiſhop of Armagh in Ireland, and Mr. Dawes, afterwards Archbiſhop of York, with whom he was very intimately acquainted, and whom he frequently viſited at Dr. Kidder's, then Rector of St. Martin's Outwich, and afterwards Biſhop of Bath and Wells.

[B] *Removed to a private Academy at Wickam-Brook in Suffolk.*] Here he contracted an acquaintance with Mr. Timothy Goodwin, who was eminent for his ſkill in the Greek language, and then deſigned for the ſtudy of Phyſic, but afterwards advanced to the Archbiſhopric of Caſhels in Ireland. Their former friendſhip ſubſiſted during the life of the Archbiſhop, and they maintained a conſtant correſpondence by letters.

[C] *Went over to Utrecht in Holland.*] In this Univerſity he became very intimate with the Lord Spencer, afterwards

Vries, and ſtudied Civil Law under Vander Muyden, and attended Grævius's Lectures upon Sophocles and Puffendorf's Introduction to his Hiſtory. At this Univerſity he purſued his ſtudies with great vigour, and devoted one whole night every week to them. While he reſided here he was invited to a Profeſſorſhip in one of the Univerſities in Scotland by Mr. William Carſtairs, who came over to Holland, in order to procure a perſon qualified for that ſtation. Upon his return to England in May 1691 he reſolved to ſpend ſome time at Oxford, and carried Letters thither from Grævius to Dr. Pocock, Canon of Chriſt Church, and Regius Profeſſor of Hebrew, and to Dr. Edward Bernard, Savilian Profeſſor of Aſtronomy, who received him with great civility, and procured leave for him to ſtudy in the Bodleian Library (*b*). Here he likewiſe applied himſelf very cloſely to his ſtudies, and had frequent opportunities of improving by the converſation of the learned Mr. Henry Dodwell. As he was reſolved to make Divinity his principal ſtudy, he examined the Controverſy between the Conformiſts and Non-Conformiſts [*D*], and determining on the ſide of the latter, he preach'd ſometimes at Oxford, and in other places in the country. Upon his return to London in 1692 he was unanimouſly invited to be Aſſiſtant to Mr. Matthew Silveſter at Black-Fryars, where he preached ſtatedly for about two years without Ordination, which he at laſt received June 22d 1694 at Dr. Anneſly's meeting-houſe in Little St. Hellen's London. Soon after this he was invited to be Aſſiſtant to Mr. Daniel Williams in Hand-Alley, where he continued till upon the deceaſe of Mr. Vincent Alſop in 1703, he was unanimouſly choſen to ſucceed him at Weſtminſter, having been appointed October the 20th the year before one of the Lecturers of Salter's-Hall (*c*). In 1702 he publiſhed his *Abridgment of Mr. Baxter's Hiſtory of his Life and Times* [*E*], in the tenth chapter of which having ſtated the grounds of the Non-Conformity of the Miniſters, who were ejected by the Act for Uniformity in 1662, he was engaged in a controverſy with Mr. Ollyffe and Mr. Benjamin Hoadly M. A. [*F*], both Miniſters of the eſtabliſhed Church, and the latter now Lord Biſhop of Wincheſter. Mr. Locke is ſaid to have ſent to him a meſſage to let him know, that he had read his *Defence of moderate Non-Conformity*, and thought ſuch a defence of it could not be anſwered, and that by adhering to the principles there laid down, he had no reaſon to fear any antagoniſt. In 1709 he took a journey into Scotland, where he was entertained with great reſpect, and had the degree of Doctor of Divinity conferred on him by the Univerſities of Edinburgh, Aberdeen, and Glaſgow (*d*). He publiſhed ſeveral works, which we

(*b*) *Funeral Sermon*, pag. 21.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 23, 24.

(*d*) Idem, ibid. pag. 26.

afterwards Earl of Sunderland, and Mr. Charles Trimnel, his tutor, afterwards ſucceſſively Biſhop of Norwich and Wincheſter; with both of whom he kept up his acquaintance as long as they lived.

[*D*] *He examined the Controverſy between the Conformiſts and Non-Conformiſts.*] With this view he ſtudied the Scriptures, and particularly the New Teſtament, and read the Hiſtory of the Church, the ſix Epiſtles of Ignatius, with what Mr. Dodwell and Biſhop Pearſon had written on the one ſide, and Monſr. Daillé and L'Arroque on the other. He read over likewiſe Chillingworth's *Religion of Proteſtants a ſafe way to ſalvation*, and Hooker's Eight Books *of Eccleſiaſtical Polity*, and the Articles, Liturgy, Homilies, and Canons of the Church of England (1).

(1) *Funeral Sermon upon the Death of Edmund Calamy, D. D. by Daniel Mayo, M. A. With ſome Account of his Life and Character*, pag. 21, 22.

[*E*] *He publiſhed his* Abridgment of Mr. Baxter's Hiſtory of his Life and Times.] When Mr. Baxter's *Narrative of his Life and Times* was to be committed to the preſs in 1696, our Author read it over, and made ſeveral remarks, and drew up the Contents prefixed, and the *Index* at the end of it. This prepared him for making the Abridgment of it, which he publiſhed under the following title; *An Abridgment of Mr. Baxter's* Hiſtory of his Life and Times. *With an account of many others of thoſe worthy Miniſters, who were ejected after the Reſtauration of King Charles the IId; their apology for themſelves and their adherents, containing the grounds of their Non-Conformity, and practice as to ſtated and occaſional Communion with the Church of England; and a Continuation of their Hiſtory till the year* 1691. *By* Edmund Calamy, *Edm. Fil. & Nepos.* London 1702 in 8vo. It was dedicated to the Right Honourable the Lord Marquis of Hartington. It was animadverted upon in a Tract publiſhed at London 1704, and intitled, *Animadverſions on ſome Paſſages of Mr.* Edmund Calamy's Abridgment of Mr. Baxter's Hiſtory of his Life and Times; *in a Dialogue between a Church-man and a peaceable Diſſenter; in which are ſhewn the affection of him and his Worthies to the eſtabliſhment of the Church and State, and the tendency of their principles. By a Lover of his Country, and a friend to peace.*

[*F*] *Engaged in a Controverſy with Mr.* Ollyffe *and Mr.* Benjamin Hoadly.] In 1703 Mr. Ollyffe publiſhed at London in 8vo pagg. 147. his *Defenſe of Miniſterial Conformity to the Church of England: in anſwer to the miſrepreſentations of the terms thereof by* Mr. Calamy *in the tenth chapter of his* Abridgment of the Hiſtory of Mr. Baxter's Life and Times. And the ſame year Mr. Hoadly publiſhed his *Reaſonableneſs of Conformity to the Church of England, repreſented to the diſſenting Miniſters: in anſwer to the tenth chapter of Mr.* Calamy's Abridgment of Mr. Baxter's Hiſtory of his Life and Times. London 1703 in 8vo pagg. 160. And ſoon after appeared the *Second Part* of his *Reaſonableneſs of Conformity*, London 1703 in 8vo. pagg. 232. In anſwer to theſe Treatiſes, Mr. Calamy publiſhed the ſame year *A Defence of moderate Non-Conformity: in anſwer to the Reflections of Mr.* Ollyffe *and Mr.* Hoadly, *on the tenth chapter of the* Abridgment *of the* Life of *the Reverend Mr.* Richard Baxter, *Part I. With a Poſtſcript containing ſome remarks on a Tract of Mr.* Dorrington's, *intituled*, The Diſſenting Miniſtry in Religion cenſured and condemned from the Holy Scriptures. London 1703 in 8vo pagg. 261. Some paſſages in this book relating to Re-ordination were animadverted upon in a *Preſervative againſt ſeparation from the Church of England, wherein the unlawfulneſs of it is proved, and the chief Objections of the Diſſenters anſwered. Directed to his Pariſhioners. By* Solomon Pagis, *Rector of Farnborow in Somerſetſhire.* London 1704 in 8vo. Soon after appeared Mr. Hoadly's *Serious Admonition to Mr.* Calamy, *occaſioned by the* firſt part *of his* Defence of Moderate Non-Conformity. London 1703 in 8vo pagg. 54. The year following Mr. Calamy publiſhed the *ſecond part* of his *Defence of Moderate Non-Conformity, &c. with an Introduction about the true ſtate of the preſent Controverſy between the Church and Diſſenters; and a Poſtſcript containing an anſwer to Mr.* Hoadly's Serious Admonition, *and ſome Remarks on a Letter of a nameleſs Author ſaid to be* A Congregational Miniſter in the Country. London 1704 in 8vo pagg. 414. and afterwards the *third part* of his *Defence; to which are added three Letters, one to Mr.* Ollyffe, *in anſwer to his* Second Defence of Miniſterial Conformity; *another to Mr.* Hoadly,

we ſhall give an account of in the note [G]. He lived in great eſteem not only with the Diſſenters, but likewiſe with ſeveral perſons of Quality and Diſtinction, and ſome among the Clergy, and other members of the eſtabliſhed Church. Mr. Mayo in his *Funeral Sermon* tells us (*e*), that he was a man of ſound judgment, extenſive learning, ſincere piety, of a candid and benevolent temper, and great moderation with regard to differences in points of Religion. He died at Weſtminſter June the 3d 1732. He was twice married, and had thirteen children, ſix whereof are ſtill living.

(*e*) Ibid. pag. 28, 29.

ly, *in anſwer to his* Defence of the Reaſonableneſs of Conformity; *and a third to the Author from Mr.* Raſtrick *of Lynn in Norfolk, giving an account of his Non-Conformity.* London 1705 in 8vo. In 1707 Mr. Hoadly publiſhed his *Defence of Epiſcopal Ordination* in 8vo. To which Dr. Calamy wrote a Reply, but forbore publiſhing it for reaſons mentioned in the ſecond Edition of his *Abridgment, Vol. I. p.* 715.

[G] *He publiſhed ſeveral works, which we ſhall give an account of in the Note.*] Beſides thoſe abovementioned and ſeveral others, printed without his name, he publiſhed the following, I. *A Funeral Sermon preached at the interment of Mr.* Samuel Stevens, *for ſome time employed in the work of the Miniſtry in this City.* London 1694 in 4to. II. *A Practical Diſcourſe concerning Vows, with a ſpecial Reference to Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper.* 1694. in 8vo. Reprinted in a ſmaller Volume in 1704. III. *A Funeral Sermon preached upon occaſion of the deceaſe of the eminently pious Mrs.* Eliz. Williams, *late wife of the Reverend Mr.* Daniel Williams. *With ſome account of her exemplary character.* 1698 *in* 8vo. IV. *A Sermon to the Societies for* Reformation of Manners *in London and Middleſex.* 12mo 1699. V. Divine Mercy exalted, *or* Free Grace in its Glory, *A Sermon on Rom.* ix. 16. *preached at the Merchant's Lecture in Salter's Hall, October the* 20th. 1702. VI. A Caveat againſt New Prophets, *in two Sermons at the Merchant's Lecture in Salter's Hall on Jan. the* 6th *and Jan. the* 20th 170⅞. *With a ſingle ſheet in anſwer to Sir Richard Bulkeley's Remarks on the ſame.* VII. *A Funeral Sermon, occaſioned by the ſudden death of the Reverend Mr.* Matthew Sylveſter, *preached at his Meeting-Houſe in Black-Fryars, on Feb.* 1. 170⅞. VIII. *A Funeral Sermon occaſioned by the much lamented death of Mrs.* Frances Lewis, *wife of* Thomas Lewis Eſq; *who departed this Life on Febr. the* 9th 170⅞. *preached at Weſtminſter on the Lord's Day following.* IX. *A Funeral Sermon, occaſioned by the deceaſe of Mr.* Michael Watts, *Citizen and Haberdaſher of London, who departed this Life on Feb. the* 3d 170⅞. ann. ætat. *LXXII. Preached at the Meeting-Houſe in Silver-ſtreet the next Lord's Day after his interment.* X. *A Sermon at the Merchant's Lecture in Salter's Hall upon occaſion of the many late Bankrupts. Preached Dec.* 7th 1708. XI. *The Inſpiration of the Holy Writings of the Old and New Teſtament conſidered and improved; in fourteen Sermons preached at the Merchants Lecture in Salter's-Hall. To which is added a ſingle Sermon in Vindication of the Divine Inſtitution of the Office of the Miniſtry, preached at the ſame Lecture in* 1710. XII. *Comfort and Counſel to Proteſtant Diſſenters; with ſome ſerious Queries to ſuch as hate and caſt them out; and a friendly admonition to ſuch as deſert them; in two Sermons, preached firſt at Weſtminſter on March the* 30th *and afterwards at the Merchants Lecture in Salters-Hall on May the* 20th *and June the* 3d 1712. XIII. The Prudence of the Serpent, and Innocence of the Dove: *A Sermon preached at Exon May the* 6th 1713. *before a numerous aſſembly of the Diſſenting Miniſters of Devon and Cornwal.* XIV. Obadiah's Character, *a Sermon to young people, preached in the Old Jewry, Dec. the* 28th 1713. XV. *Abridgment of Mr.* Baxter's Hiſtory of his Life and Times. *The Second Edition.* Together with, XVI. *An Account of the Miniſters, Lecturers, Maſters and Fellows of Colleges, and School-maſters, who were ejected or ſilenced after the Reſtoration in* 1660, *by or before the* Act for Uniformity. London 1713, in 8vo. XVII. The ſeaſonableneſs of Religious Societies. *A Sermon preached to the Supporters of the Lecture on Lord's Day Mornings at Little St. Hellen's upon April the* 23d 1714. XVIII. God's Concern for his Glory in the Britiſh Iſles; *and* the Security of Chriſt's Church from the Gates of Hell: *in three Sermons at the Merchants Lecture in Salter's-Hall.* 1715 *in* 8vo. XIX. The Principles and Practice of Moderate Non-Conformiſts with reſpect to Ordination exemplified; *in a Sermon preached at the Ordination of Mr.* John Munckley *Jan. the* 19th 1717; *and a charge given to Mr.* James Read, *Mr.* Henry Read, *Mr.* Richard Biſcoe, *Mr.* George Smyth, *and Mr.* Samuel Chandler, *after their being ordained, Dec. the* 19th 1716. *To which is added* A Letter to a Divine in Germany, giving a brief but true account of the Diſſenters in England. 8vo. XX. Sober-mindedneſs recommended: *in a Sermon preached to a Society of Catechumens in Jewen-ſtreet on April the* 22d 1717. XXI. *The Repeal of the* Act againſt Occaſional Conformity *conſidered, in a Letter to a Member of the Honourable Houſe of Commons, Octob.* 1717. XXII. *A Letter to Mr. Archdeacon* Echard, *upon occaſion of his* Hiſtory of England; *wherein the true Principles of the Revolution are defended; the Whigs and Diſſenters vindicated; ſeveral perſons of diſtinction cleared from aſperſions; and a number of Hiſtorical Miſtakes rectified.* London 1718 in 8vo. *3d Edition.* XXIII. *The Church and Diſſenters compared as to perſecution, in ſome Remarks on Dr.* Walker's Attempt to recover the Names and Sufferings of the Clergy, that were ſequeſtered &c. between 1640 and 1660. London 1719 in 8vo. XXIV. Diſcontented Complaints of the preſent Times proved unreaſonable; *in a Sermon preached at Rotherhith on the Anniverſary of King George's Coronation, Octob. the* 20th 1720. XXV. *A Charge given to Mr.* Obadiah Hughes, *Mr.* Clerk Oldiſworth, *Mr.* Thomas Newman, *and Mr.* John Smith, *after their Ordination in the Old Jewry,* Jan. the 11th 172⅞. XXVI. *Thirteen Sermons concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity, preached at the Merchants Lecture in Salter's-Hall: together with a Vindication of that celebrated text,* 1 John v. 7. *from being ſpurious, and an Explication of it, upon the ſuppoſition of its being genuine; in four Sermons, preached at the ſame Lecture,* ann. 1719 *and* 1720. London 1722 in 8vo. XXVII. The Miniſtry of the Diſſenters vindicated, *in an Ordination Sermon preached at Ailſbury in the County of Bucks on June the* 11th 1724. To which is added in the ſecond Edition *a Letter to the Author of a Pamphlet,* intitled, The Miniſtry of the Diſſenters proved to be null and void, from Scripture and Antiquity. XXVIII. *Memoirs of the Life of the late Reverend Mr.* John Howe. London 1724 8vo. XXIX. The Word of God the Young Man's beſt Directory; *A Sermon preached to a Society of Young Men in Silver-ſtreet on May the* 28th 1725, *the Birth Day of his Majeſty King George.* XXX. *A Charge given to Mr.* William Hunt, *after his Ordination at Newport-Pagnel in the County of Bucks on Sept. the* 15th 1725. XXXI. *A Funeral Sermon for the late Reverend Mr.* John Sheffield, *Miniſter of the Goſpel in Southwark, who departed this Life, Jan. the* 24th 172⅝. ann. ætat. *LXXIII.* XXXII. A Funeral Sermon for the late Reverend Mr. Joſeph Bennet, *Miniſter of the Goſpel in the Old Jewry, who departed this Life, Feb. the* 2d 162⅞, ann. ætat. *LXI.* XXXIII. *A Continuation of the Account of the Miniſters, Lecturers, Maſters and Fellows of the Colleges, and School-maſters, who were ejected and ſilenced, after the Reſtoration in* 1660, *by or before the* Act for Uniformity. London 1727 in 8vo. 2 Volumes. XXXIV. *A Funeral Sermon for the late Reverend Mr.* John Motterſhed, *Miniſter of the Goſpel in Ratcliffe, who departed this Life Octob. the* 13th 1728. an. ætat. *LXIII.* H.

CALCHAS, ſon of Theſtor (*a*), followed the Greek army to Troy in the function of a great Diviner, or Prophet; for in thoſe days ſuch an officer was not leſs neceſſary in an army, than a General. All the world knows how he foretold that the ſiege of Troy would laſt ten years, and that the fleet, which was detained in the Port of Aulis by contrary winds, would not ſet ſail till Agamemnon's daughter had been ſacrificed to Diana. Homer

(*a*) See the Hiſtory of this Theſtor in Hyginus, cap. 190.

Homer mentions him often, and particularly on account of the diſpute which aroſe between Agamemnon and Achilles. It is ſaid, that after the taking of Troy Calchas retired to Colophon, where he died with grief, becauſe he could not divine what another man of his own profeſſion, called Mopſus, diſcovered. We ſhall ſpeak at large of this diſpute in the article of MOPSUS. Then was fulfilled the prediction mentioned by Sophocles (*b*), which foretold, that Calchas ſhould die as ſoon as he ſhould meet with his maſter in the art of divining. If Mopſus had been as ignorant as that other Diviner, who ſeeing Calchas planting a vine, ventured to give him advice, he would not have been the cauſe of the prophecy's being accompliſhed, he would only have made Calchas laugh a little too much (*c*). This adventure happened at the ſame place where Mopſus diſputed with Calchas [*A*]. If we may believe Suidas, one of the Sibyls was Calchas's daughter, I mean her, whom he calls Lampaſa [*B*], and to whom he aſcribes ſome Oracles in verſe. He calls her alſo the Colophonian.

(*b*) *Apud* Strabon. lib. 13. p. m. 442.

(*c*) Servius *in Ecl.* 6. ver. 72.

(1) In Calepin. it is, *apud fanum.*
(2) In the article of MOPSUS. Remark [*E*].
(3) *Apud* Strabon. lib. 13. pag. 442.
(4) He was born at Geneva, and died at London, where he was a Miniſter of a French Church. *See* Decker, *de Scriptis Adeſpotis*, pag. 397. ed. Amſt. 1686.

[*A*] *This adventure happened at the ſame place where Mopſus diſputed with Calchas.*] Namely in the ſacred wood of Apollo of Claros, near the city of Colophon. I do not know, why Charles Stephens, Lloyd and Hofman added, that this place was at Samos, *prope Samum* (1). I ſhall take notice in another place (2) of the blunder they have committed in making Mopſus the aggreſſor, tho' Calchas is made to attack him, in the two Authors they quote, Heſiod and Pherecydes (3). The ſame error is in Calepin.

[*B*] *If we may believe Suidas, one of the Sibyls was Calchas's daughter; namely ſhe, whom he calls Lampaſa.*] Monſieur Muſſard (4), who was a very learned Miniſter, has given us the picture of this daughter of Calchas, in *page* 325 of his *Hiſtoria Deorum fatidicorum*. In the inſcription, which is at the bottom of the print, ſhe is ſaid to be the daughter of Calchas, and Prieſteſs of Apollo. The diſcourſe annexed to this print acquaints us, that there are ſeveral predictions of the Sibyl Lampaſa extant. Strabo is thereupon quoted, inſtead of Suidas. Mr. Blondel (5) cenſures Suidas, becauſe Calchas being an European, it is not probable, that his daughter ſhould be of Colophon. But this objection is of no weight; for the Sibyls did not always prefer the name of the place where they where born, to that of the place in which they ſettled. And beſides, might not Calchas have lived in ſome city of Aſia after the Siege of Troy?

(5) Blondel, *Traité des Sibylles*, pag. 37.

CALDERINUS (JOHN) was Profeſſor of Canon Law at Bologne his native country, where he died towards the middle of the fourteenth Century. See above (*a*) the article of ANDREAS (JOHN (*b*).

(*a*) Vol. 1. pag. 685.
(*b*) Remark [*E*].

CALDERINUS (DOMITIUS) read Lectures upon polite Literature at Rome with a great reputation, towards the end of the fifteenth Century. He was born at Calderia near Verona (*a*). He was a haughty Critic, who treated his adverſaries too ſeverely (*b*) [*A*], and who beſides had no Religion [*B*]. In order to ſupport the good opinion, which men had conceived of his knowledge, he was obliged to have recourſe to impudence, and many artful tricks [*C*]. He died very young [*D*] in the year 1477 (*c*). The Academy

(*a*) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 21.
(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) Trithem. *apud* Geſn. *in Biblioth.*

[*A*] *He was a haughty Critic, who treated his adverſaries too ſeverely.*] Paulus Jovius acquaints us with this particular. *Peracerbas*, ſays he (1), *ſed juventuti maxime utiles cum æmulis ſimultates exercuit. Ambitioſo quidem & nimis aculeato dicendi genere ex aliena inſcitia (dum intemperanter perſtringit atque remordet) nomen quærens.* i. e. "He had very bitter "diſputes with his adverſaries, but which proved very "uſeful to the youth: he endeavoured to make himſelf famous by the ignorance of others, and in his "cenſures and anſwer to others he made uſe of too "haughty and ſharp a ſtile." Raphael Volateranus, tho' his friend, could not forbear acknowledging this defect in him. *Hujus ego, quamquam eram familiaris, vitium unicum livoris atque obtrectationis in omnes pene doctos non præteribo, dignus præterea, ut de Cælio Quintilianus ait, vita longiore ac ingenio meliore* (2). i. e. "Tho' he was my friend, yet I cannot omit mentioning the only defect he had, which was envy; this "made him revile almoſt every learned man of his "time: in other reſpects he deſerved a longer life and a "better inclination, as Quintilian ſaid of Cælius." Latomus made ſport with his character in the Epitaph he wrote for him (3), and which may be read in Jovius.

(1) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 21.
(2) Volat. lib. 21. pag. 777.
(3) . . . *Caput languet Adhuc miſello tinniens, ob illas quas Convitiorum prope muliebrium pugnas Pro literis pluſquam viriliter geſſit: Humanitatis haud ferentibus Muſis Decus tam ineptè turpiterque proſcindi.* Latomus, *apud* Jovium, *Elogior.* cap. 21. i. e. "The poor "man's head "rings ſtill with "thoſe quarrels "he ſuſtained "with a courage "more than "manly, though "almoſt with a "woman-like "ſcolding. Tho' "the Muſes do "not willingly "ſuffer, that the "glory of polite "Literature "ſhould be de-"baſed in ſo "ſilly and ſhame-"ful a manner."

[*B*] . . . *And who beſides had no Religion.*] He went to Maſs as ſeldom as he could; and if he happened to go at his friend's requeſt, he uſed to ſay, *let us go and ſee the popular error. Domitius Calderinus ne Miſſam quidem volebat audire, & cum ab amicis eò duceretur, dixiſſe fertur, eamus ad communem errorem* (4); this gave Politian an occaſion to preſent him with the following epigram.

Audit Marſilius Miſſam: miſſam facis illam
Tu, Domiti; magis eſt religioſus uter?
Quis dubitet? tanto es tu religioſior illo,
Quanto audire minus eſt bona quam facere (α).

(4) Lud. Viv. *de Veritate fidei*, lib. 2. p. m. 264, 265.
(α) Theſe verſes run only upon an equivocation, which cannot be tranſlated into Engliſh.

I have read ſome books of controverſy, written by Proteſtants, in which Calderinus was ranked amongſt the *Witneſſes of truth*, that is, amongſt thoſe perſons of underſtanding, who in the midſt of Popery had acknowledged the errors which crept into the Roman Church. Did they not make a very good choice?

[*C*] *He was obliged to have his recourſe to impudence, and many artful tricks.*] Here follows what we read in Politian. *Auctoritatis tam magnæ fuit, ut Romæ inter Profeſſores juvenis adhuc primam ſibi celebritatem vindicaverit: cujus tuendæ ac retinendæ gratia factum compluries putamus, ut in ſuis operibus frontem perfricuerit, & per æqua per iniqua famam captans, parum ex fide quapiam retulerit, nonnulla etiam malè ſolers & præſtigioſus, ſpeciem quidem primorem veri habentia, magno credentium diſpendio, ſententiis ignorabilibus implicuerit, & pulverem, quod aiunt, oculis offuderit; aut ſicubi major difficultas nec abſtinens nec congrediens ſpem lectoris illuſerit. Ita dum neſcire ſe nihil probare contendit, etiam Parthis aliquoties & Cretenſibus mendacior invenitur* (5). i. e. "He had gained ſo great a repu-"tation, that tho' he was ſtill very young, yet he "pretended to the greateſt fame amongſt all the Pro-"feſſors at Rome. We think it was in order to ſup-"port and maintain his reputation, that in his works "he forſook all ſhame, and endeavouring to make "himſelf famous right or wrong, he related many "things unfaithfully; and even ſome things, which "at firſt view ſeemed true, he hid artfully under un-"intelligible words, to the great detriment of thoſe, "who put any confidence in him, thus caſting a miſt "before people's eyes, as the ſaying is. Or if ſome "hard objection was propoſed to him, he diſappoint-"ed his hearers, becauſe he would neither recant his "opinions, nor enter into a diſpute to prove them, "Thus labouring to ſhew that he knew every thing, "he has been found a greater lyar, than even the Par-"thians or the Cretans." The character of a knaviſh boaſter cannot be better deſcribed. When this man found himſelf cloſely preſſed by any objection, he would neither fight nor retire. This puts me in mind of the tricks of ſome informers, who will neither recant nor prove their accuſations.

(5) Politian. *Miſcellan.* cap. 9.

[*D*] *He died very young.*] At the age of thirty, if we may believe Leander Albertus (6) and Volaterranus;

(6) Leand. Albert. *in Deſcriptione Italiæ*, pag. m. 722.

Academy of Rome cauſed him to be buried in a very pompous manner; and the Scholars attended his funeral in a mourning habit (*d*). Several of his Commentaries upon the ancients are extant, and he was the firſt, who ventured to write ſome upon the moſt difficult Poets [*E*]. He got an eſtate, and had been Apoſtolical Secretary, according to Volaterranus (*e*).

(*d*) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 21.
(*e*) Volat. *Comment. Urban.* lib. 21. pag. 777.

(7) Volat. lib. 21. pag. m. 777.
(8) In Ibid. pag. 2.

(9) We read in Geſner's *Bibliotheca*, that Calderinus's *Commentary upon the Satyrs of Juvenal*, was printed at Rome in 1474.
(10) Volater. lib. 21. pag. 777.
(11) Jovius *in Elog.* cap. 21.

nus (7); or at thirty four according to Monſieur de Boiſſieu (8): but as he obſerves, that Domitius wrote a Commentary upon Ovid's *Ibis* in the year 1495, he ought not to have thought that this Critic died ſo young; for how is it poſſible that a man, who publiſhes a Commentary in the year 1474 (9), ſhould write another upon Ovid's *Ibis* in 1495, and yet live but thirty four years? He died of the plague according to ſome Authors (10); others ſay of a continual fever, having ruined his conſtitution by too great an application to his ſtudies. *Ætate laudeque florentem, ſed imbecilli ſtomachi temperaturam nimis lucubrationibus exterentem, quum digna multis ſæculis opera conciperet, rapida febris eripuit* (11). i. e. "A continual fever ſnatched him away in the prime of his "years and of his reputation, at a time when he pro"jected ſeveral works, which would have deſerved to "live a great many Ages; he had ruined the conſti"tution of his weak ſtomach by ſtudying too much." I have often wondered at the bad cuſtom of writers of Elogies; they very often forget to mention the year of the birth, and of the death, with ſuch other chronological circumſtances. I have enquired after the reaſon of theſe omiſſions, and finding that they were not owing to the love of brevity (for one ſheet of paper would contain five or ſix hundred dates of this kind) I concluded that lazineſs was the cauſe of all this; theſe writers don't remember theſe circumſtances, nor will they be at the pains of enquiring about them.

[*E*] *He was the firſt, who ventured to write Commentaries upon the moſt difficult Poets.*] Volaterranus tells us this. *Acri vir ingenio*, ſays he (12), PRIMUS *qui hoc tempore Poetas duriuſculos diligentius cœperit enarrare, & in eos commentarios edere admodum juvenis.* i. e. "He was a man of a very acute genius; and he "is the firſt, who began to explain the more difficult "Poets, and he wrote commentaries upon them, be"ing ſtill very young." Here follows what Calderinus himſelf ſays in his Preface to his edition of Statius. *Incidi in libros 5. ſilvarum Papinii Statii, opus granditate heroica ſublime, argumento varium, doctrina remotiſſimum, quod nemo ante nos aut auſus eſt, aut potuit attingere.* i. e. "I met with Papinius Statius's five "Books intitled, *Silvæ*; a work ſublime for its heroic "majeſty, containing a great variety of ſubjects, very "difficult on account of the doctrines it teaches, and "which no one before me either dared to attempt, or "could explain." He wrote this work in 1475 (13). See an encomium upon it in Barthius (14).

(12) Volat. lib. 21. pag. 777.
(13) Barthius *in Statium*, tom. 1. pag. 483.
(14) Idem, ibid.

☞ CALDWALL or CHALDWELL (RICHARD), an eminent Phyſician in the ſixteenth Century, was born in Staffordſhire, and educated in Brazen-Noſe College in the Univerſity of Oxford, of which he was afterwards Fellow (*a*). He took the Degree of Maſter of Arts in the year 1539 (*b*). In the 32d year of his age he became one of the Senior Students of Chriſt's-Church ſoon after its laſt foundation by King Henry VIII in 1547 (*c*). In 1555 he entered upon the Phyſic-line (*d*), and proſecuted his ſtudies in that Faculty with ſuch vigour and ſucceſs, that he took the Degrees in it, and was examined, approved, and admitted into the College of Phyſicians at London, and made Cenſor of it, in one and the ſame day [*A*]. Six weeks after he was choſen one of the Elects of that College, and in 1570 Preſident thereof (*e*). He wrote ſeveral Tracts relating to his Profeſſion [*B*]. He founded a Lecture upon Chirurgery in the College of Phyſicians, (which was then in Knight-riders-ſtreet, near the Church of St. Bennet Paul's Wharf (*f*),) in conjunction with the Lord Lumley (*g*). He died in the year 1585, and was interred in St. Bennet's Church abovementioned, where a monument was erected to him (*b*).

(*a*) Wood, *Hiſt. & Antiquit. Univerſ. Oxon.* lib. 2. pag. 217. and *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 223. 2d edit. London 1721.
(*b*) Idem, *Hiſt. & Antiq. ubi ſupra.*
(*c*) Idem, ibid. and *Athen. Oxon. ubi ſupra.*
(*d*) Idem, *Hiſt. & Antiq. ubi ſupra.*
(*e* Idem, *Athen. Oxon. ubi ſupra.*
(*f*) Idem, ibid.
(*g*) Camden, *Annales Regin. Elizabeth. ad ann.* 1585.
(*b*) Idem, ibid.

[*A*] *Examined, approved, and admitted into the College of Phyſicians at London, and made Cenſor of it, in one and the ſame day.*] Mr. Wood in his *Athenæ Oxonienſes* (1), and Dr. John Freind in his *Oratio Anniverſaria in Theatro Collegii Regalis Medicorum Londin. habita, ex Harvæi Inſtituto, in eorum commemorationem, qui ſuâ in hoc Collegium beneficentiâ claruerunt, die 18 Octobris anno* 1720 (2), mentions the ſame fact, which he tells us (3) was an honour, that perhaps never happened to any other perſon. *Præ cæteris emicuit Caldwaldi Liberalitas; qui cum uno eodemque die, quod alii fortaſſe nemini contigit, & ſub examen vocatus, & ſimul admiſſus, & etiam ad cenſorium munus erectus fuiſſet, hanc, quæ ei indulta eſt, gratiam pio animo, retulit, &c.* See likewiſe Dr. William Wood's *Anniverſary Oration* before the College (4), October 18th 1733.

(1) Vol. 1. col. 223. 2d edit. London 1721.
(2) Printed at the end of his *Epiſtola ad celeberrimum Virum Richardum Mead M. D. de quibuſdam Variolarum Generibus*, London 1727 in 8vo.
(3) pag. 15.
(4) pag. 7.

[*B*] *He wrote ſeveral Tracts relating to his Profeſſion.*] Mr. Wood in his *Hiſtoria & Antiquitates Univerſitatis Oxonienſis.* (5) and in his *Athenæ Oxonienſes* (6) informs us of this, but obſerves that he had never met with any of his works, except a Tranſlation into Engliſh of *The Tables of Surgery, briefly comprehending the whole Art and Practice thereof.* London 1585 in fol. Written originally in Latin by Horatio Moro, a Florentine Phyſician. T.

(5) Lib. 2. pag. 217.
(6) *Ubi ſupra.*

CALENUS (OLENUS) the moſt famous Diviner of his time amongſt the Etrurians, would have impoſed upon the Embaſſadors of Rome in the affair of the utmoſt importance, had not his own ſon acquainted them with the neceſſary precautions, they were to take. Tarquin, ſurnamed *Superbus*, or the Haughty, ſent to conſult Calenus concerning a Prodigy, which was, that the head of a man had been found in the ground, when people were digging to lay the foundations for a Temple, which Tarquin would build to Jupiter on mount Tarpeius. He thought that it was not proper to go on with the building, till it was known what that head portended. He ſent for all the Diviners of his Kingdom, but they anſwered, that they were not well enough ſkilled in their art to explain that Omen, and that he muſt apply to the Prophets of Etruria; they directed him to the moſt famous of them, and Tarquin ſent him immediately a Deputation. As ſoon as this Diviner knew, that the Prodigy portended a great happineſs, he endeavoured to deprive the Romans of it, and to divert ſo great an advantage in favour of his Etrurians. He would have accompliſhed his deſign, had not the Deputies, who had received notice of his intentions, taken care not to commit blunders in their anſwers to his artful

queſtions (a) [A]. I ſhall explain this piece of curioſity in a Note.

(a) From Dionyſ. Halicarn. lib. 4. cap. 66 and 67. *and* Plin. lib. 27. cap. 2. pag. m. 558.

[A] *He would have accompliſhed his deſign, had not the Deputies . . taken care not to commit blunders in their anſwers to his artful queſtions.*] Pliny mentions this as an inſtance, which proves that one ſingle word is ſufficient to alter the fate of things. Let us quote his own words: *Multi verò* (auctores ſunt) *multarum rerum fata & oſtenta verbis permutari. Cum in Tarpeio fodientes delubro fundamenta caput humanum inveniſſent, miſſis ob id a ſe legatis, Etruriæ celeberrimus vates Olenus Calenus prælarum id fortunatumque cernens, interrogatione in ſuam gentem transferre tentavit, ſcipione pius determinata templi imagine in ſolo ante ſe:* HOC ERGO DICITIS ROMANI? HIC TEMPLUM JOVIS OPTIMI MAXIMI FUTURUM EST, HIC CAPUT INVENIMUS: *conſtantiſſima annalium affirmatione, tranſiturum fuiſſe fatum in Etruriam, ni præmoniti a filio Vatis Legati Romani reſpondiſſent;* NON PLANE HIC, SED ROMÆ INVENTUM CAPUT DICIMUS (1). i. e. "Several Authors maintain, that words can "change the fate of things, and the effects of prodi- "gies. When in digging the ground on mount Tar- "peius for laying the foundations of a Temple, a "man's head was found, the Romans ſent Embaſſa- "dors to Olenus Calenus, the moſt famous Diviner of "Etruria; who finding that the prodigy portended "ſomething very glorious and fortunate, endeavoured "by his ſubtle queſtions to divert the omen in favour "of his own Nation. Wherefore he drew the figure "of the Temple with his ſtick upon the ground be- "fore him, and addreſſed the Embaſſadors in the fol- "lowing manner: *This then you ſay Romans; here "the Temple of Jupiter will be built; and here the "head has been found.* It is conſtantly related in the "Annals, that the fate of Rome would have paſſed to "Etruria, had not the Roman Embaſſadors, who had "been forewarned by the Diviner's ſon, anſwered; "*Not here, by no means, but at Rome, we ſay the head "has been found.*" This is a very preſſing inſtance. A man's head was found in the foundations of the Capitol; the earth had already been dug very deep, when the prodigy was diſcovered; the head of a man lately killed, ſtill warm, ſtill bleeding (2). Men leſs ſuperſtitious than the Heathens would have found a myſtery in this. It was after all an omen, that the place where the head was found, ſhould become the head of all Italy (3); but by a ſophiſtical trick that place might be cheated out of the rights which fate had granted it, and theſe advantages might be transferred to another place; and if Tarquin's Embaſſadors had forgot to mention Rome and Mount Tarpeius, when the Diviner aſked them, *has not the head been found here?* Rome would have loſt the Dominion of Italy, and the whole prodigy would have turned to the advantage of the Etrurians. Calenus endeavoured to accompliſh that fraud; for as ſoon as he knew what was the matter, he drew a circle upon the ground, marked the cardinal points upon it by ſtreight lines, Here is Mount Tarpeius, ſaid he to the Embaſſadors. Here is the Eaſt, the South, the North, the Weſt. Is it here or there (pointing with his ſtick) the head has been found? If they had anſwered *it is here*, the promiſes of fate would have been for Etruria; the place where Calenus was, would have become the ſeat of the Italian Monarchy. But the Roman Deputies were upon their guard, *It is not here*, anſwered they conſtantly, *the head has been found, but at Rome on Mount Tarpeius.* Calenus's ſon had taught them this expedient. My father, ſaid he to them, will explain this prodigy to you, without making uſe of any lye in the leaſt; for that is not permitted to a Diviner. But take care how you anſwer his queſtions. This is a curious piece of morality. Here we have a Prophet, who ſcruples to tell a lye in the explication of a prodigy; but who does not ſcruple to enſnare thoſe, who conſult him, nor to impoſe upon them by equivocations, and captious queſtions.

(1) Plinius, lib. 28. cap. 2. pag. m. 558.

(2) Dionyſ. Halic. lib. 4. cap. 66, pag. m. 247.

(3) Idem, ibid. cap. 68. pag. m. 248.

I do not wonder that the Heathens ſhould have believed there is a kind of fatality annexed to ſome inanimate things: for as the notion they had of God was not inconſiſtent with imperfections, there is no capricious whim, but they might aſcribe to their Gods. They might therefore think them capable of fixing their affections upon an image, a ſhield, &c. that is, of granting ſome particular favours to thoſe Nations, who ſhould ſucceſſively have that image, that ſhield, &c. in their poſſeſſion. But ſuch a diſpoſition of fate is inconſiſtent with the Wiſdom and Majeſty of a Sovereign Being, acting immediately himſelf. The occaſional cauſes maintained by the Carteſians, might afford ſome kind of ſolution in caſe of need. Whatever may have been the caſe of the Palladium of Troy, or of Numa's Shield, we have in this affair of the Capitol a very ſingular abſurdity: for it cannot be conceived, that a benefactor, how capricious ſoever he be, ſhould alter his deſigns for the ſake of the frivolous ſubtleties of an interpreter of prodigies. He deſigns to give the Empire of Italy to the City, in which a man's head ſhould be found in the earth. You are of that City, and in the ſincerity of your heart you ſay to ſome Divines of another place, who ſhew you a draught of your country, *here the head has been found:* and from that moment the Empire of Italy is transferred from your country, to the place where you ſpeak thus. Can there be any thing more monſtrouſly abſurd? I don't doubt but Pliny laughed in his heart at all theſe ſilly things, though he relates them, without ſeeming to deſpiſe them. *Hæc ſatis ſint,* ſays he (4), *exemplis ut appareat, oſtentorum vires & in noſtra poteſtate eſſe, ac prout quæque accepta ſint, valere.* i. e. "This is ſufficient to ſhew "by ſome examples, that the effects of prodigies are "in our power, and that they are, what the opinion "we have of them makes them to be."

(4) Plinius, lib. 28. cap. 2. pag. 558.

CALIGULA (CAIUS CÆSAR) Emperor of Rome ſucceeded Tiberius A. C. 37. He was the ſon of Germanicus and Agrippina, and degenerated in ſo terrible a manner, that the reign of his predeceſſor was regretted (a), which is the worſt that could be ſaid of him. They who have ſaid that Nature made choice of him in order to ſhew the world the utmoſt of her power in the way of evil [A], have judged very right. It is probable, that a ſuperior power, I mean a phyſical cauſe, greatly encreaſed the moral depravation of this Emperor [B]. He was almoſt entirely deprived of his free will by the

(a) *Sceleratiſſimus ac funeſtiſſimus & qui etiam Tiberii dedecora purgaverit.* Eutropius, lib. 7.

(1) *De Conſolat. ad Helviam*, cap. 9. pag. m. 779.

(2) This is quite the reverſe of Scipio Africanus's character, of whom Valerius Maximus ſays (lib. 6. cap. 9. num. 2.) *Quem Dii immortales naſci voluerunt, ut eſſet in quo ſe virtus per omnes numeros hominibus efficaciter oſtenderet.*

(3) Seneca, *de Conſolat. ad* Polybium, cap. 36. pag. 732.

[A] *Nature made choice of him in order to ſhew the utmoſt of her power in the way of evil.*] Thus I take the liberty to tranſlate the following words of Seneca (1): *C. Cæſar quem mihi videtur rerum natura* (2) *edidiſſe ut oſtenderet quid ſumma vitia in fortuna poſſent.* What he ſays in another place is not leſs ſtrong; Nature, ſays he, had produced him to the ſhame and ruin of mankind. *Non poſſum . . . hunc præterire, ex omni Cæſarum numero excerpendum, quem rerum natura in exitium opprobriumque humani generis edidit* (3).

[B] *A phyſical cauſe greatly encreaſed the moral depravation of this Emperor.*] Fools and madmen ſin with impunity, at leaſt with regard to the Civil Law; for a madman is not hanged, if having broken his chains, and falling upon the firſt man he meets, he kills him. They who condemn with the utmoſt ſeverity and without exception thoſe State-Revolutions, in which a lawful Sovereign is depoſed, do not deny, that it ought to be done, when a Prince is incorrigibly bad, or, which is the ſame thing, when his wickedneſs is owing to a diſorder in his organs, to a bodily diſeaſe, in a word, to any natural cauſe. The queſtion only is, whether Caligula's frenzy was of this kind. It is very probable, that the philter he was made to ſwallow, increaſed his wickedneſs to the utmoſt degree, and changed it into a mechanical and irreſiſtible fierceneſs, if I may be allowed the uſe of that word *irreſiſtible*, which is conſecrated to ſhew the efficacy,

the Philter which had been given him; ſo that though the Romans had depoſed him in a regular manner, I do not think it could have afforded the leaſt argument to thoſe who are called *Monarchomachi* (α). The corruption of his mind diſcovered itſelf very early, for he wore ſtill the child's-robe, when he was ſurprized in inceſt with one of his ſiſters (b) [C]: he debauched all thoſe he had, and lived publickly with one of them, as though ſhe had been his wife [D]. But as we muſt give every one his due, I find myſelf obliged to ſay, that I believe they wrong him, who pretend that he committed inceſt with his own daughter [E]. He carried the crime of blaſphemy as far as it is poſſible for

(α) That is, the enemies of Monarchy. CRIT. REM.

(b) See the Article DRUSILLA (JULIA) remark [B].

ficacy of neceſſitating grace. Juvenal aſcribes Caligula's mad cruelties to the malignant effects of that philter:

——— Tamen hoc tolerabile, ſi non
Et furere incipias, ut avunculus ille Neronis,
Cui totam tremuli frontem Cæſonia pulli
Infudit. Quæ non faciet, quod Principis uxor?
Ardebant cuncta, & fracta compage ruebant,
Non aliter quam ſi feciſſet Juno maritum
Inſanum. Minus ergo nocens erit Agrippinæ
Boletus: ſiquidem unius præcordia preſſit
Ille ſenis, tremulumque caput deſcendere juſſit
In Cælum, & longa manantia labra ſaliva.
Hæc poſcit ferrum, atque ignes, hæc potio torquet,
Hæc lacerat mixtos equitum cum ſanguine patres (4).

That is,

" Some nimbler juice would make him foam and
" rave,
" Like that, Cæſonia to her Caius gave:
" Who plucking from the forehead of the fole
" His mother's love, infuſed it in the bowl.
" The boiling blood ran hiſſing in his veins,
" Till the mad vapour mounted to his brains.
" The Thund'rer was not half ſo much on fire,
" When Juno's girdle kindled his deſire.
" What woman will not uſe the pois'ning trade
" When Cæſar's wife the precedent has made?
" Let Agrippina's Muſhroom be forgot,
" Giv'n to ſlav'ring, old, unuſeful ſot;
" That only clos'd the driveling dotard's eyes,
" And ſent his Godhead downward to the skies.
" But this fierce potion calls for fire and ſword;
" Nor ſpares the Commons when it ſtrikes the Lord.
Dryden.

(4) Juvenal. Sat. 6. ver. 614.

Suetonius ſays, not only that this philter made him turn raving mad, but alſo, that the oppoſite paſſions, with which he was tranſported, muſt be aſcribed to a diſorder in his mind. He obſerves that this Prince ſlept very little, and that he was troubled with a thouſand wild and extravagant viſions in his dreams. *Mentis valetudinem & ipſe ſenſerat, atque ſubinde de ſeceſſu, deque purgando cerebro cogitavit. Creditur potionatus a Cæſonia uxore, amatorio quidem medicamento, ſed quod in furorem verterit. Incitabatur in ſomnia maxime; neque enim plus quam tribus nocturnis horis quieſcebat; ac ne his quidem placida quiete, ſed pavida miris rerum imaginibus; ut qui inter cæteras, pelagi quondam ſpeciem colloquentem ſecum videre viſus eſt. Ideoque magna parte noctis vigiliæ cubandique tædio, nunc toro reſidens, nunc per longiſſimas porticus vagus, invocare identidem atque expectare lucem conſueverat. Nec immeritò mentis valetudini attribuerim diverſiſſima in eodem vitia, ſummam confidentiam & contra nimium metum* (5). i. e. " He perceived himſelf the diſorder of his mind; and " had now and then ſome thoughts of retiring and of " purging his brains. It is believed that Cæſonia his " wife had given him a draught; it was indeed a " love-potion, but it made him grow mad. He was " moſtly troubled in his ſleep; he reſted only three " hours in the night; nor had he an eaſy reſt being " diſturbed by extraordinary dreams and viſions; as " for inſtance, he fancied once that the image of the " Sea ſpoke with him. So that being tired with lying " a-bed without ſleeping, he uſed to paſs a great part " of the night, either ſitting on his bed, or walking in " his long galleries, every now and then invoking, and " impatiently expecting the next day. I ſhould not " be miſtaken, I think, if I ſhould aſcribe to a diſ- " order in his mind the contrary vices which met in " him, as the utmoſt confidence with a very great " fear." I own that Tiberius, who as a very wicked man, but whoſe wickedneſs was attended with the utmoſt hypocriſy, was very capable of forming a right judgment concerning the inclinations of others, foretold that Caligula would be the plague of mankind (6). I do not deny, therefore, that Caligula had naturally very pernicious diſpoſitions; but it was in his power to hide, and even to correct them before he took Cæſonia's potion. The beginning of his reign was admirably good; and no man ever acted his part more artfully, than he did under Tiberius. *Omnibus inſidiis tentatus elicientium, cogentiumque ſe ad querelas, nullam unquam occaſionem dedit, perinde obliterato ſuorum caſu, ac ſi nihil cuiquam accidiſſet: quæ verò ipſe pateretur, incredibili diſſimulatione tranſmittens. Tantique in Avum, & qui juxta erant, obſequii, ut non immeritò ſit dictum, nec ſervum meliorem ullum, nec deteriorem dominum fuiſſe. Naturam tamen ſævam atque probroſam nec tunc quidem inhibere poterat, &c.* (7). i. e. " Tho' many ſnares were laid before him, to " draw ſome complaints from him, yet he never gave " the leaſt occaſion to accuſe him. He ſeemed to " have forgotten the misfortunes of his friends, as tho' " none of them had ſuffered any thing: and he art- " fully diſſembled what he ſuffered himſelf. He was " ſo complaiſant to his grandfather and to all thoſe " who were about him, that it was ſaid of him, and " not without reaſon, that he was the beſt ſlave, and " the worſt maſter. Yet even then he could not al- " ways keep his fierce and ſavage temper within " bounds, &c." This ſhews, that tho' on ſome occaſions he ſhewed his fierceneſs, yet he could maſter it, and make his paſſions yield to reaſon when he pleaſed. If you conſider carefully what he did ſince that time, you will find in his conduct ſeveral ſymptoms of a diſeaſed mind, and many marks of madneſs.

(6) *Quod ſagaciſſimus ſenex ita prorſus perſpexerat ut aliquoties prædicaret, exitio ſuo omniumque Cajum vivere & ſe natricem (ſerpentis id genus) populo Romano, Phaëtontem orbi, terrarum educare.* Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 11. i. e. " The ſagacious " old man had " ſo well diſcovered Caligula's character, " that he ſometimes would " ſay, that that " Caius was " born for his " own ruin, " and for that of " all; and that " he educated a " Natrix (it is a " kind of ſerpent) for the " Romans, and " a Phaeton for " the whole " world."

(7) Suetonius, *in Caligula*, cap. 10 and 11.

[C] *He wore ſtill the child's robe, when he was catched in an inceſt with one of his ſiſters.*] See above (8) the article of ANTONIA, where you will find in the margin (9) a paſſage of Suetonius, which proves this fact. You will find the ſame paſſage in the following remark.

(8) Vol. 2. pag. 66, 67.

(9) Quotation (9).

[D] *He lived with one of his ſiſters, as tho' ſhe had been his wife.*] He had three ſiſters, and all three lay with him; but Druſilla was always his favourite. It was with her that their Grandmother Antonia ſurprized him, and it is her I mean in the text of this Remark. The exceſſive griefs with which he was overwhelmed at her death, and the divine honours he conferred upon her (10), are not the leaſt follies of which he was guilty. As for his other ſiſters, he proſtituted them to his *Bardachios*, and then puniſhed them under the pretence of adultery and conſpiration, *Cum omnibus ſororibus ſuis ſtupri conſuetudinem fecit, plenoque convivio ſingulas infra ſe viciſſim collocabat, uxore ſupra cubante. Ex his Druſillam vitiaſſe virginem prætextatus adhuc creditur, atque etiam in concubitu ejus quondam deprehenſus ab avia Antonia, apud quam ſimul educabantur. Mox Lucio Caſſio Longino conſulari collocatam abduxit, & in modum juſtæ uxoris propalam habuit. Hæredem quoque bonorum atque Imperii æger inſtituit. . . Reliquas ſorores nec cupiditate tanta nec dignatione dilexit, ut quas ſæpe exoletis ſuis proſtraverit. Quo facilius eas in cauſſa Æmilii Lepidi condemnavit quaſi adulteras, & inſidiarum adverſus ſe conſcias* (11).

(10) *See* Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 10. Seneca *de Conſolat. ad* Polybium, cap. 28. lib. 59. pag. m. 744. Dion, *ad ann. U.* 791.

(11) Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 24.

[E] *I believe they wrong him who pretend that he committed an inceſt with his own daughter.*] " He " indulged his laſciviouſneſs with his own ſiſters; " and to appear ſtill more prodigiouſly inceſtuous he " raviſhed a daughter he had by one of his ſiſters." This is what we read in the Abbé de Marolles's French tranſlation of Eutropius; but I think that he did not well underſtand the original. Eutropius's words are as follow. *Stupra ſororibus intulit, ex unâ etiam natam filiam cognovit* (12). I am very much miſtaken if the ſenſe of theſe words is not this, *He lay with his ſiſters, and even acknowledged for his daughter a girl*

(12) Eutropius, lib. 7. cap. 7. *in Caligula.*

for a creature to do. Like the Devil, he believed that there is a God, and trembled at the thought, and yet he belched out the moſt abominable blaſphemies againſt the Deity [*F*]. He proudly uſurped all religious honours [*G*], nor did he ſtick at any crime whatſoever (*c*). The laſt of his four wives was Cæſonia; ſhe was neither beautiful nor young, and yet he loved her paſſionately, notwithſtanding which his very careſſes of her were ſometimes attended with ſome marks of his ſavage and cruel temper [*H*]. He had a daughter

(*c*) Concerning his cruelty. *See* Seneca, *de Ira*, lib. 3. cap. 18, 19.

girl he had by one of them (* *a*). I know that it can be proved by ſome inſtances that the Latin expreſſion. *cognoſcere fœminam* ſignifies ſometimes *to lay with a woman*. But theſe inſtances are ſcarce, and beſides, it is not at all probable, that in this paſſage Eutropius would have employed that expreſſion in that ſenſe. This was not a proper place to make uſe of ſuch modeſt and equivocal words. He had employed the word *ſtuprum*, when he ſpoke of the brother and ſiſters, and ſpeaking in the ſame ſentence of the father and the daughter ſhould he have made uſe of a ſofter expreſſion? With Caſaubon's leave (13), I do not find the leaſt probability in it. I add, that the common acceptation of the word *cognoſcere*, puts a very good ſenſe upon Eutropius's words. For it is a new degree of impudence in a man to acknowledge for his daughter the child he had by his own ſiſter. It is having ſome regard for the publick, to hide an inceſtuous commerce, and a man ſhews more or leſs reſpect for the publick, according as he keeps ſuch an intrigue more or leſs ſecret: but when a man acknowledges himſelf publickly for the father of the children, who are born of ſuch inceſt, it ſhews that he has loſt all manner of ſhame. I will not object to the Abbé de Marolles, that Caligula was never accuſed of having raviſhed his own daughter; for my tranſlation of Eutropius's words is not better ſupported by other Hiſtorians, than Monſieur de Marolles's verſion. Eutropius is the only Author, that I know of, who mentions either that acknowledgment, or that inceſt, which makes me doubt very much of what he relates. An Emperor, who dy'd before he was twenty nine years old, who had a daughter by his ſiſter, who ſhould ſee that daughter full grown, who ſhould raviſh her, or who from her cradle ſhould have acknowledged her publickly for his daughter, all this, I ſay, is too extraordinary and ſurpriſing, to have been mentioned only by one ſingle Author, if it were true.

(13) He takes Eutropius's words in the ſame ſenſe as Mr. *De Marolles* did. *See* Caſaub. *in Sueton. Calig.* cap. 24. Conradus Dietericus, *in Vita Calig.* pag. 29. takes the words in the ſame ſenſe.

Obſerve, that in all likelihood, Caligula did not lay with his ſiſters, before he entered into his grand-mother's houſe; and ſince he was eighteen years of age, when he went to live with her (14), it is impoſſible he ſhould have ſeen that daughter full grown, who was born of this inceſt. If it be objected, that the word *cognoſcere* would not be proper in the ſenſe I take it, ſince AGNOSCERE (15) is the word affixed to that ſenſe, I anſwer that Eutropius, is none of thoſe Authors, who write with the greateſt accuracy.

(14) See the remark [*B*] of the article DRUSILLA (JULIA.)

(15) *See* Pitiſcus, *in Sueton. in Jul.* cap. 52. num. 9.

(* *a*) *Acknowledged for his daughter a girl he had by one of them.*] Pæanius, who tranſlated Eutropius into Greek, puts the ſame ſenſe upon this paſſage, as Monſieur de Marolles does; for he tranſlates it thus. Καὶ τῆς ἑαυτῦ ἐκγόνης ἄυθις ἐγένετο φθορεύς. Upon which Barthius obſerves †, that it cannot be granted, that Caligula, who died at the age of twenty nine, ſhould have raviſhed his own daughter; wherefore, adds he, ſome with very good reaſon, read *agnovit*, inſtead of *cognovit* in the paſſage of Eutropius. *Non hoc conceſſerit, qui noverit modo, anno xxix ætatis Caligulam interiiſſe. Quare alii optime ediderunt apud Eutropium*, ex unâ etiam natam filiam agnovit. CRIT. REM.

† Barthius, *Adverſarior.* lib. 23. cap. 9.

[*F*] *He believed that there is a God, and trembled at the thoughts, and yet he belched out . . . . blaſphemies againſt the Deity.*] Here follows a paſſage from Calvin, which is not impertinently quoted. *Nemo in audaciorem aut effrenatiorem numinis contemptum prorupiſſe legitur quam C. Caligula: nemo tamen miſerius trepidavit, cum aliquod iræ divinæ indicium ſe proferebat: ita Deum, quem ſtudebat ex profeſſo contemnere, invitus exhorrebat* (16). i. e. "We read in Hiſtory, "that no body ever diſcovered a more audacious and "furious contempt for the Deity, than C. Caligula "did, and yet no body trembled in a more deſpicable "manner than he, at the leaſt token of divine wrath. "Thus dreading againſt his will that ſame God, whom "he ſtrove to contemn." All this is grounded on Suetonius's account, who tells us, that this ſame Caligula, who ſhewed ſo much contempt for the Gods, uſed to hide himſelf under a bed, when he heard a great thunder. *Qui Deos tantopere contemneret, ad minima tonitrua & fulgura connivere, caput obvolvere, ad vero majora proripere ſe è ſtrato, ſub lectumque condere ſolebat* (17). i. e. "He, who pretended ſo much to "deſpiſe the Gods, uſed to ſhut his eyes, and to co-"ver his head at the leaſt thunder and lightning, "and if it happened to thunder very much, he jump-"ed out of his bed, and hid himſelf under it." But let us obſerve, that he had not always ſuch a fear; for on the contrary, there was a time when he affected to vie with Jupiter, as well with regard to thunder as to thunder-bolts. With the noiſe of his engines, he anſwered the noiſe of the thunder, and if thunder-bolts fell from the ſky, he flung ſtones towards heaven, and addreſſing himſelf to the God, who thunder'd, he cried to him, *take me out of the world, or I ſhall take thee out of it.* Ταῖς τε βροντᾶις ἐκ μεχανῆς τινὲς ἀντέβροντα, καὶ ταῖς ἀστραπαῖς ἀντήστραπτε. καὶ ὅποτε χεραυνὸς καταπέσοι λίθον ἀντηκόντιζεν, ἐπιλέγων ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ τὸ τῦ Ὁμήρυ, ἢ μ' ἀνάειρ' ἢ ἐγὼ σε (18). Torrentius finds more fear than threatnings in theſe words, upon which he immediately quotes Suetonius who mentions Caligula's fear of the thunder. *Non tam comminantis quam timentis eſt etiam*, aut occide me aut ego te. *Expaviſſe autem Cajum fulmina auctor eſt Suetonius* (19). Torrentius did not underſtand this well, and put a wrong conſtruction upon Caligula's words. His expreſſions do not in the leaſt ſavour of fear; they contain a downright challenge, to a deſperate fight, which was not to end but by the death of one of the combatants. This is the ſenſe which Seneca plainly puts upon Caligula's words (20). *Ad pugnam vocavit Jovem, & quidem ſine miſſione, Homericum illum exclamans verſum* (21). Here follows another inſtance of Caligula's impiety. He uſed to approach the ſtatue of Jupiter Capitolinus in the day time, as tho' he would begin a converſation with him. Sometimes he ſpoke loudly to him, ſometimes ſoftly and in his ear; and then in his turn put his ear to Jupiter's mouth. Theſe converſations did not uſe to end without ſome diſputes, and Caligula was once heard to threaten Jupiter that he would ſend him back into Greece, εἰς γαῖαν Δαναῶν περάω σε. He boaſted that Jupiter had prevailed upon him by his prayers, not to put that threatning in execution, and obtained from him the favour of lodging with him; and it is for that reaſon, ſaid he, that I have cauſed a bridge to be made between my houſe and the Capitol (22).

(17) Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 51.

(18) Dion, lib. 59. pag. 761. *See alſo* Seneca *de Ira*, lib. 1. cap. 16.

(19) Torrent. *in Sueton.* cap. 22.

(20) Seneca, *de Ira*, lib. 1. cap. 16.

(21) It is verſe the 724th of the 23d book of the *Iliad*. Ajax addreſſed thoſe words to Ulyſſes, with whom he wreſtled; they have not a ſanguinary ſignification in that place.

(22) Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 22.

[*G*] *He proudly uſurped all religious honours.*] He often placed himſelf between the ſtatues of Caſtor and Pollux, and there received the adorations of all comers. He had a temple built to him, in which the choiceſt animals were every day ſacrificed to him (23). For ſome time he called himſelf Jupiter, and ſaid, it was for that reaſon he had lain with ſo many women, and even with his own ſiſters. At other times he would be Juno, Diana, Venus, Bacchus, and dreſſed himſelf in the habit proper to theſe Deities (24). He ordered a Body or College of Prieſts to be erected for him, his wife Cæſonia, and Claudius his uncle were members of that College, none were admitted into it, but rich men, who bought that dignity very dear. He would be himſelf his own Prieſt, for which reaſon he entered himſelf into that College, into which he alſo admitted his horſe (25).

(23) Idem, ibid. *See alſo* Dion, lib. 59. pag. 761.

(24) Dio, lib. 59. pag. 759.

(25) Idem, ibid. pag. 761.

[*H*] *He loved Cæſonia paſſionately, notwithſtanding which his very careſſes of her were . . . . attended with ſome marks of his ſavage and cruel temper.*] Mr. de Balzac will furniſh us with a Commentary upon theſe words. *The fair*, ſays he (26), *who are beloved by tyrants are not ſafe. . . . Poppea was firſt Nero's miſtreſs, then his wife, and always his Governeſs. She had tamed that monſter, and made him tractable, yet ſhe could not always maſter him, for being once in a paſſion againſt her, he killed her by a kick he gave her*

FACTS relating to CÆSONIA.

(26) In one of his Letters.

daughter by her, who died with her father and mother in Caſſius Chærea's conſpiracy (*d*), A. C. 41. Lollia Paulina, another of his wives, had not been married to Caius Cæſar, Agrippa's ſon, as the learned Archbiſhop Uſher thought (*e*) [*I*]. Philo relates a ſaying of Caligula, which deſerves to be conſidered [*K*]. Seneca wonders that this Emperor ſhould have inſulted others by his railleries, whilſt he himſelf by his bodily defects was ſo much expoſed to ridicule [*L*]; but he was not afraid that people ſhould dare to laugh at him as he laughed at others. Perhaps alſo he did not perceive his own defects. One of his moſt impertinent follies was, that when the Moon was full, he deſired her to come

(*d*) See the article of this CASSIUS, quotation (*i*).

(*e*) *Annal.* tom. 2. *ad An.* 4003.

her on the belly. His uncle Caius did not treat Cæſonia ſo ſeverely; however in the height of his love, he uſed to court her after this manner. This fine head will be cut off the moment I command it. *He told her ſometimes, that he would have her put to the rack, in order to know from her, why he loved her ſo much.* This is borrowed from Suetonius. *Quoties uxoris vel amiculæ collum exoſcularetur, addebat,* tam bona cervix, ſimulac juſſero, demetur. *Quin & ſubinde jactabat, exquiſiturum ſe vel fidiculis de Cæſonia ſua, cur eam tantopere diligeret* (27). It is ſtrange, that this woman, who was neither young nor beautiful, and who had already had three children by her huſband, ſhould have filled that ſavage breaſt with ſo great and ſo conſtant a love. Let men commend, as much as they pleaſe, the prime of youth, it will be found after all, that the ſkill and addreſs of a woman between thirty and forty, will better ſupport her reign, if ſhe be the miſtreſs of a Prince, than the beauty alone of a tender girl could do. Add to this that Cæſonia, and probably ſome other Ladies of the ſame character, learned ſeveral love practices, which abundantly ſupply the want of beauty. However that be Suetonius ſeems to hint, that Cæſonia's laſcivious temper was the reaſon why Caligula loved her ſo much. That Prince was ſo fooliſhly fond of her, that he uſed to ſhew her ſtark naked to his friends. *Cæſoniam neque facie inſigni, neque ætate integra, matremque jam ex alio viro trium filiarum, ſed luxuriæ ac laſciviæ perditæ, & ardentius & conſtantius amavit, ut ſæpe Chlamyde peltaque & galea ornatam & juxta adequitantem militibus oſtenderit, amicis vero etiam nudam* (28). He did not acknowledge her for his wife before ſhe was brought to bed; it was of a daughter ſhe was delivered; Caligula loved this daughter very tenderly; he found that ſhe was his own blood by her ſcratching the face of the little children with whom ſhe played. *Nec ullo firmiore indicio ſui ſeminis eſſe credebat, quam feritatis quæ illi quoque tanta jam tunc erat, ut infeſtis digitis ora & oculos ſimul ludentium infantium inceſſeret* (29). Judge, whether the perſon, who made her undergo the ſame kind of death, which the Pſalmiſt wiſhed to the children of Babylon (30), might not truly ſay, that he cruſhed to pieces a ſerpent ready hatched, *mali corvi malum ovum.*

(27) Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 33.

(28) Ibid. cap. 25.

(29) Ibid.

(30) *Periit una & uxor Cæſonia gladio à Centurione confoſſa, & filia parieti illiſa.* Suet. cap. 59. i. e. "Cæſonia "and her daughter died at the "ſame time, "the former by "the ſword, the "latter being "daſhed againſt "the wall." Here follow the words of Pſalm cxxxvii. ver. 9. *Happy ſhall be he, that takes and daſhes thy little ones againſt the ſtones.*

[*I*] *Lollia Paulina another of his wives, had not been married to Caius Cæſar . . . . as Archbiſhop Uſher thought.*] His miſtake was occaſioned by the following words of Suetonius in Chapter the xxvith of the life of the Emperor Claudius, *Deque Lolliæ Paulinæ, quæ C. Cæſari nupta fuerat.* i. e. "Of Lollia Pau"lina's (marriage), who had been married to C. "Cæſar." The Archbiſhop thought that theſe words muſt be underſtood of Auguſtus's grandſon. But he would not have committed this ſmall blunder, had he obſerved, two things; I. he ſhould have conſidered, that Suetonius in Chapter the XXVth of Caligula's life, ſays poſitively that this Emperor married Lollia Paulina, and ſoon after divorced her. II. That Tacitus, in Chapter XL of the fourth Annals, tells us, that Caius Cæſar, Auguſtus's grandſon, married Livia Druſus's daughter, and ſiſter of Germanicus, and that he died before her, ſince it is known, that ſhe was afterwards married to Druſus Tiberius's ſon. Theſe obſervations come from the learned F. Noris (31), and not from me.

(31) Cenotaph. Piſan. pag. 189.

[*K*] *Philo relates a ſaying of Caligula, which deſerves to be conſidered.*] One of our modern Authors has dreſſed it in the following manner. *Far from being ſurprized,* ſays he (32), *that* Princes have not all the good qualities, which are requiſite in them, I ſhould be much more ſurprized, if they did not argue like Caligula ſince our blind ſubmiſſion to their moſt wild and unjuſt fancies, muſt naturally raiſe their pride to the higheſt degree of *inſolence.* "Since they, who lead "droves of cattle, *ſaid that arch-madman* *, are not "beaſts, like them, but of a more exalted nature; "ſo they who command men, in a manner ſo ab"ſolute, and to whom others obey, cannot be mere "men like them, whom they govern, but muſt be "Gods." *This is the effect, which our flattery muſt naturally produce upon the minds of Princes, and which it uſed to produce amongſt the Heathens.* That the reader may obſerve the difference there is between Authors, I ſhall here relate in what manner St. Romuald, a Monk of the Order of St. Bernard, has miſrepreſented all this. *At that time* (33), ſays he, *flouriſhed Caius, that illuſtrious Philoſopher, to whom the following fine apophthegm is aſcribed.* "He who governs others, "ſhould not only be a man but more than a man; "that is, much more virtuous and perfect than they. "For as they do not chuſe a ſheep, to lead ſheep, ſo to "govern men you muſt not chooſe a man but a God. "*Paſtor ovium* ſays he, *non eſt ovis, Paſtor boum non "eſt bos, caprarum paſtor non eſt capra ſed homo; "ergo hominum paſtor aliud quam homo eſſe debet, Quid "ergo? Deus.* Otherwiſe he is in danger of deſtroy"ing them, and himſelf with them." Let the reader, if he thinks fit, be at the pains of examining how many blunders there are in the words of that honeſt Monk.

(32) S. Real, *Ceſarion*, pag. m. 202.

* Philo Judæus in his embaſſy.

(33) That is, in the time of Perſeus, the laſt King of Macedon, in the year of the world 3826. See his *Abregé Chronol.* tom. 1. pag. m. 697.

[*L*] *He inſulted others by his railleries, whilſt he himſelf by his bodily defects was ſo much expoſed to ridicule.*] He was the greateſt ſlanderer in the world, and a very ugly man; pale, his eyes ſunk deep in his head, a wild look, a hairy neck, and a bald head; his feet enormouſly big, and his legs thin like a ſpindle. A man ill-favoured as he was, laughed at every one, and uſed to tell people the moſt ſhocking things; as when he told Valerius Aſiaticus with a loud voice in a full company, the defects he had found in his wife, when he had enjoyed her (34). Let us hear Seneca upon this. *C. Cæſar, inter cætera vitia, quibus abundabat, contumelioſus mirabiliter ferebatur omnibus aliqua nota feriendis, ipſe materia riſus benigniſſima. Tanta illi palloris inſaniam teſtantis fæditas erat, tanta oculorum ſub fronte anili latentium ſervitas* (35), *tanta capitis deſtituti & emendicatis capillis aſperſi, deformitas; adjice obſeſſam ſatis cervicem, & exilitatem crurum, & enormitatem pedum. Immenſum eſt, ſi velim ſingula referre, per quæ in patres avoſque ſuos contumelioſus fuit, per quæ in univerſos ordines: ea referam, quæ illum exitio dederunt. Aſiaticum Valerium in primis amicis habebat, ferocem virum, & vix æquo animo alienas contumelias laturum. Huic in convivio, item in concione, voce clariſſima, qualis in concubitu eſſet uxor ejus, objecit. Dii boni, hoc virum audire, Principem ſcire, & uſque eo licentiam perveniſſe, ut non dico Conſulari, non dico amico, ſed tantum marito, Princeps & adulterium ſuum narret, & faſtidium* (36)? i. e. "Amongſt the other vices to which Caligula was ſub"ject, he was very ſmart upon thoſe, who gave the "leaſt occaſion for raillery, for which he himſelf af"forded matter in abundance; by his pale face, a "ſure ſign of his madneſs, by his eyes deeply hid in "his old woman's head, by his bald pate; covered "with borrowed hair; add to this, his hairy neck, "thin legs, and monſtrous feet. It would be an in"finite taſk to relate, how many ways he abuſed his "fathers, and grand-fathers, and all the orders of the "State. I ſhall only mention that, which brought "his ruin upon him. Valerius Aſiaticus was one "of his beſt friends, a proud man, who could "hardly bear the reproaches of others: to him Cali"gula told at dinner, before company with a loud "voice, how his wife behaved in bed. Good God! "A huſband to hear this, a Prince to know it; and "that licentiouſneſs ſhould go ſo far, that a Prince "ſhould

(34) Suetonius *in Calig.* cap. 36. tells us, *that Caligula uſed to invite the moſt eminent men of Rome to dinner with their wives; and when he had a mind, he uſed to go out with the woman he liked beſt; and returning ſome time after, he related to the company the moſt hidden beauties or defects he had found in the Lady.* Recentibus adhuc laſciviæ notis reverſus, vel laudabat palam, vel vituperabat, ſingula enumerans bona malave corporis atque concubitus.

(35) *See* Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 50. where he draws a picture of this Emperor, much like what we tranſcribe here, and with ſome ſtrokes which are not in Seneca.

(36) Seneca, *de Conſtantia*, cap. 18. pag. m. 693.

come and lie with him (*f*), he even boaſted that he had lain with her (*g*). What ſhall I ſay of the honours of Prieſthood which he conferred on his horſe (*b*)? See the laſt remark [*M*]. The deſcription which St. Paul gives us of the Man of Sin, of Antichriſt, agreed ſo well with this Emperor's character, that I don't wonder ſome learned men ſhould have explained of him that part of the propheeies contained in the New Teſtament (*i*). However I do not pretend to affirm that they are in the right. The reader will find in the article of MACRO, that the intrigues of a woman contributed very much to the raiſing of Caligula ſooner to the Throne. A Profeſſor at Utrecht has very well diſplayed in an Oration (*k*) the bad qualities and monſtrous actions of this Emperor.

(*f*) Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 22.
(*g*) Dio, lib. 59. pag. 761.
(*b*) Idem, ibid.
(*i*) *See* Grotius, *in Tractatu de Antichriſto.*
(*k*) See the 13th Oration of Antonius Æmilius.

" ſhould boaſt of his adultery and diſguſt; I do not " ſay before a conſular man, before a friend, but even " before the huſband himſelf? I have quoted in the margin a paſſage from Suetonius, which ſhews that Valerius Africanus's wife had ſeveral fellow ſufferers in her misfortune, and that there were many more women, whoſe hidden defects the indiſcreet Caligula publiſhed. They who know how detrimental ſuch an indiſcretion was to the affairs of Henry the IIId of France, will be ſurpriſed that the Ladies had ſo little ſhare in the conſpiracies againſt Caligula. For I believe, that at that time the Roman Ladies were not leſs concerned at ſuch affronts, than the Ladies at the French Court in the XVIth Century. Now, here follows what we read in Mezerai. *It was reported to the King, that the leaſt evil the leaguers intended to do him, was to make a Monk of him, and that the Ducheſs of Montpenſier ſhewed the ſciſſars, with which ſhe intended to clip his crown. The reaſon of this was, that he had exaſperated that widow, by diſcovering in converſation ſome hidden defects of her; an injury much more unpardonable with women, than an attempt upon their chaſtity* (37).

(37) Mezerai, *Abregé Chronol.* tom. 5. *ann.* 1588, pag. m. 315.

[*M*] *See the laſt remark.*] His converſations with the ſtatue of Jupiter, the pretended ſecrets he told him in his ears, his quarrelling, and threatnings, during that fine converſation (38), his enjoyment of the moon, his deſigning to make his horſe a Conſul, his whim of having his horſe dine at table with him, and a thouſand other things like theſe, are unqueſtionable marks of madneſs. He was very wicked, but he was at leaſt ſomething more mad than wicked. It is certain, that he was no Atheiſt; all his impious actions prove, that he believed the being of Gods; ſo that the Author of the *Penſees ſur les Comètes*, was in the right (39), when he quoted Caligula as an inſtance, that the moſt profligate wretches, mentioned in hiſtory, have acknowledged a Deity.

(38) See above, remark [*G*].
(39) Pag. 344, 380.

☞CALLIMACHUS, a Greek Poet, who flouriſhed in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and Ptolemy Euergetes, Kings of Egypt, was born in Cyrene, a famous City of ancient Libya, and was ſon of Battus [*A*] and Meſatme (*a*); from whence Ovid calls our Poet *Battiades*. Strabo informs us (*b*), that our Poet declared himſelf to be deſcended from King Battus, who was the Founder of Cyrene. We have no account of the particular year, when he was born; but it is generally agreed, that he commenced his fame under the patronage of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and continued in the reign of his ſucceſſor Ptolemy Euergetes (*c*), whoſe Queen Berenice having conſecrated her locks in the Temple of Venus, and a cunning Mathematician having ſtolen them thence to tranſlate them to Heaven, gave occaſion to the beautiful Elegy of this Poet, which we have now only in the Latin of Catullus. Aulus Gellius (*d*) tells us, that he flouriſhed a little after the firſt Punic War. He ſtudied under Hermocrates Jaſenſis the Grammarian, and married the daughter of Euphrates of Syracuſe (*e*). Before he was recommended to the favour of Ptolemy Philadelphus, he taught ſchool in the ſtreet Eleuſine in Alexandria, and had the honour of educating Apollonius, the Author of the Argonautics [*B*]. He wrote a great number of ſmall Poems, of which we have only ſome Hymns and Epigrams remaining [*C*]. We ſhall give the judgments, which have been

(*a*) Suidas *in Voce* Καλλίμαχος.
(*b*) Lib. 17.
(*c*) Suidas, *ubi ſupra.*
(*d*) *Noctes Atticæ*, lib. 17. cap. 21.
(*e*) Suidas, *ubi ſupra.*

[*A*] *He was ſon of Battus.*] Mr. Baſil Kennet in his *Lives and Characters of the Ancient Greek Poets* (1) tells us, that our Author's common title of *Battiades* makes the Grammarians uſually aſſign one *Battus* for his father; but that perhaps he may as well derive that name from King Battus the Founder of Cyrene, from whoſe line, as Strabo (2) aſſures us, he declared himſelf to be deſcended. But whoever his father was, our Poet has paid all his duties and obligations to him in a moſt beautiful epitaph, which we find in the *Anthologia*; and in which the old man is repreſented as addreſſing the viſitants at his tomb in the following manner:

(1) Part 1. pag. 156. edit. London 1697, in 8vo.
(2) Lib. 17.

Ὅστις ἐμὸν παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδα, Καλλιμάχῳ, με
Ἰοδὶ Κυρηναῖος παῖδά τε καὶ γενέτην.
Εἰδείης δ' ἄμφω κεν· ὁ μὲν πότε πατρίδος ὅπλων
Ἦρξεν, ὁδ' ἵππευσεν κρείσσονα Βασκανίης.
Οὐ νέμεσις· Μῶσαι γὰρ ὅσους ἴδον ὄμμασι παῖδας
Ἀχρὶ βίης πολιὰς οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλας.

That is,

" Stranger! I beg not to be known but thus,
" Father and ſon of a Callimachus.
" Chief of a war, the firſt enlarg'd his name;
" And the laſt ſung what envy ne'er ſhall damn;
" For whom the heav'nly Muſe admir'd a child,
" On his grey hairs the Goddeſs always ſmil'd."

Kennet.

[*B*] *Had the honour of educating Apollonius, the Author of the* Argonautics.] This Poet having provoked Callimachus, the latter wrote an invective Poem againſt his ungrateful Scholar, under the reproachful name of *Ibis* (3); which furniſhed Ovid with a pattern and a title for his ſatyrical piece of the ſame kind.

(3) Suidas *in* Καλλιμαχος.

[*C*] *He wrote a great number of ſmall Poems, of which we have only ſome* Hymns *and* Epigrams *remaining.*] He uſed often to ſay, that *a great book was a great evil.* When it was objected to him by his enemies, that his Muſe could not undertake any conſiderable work, he gave them the following anſwer at the end of his hymn to Apollo:

Ὁ φθόνος Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπ' οὔατα λάθριος εἶπεν,
Οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν, ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πάντος, ἀείδει.
Τὸν φθόνον ὁ Πόλλων ποδὶ τ' ἤλασεν ὦδί τ' ἔειπεν,
Ἀσσυρίω ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ
Λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἕλκει,
Δηοῖ δ' ἐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φερέυσι Μέλισσαι,
Ἀλλ' ἥτις καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχραδάντος ἀνέρπει
Πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβάς, ἄκρον ἄωτον.

That is,

" Sly envy in his ear Apollo told,
" He's poor, that writes leſs than a ſea can hold.
" Apollo ſpurn'd the monſter off, and ſaid,
" See vaſt Euphrates, how his billows ſpread:
" But ſee the loads of muck, that preſs his ſide,
" And foul the water, while they raiſe the tide.

" But

been passed upon him, in the Note [*D*]. Gerrard John Vossius in his first Book (*f*) *de Historicis Græcis* places our Author among the Historians, because he wrote a Table or Account of those Persons, who were eminent in every Science, and of the Books, which they wrote; which work consisted of an hundred and twenty Books, and is mentioned by Suidas and Athenæus in his *Deipnosophists* (*g*), and by an Etymological writer quoted by Vossius. Athenæus observes, that Callimachus mentioned in this work how many lines every book contained; for as it is easy for the Moderns to do this with regard to the Poets, so it was not difficult for the Antients to do the same with respect to the writers in prose, since in transcribing Authors they used paper of a certain form (*b*). Our Author wrote likewise of the origin of Islands and Cities, and of the changes of their names; of the Rivers in Europe; of the wonderful and incredible things in Peloponnesus and Italy; of the alteration of the names of Fishes; of the Winds; of Birds; of the Rivers of the Earth; and collections concerning the wonderful things in the several parts of the World; with

(*f*) Cap. 15. pag. 92. edit. Francofurti 1677, in 4to.

(*g*) Lib. VI. and XIV.

(*b*) *See* Salmasius's *Prolegomena* to Solinus.

[*D*] *We shall give the judgments, which have been pass'd upon him in the Note.*] Madam Dacier in the Preface to her Edition of him, printed at Paris 1674 in 4to under the following title, *Callimachi Hymni, Epigrammata, & Fragmenta, Græcè & Latinè, nec non ejusdem Poematium de Comâ Berenices a Catullo versum, edente cum notis & indice Anna Tanaquilla Fabri filia*; tells us, that among the writings of ancient Greece, there is nothing more elegant and polite than these compositions of our Author. And that Lady's father, Tanaquil Faber, in his *Abregé des Vies des Poetes Grecs*, is of the same opinion, and declares that Callimachus's manner of writing is neat and strong; and that Catullus and Propertius imitate him very frequently, and sometimes even translate him. However some other writers have not entertained so favourable an opinion of his genius. For Ovid, when he gives him a place in his Catalogue of Poets, pronounces him immortal merely upon the account of his art, and at the same time expressly denies his title to wit:

Battiades toto semper cantabitur orbe:
Quamvis ingenio non valet, arte valet (5).

(5) Amor. *Eleg.* 15. lib. 1.

But Daniel Heinsius, in the *Prolegomena* to his *Hesiod*, has endeavoured to make Ovid's judgment speak a more favourable sense, and tells us, that when that Poet seems to accuse Callimachus for want of genius, he does not pretend that he wanted invention, subtilty, address, or spirit; but because he was not natural enough, and was too elaborate and affected, as if he had endeavoured after the reputation of a good Grammarian rather than that of a true Poet. Mr. Basil Kennet (6) observes, that Heinsius did not succeed in this explication of Ovid's words, and that the attentive reader will be apt to imagine, that Ovid intended his words should be understood according to their natural import, but that thro' a spirit of envy and emulation, he has wilfully contracted his rival's praises; and that it is plain Ovid had no higher ambition than to be thought superior to Callimachus; and declares he should admire a mistress, who would honour him with that preference:

(6) *Ubi supra*, pag. 162.

Est quæ Callimachi præ nostris rustica dicit
Carmina; cui placeo, protinus ipsa placet (7).

(7) Amor. lib. 2. Eleg. 4.

"But not with liquor drawn at every stream,
"Great Cere's Maids regale their Heav'nly Dame:
"But some untainted chrystal brook supplies
"Its spotless drops to purge the sacrifice." Kennet.

The Scholiast on this place observes, that to stop the mouths of these detractors, the Poet composed his *Hecate*, a work of a large size; which is now lost, but is frequently cited by the Greek and Roman Authors (4). Suidas, who omits the mention of that Poem, tells us, that he wrote eight hundred pieces. Καὶ ἐστι αὐτῷ τὰ γεγραμμένα βιβλία ὑπὲρ τὰ ὠ. The same writer mentions the titles of some of them, particularly *the Arrival of Ion, Semele, the Builders of Argi, Arcadia, Glaucus,* Ἐλπίδες or *Hope, Satyrical Fables, Tragedies, Comedies, Poems, Ibis*, &c. His *Hymns* and *Epigrams* were published at Utrecht 1697 in two volumes in 8vo under the following title, *Callimachi Hymni & Epigrammata & Fragmenta ex recensione Theodori J. G. F. Grævii, cum ejusdem & aliorum animadversionibus.*

(4) See the argument of this Poem in Politian's *Miscellanies*, cap. 24.

Mr. Kennet likewise remarks (8), that it is true, we have still many prodigious instances of his art, as, besides the Apology for himself abovementioned, the manner of bringing King Ptolemy's praise into the Hymn of Jupiter, the making Apollo while yet in his mother's belly prophecy of the same Prince's, and the like; yet it will be difficult to persuade any person, who has considered the surprizing delicacy of his thought and turn, to compound for half his applause, and to quit the credit of his invention for that of his judgment; since both the talents seem so happily tempered together, that it is hard to give an instance of one virtue, without displaying the other in the same view. *What can be a fairer argument*, continues the same writer (9), *for the union of the same talents, than those wise and delicious sentences, which striking us suddenly in a work, where one would not expect them, look as much like inspiration as any thing, that Poetry can produce? Two of these in the very first hymn may vie with the entire labours of more bulky Authors.* The first of them is a fine Answer to the modern Libertines, who from the fancied uncertainty of a future state, take occasion to live and die at a venture, and expect as good a chance as their neighbours. The Poet is speaking of Jupiter's title to the Empire of Heaven, as a thing acknowledg'd and unenvied by his two brothers; and hence he reflects on the folly of the ancient story-tellers, who would make the three sons of Saturn divide the three Realms by lot.

(8) Pag. 159.

(9) Pag. 161.

Τὶς δὲ κ' ἐπ' Ὠυλύμπῳ τε καὶ ἀμφὶ κλῆρον ἵησται,
Ὃς μάλα μὲν νήπλω· ἐπ' ἰσαίη γὰρ ἔοικε
Πλαῶς· Τὰ δ' τόσσον ὅσον διὰ πλείων ἔχουσι.

That is,

"For who, yet blest'd with senses, would submit,
"A lottery should decide his doubtful right
"To Heaven or Hell? In things of equal state
"The lot's of use, and ends the vain debate.
"But those so wide, that distance cannot name
"The space; for distance is express'd by them."

The other is the concluding Strain of the Hymn, where he makes his fare-well Prayer to the Deity:

Χαῖρε πάτερ, χαῖρ' αὖθι· δίδε δ' ἀρετήν τ' ἄφενός τε,
Οὔτ' ἀρετῆς ἄτερ ὄλβος ἐπίσσεται ἀνδρὸς ἀέξειν,
Οὔτ' ἀρετὴ ἀφένοιο. δίδυ δ' ἀρετήν τε καὶ ὄλβον.

That is,

"Hail, Father! hail again! and send us down
"Virtue and gold. For gold is quickly gone,
"Unblest'd with virtue's care; and virtue's cold,
"Naked of wealth: send virtue down and gold."

A modern Author, who assumed the fictitious name of Candidus Hesychius, in his book, entitled, *Godellus utrum Poeta* (10), asserts that Callimachus finding that he had not the wind favourable, never dared to expose himself to the open sea, but had the prudence to keep near the shore, that he might be secure of a port; that is, not having the poetical Genius and Enthusiasm, which elevates Poets, he would not attempt works of a large size. Quintilian in his *Institutiones Oratoriæ* (11) affirms, that our writer is the Prince of Elegiac Poets, among the Greeks. *Tunc & Elegiam vacabit in manus sumere, cujus princeps habetur Callimachus.* And Mr. Kennet observes (12), that the greatest testimonies of his merit and the foundation of his character with the ancients, were his numerous

(10) Cap. 2. pag. 75. *apud* Baillet, *Jugemens des Savans*, tom. 3. num. 1124. pag. 143. edit. Amsterdam 1725, in 4to.

(11) Lib. 10. cap. 1.

(12) Pag. 162.

with ſeveral other works mentioned by Suidas. But this Author has omitted his Treatiſe περὶ ἀγώνων, in which he treated of the *Actian Games*, mentioned by Virgil, as Harpocration informs us under the word Ἄκτια; who likewiſe under the word Ἀκή cites our Author's ὑπομνήματα or *Commentaries*. There was another CALLIMACHUS of Cyrene, an Epic Poet, and ſon of Staſenor and Megatima, ſiſter of the elder Callimachus. But his reputation was much inferior to his Uncle's; ſo that when Strabo (*i*) gives an account of the famous men of Cyrene, he mentions only the elder Callimachus, who, he ſays, was highly honoured by the King of Egypt. (*i*) Lib. 17.

pieces in the elegiac ſtrain; of which we have only the Hymn upon Minerva's Bath, and Catullus's Tranſlation of his Poem upon Queen Berenice's Hair. *The former ſeems, like his other Hymns, to incline moſt to the free ſpirit of Lyrics; the curious ſtory of Tireſias making the greater part of the Poem. The other is more agreeable to our common notions of Elegy; and, as it is commonly printed with the works of Tibullus and Propertius in the ſame ſtrain, ſo it may vie with the ſweeteſt and the moſt exact of their pieces.* For inſtance they have nothing of a more natural turn, than that thought, which makes it a greater honour to belong to the Queen's Head, than to have a place among the Conſtellations. The Star is ſuppoſed to ſpeak, and thus compliments its miſtreſs:

Sed quanquam me nocte premunt veſtigia divum.
Luce tamen canæ Tethyi reſtituor;
Non his tam lætor rebus, quam me abſore ſemper,
Abſore me à Dominæ vertice diſcrucior.
Sydera cur retinent? Utinam coma regia fiam,
Proximus Arcturo fulgeat Erigone.

That is,

" But tho' all night honour'd with feet divine,
" And lodg'd with Tethys, when I ceaſe to ſhine;
" The unequal'd glory baniſh'd I contemn,
" Baniſh'd for ever from my Princely Dame,
" Ye Gods reſtore me to that ſacred Head,
" And let Arcture unparted court his maid."

Propertius fix'd our Poet as his pattern:

Inter Callimachi ſat erit placuiſſe libellos,
Et cecinisſe modis, pure Poeta, tuis (13). (13) Eleg. 5. l. 3.

However there is another paſſage in Propertius, which ſeems to contradict his former judgment, and which is commonly alledg'd by thoſe, who pretend to cenſure Callimachus. It is in the thirty third Elegy of the ſecond Book:

Tu ſatius memorem Muſis imitare Philetum,
Et non inflati *ſomnia Callimachi.*

That is,

" But you, my friend, court ſweet Phileta's Muſe,
" And fly the dreams of ſwoln Callimachus."

But Mr. Kennet remarks (14), that by joining *non* with *inflati* in the conſtruction, the difficulty is eaſily ſolved, and the ſuppoſed detraction turns into a commendation; but that it is much more rational to imagine, that Propertius here cenſures ſome particular work of Callimachus (at preſent not extant) as bombaſt and extravagant; adviſing his friend to apply himſelf to ſome eaſier and more agreeable labour. Scaliger judges the particular piece to have been the Ἄκτια, which Martial ridicules as an harſh obſcure Poem, and which Propertius's friend might then probably think of tranſlating. This conjecture may be farther improved from hence, that in one of the old Epigrams in the *Anthologia*, Callimachus is ſuppoſed to have been honoured with the commands of the Muſes in a dream, for undertaking that difficult work. " But whatever, *ſays* " *Mr. Kennet*, becomes of this point, it is impoſſible " Propertius ſhould deſign any general reflection, ſince " he declares it for his higheſt wiſh, to be called the " *Roman Callimachus.*

" *Ut noſtris tumefacta ſuperbiat Umbria libris,*
" *Umbria Romani Patria Callimachi.*" T. (14) Pag. 164.

CALLIRHOE, daughter of the River Achelous, and wife of that Alcmeon who killed his mother Eryphile, was married to him when he had ſtill another wife living. He had given to this other wife the famous necklace, of which a preſent had been made to Eryphile [*A*], in order that ſhe might perſuade Amphiaraus her huſband to engage in the Theban expedition. Callirhoe having heard of this fine necklace, flatly declared

[*A*] *The famous necklace, of which a preſent had been made to Eriphyle.*] It was a gold necklace, which Venus had given to Hermione her daughter and wife to Cadmus (1). She gave her at the ſame time a *Peplum*, which was a kind of Robe. Both theſe preſents fell into the hands of Eryphile; Polynice gave her the necklace, and Therſander Polynice's ſon the *Peplum*. The necklace was the occaſion why ſhe was betrayed by her huſband, and the peplum made her be betrayed by her ſon. But to give the curious a more full ſatisfaction, I muſt obſerve, that men talked differently of Hermione's necklace. Some ſaid (2), it came originally from Jupiter, who gave it to Europa, ſhe to Cadmus, and Cadmus to Hermione. Others ſay (3), that Vulcan was the workman of that necklace, and made a preſent of it to Cadmus. It is added (4), that he made that preſent out of malice, and to be revenged on Hermione, who was born of the adultery of Venus with Mars, for his wife's injury to him. He cauſed this necklace to become fatal to all thoſe, who ſhould wear it. He choſe the materials to compoſe it, with miſchievous figures, and, amongſt other things, he mixed it with aſhes, which remained upon his anvil after he had made the thunderbolts (5). In a word, it ſeems that he deſigned to make a fatal Taliſman of it; and hence it happened that Hermione, Semele, Jocaſta, Eriphyle, &c. who wore that necklace ſucceſſively, came to an unhappy end. We may therefore compare it to the *Aurum Tholoſanum* (the gold of Toulouſe), and to the horſe Sejanus. When Polynice fled from Thebes to Argos he took with him Hermione's necklace and peplum (6). Statius (7) and Nonnus (8) deſcribe this necklace at large; but eſpecially the latter, who deſcants upon it without bounds or meaſure. The Scholiaſt on Statius ſays (9), that this necklace was conſecrated to Apollo, and thrown into a fountain, where it was ſtill to be ſeen, but that one could not touch it, without perceiving that the Sun was offended at it, ſince there aroſe immediately great tempeſts. Pauſanias's account is much leſs chimerical. This Author thinks (10), that when the Temple of Delphi was plundered by the Phoceans, Hermione's necklace was part of their plunder; and he ſhews, that that, which had been carried to Amathonte in the Iſland of Cyprus, and lodged in the Temple of Venus and Adonis, and which was ſaid to be Hermione's and Eriphyle's necklace, was not the true one.

Diodorus Siculus aſſures us, that a Phocean Lady, who after the pillaging of the Temple of Delphi dared to adorn herſelf with Eryphile's jewels, was burnt in her houſe, which had been ſet on fire by her eldeſt ſon, who was excited to it by the Furies (11). See the remark [*S*] of the article HELENA. Obſerve, that Athenæus (12) quotes an Author, who ſays, that Alcmeon did really conſecrate Eriphyle's Necklace in the Temple of Delphi, the Oracle having required that reward of him, to cure him of his madneſs. The Heathen Gods did nothing *gratis*. What you aſk for, ſaid the Oracle, is very valuable; you pray for a remedy

(1) See Diodor. Sic. lib. 5. cap. 6.

(2) Pherecydes, *apud* Apollod. lib. 3. pag. 171.

(3) Apollod. pag. 169.

(4) Statius, *Theb.* lib. 2. ver. 272, *& ſeq.*

(5) *Siculaque incude relictos Fulminis extremi cineres.* Stat. *Theb.* lib. 2. ver. 279.

(6) Apollod. lib. 3. pag. 185.

(7) *Theb.* lib. 2. ver. 279.

(8) Dionyſius, lib. 5.

(9) *See* Barthius's *Comment.* tom. 2. pag. 967.

(10) Lib. 3. *ſub finem.*

(11) Diodor. Sic. lib. 16. cap. 65. pag. m. 786.

(12) Athen. lib. 6. pag. 232.

declared to Alcmeon, that ſhe would abſolutely not lie any more with him [*B*], if he did not make her a preſent of that jewel. Hereupon the unhappy man went to Phegeus (*a*), his other wife's father, and made him believe, that the Oracle had declared, that he would never be cured of his frenzy (*b*), if he did not offer up this necklace in the Temple of Delphi. Phegeus delivered him the necklace; but being acquainted that it was deſigned for Callirhoe, he commanded his two ſons to murther Alcmeon, which they did accordingly. Callirhoe was very much concerned at his death, but yet in ſuch a manner as made her wiſh to be revenged, rather than engaged her to mortify her fleſh. She deſired paſſionately that her huſband's murderers ſhould be puniſhed, but at the ſame time ſhe indulged her ſelf with the ſoft pleaſures of love. It was when Jupiter enjoyed her (*c*), that ſhe begg'd of him that the children ſhe had by Alcmeon, and who were ſtill very young, might become in a moment full grown men [*C*]. This petition was too well timed, to be refuſed (*d*). She owned that ſhe deſired this miracle, that her children might be very ſoon capable of revenging their father's death. Her petition was granted, and immediately her two ſons Amphoterus and Acarnanus ſet out; they met on the road Alcmeon's two murderers [*D*], who were going to offer the necklace and Eriphyle's gown at Delphi. Callirhoe's ſons killed them, and went afterwards to Pſophis, where they murdered Phegeus and his ſpouſe. On their return they were purſued as far as Tegeum; but there they met with ſuch a powerful aſſiſtance, that they were capable of putting the enemy to flight. Having given an account to Callirhoe of what they had done, they ſet out for Delphi, where they conſecrated the necklace and Eriphyle's gown to Apollo, as Achelous had commanded them to do. They went afterwards to Epirus, where they eſtabliſhed a Colony (*e*). With regard to the two children, which Euripides ſuppoſes Alcmeon had by Manto the Propheteſs, it muſt be known, that their father ſent them to Creon King of Corinthus, to be educated by him; one of theſe children was a boy nam'd Amphilochus, the other a girl call'd Tiſiphone, who was a perfect beauty. Creon's wife, fearing leſt her huſband ſhould marry that beautiful virgin, had her ſold away, and it was Alcmeon himſelf who bought her without knowing her. Apollodorus, from whom I have extracted this article (*f*), does not tell us, how Tiſiphone came to be known. This ſerved, no doubt, to unravel the plot in Euripides's Play.

We read in Pauſanias, that Clytius the ſon of Alcmeon, and of Phegeus's daughter, left his mother's brothers, becauſe he did not doubt but they had killed his father, he retired into Elis, where he left a poſterity behind him. Eperaſtus the Diviner, who carried the prize at the Olympick Games, was deſcended from him (*g*).

(*a*) He lived at Pſophis in Arcadia.

(*b*) He was tormented by the Furies after he had killed his mother.

(*c*) Καλλιῤῥόη τὴν Ἀλκμαίωνος ἀπώλειαν μαθοῦσα. πλησιάζοντος αὐτῇ τοῦ Διὸς αἰτεῖται. Apollod. lib. 3. pag. 199.

(*d*) *Gaudia poſt Veneris quæ poſcet munus amantem;*
Ipſa ſuas nolet pondus habere preces. i. e. "She who asks "a favour of "her lover after "enjoyment, "acts as if ſhe "would not "have her peti-"tion granted." Ovid. *de Art. Amandi*, lib. 3. *ſub finem*, ver. 805.

(*e*) That of Acarnania.

(*f*) *Biblioth.* lib. 3. pag. 199, &c.

(*g*) From Pauſanias, lib. 6. pag. 195.

(13) Idem, ibid.

medy againſt madneſs, it muſt coſt you a rich preſent; bring me your mother's necklace (13). Apollo acted the Merchant, he made uſe of the conditions of a contract, *do ut des, I give, that you may give in your turn.* If he had only accepted voluntary offerings, it had been tolerable, but he was for ſtipulating and making bargains beforehand.

[*B*] *She declared to her huſband that ſhe would not lie any more with him.*] I expreſs myſelf thus, becauſe they had already had two children, when ſhe aſked her huſband for the necklace. We muſt therefore correct in Charles Stephens, Lloyd and Hofman, the prepoſterous order in which the facts are related. They tell us, that Alcmæon promiſed Callirhoe to make her this preſent, if ſhe would be his wife. Neither Apollodorus nor Philoſtratus mention this; and the latter ſays very clearly (14), that Alcmæon had two ſons by Callirhoe, when that woman obliged him to go and fetch againſt his will this necklace, which ſhe would have abſolutely.

(14) Pauſanias, lib. 8. pag. 255.

[*C*] *She begged of Jupiter, that the children, ſhe had by Alcmæon . . . . might become in a moment full grown men.*] Ovid mentions this in ſuch a manner, as deſerves to be here related; he gives a very happy turn to Alcmæon's action, and to the reſt of his ſtory.

——— *Ultuſque parente parentem*
Natus, erit facto pius & ſceleratus eodem:
Attonituſque malis, exul mentiſque domuſque,
Vultibus Eumenidum, matriſque agitabitur umbris:
Donec eum Conjux fatale popoſcerit aurum,
Cognatumque latus Phegeius hauſerit enſis.
Tum demum magno petet hoc Acheloïa ſupplex
Ab Jove Callirhoe, natis infantibus annos
Addat, neve necem ſinat eſſe ultoris inultam.
Jupiter his motus privignæ vota (15) *nuruſque*
Præcipiet, facietque viros impubibus annis (16).

That is,

" The ſon ſhall bath his hands in parents blood,
" And in one act be both unjuſt and good.
" Of home and ſenſe depriv'd, where-e'er he flies,
" The Furies and his mother's ghoſt he ſpies.
" His wife the fatal bracelet ſhall implore,
" And Phegeus ſtain his ſword in kindred gore.
" Callirhoe ſhall then with ſuppliant pray'r
" Prevail on Jupiter's relenting ear.
" Jove ſhall with youth her infant ſons inſpire,
" And bid their boſoms glow with manly fire.

GAY.

(15) He means Hebe, the Goddeſs of Youth, Juno's daughter and Hercules's wife.

(16) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 9. ver. 408, &c.

Moreri ſays (17), it was Achelous, who obtained from Jupiter, that Alcmæon's children ſhould paſs ſuddenly from infants to full grown men; this is making the whole ſtory inſipid, at the ſame time that it is giving a falſe account of it. But he alledges a proof againſt his own aſſertion, by quoting Ovid's verſes. Charles Stephens, Lloyd and Hofman relate, that Jupiter changed Alcmæon's ſons into Gods, as ſoon as they were born. I don't think they read this in any of the ancient Authors.

(17) See the article of Callirhoe.

[*D*] *They met on the road Alcmeon's murtherers.*] Why then ſhould Charles Stephens tell us a falſity, which was to be tranſcribed from one Dictionary into another for ſo many years following? I mean, that Phegeus's ſons were killed on the ſpot by Alcmeon, at the ſame time that they murthered him. *Qui tamen & ipſi ab eodem (Alcmeone) mutuis vulneribus petiti, perierunt.*

CALLISTRATUS, an Athenian Orator, gained a great reputation and authority in his native country. He was the occaſion that Demoſthenes, being ſtill but a young ſcholar, dedicated himſelf entirely to the ſtudy of eloquence. For Calliſtratus having pleaded with a wonderful ſucceſs a very important cauſe concerning the City of Oropus, this filled the young lad's mind with an eager deſire of making his way through the world in the profeſſion of an Orator. Admiring the force of eloquence, and the glory Calliſtratus

acquired by it, he had no other thought than to diſtinguiſh himſelf the ſame way (a). Some ſay that he was already a diſciple of Plato, and that he quitted the ſtudy of Philoſophy, to apply himſelf entirely to Oratory [A]. Calliſtratus was baniſhed, which was the uſual fate of thoſe who had the greateſt ſhare in the government of the Athenian Republic. In this misfortune he ſaid a thing which very much deſerves to be praiſed, and which gave Seneca an opportunity of delivering very good maxims [B]. He upbraided once the Thebans with the parricide of Œdipus, and the Argians with that of Oreſtes, but Epaminondas anſwered him with gravity and wit, *We have baniſhed them from our Cities, and you have admitted them into yours* (b). Melanopus, who was Caliſtratus's antagoniſt in the management of the affairs of the Commonwealth, *ſuffered himſelf always to be bribed by him with money, and then mounting into the pulpit, he told the people; It is true, that Calliſtratus is my enemy, yet I muſt yield to him this time; the intereſt of the public muſt carry it* (c).

(a) Plutarch. *in Demoſth.* pag. 847, 848.

(a) Plutarch, *de gerenda Republica*, pag. 810.
(c) Idem, *in Vita Demoſt.* pag. 851, 852. We have followed the original. Mr. Bayle quotes Amiot's French Tranſlation.

[A] *Some ſay that Demoſthenes . . . . quitted the ſtudy of Philoſophy, to apply himſelf entirely to Oratory.*] Hermippus related this, and even added, that it was only by chance Demoſthenes happened to hear that fine diſcourſe of Calliſtratus. For as he was going to the Academy, where Plato uſed to read his lectures, he ſaw a great concourſe of people, and having aſked the reaſon of their meeting, he was told that they went to hear a great Orator, which created in him a deſire to know, whether that man's eloquence really deſerved ſuch a concourſe of auditors. He heard him, and was ſo charmed with his Oration, that from that moment he became his diſciple, and forſook Plato and the Academy (1). *Ita motus & demulctus & captus eſt, ut Calliſtratum jam inde ſectari cæperit, Academiam cum Platone reliquerit* (2). Henry Stephens has corrected ſome words in the Chapter, in which Aulus Gellius relates this: he thought that the words *Calliſtrato Rhetore*, which are in the title of the chapter, were a miſtake; ſince Calliſtratus being only ſtiled an Orator, and a Demagogue (a man who knows how to manage the people, or, who is conſulted by the people) he ſhould not have been called a Rhetorician in the title or ſummary (3). I believe, however, that Aulus Gellius conſidered him as a man who uſed to teach Rhetorick, and who really taught Demoſthenes that art: but then, I think Aulus Gellius was miſtaken in this; and yet I would not change any thing in the ſummary, ſince it muſt anſwer to what is contained in the chapter to which it is prefixed.

(1) From Aulus Gellius, lib. 3. cap. 13.
(2) Ibid.
(3) Henr. Steph. *Specimen Emendat. in Aul. Gell.* pag. m. 193, 194.

[B] *He ſaid a thing, which gave Seneca an opportunity of delivering very good maxims.* I ſhall quote that Philoſopher's own words, to which I ſhall add the tranſlation. *Calliſtratum aiunt, ita certe Hecaton Auctor eſt, cum in exilium iret, in quod multos ſimul cum illo ſeditioſa civitas, & intemperanter libera expulerat, optante quodam, ut Athenienſibus neceſſitas reſtituendi exules eſſet, abominatum talem reditum. Rutilius noſter animoſius; cum quidam illum conſolaretur, & diceret inſtare arma civilia; brevi futurum, ut omnes exules reverterentur; Quid tibi, inquit, mali feci, ut mihi pejorem reditum, quam exitum optares? Malo ut patria exilio meo erubeſcat, quam reditu mœreat. Non eſt iſtud exilium, cujus neminem non magis, quam damnatum, pudet. Quemadmodum illi ſervaverunt bonorum civium officium, qui reddi ſibi penates ſuos noluerunt clade communi, quia ſatius erat, duos iniquo malo affici, quam omnes publico; ita non ſervat grati hominis affectum, qui bene de ſe merentem difficultatibus vult opprimi, quas ipſe ſubmoveat: qui etiamſi bene cogitet, male precatur. Ne in patrocinium quidem, nedum in gloriam eſt, incendium exſtinxiſſe quod feceris* (4). i. e. "They "ſay, (and they have it from Hecaton) that when Cal-"liſtratus went into baniſhment, with ſeveral other "perſons, whom the city of Athens, then full of ſe-"ditions, and who made a tyrannical uſe of her li-"berty, had baniſhed, ſomebody wiſhed, that the "Athenians might ſoon be obliged to reſtore the ex-"iles; at which Calliſtratus ſhewed a great abhor-"rence. Our Rutilius acted ſtill in a more heroic "manner. For when ſomebody would comfort him, "by repreſenting to him, that a civil war would ſoon "break out, which would occaſion all the exiles to "return; What harm have I done to thee, ſaid "Rutilius, that thou ſhouldſt wiſh me a return "worſe than my baniſhment? I chooſe rather that "my country ſhould bluſh at my baniſhment, than "mourn at my return. That cannot properly be cal-"led a baniſhment, at which none is left more aſhamed "than the perſon condemned. Now, as theſe two "have performed the duties of good citizens, by re-"fuſing to owe their return to a public calamity, "becauſe they thought it was better that two perſons "only ſhould ſuffer unjuſtly, than that the whole "ſtate ſhould come under misfortunes; ſo a man "does not ſhew a grateful heart, who wiſhes, that "a perſon, to whom he is under ſome obligations, "ſhould fall under difficulties, that he might have "an opportunity to extricate him; for though his "thoughts are good, yet his wiſhes are bad. There "is neither kindneſs nor glory in extinguiſhing a "fire, which you kindled yourſelf (5)." Seneca had already illuſtrated this laſt thought very nobly by ſeveral inſtances, in order to prove, that a man is ungrateful, if he wiſhes that his benefactor ſhould want his aſſiſtance (6). *Quis pium dicet Æneam, ſi patriam capi voluerit, ut captivitate patrem eripiat? Quis Siculos juvenes, ut bona liberis exempla monſtrarent, ſe optaverint, ut Ætna immenſa ignium vi ſupra ſolitum ardens & incenſa præcipitet, datura ipſis occaſionem exhibendæ pietatis, ex medio parentibus incendio raptis? Nihil debet Scipioni Roma, ſi Punicum bellum ut finiret, aluit; nihil Deciis, quod morte patriam ſervaverunt, ſi prius optaverant, ut devotioni fortiſſimæ locum ultima rerum neceſſitas faceret. Graviſſima infamia eſt medici, opus quærere: Multi, quos auxerant morbos, & incitaverant, ut majore gloria ſanarent, non potuerunt diſcutere, aut cum magna miſerorum vexatione vicerunt* (7). i. e. "Who would call Æneas pious, if he had wiſhed for "the ruin of his country, that he might deliver his "father from ſlavery? Who would commend the young "men of Sicily, if in order to afford a bright exam-"ple to poſterity, they ſhould wiſh, that Mount Etna "might throw up more flames, than it uſes to do, that "they might have an opportunity of ſhewing their love "of their parents, by carrying them away thro' the "flames? Rome has no obligations to Scipio, if he "protracted the Punic War, in order to have the glory "of finiſhing it; the Decii deſerve no thanks, for "undergoing a voluntary death for their country, if "they could have wiſhed beforehand, that their "country were reduced to ſuch ſtreights, as not to be "ſaved but by ſuch a couragious action. 'Tis a great "ſhame for a Phyſician to wiſh for patients. There "have been ſeveral amongſt them, who having en-"creaſed a ſickneſs, that they might acquire more repu-"tation by the cure, could not perform it afterwards; "or if they did perform it, it was after they had mi-"ſerably tormented their patients (8)."

(4) Seneca, *de Beneficiis*, lib. 6. cap. 37. pag. m. 334.

(5) Mr. Bayle, quotes Chalvet's French Tranſlation of Seneca *De Beneficiis*, folio 67 of the Paris edition 1637, fol.
(6) *Qui optat amico aliquam neceſſitatem, quam adjutorio fideque diſcutiat: quod eſt ingrati, ſe illi præfert, & tanti æſtimat illum miſerum eſſe, ut ipſe gratus ſit, eb hoc ipſum ingratus.* Seneca, *de Beneficiis*, lib. 6. cap. 34. pag. 132.
(7) Idem, ibid. cap. 36. pag. 134.

We meet in Demoſthenes with a Calliſtratus, who was baniſhed to Methone in Macedonia, whom the Athenians had twice condemned to death; and who had a daughter married to Timomachus an inhabitant of the Iſle of Thaſus (9). He is probably the ſame with him who is the ſubject of this article; Juſtus Lipſius did not doubt of it (10).

(8) This may add weight to the objections of the Manichees, which I mention in the Remark [E] of the Article ORIGEN, num. 4. and in the Remark [E] of the Article PAULICIANS.
(9) *See* Demoſth. *Orat. adv. Polyclem.* pag. m. 712.
(10) Lipſius, *in Senecam de Beneficiis*, lib. 6. cap. 37.

CALVIN (JOHN) one of the chief Reformers of the Church in the ſixteenth Century, was born at Noyon in Picardy July the 10th 1509. As he was deſigned for the Church, they procured him very ſoon a Living in the Cathedral Church of Noyon, and afterwards

afterwards the Rectory of Pont-l'Evéque (a) [A]. But theſe deſigns took no effect, firſt, becauſe Calvin, by the advice of Robertus Olivetanus applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Religion from the pureſt ſprings of it, which determined him to renounce all ſuperſtitions; and ſecondly, becauſe his father, altering his mind, choſe to make a Lawyer of him rather than a Divine. Therefore, after he had gone through a courſe of polite Literature at Paris, he was ſent to Orleans, where he ſtudied the Law under Peter de l'Etoile (b), then to Bourges, where he continued the ſame kind of ſtudy under Andrew Alciat. He made a great progreſs in that Science, and did not improve leſs in the knowledge of Divinity by his private labours. At Bourges he applied himſelf to the Greek tongue, under the direction of Wolmar, who taught this language there. His father's death having obliged him to return to Noyon, he continued there but a ſhort while, and went ſoon after to Paris, where he wrote a Commentary upon Seneca's Treatiſe *De Clementia* [B]. He ſoon made himſelf known to thoſe who had ſecretly admitted the Reformation. The Oration which he ſuggeſted to Nicholas Copus, Rector of the Univerſity of Paris, having been very much diſliked by the Sorbonne, and the Parliament, occaſioned the beginning of a perſecution againſt the Proteſtants; ſo that Calvin, who narrowly eſcaped being taken in the College of Fortet [C], retired into Xaintonge [D], after he had had the honour

(a) A village, where Calvin's father was born, ſituated near Noyon.

(b) He was Preſident in the Parliament of Paris. He is called in Latin *Petrus Stella*.

[A] *They procured him very ſoon a Living in the Cathedral Church of Noyon, and afterwards the Rectory of Pont-l'Evéque.*] They who have ſaid, that Calvin was a Canon of Noyon, have been miſtaken. The living, which was given him was not a Canonſhip, but a Chappel called *de la Geſine*. He was preſented to it May the 21ſt, 1521. And as to the Rectory of Pont-l'Evéque, he obtained it July the 5th, 1529, having exchanged for it the Rectory of Marteville, to which he had been preferred September the 27th, 1527. They who are curious to ſee the Hiſtory of the changes, reſignations, ſales, &c. of theſe Livings, will find it in a Book of Monſieur Drelincourt (1). We read there, that on Munday the 4th of May, 1534, Calvin reſigned the Chappel of Geſine to Maſter Anthony de la Marlière, and the Rectory of Pont-l'Evéque to Caim. Monſieur Maimbourg is therefore miſtaken, in placing this before Calvin's journey to Paris, which happened in 1532 (2). It muſt be carefully obſerved, that Calvin never was in Prieſt's-Orders, and that he belonged to the Clergy only by having received the firſt tonſure.

(1) *Défenſe de Calvin*, pag. 215, &c. The Author quotes the *Annales de l'Egliſe de Noyon*, written by James le Vaſſeur, Doctor of the Sorbonne, and Dean of that Cathedral, printed at Paris, in 4to, in the year 1633, 1634.
(2) *Hiſt. du Calviniſme*, pag. 57.

[B] *He wrote a Commentary upon Seneca's Treatiſe* de Clementia.] He dedicated it to Claude Hangeſt, Abbot of St. Eloi at Noyon. The Dedication is dated from Paris April the 4th, 1532; whence it follows, that he wrote this Book before he was full twenty three years old, and not in his twenty fourth year, as Beza aſſerts (3). Monſieur de Varillas's blunders with regard to this Book, are ſo monſtrous, that they are ſufficient to make a man forſake for ever the ſtudy of Hiſtory. For ſince we cannot be better prepoſſeſſed in favour of a thouſand Hiſtorians of former ages, than we can be in his favour, how ſhall we know, that what we read in them, is more to be depended upon, than his falſhoods are? If Calvin's treatiſe was loſt, who ſhould dare to object any thing againſt all the falſities, which Monſieur de Varillas relates with a thouſand circumſtances? And is it not reaſonable to think, that a great many Hiſtorians are like him? However that be, here follows an account of the many falſities he relates upon the ſubject before us.

(3) Beza, *in Vita Calvini*.

VARILLAS's miſtakes.
(4) Varillas's, *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, lib. 10.

I. *Calvin*, ſays he (4), *ſoon gained their eſteem, by a Book he wrote upon conſtancy, with a deſign to encourage them to ſuffer for the new doctrine.* This is neither the true title, nor the deſign of the Book. II. *It is ſurpriſing, that this ſmall work ſhould have made ſuch a noiſe in the world, and that Calvin's Panegyriſts ſhould have preferred it before all the pieces of eloquence and learning, which have been written by the Ancients, or Moderns.* We do not believe, that this work was ever commended in ſuch a manner, and we challenge Monſieur de Varillas to name ſuch Panegyriſts. III. *There are blunders* in that Book, *which cannot be excuſed, but on account of Calvin's tender age, who was then but eighteen.* He was in his twenty third year. IV. *There is nothing particular in that Book, but continual invectives, and figures exceſſively bold.* The Book contains nothing of that nature; it being only an explication of Seneca's thoughts ſupported with proper authorities, and examples; the whole in the ſtile of a Commentator. Varillas had never read that Book, and took it to be an Oration. V. *The Sacramentarians, who were burnt at a ſlow fire, are there exalted to the ſkies, far above the moſt illuſtrious Martyrs of the ancient Church, and King Francis I . . . . has his character drawn in the moſt odious light.* There is not a word in the whole Book either to the honour of thoſe, who ſuffered death for the ſake of their Religion under Francis I, nor againſt that Prince. How would Calvin have dared to publiſh a Book ſuch as Varillas repreſents it? How, ſay I, would he have dared to publiſh it at Paris, with his name, turned into Latin, prefixed to it (5), and with that of the Abbot of St. Eloi, to whom it was dedicated? VI. *The reſt of the Book contains nothing but ſcraps taken from Seneca the Philoſopher, and tacked together with a great deal of careleſneſs.* The whole is a perpetual Commentary upon Seneca's Treatiſe of Clemency: the text of Seneca is given entire, and at the end of ſome chapters of Seneca there is a Commentary by Calvin, and ſuch as I have repreſented it. VII. *The cream of the jeſt is, that Calvin did not know then, that there have been two Seneca's, both born at Corduba in Spain. The one known by the title of the Rhetorician, becauſe he taught Rhetoric all his life time; the other the ſon of the Rhetorician, more famous than his father, ſurnamed the Philoſopher, and who was Nero's Præceptor. As they both lived very long, tho' the Philoſopher had obeyed the command, which* Crevo (6) *ſent him, of killing himſelf, Calvin, who could not deny it, bethought himſelf of giving to one only the years which belonged to both, and wrote, that his imaginary Seneca lived an hundred and forty years.* Since Mr. De Varillas thought that Calvin was then but eighteen years old, he ought not to have confider'd it as ſuch a groſs piece of ignorance, that he did not know that there have been two Seneca's. It is not true, that Calvin makes his Seneca live 140 years; he gives him but about 115 years. Obſerve that this ſame Hiſtorian ſpeaks more pertinently of this work of Calvin, in his Hiſtory of Francis I. *He wrote*, ſays he (7), *his Commentary upon Seneca's Book on Clemency*, in order to gain a reputation by hiding his deſign under the veil of a Moral Philoſophy, which favoured of nothing but Heatheniſm. His only view was, to fill the mind of Francis I, who loved very much ſuch kind of treatiſes, with doubts and ſcruples about the fires, which at his command had been kindled thro' the whole Kingdom, againſt thoſe, who ſhould be convicted of having ſaid any thing againſt the Religion of their anceſtors.

(5) Having put his name in Latin in the title of his book, he left his ſurname of *Cauvin*, to take that of *Calvin*. Maimbourg, *Hiſt. du Calviniſ.* page 57. Papyrius Maſſo, *in Vita Calvini*, pag. 412. ſays, *that the Commentary upon the books* de Clementia, *was publiſhed under the name of* Lucius Calvinus, Civis Romanus.
(6) Read Nero.

(7) Varillas, *Hiſt. de Francois I.* liv. 8. tom. 2. pag. 251. edit. Holl. in 1690.

[C] *He narrowly eſcaped being taken in the College of Fortet.*] Beza's ſilence makes me doubt of the following account. "*Lieutenant* * Morin . . . . went "himſelf, with a great many attendants to the Col- "lege of Cardinal le Moin, where Calvin lodged, in "order to ſeize his perſon; but when they came to "his room, they found that he had made his eſcape "thro' the window, by ſliding down by his ſheets, "which were found faſtened to the window (8)." If this account was true (9), Beza would be a bad Hiſtorian, for he ſays only, that Calvin happened not to to be at home, *quo forte domi non reperto* (10); Varillas tells us the ſame ſtory with Maimbourg, and relates it with a great many circumſtances (11).

* It is a kind of a Judge, who takes cognizance of ſome cauſes.
(8) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. du Calviniſm*, pag. 58.
(9) This ſtory is grounded on Papyrius Maſſo, *in Vita Calv.* pag. 414.
(10) Beza, *in Vita Calvini*, pag. 367.
(11) *Hiſtoire de François I.* liv. 7. pag. 201.

[D] *He retired into Xaintonge.*] He met there with a very good friend, at whoſe requeſt he compoſed ſome *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, liv. 10. pag. 336.

honour to ſpeak with the Queen of Navarre, who had appeaſed this firſt ſtorm. She alſo reſcued the learned Faber Stapulenſis * out of the hands of the Inquiſitors, and ſent him to Nerac, where Calvin went to pay his reſpects to him, after which he returned to Paris in the year 1534. Servetus was then in that City, and did not go to the place which had been appointed for a conference between Calvin and him. This year was very ſevere to the Reformed; for which reaſon Calvin reſolved to retire out of France, after he had publiſhed at Orleans a Treatiſe againſt thoſe, who believe that the departed ſouls are in a kind of ſleep [*E*]. He choſe Baſil for the place of his reſidence, and ſtudied Hebrew in that city; where he was particularly beloved by Grynæus and Capito; and though he did not hunt after glory, yet he was obliged to publiſh a work, which was very proper to ſpread his reputation abroad; I mean his Chriſtian Inſtitution, which he dedicated to Francis I [*F*]. After he had publiſhed this work, he went to pay

* In French, *Le Fevre d'Eſtaples.*

ſhort Chriſtian exhortations, which in ſome pariſhes were read at Church in order to bring the people inſenſibly to an enquiry after truth. Beza (12) does not name this friend of Calvin, nor can I well gueſs for what reaſon: for a man who had acquired ſuch a taſte for the true doctrine, that he retired into Switzerland with Calvin, for the ſake of the Goſpel, as that Hiſtorian tells us (13) did very well deſerve that his name ſhould appear in the life of that great Reformer. The Reader will not be diſpleaſed to find here, that his name was Lewis du Tillet (14), and that he was brother of John du Tillet, Regiſter to the Parliament of Paris, and of another du Tillet, Biſhop of Meaux. Monſieur Maimbourg ſays (15), that this Lewis du Tillet was a Canon of Angouléme, and Curate of Claix, and that he was reclaimed *from his errors by the admonitions of his brother John du Tillet, ... who went himſelf to bring him into Germany, in order to bring him back to the Catholic Church.* That Author adds; that *Calvin being thus forſaken by his friend, and not daring to appear again at Angouléme, went to ſeek for other friends at Poitiers,* when he made new diſciples, with whom *he celebrated the Lord's Supper his own way, in cellars and caves.* This laſt fact ſeems doubtful to me, not to ſay any thing worſe. For if this fact had been true, Beza would not have been ignorant of it; and if he had known it, he would not have omitted it in the Life of Calvin. Add to this, that if the Regiſter John du Tillet, had been in Germany to bring home the loſt ſheep, I mean his brother the Canon of Angouléme, he muſt have converted him ſince Calvin and the Canon had retired to Baſil, and whilſt they were there. Now at that time Calvin had left Angouléme, ſo that it ought not to have been ſaid, that he durſt not ſhew his face there. Laſtly, Beza aſſerts, that ſince this journey to Baſil, Calvin did not return into France, but only to ſettle his private affairs, after which he deſigned to go to Baſil by the way of Savoy, but ſtopt at Geneva, in the year 1536. *Ex Italia . . . in Galliam regreſſus, rebus ſuis omnibus ibi compoſitis, abductoque, quem unicum ſuperſtitem habebat, Ant. Calvino frater, Baſileam vel Argentinam reverti cogitantem, interclusis aliis itineribus, per Allobrogum fines iter inſtitutum proſequi bello coegerunt. Ita factum ut Genevam veniret* (16). See the Remark [*G*].

(12) *In Vita Calvini Oper.* tom. 3. pag. 367.

(13) Ibid.

(14) See *The Defence of Calvin*, by Mr. Drelincourt, pag. 40.

(15) *Hiſt. du Calviniſme*, pag. m. 59.

(16) Beza, *in Vita Calvini*, pag. 368.

[*E*] *He retired out of France, after he had publiſhed at Orleans a Treatiſe againſt thoſe, who believe that the departed ſouls are in a kind of ſleep.*] Poſtquam Aureliæ inſignem illum libellum edidiſſet, quem *Pſycopannychian* inſcripſit, adverſus illorum errorem, qui dormire ſejunctas a corporibus animas, errore a vetuſtiſſimis ſæculis repetito, docebant (17). i. e. "After he "had publiſhed at Orleans that famous Book, which "he entitled *Pſycopannychia* againſt them, who teach "that the ſouls ſleep, when they are ſeparated from "the bodies; an error revived from the moſt ancient "times."

(17) Idem, ibid. pag. 367.

[*F*] *He was obliged to publiſh . . . his* Chriſtian Inſtitution, *dedicated to Francis I.*] Some ſay, that *he compoſed the greateſt part of his Inſtitution* at Claix, in the houſe of Lewis du Tillet (18). This may be; but Beza ſays nothing of it, nor does he mention the year in which it was printed, tho' he ſays on what occaſion it was publiſhed. He tells us (19) that Francis I courting the friendſhip of the Proteſtants in Germany, and knowing that they were full of indignation on account of the cruel perſecutions, which their brethren ſuffered in France, made uſe of an evaſion, which William de Bellay ſuggeſted to him (20): for he would perſuade them, that he had puniſhed only ſome Enthuſiaſts, who under the name of Anabaptiſts ſubſtituted their own Inſpirations inſtead of the word of God, and deſpiſed all the Magiſtrates. Calvin thought himſelf under an obligation to write an apology for the Reformed, whom they burnt in France; and this engaged him to publiſh his Inſtitution, with an Epiſtle Dedicatory to Francis I, which is one amongſt the three or four prefaces, which are moſt admired (21). It is dated from Baſil Auguſt the 1ſt, 1536. This date agrees perfectly well with Beza's account; for it was in 1535 that William du Bellai made uſe of that ridiculous evaſion, by which he proved the truth of that old ſaying, *you take us for Germans.* Here follows what we read in the life of Calvin. *Edere coactus eſt Chriſtianæ Religionis Inſtitutionem quam vocavit, operis longe maximi rudimentum. Quum enim illam Franciſci Regis carnificinam ægre ferrent Germani Principes, qui Evangelio nomen dederant, & quorum ille tam amicitiam ambiebat, hoc unum ille σοφὸν φαρμάκον auctore Gulielmo Bellaio Langæo repererat, ut ſeſe non niſi in Anabaptiſtas pro verbo divino ſuum tantum Spiritum jactantes, & omnium Magiſtratuum contemptores animadvertiſſe diceret. Hoc vero dedecus veræ Religioni inuſtum non ferens Calvinus, ejus edendi libri occaſionem arripuit, meo quidem judicio incomparabilis; addita excellenti ad Regem ipſum præfatione, quam ſi forte legiſſet ille, aut ego vehementer fallor, aut magnum eſſet illi meretrici Babylonicæ jam tum vulnus illatum* (22). Beza pretends, that after the publication of this Book, Calvin went to ſee the Dutcheſs of Ferrara in Italy; whence being returned into France, and having ſettled his affairs there, he intended to return to Baſil or to Straſbourgh, over the territories of the Duke of Savoy, but that he was prevailed upon to ſtay at Geneva, where he was declared a Miniſter, and Profeſſor of Divinity, in Auguſt 1536. This is ſo inconſiſtent with the date of the Preface, that there is no occaſion for me to ſhew the inconſiſtency. See below the Remark [*V*]. I do not object to Beza Monſieur Spon's account, who ſays (23) that in September 1536 Farel prevailed upon Calvin *to ſtay at Geneva not to preach, but to teach Divinity* (24). It would be an endleſs taſk, if one was to relate all the Chronological differences, which are to be met with in the accounts of different Authors. Here for inſtance, we have Mr. Leti (25), who ſays, that Calvin arrived at Geneva September the 14th. This puts us very far from the month of Auguſt mentioned by Beza, for according to Mr. Spon, whom Mr. Leti does not contradict, Calvin was a *great while* before he yielded to the intreaties of Farel; Mr. Leti ſuppoſes, that Calvin, as a man of wit, would be preſſed, and that he alledged ſeveral reaſons to be excuſed, till the Syndics themſelves joined their prayers to thoſe of the Miniſters. But let us return to the Inſtitution.

(18) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. de Calvin.* pag. 59. Varillas, *Hiſt. de Franc. I.* liv. 7. pag. 251; *Hiſt. de l'Herés.* liv. 10. pag. 376.

(19) Beza, *in Vita Calv.* pag. 367. *See alſo* Calvin, *Præf. in Pſalm.* I quote him below, Remark [*V*].

(20) See the Remark [*B*] of the Article BELLAI (William du).

(21) Thuanus's Dedication, and Caſaubon's Preface on Polybius are of this number. *See* Alexander Morus in his *Panegyrique de Calvin*, pag. 22. *and* Tanaquillus Faber, *Notis in I Scaligerana*, pag. 40. To theſe Prefaces muſt be added that which Monſieur Peliſſon wrote on the works of Saraſin.

(22) Beza, *in Vita Calvini*, pag. 367.

(23) Spon, *Hiſt. de Geneve*, liv. 3. pag. m. 243.

(24) See the Remark [*I*] quotation (55).

(25) Leti, *Hiſtoria Genevrina*, tom. 3. pag. 40.

When this work was firſt publiſhed, it was only a ſketch of a larger work (26). The Author reviſed afterwards ſeveral times, and made it ſo perfect, that even Scaliger admired it (27). There are few perſons but know the famous diſtich of Paul Thurius, in which he places this Work next to the Writings of the Apoſtles.

Præter Apiſtolicas poſt Chriſti tempora Chartas,
Huic peperere libro ſæcula nulla parem.

The firſt edition is that of Baſil, 1535, 8vo. The ſecond of Straſbourgh, 1539, in folio. Calvin was then Profeſſor of Divinity and Miniſter at Straſbourgh. This edition was larger and more correct than the former;

(26) *Operis longe maximi Rudimentum.* Beza, *in Vita Calvini*, pag. 367. *Neque enim denſum hoc & laboriоſum opus, quale nunc extat, ſed breve duntaxat Enchiridion, tunc in lucem prodit.* Calv. *Præf. in Pſalmos.*

(27) See *I Scaligerana*, pag. 40. and *II Scaligerana*, pag. 14

pay a visit to the Duchess of Ferrara, a Princess famous for her piety, who received him very kindly. He then returned into France, and having settled his private affairs, he proposed to go to Strasbourgh or to Basil [G], in company with Anthony Calvin, the only brother he had left. But as on account of the war the roads were not safe, except thro' the territories

mer; the same may be said of the third with regard to the second. The third is also of Strasburgh, 1543. It is to this edition (28) that the words of Sturmius relate, which are generally prefixed to the work. *Joannes Calvinus, homo acutissimo judicio summâque doctrinâ & egregiâ memoriâ præditus est, & scriptor est varius, copiosus, purus, cujus rei testimonium est Institutio Christianæ Religionis, quam primo inchoatam, deinde locupletatam, hoc verò anno absolutam edidit.* That is, "John Calvin is a man adorned with a penetrating "judgment, very great learning, and a happy me- "mory. He is a writer of a great and diversified "eloquence, and an exact and clear style; witness "his *Institution of the Christian Religion*, of which he "first printed only a sketch, afterwards he enlarged "it, and this year he has publish'd it quite finished." Gesner (29) heard, that in 1544 they were printing a fourth edition in the same city, with new additions. That of Geneva 1550 *ex Officina Joannis Gerardi*, in 4to would then be the fifth at least. It is said in the title-page, that the work had been corrected in an infinite number of places, and that it was adorned with two Indexes. *Nunc ex postrema Auctoris recognitione quibusdam locis auctior, infinitis verò castigatior .... additi sunt Indices duo locupletissimi; unus rerum insignium, alter verò locorum omnium, quos partim ex sacris Bibliis, partim ex aliis Theologiæ Doctoribus Author tanquam ex divite penu in suum usum vel apte transtulit, vel docte interpretatus est.* One of the Indexes was of the remarkable things treated of in the work; the other of the passages either from the Bible, or from the writings of other Divines, which are quoted or explained in the *Institution*. The last edition either French or Latin, revised by the Author, is of the year 1558 (30). In that edition the work was divided into four books, and each book into several chapters, of which there are in all fourscore; there being eighteen in the first book, seventeen in the second, twenty five in the third, and twenty in the fourth. The edition of 1550 is divided only into one and twenty chapters. There is therefore an egregious falshood in Varillas, who says, that about the year 1535 Calvin's *Institution* was printed in four books and 104 chapters (31). The following words of Papyrius Masso have misled Varillas. *Basileæ anno* 1536 *publicavit de Institutione Christianæ Religionis Libros quatuor .... illâ Institutione sæpe aucta & millies excusa capitibus centum & quatuor ... rejecit, &c.* (32). I have said in another place (33), that the public complained of Beza, because he altered and corrected his Notes upon the New Testament in every new edition. Bolsec complains also, or rather insults in a very unpolite manner the frequent corrections of Calvin's work. *I cannot forbear taking notice,* says he (34), *of a circumstance mentioned by Beza to the great honour, as he thinks, of his master, father, and friend Calvin. He says that Calvin, being obliged to keep at home on account of his sickness, and to leave off reading and preaching, yet did not lose his time; for he laboured at home, and during that time he began and finished his last Institution, in Latin and French. One might very well ask Beza here, which was this last Institution; for the first only has been seen, which was composed and published long before. If the first was so well done, and every way complete, what occasion was there to revise and alter it so often? But here we discover the falshood of what Beza asserts; he says, that his master, father, and friend Calvin was so perfectly learned, that he never retracted any of the opinions or propositions, which he had written, or spoken. For having been censured, and accused of heresy for several false opinions, which were discovered in his Institution of the first and second edition, he revised and corrected them, and then suppressing the former editions, he caused the work to be reprinted thus corrected. In the mean time he resisted those who censured his opinions, calling them lyars, impostors, calumniators, and appealing to this last edition of his Institution, in which he had corrected his errors. By this artifice he would make himself pass for an infallible Doctor, who never retracted any of the opinions he either wrote or spake.*

If we may believe F. Maimbourg (35), John Calvin's *Christian Institution* was first published in French. Mr. de Sponde says the same thing (36), and adds that it was at Basil August the 1st 1535, and that there was in the title-page a *flaming sword*, with these words, *non veni mittere pacem sed gladium*, that is, "I "came not to send peace, but a sword." I cannot well say whether they are mistaken or not; only I know that there had been some editions of this work in French before the year 1544 (37), and that Calvin himself had translated it into French. There have been also Italian (38), German, Dutch, Spanish (29) and English Translations of it. But Monsieur Teissier ought not to have understood literally these words of Papyrius Masso *millies excusa. He* (Masso) *testifies,* says Mr. Teissier (40), *that this work was so well received by the Public, that it went through above a thousand editions in a very little time.* Papyrius Masso was very far from saying this. You will find a Supplement to this in the remark [BB] of this article, and in the remark [B] of the article SCHULTINGIUS.

Here follows an abstract of a Letter. "The most "ancient edition of *Calvin's Institution*, which is in "the Library of Geneva, is an *octavo* of 514 pages, "printed at Basil *per Thomam Platterum, & Balthasarum Latium, mense Martio, Anno* 1536. At the "end of the book there is a figure of Minerva, with "these words, *Tu nihil invita facies dicesve Minerva.* "The beginning is wanting to page 42. So that we "cannot know by this copy, whether the Flaming "Sword was in this edition: it is to be found in se- "veral other as well Latin as French Editions, as in "a French one of the year 1545, and in another of "the year 1561 (41)." I have observed, that John Girard the Bookseller, who printed this *Institution* in Latin in the year 1550, in 4to, did not put these words *non veni pacem mittere in terram sed gladium*, about the sword surrounded with flames, as he had put them in the frontispiece of Calvin's Treatise *contre la Secte phantastique & furieuse des Libertins*, i. e. "against "the phantastical and furious Sect of the Libertines" in the year 1545: but I have also observed, that he put them in the French Edition of the *Institution*, published in the year 1553, 4to. For the rest, I don't believe, that the Edition of Basil *per Thomam Platterum, & Balthasarum Latium mense Martio, Anno* 1536, is the first. I shall give my reasons for it in the remark [B] of the article SCHULTINGIUS.

[G] *He proposed to go to Strasbourgh, or to Basil.*] All men of sense will grant me, that with regard to the chronological series of Calvin's voyages, no Author is more to be depended upon than Beza, when things of this nature cannot in the least affect Calvin's reputation. Since then Beza asserts, that Calvin left Paris to go to Xaintonge, that from Xaintonge he returned to Paris, that from Paris he retired to Basil, that from Basil he went to Ferrara, that from Ferrara he returned into France, that from France he went to Geneva, with a design to go further either to Basil or Strasbourg, we must follow this account rather than that of the Maimbourg's and the Varillas's: for in the first place it is neither more nor less glorious to Calvin to have gone from Ferrara directly to Geneva, than to have returned from Ferrara into France, and to have left that Country immediately, in order to go to Geneva. I do therefore believe, that all reasonable men will explode what Mr. Maimbourg says (42), viz. that Calvin having took a journey into Germany with Lewis du Tillet, returned into France, preached secretly at Poitiers, gained the Magistrates, the Professors, and a great many other disciples, and celebrated the Lords Supper in a cellar his own way; that he returned to Paris, where finding that the persecution was more cruel than ever, he left France for ever, and made his escape to Basil. These adventures at Poitiers are so considerable, and so much to the honour of Calvin, that it would be very strange, if they had been unknown

(28) See the Remark [H] of the Article STURMIUS (John).

(29) Gesn. *Bibliothec.* fol. 395. *verso.*

(30) Beza, *in vita Calvini, ad ann.* 1558 asserts it. But observe, that the Preface, which Calvin prefixed to his last Latin edition, is dated August the 1st 1559, and that this edition printed at Geneva by Robert Stephens, fol. is dated 1559.

(31) Varillas, *Hist. de François I.* liv. 7. pag. 249.

(32) Papyr. Masso, *Elog.* tom. 2. pag. 414, 415.

(33) In the Remark [E] of the Article BEZA.

(34) *Hist. de Calvin*, cap. 32. pag. m. 107.

(35) *Hist. du Calvinis.* pag. 60.

(36) *Ad ann.* 1535. num. 6.

(37) Gesner, *in Bibl.* folio 396 *verso.*

(38) See the Article PASCHALI (Gulio Cæsare).

(39) This was done by Cyprianus de Valera, and printed in 1597, in 4to.

(40) *Eloges des Hommes Savans*, tom. 1. pag. 246.

(41) Taken from a Letter of Mr. Turrettin, written June the 7th, 1700.

(42) *Hist. de Calvin*, pag. 59, 60, &c.

territories of the Duke of Savoy, he was obliged to go that way. This was a particular direction of Providence; it was his deſtiny to ſettle at Geneva, and when he only deſigned to paſs through that City in order to go further, he found himſelf ſtopped there by an order from heaven, if I may ſay ſo, particularly intimated to him [*H*]: for William Farel threatened him in the moſt ſolemn manner, with God's curſe, if he did not ſtay to aſſiſt him in that part of the Lord's vineyard. Calvin therefore found himſelf obliged to comply with the choice, which the Conſiſtory and Magiſtrates of Geneva had made of him, with the people's conſent, as well to preach as to be a Profeſſor of Divinity [*I*]. He had condeſcended to accept only this laſt employment, and would have refuſed the firſt, but he was at laſt obliged to take them both upon him in Auguſt 1536. The next year he made the whole people ſwear ſolemnly to a body of doctrines, which contained alſo a renunciation of Popery; and becauſe the reformation of the doctrinal part of Religion had not had a great influence upon the morals of the people, which were very much corrupted, nor baniſhed the ſpirit of faction, which divided the chief families of the Commonwealth, Calvin, aſſiſted by the other Miniſters, declared, that ſince all their admonitions and warnings had proved unſucceſsful, they could not celebrate the holy Sacrament,

known to Beza, and ſtranger ſtill, if having been acquainted with them, he had omitted to mention them in the Life of Calvin. As for Mr. Varillas, he tells us (43), that Calvin and Lewis du Tillet, being reſolved to take a journey into Germany, parted at Geneva, becauſe du Tillet the Regiſter, who overtook them in that city, prevailed upon his brother to return back into France; that Calvin continued his journey to Straſbourgh; that he had a conference there with Bucer; that he went back into France; that he ſtopp'd at Poitiers, where he made ſeveral diſciples; that he ſent ſome of them as his Apoſtles to preach the Goſpel in the Provinces; that he returned to Paris; that he left that city ſoon after, and went to Straſburgh, where he founded a Church compoſed of French Refugees; that he taught Divinity there; that having ſpent two whole years in that difficult employment, he went to Ferrara; but as he could ſtay no longer there (44), and not knowing whither to retire, he went to Geneva, where Farel detained him in the year 1536. This account abounds with falſe facts and chronological miſtakes; for firſt, when Calvin and Du Tillet went into Germany, they did not go thro' Geneva, but over Lorraine, and ſtopped together at Baſil: *Secedere ex Gallia ſtatuit, eoque conſilio unà cum illo, quicum eum apud Santonas aliquandiu vixiſſe diximus, iter Baſileam verſus per Lotharingiam ingreſſus, non procul urbe Metenſi in maximam difficultatem incidit . . . adeo ut . . . vix Argentinam indeque Baſileam pervenerint* (45). II. Calvin did not make any ſtay at Straſbourgh then, and he did not return into France, till he had been at the Court of Ferrara. III. He was not choſen a Miniſter and Profeſſor at Straſburgh, but after he had been baniſhed from Geneva in the year 1538. IV. This whole account is entirely confuted, even more than Mr. Maimbourg's, by Beza's ſilence. It muſt be obſerved that it is no where hinted in the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories of the Reformed Churches, written by Beza, that Calvin was any ways concerned in the beginning of the Reformation within the city of Poitiers (46). Such a ſilence would certainly be ſurprizing to the utmoſt degree, if all that others relate were true. The Author of the *Hiſtoria Genevrina* (47) ſuppoſes that Calvin having left Paris, becauſe Queen Catherine (48), who governed the whole Kingdom, had publiſhed an Edict by which all the Lutherans were baniſhed, went to Angouleme, and that after three years ſtay in that city, he could not live there any longer, and was obliged to go into Italy, whence having made his eſcape, as it were, by a miracle (49), he went to Geneva in the year 1536. One muſt be very cunning, to find at that time a Queen Catherine in France. Beſides, Beza in page the 14th of the firſt Book of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, aſſerts that Calvin, after he had retired into Xaintonge, returned to Paris the next year.

Let us obſerve that Varillas's account is only a tranſcript of that of Florimond de Remond. See below the remark [*AA*]. The principle I have laid down in the beginning of this remark, is very proper to confute thoſe, who ſay (50), that Calvin, whilſt he ſtudied at Orleans, *revolted from the Church of Rome, and went into Italy, and ſtaid chiefly at Rome, at Venice, and at Padua*; that thence he returned to Paris, where he eſcaped being taken by the *Lieutenant Criminel*; that he retired to Noyon; that he there diſpoſed of his livings, after which *he went into Gaſcony and Bearn in the year* 1533, *where* he did not meet with a kind reception, *becauſe he was a Sacramentarian*; that *he went to Geneva, where he was like to be thrown down from the top of the bridge, (which is a kind of puniſhment uſed amongſt them) becauſe he ſpread his opinions abroad*; that *having made his eſcape, he fled to Lauzane, whence in a little time he returned to Geneva, where ſeveral perſons being then already corrupted in their Religion, he could ſtay with more liberty.* This is the ſubſtance of an Information, which a Notary of Noyon communicated to Cornelius vander Myle, and which Mr. Drelincourt has inſerted into his Vindication of Calvin, where he obſerves (51), that Andrew Rivet had already inſerted it into his *Jeſuita vapulans*. James Deſmai, a Doctor of the Sorbonne publiſhed at Roan in 1647 (52) a ſmall book entitled, *Remarques ſur la vie de Jean Calvin Hereſiarque, tirées des Regiſtre de Noyon ville de ſa naiſſance*, i. e. "Obſervations upon the Life of John Calvin the "Hereſiarch, taken from the Regiſters of Noyon his "native place." He aſſerts (53) in page 39, that Calvin *went to the Univerſities of Paris, Orleans, Toulouſe, Padua*; that *he took a journey to Rome, and Venice, and into Bearn, and to ſome other places*; that *he did not continue long at Rome nor at Venice, but was ſome time longer at Padua.* You may ſafely ſtrike out of the catalogue of his voyages all thoſe which Beza does not mention. He could not have been ignorant of them, had they been real; and he would certainly have mentioned them, had he known them; for theſe are things which are honourable to Calvin. One has reaſon to be ſurprized at ſo many falſhoods related to no purpoſe whatſoever.

[*H*] *He found himſelf ſtopt at Geneva by an order from Heaven, if I may ſay ſo, particularly intimated to him.*] "Farellus ut erat plane vir ille ſpiritu quodam "heroico afflatus, multis eum verbis fruſtra obteſta"tus, ut ſecum potius Genevæ laboraret, quam lon"gius excurreret, nec ei facile Calvinus aſſentiretur. "At ego tibi, inquit, ſtudia tua prætexenti, denuncio "Omnipotentis Dei Nomine, futurum ut niſi in opus "iſtud Domini nobiſcum incumbas, tibi non tam "Chriſtum, quàm te ipſum quærenti Dominus ma"ledicat (54)." The ſubſtance of this paſſage has been given in the text, to which this remark belongs.

[*I*] *Calvin complied . . . as well to preach as to be a Profeſſor of Divinity.*] Beza aſſerts this ſo poſitively, that Moreri has not miſtaken him. *Calvinus ſe Preſbyterii & Magiſtratus voluntati permiſit, quorum ſuffragiis, accedente plebis conſenſu, delectus non Concionator tantum, (hoc autem primum recuſârat) ſed etiam ſacrarum Literarum Doctor, quod unum admittebat, eſt deſignatus anno Domini* 1536, *menſe Auguſto* (55). i. e. "Calvin yeilded to the deſire and wiſhes of the Con"ſiſtory, and of the Magiſtrates, by whoſe ſuffrages "and the people's conſent, he was choſen not only a "Preacher (which he firſt declined) but alſo Profeſſor "of Divinity, which poſt alone he was willing to "accept, in Auguſt 1536." Can there be any thing more

(43) *Hiſt. de le Hereſie*, liv. 10. pag. 337, &c.

(44) Ibid. liv. 11. pag. 3 and 30.

(45) Beza, *in Vita Calvini*, pag. 367, *ad ann.* 1534.

(46) See that *Hiſtory*, Book 1. pag. 63.

(47) Tom. 3. pag. 152.

(48) He means no doubt *Catherine de Medicis*.

(49) *Hiſt. Genevrina*, tom. 3. pag. 40.

(50) *See* Mr. Drelincourt, *Defenſe de Calvin*, pag. 35, &c.

(51) Ibid. pag. 37.

(52) Ibid. pag. 155.

(53) Ibid. pag. 166, 167.

(54) Beza, *in Vita Calvini*, pag. 368.

(55) Idem, ibid.

Sacrament, as long as theſe diſorders reigned. He alſo declared, that he could not ſubmit to the regulations, which the Synod of the Canton of Berne had lately made [*K*], and that they of Geneva ought to be heard in the Synod which was to meet at Zurich. Hereupon the Syndics having ſummoned the people, it was ordered in that Aſſembly, that Calvin (*c*), Farel, and another Miniſter ſhould leave the City within two days, becauſe they had refuſed to adminiſter the Sacrament. Calvin retired to Straſburgh, where Bucer and Capito gave him a thouſand proofs of their love and eſteem. He eſtabliſhed a French Church at Straſburgh, of which he was made the firſt Miniſter; he was alſo choſen at the ſame time Profeſſor of Divinity there. During his ſtay at Straſburgh, he continued to give ſeveral marks of his kind affection to the Church of Geneva, as appears amongſt other things, by the anſwer he wrote in 1539 to the beautiful but artful Letter of Cardinal Sadolet (*d*) [*L*] Biſhop of Carpentras. Two years after the Divines of Straſburgh would have him aſſiſt at the Diet, which the Emperor had appointed to meet at Worms and at Ratiſbon, in order to appeaſe, if poſſible, the troubles occaſioned by the difference of Religion. Calvin went therefore to the Diet with Bucer, and entered into a conference with Melancthon. The people of Geneva entreated him ſo earneſtly to return to them, that at laſt he conſented to be their Miniſter again for a certain time (*e*); but they were to wait till he was returned from the Diet. He arrived at Geneva September the 13th 1541, to the great ſatisfaction of the people, and the Magiſtrates. The firſt thing he did after his arrival was, to eſtabliſh a form of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, and a Conſiſtorial Juriſdiction with the power of reproving, and inflicting all kinds of canonical puniſhments, as far as excommunication excluſively. This was very much diſliked by ſeveral perſons, who ſaid, that by this means the papal tyranny would ſoon be revived. However the thing was executed; and this new Canon paſſed into law in an Aſſembly of the whole people held November the 20th 1541, and the Clergy and Laity promiſed ſolemnly to conform to it for ever. The inflexible ſtrictneſs with which Calvin aſſerted on all occaſions the rights of his Conſiſtory, drew upon him the hatred of a great many perſons (*f*), and occaſioned ſometimes great tumults in the City; and one would hardly believe, if there were not unqueſtionable proofs of it, that amongſt all the diſturbances of the Commonwealth, he could yet take ſo much care as he did of the foreign Churches in France (*g*), in Germany, in England, and in Poland, and write ſo many books [*M*], and ſo many letters. He did more by his pen than by his preſence, and yet on ſome occaſions he acted in perſon, as when he went to Francfort in 1556, on purpoſe to put an end to the diſputes which divided the French Church there. He had been ſick ſome time before, and the report which was ſpread of his being dead did very much pleaſe the Roman Catholicks [*N*]. He always led an active life, having almoſt conſtantly pen

(*c*) In 1538.

(*d*) He wrote it to the Senate, Council, and People of Geneva, exhorting them to return into the pale of the Church.

(*e*) The Magiſtrates of Straſburgh conſented afterwards to the abrogation of this limiting clauſe.

(*f*) See the Article of BERTELIER.

(*g*) See Paſquier, *Recherch. de la France*, liv. 8. chap. 55.

more poſitive? And yet neither Mr. Spon nor Mr. Leti amongſt the Proteſtants, nor Mr. Maimbourg amongſt the Roman Catholics, underſtood this. Farel would detain Calvin, ſays Mr. Spon (56); *but he reſiſted for a long while; at laſt Farel entreating him more earneſtly he conſented to ſtay, not to preach but to teach Divinity.* Mr. Leti ſays the ſame. *Calvino ſe laſciò perſuadere di fermarſi non gia con la conditione di predicare, di che ne laſciava a gli altri la cura, mà d'inſegnare la Theologia* (57). Mr. Maimbourg's words are as follow: *They ſhared between them the functions of their Miniſtry. Farel, who uſed to thunder in the pulpit, continued to preach; and Calvin, who was not an agreeable Orator, took upon him the taſk of teaching Divinity, in his own way, without having ever ſtudied it* (58).

(56) *Hiſt. de Geneve*, liv. 3. pag. m. 243.

(57) *Hiſtoria Genevrina*, tom. 3. pag. 41.

(58) *Hiſtoire du Calviniſme*, pag. 64.

[*K*] *He declared that he could not ſubmit to the Regulations, which the Synod of the Canton of Berne had lately made.*] The Church of Geneva made uſe of leavened bread in the holy Communion, and had cauſed the baptiſmal fonts to be removed out of the churches, and had aboliſhed all the Feaſts except the Sundays. The Churches of the Canton of Berne diſliked theſe three things, and paſſed an Act in the Synod held at Lauſanne, to require that the uſe of unleavened bread, the baptiſmal fonts, and the feaſts be reſtored at Geneva: theſe were the regulations, to which Calvin refuſed to ſubmit (59).

(59) Beza, *in Vita Calvini*, pag. 369, *ad ann.* 1538.

[*L*] *The anſwer he wrote to the ... Letter of Cardinal Sadolet.*] That Letter is to be found in the volume, which contains Calvin's ſmall works (*opuſculos*): it is dated from Straſbourgh September the firſt 1539, and it is certain that Calvin did not return to Geneva but in the year 1541. The Author of the *Hiſtoria Genevrina* did not obſerve this (60). *Queſta lettora .... ancora communicata à Calvino in Straſburg; che pure riſpoſe ma dopo ritornato in Geneva.*

(60) Tom. 3. pag. 69.

[*M*] *One would hardly believe ... he could ... write ſo many books.*] The edition of his works publiſhed at Geneva contains twelve volumes in folio, which have been reduced to nine volumes in the edition of Amſterdam printed in 1667. The Commentaries upon the Bible are the moſt conſiderable part of Calvin's works. See the judgment, which Mr. Simon paſſed upon theſe Commentaries (61); it is mixed with good and bad; but after all he ſhews a very great eſteem for Calvin, and very much extolls his merit. There is a Jeſuit, who falſly ſuppoſes that this Miniſter publiſhed a work *de non caſtigandis Hæreticis* (that hereticks ought not to be puniſhed) after the puniſhment of Servet. This Jeſuit quotes this as an inſtance to prove, that it is the ſpirit of heretics to endeavour to unite together things inconſiſtent. *A thing*, ſays he (62), *which never appeared more evidently than in the perſon of John Calvin ... for as ſoon as Calvin had cauſed Servet to be condemned to death, becauſe of the novelties and the atheiſm, which he ſpread at Geneva, immediately after this curſed heretick had been burnt, and his aſhes ſcatter'd through the air, Calvin wrote a book* de caſtigandis hæreticis, *belying thus his own action by his doctrine. Thus the wicked confute themſelves, like the Antipheron of Ariſtotle.* All this is ridiculous: for on the contrary, after the puniſhment of Servet, Calvin publiſhed a book intitled, *Fidelis expoſitio errorum Michaelis Serveti, & brevis eorundem refutatio, ubi docetur jure gladii coercendos eſſe Hæreticos.* i. e. "A "faithful account of Michael Servetus's errors, with a "ſhort confutation of them; in which it is proved, "that Hereticks ought to be reſtrained by the ſword." A book, which ſtill occaſions a great clamour againſt its Author. This falſhood, publiſhed againſt Calvin, could no where be better taken notice of, than in a remark, which relates to his works.

(61) *Hiſt. Critique du Vieux Teſtament*, liv. 3. chap. 14. pag. 434, &c.

(62) Garaſſe, *Doctrine Curieuſe*, pag. 230.

[*N*] *The report which was ſpread of his being dead did very much pleaſe the Roman Catholicks.*] In the year 1556 he had been ſeized with a tertian ague whilſt he was preaching, and as he was forced againſt his will to come down from the pulpit, this occaſioned immediately a thouſand falſe reports concerning him. Beza adds, that the Canons of Noyon made a ſolemn

 proceſſion

pen in hand, even when his diſtempers confined him to his bed. He lived, I ſay, in the continual labours, which his zeal for the general good of the Churches impoſed upon him, till May the 27th 1564 (*b*). He was a man on whom God had conferred the moſt eminent talents; a great wit, a ſound judgment, an happy memory [*O*]; he was a judicious, eloquent, and indefatigable writer; he had a very extenſive learning, and a great zeal for the truth. Joſeph Scaliger, who found but very few perſons worthy of his praiſes, yet could not forbear admiring Calvin (*i*); he commended him amongſt other things, for not having attempted to write a Commentary on the Revelations of St. John [*P*]. The Roman Catholicks have at laſt been obliged to rank amongſt the ill-ground fables, all thoſe horrid calumnies, which had been publiſhed againſt Calvin's morals; their beſt Writers content themſelves now [*Q*] with ſaying, that if he were free of the vices of the body, yet he was ſubject to thoſe of the mind, as pride, anger, detraction, &c. There has been ſpread abroad a pleaſant ſtory concerning his Devotion to St. Hubert [*R*]; they, who

(*b*) Taken from his Life written by Beza.

(*i*) See the *Scaligerana*.

proceſſion to give thanks to Heaven for the death of the hereſiarch, whom their City had produced. *Multis inde falſis ſecutis rumoribus, iiſque uſque adeo Pontificiis gratis, ut de Calvini Morte ſolemni ſupplicatione Novioduni, Calvini patria, Canonici ſuis idolis gratias egerint* (63). I ſuſpect the Hiſtorian's memory play'd him here ſome bad trick; he miſtook, I think, the year 1556 for the year 1551. I have quoted in another place (64) a paſſage of Calvin, which ſhews that the proceſſion of his countrymen the Canons, in order to give thanks for his pretended death, happened in the year 1551. Would they have done the ſame thing over again, five years after, upon a falſe report? I can hardly believe it; I think it is much more probable, that Beza writing this ſeveral years after it happened, was miſtaken with regard to the time. The beſt memories are oftener guilty of ſuch miſtakes, than we are aware of.

(63) Beza, *in Vita Calvini*, pag. 379. *ad ann.* 1556.

(64) In the marginal reference (8) of the article BERTELIER.

[*O*] *He had a happy memory.*] His Hiſtorian gives the following inſtances of it. He knew men again after ſeveral years, tho' he had ſeen them but once; when he dictated any thing, and happened to be interrupted for ſeveral hours, he followed the thread of his diſcourſe, without having occaſion of being told where he ſtopped; and he never forgot what he once had truſted to his memory, I ſpeak of ſuch things, which it was his duty to remember. *Memoriæ incredibilis, ut quos ſemel aſpexiſſet, multis poſt annis ſtatim agnoſceret; & inter dictandum ſæpe aliquot horas interturbatus, ſtatim ad dictata, nullo commonefaciente, rediret, & eorum, quæ ipſum noſcere muneris ſui cauſa intereſſet, quantumvis multiplicibus & inſignitis negotiis oppreſſus, nunquam tamen obliviſceretur* (15).

(65) Beza, *in vita Calvini*, pag. 386.

[*P*] *Scaliger commended him, amongſt other things, for not having attempted to write a Commentary upon the Revelations of St. John.*] And yet he conſidered him as one who had better diſcovered the ſenſe of the Prophets, than any of the other Commentators. *O quam Calvinus bene aſſequitur mentem Prophetarum! nemo melius* (6). Since therefore he adds, *Sapit, quod in Apocalypſi non ſcripſit:* i. e. "He did wiſely, not to "write on the Apocalyps," he muſt have been perſuaded, that there is nothing to do upon that book. I have read in Bodin a thing, which I ſhall relate here. *In Oraculis interpretandis, malui judiciorum illam formulam,* NON LIQUET, *uſurpare, quam temere ex aliorum opinione non intellecta cuiquam aſſentire. Ac valde mihi probatur Calvini non minus urbana quam prudens oratio, qui de libro Apocalypſeos ſententiam rogatus, ingenue reſpondit, ſe penitus ignorare, quid velit tam obſcurus ſcriptor, qui qualiſque fuerit nondum conſtat inter eruditos* (67). i. e. "In the explication of "Prophecies I chooſe rather to make uſe of this law-"word, *non liquet*, (or, it does not appear to us) "than to follow any one in fixing a ſenſe upon an au-"thor, whoſe opinions I do not underſtand. And I "approve very much Calvin's prudent and civil an-"ſwer, who being aſked what he thought of the "Apocalyps, ſaid very frankly, that he did not know, "what was the deſign of ſo obſcure an author, it "being not yet agreed amongſt the learned, who, or "what ſort of a man he was." I would be glad to know, if Calvin ſaid this in ſome book, or only in converſation. I had rather think the latter; becauſe it would not bave been prudent for a man like him; to declare, that it was not yet determined amongſt the learned, what ſort of a man the Author of the Apocalyps was.

(66) *In Scaligeranis*, pag. m. 41.

(67) Bodin, *Method. Hiſtor.* cap. 7. pag. m. 416.

[*Q*] *The Roman Catholics have been obliged at laſt to rank amongſt the ill-grounded fables the . . . Calumnies, which had been publiſhed againſt Calvin's Morals: their beſt writers content themſelves now &c.*] I deſire that my expreſſions be not taken in a more general ſenſe, than ſuch propoſitions naturally bear. I know that Cardinal de Richelieu, or that excellent Writer, who publiſhed *La Methode pour convertir* (The Method of making Converſions) under the name of his Eminence, has admitted all the ſilly tales of Boliec. It is therefore not at all impoſſible but ſome great Author ſhould ſtill tranſcribe them at this time. I don't pretend to deny this; my meaning is only, that generally ſpeaking, great Authors ſcorn to bring ſuch things again upon the carpet. As for the common ſcriblers who, as Papyrius Maſſo obſerves (68), have ſpread theſe calumnies, they will never give them up. They are a ſort of men, who never let a piece of news drop, when they like it; ſo that we may ſay, that, thanks to their carefulneſs, there is never ſo mean a News-Writer, but may hope to be immortalized by all the groſs lies he invents with a pipe in his mouth. They will be tranſcribed three months after by ſome of theſe ſcriblers, and publiſhed again now and then, as there will be occaſion for it. And if any publick or private intereſt requires it, they will be found two or three hundred years hence, in ſome collections of Satyrs, amongſt the duſt of Libraries, and will be quoted again in ſome new Libel (69). Bolſec's work will meet with the ſame fate (70), as long as there will be Calviniſts in the world, who will have adverſaries. But to convince him for ever of calumny, it will be ſufficient to quote a certain number of grave Authors, who did not admit his ſtories. If they had the beſt appearance of truth, theſe grave Authors would not ſo eaſily give up the advantages they could make of them. This reflection ſhould be carefully obſerved. An Author adorned with a vaſt many titles (71) has lately copied after Bolſec.

(68) *Plebei Scriptores libidines ei, ſcortationeſque objiciunt, nemo tamen adulteria acrius odiſſe videbatur.* Papyr. Maſſo, *in Elog.* tom. 2. pag. 429.

(69) See the remark [*A*] of the article CAPET.

(70) Theſe calumnies are formed in the *Syſtema Decretorum dogmaticorum*, publiſhed at Avignon in 1693, by Francis Porter, *Hibernus Medenſis, Ordinis Fratrum Minorum Provinciæ Hiberniæ, olim in Romano Sancti Iſidori Collegio Sacræ Theologiæ Profeſſor Primarius, & nunc Lector bis jubilatus, ac ſereniſſ. Majeſtatis Britannicæ Theologus & Hiſtoricus.*

[*R*] *They have ſpread a pleaſant ſtory concerning his devotion to St. Hubert.*] It has been ſaid, that he having made uſe of all kinds of remedies, to cure his ſon, who had been bit by a mad dog, but all to no purpoſe, had his laſt recourſe to the interceſſion of St. Hubert. It is added, that the ſon of the Hereſiarch having paid all the neceſſary devotions in the church of that Saint, was cured of his double madneſs that was occaſioned by the dog, and that of Calvin; and they quote verſes which were made on that occaſion. *Notabile illud fuit, filium Calvini fruſtra expertum alia quævis amuleta, miſſum Geneva Andainum, ab impio & ſacrilego parente, ut ibi ope ſancti Huberti a rabidi canis morſu curaretur. Quemadmodum ille reipſa ibidem abjurata ſimul hæreſi, ab utraque, hoc eſt, caninâ & Calviniânâ, rabie convaluit. Extant verò de ea re carmina Bartholomæi Honorii, Poetæ illius ætatis* (72). Let us tranſcribe theſe verſes (73) written by Bartholomy Honorius, a Poet of thoſe times.

(71) See the foregoing quotation.

Scis quid Calvinus Sanctorum fecerit oſor,
A cane cum rabido filius ictus erat?
Tentavit medicis illum ſanare venenis,
Quæ Pedemontanus juſſit Alexis emi;
Sed Deus hunc non eſt medicina paſſus abuti,
Ne quis ab hoc Divos temneret Hærcticus.
Namque opus invalidum Calvini reddidit, ut ſe
Per Sanctos cuivis ferre probaret opem.

(72) Silveſter à Petra Sancta, *Notis in Epiſtol. Molinæi ad Balzacum*, cap. 17. pag. 171.

(73) Jean Chappeville, Canon and Grand-Vicar of Liege, quotes them, and from him le Vaſſeur, quoted by Drelincourt, *Defenſe de Calvin*, pag. 198.

Ille

who pretended to confute that ſtory, by ſaying that Calvin had no children, were miſtaken; for it is not true that his marriage was fruitleſs [S]. Nothing ſhews more the bad effects, which a miſtaken zeal has upon men's judgment, than to ſee Authors of ſome reputation, who yet relate with the utmoſt gravity, that Calvin would make people believe, that he raiſed the dead [T]. It is not long ſince a young Abbot accuſed him of having

Ille itaque incaſſum ſudans, eſt nocte coactus
Pignus in Ardennam mittere languidulum.
Immortalis ubi Numen ſe pandit Huberti,
Talia qui Chriſti vulnera curat ope.
Venit eo proles ſcelerati manca parentis,
Et ſupplex Aras procidit ante ſacras.
Quodque precabatur ſuperos, erat ut ſibi vellent
E membris morbum pellere rabificum.
Neve ſibi objicerent male ſani dogmata patris,
Quæ modo per mundi climata nata forent;
Nam ſe cum ſtolido non conſentire parente
Velle ſed in veteri Religione mori.
Hæc ubi fatus erat ſacra cum veſte Sacerdos
Prodiit, illius vulnera dira fovens.
Nec multos manſiſſe dies narratur ibidem,
Quin fuerit dono ſanus, Huberte, tuo.
Sparſerat interea Calvinus in urbe Genevâ,
Saxonicas natum nuper adiſſe plagas;
Ille quidem dignus, non qui luat à cane tali
Vindictam, ſed quem Cerberus ipſe vovet.

The ſenſe is,

" Would you know, what Calvin the Saint-hater did, " when his ſon had been bit by a mad dog? He " thought firſt to cure him with medicines; but God " would not ſuffer him to be thus cured, leſt the He- " retics ſhould hence take an opportunity of deſpiſing " the Saints. God render'd Calvin's endeavours " fruitleſs, in order to prove that he helps men " by the interceſſion of the Saints. The Hereſiarch " therefore was obliged to ſend his ſon to St. Hubert, " who cures ſuch diſeaſes by Chriſt's aſſiſtance. The " child then of that wicked father came to the Saint, " and falling down upon his knees before the Altar, " he prayed to be delivered of his madneſs; and beg- " ged that his heretical father's errors, which he had " ſpread over the world, might not be objected to him, " for that he was not of his ſtupid father's opinion, " and would die in the old Religion. When he had " thus pray'd, the Prieſt came in his Holy Garment, " and fomented his wound: nor did the youth wait " many days, but he was cured by your favour, O " Hubert, as it is reported. In the mean time Cal- " vin reported at Geneva that his ſon was gone into " Saxony; Calvin, a man who deſerved to be puniſhed " not by the bite of a mad dog, but to be devoured " by Cerberus himſelf."

It is not worth the while to confute all this, no more than what we read in Varillas; I. *Calvin being intreated by a Canon to return into the Pale of the Catholic Church, anſwered, that ſince he was engaged in his new maxims, he would perſevere in them to the end; but that if he was to begin again, he would never forſake the faith of his anceſtors.* II. *Calvin's nephew aſked him one day, whether one might be ſaved in the Church of Rome, to which he anſwered, yes.* III. *A Roman Catholick exhorting him one day to retract his errors, he anſwered with a ſigh, it is too late* (74). Theſe are things, which an Hiſtorian, who knows his duty as ſuch, will never publiſh, becauſe, a mere denial, muſt neceſſarily reduce him to a ſhameful ſilence.

(74) Varillas, *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie.* liv. 10. pag. 336.

[S] *It is not true, that his marriage was fruitleſs.*] Calvin did not ſhew, like ſome other perſons, a great inclination for marrying. He was at leaſt thirty, when he married Idolletta de Bure (75) the widow of an Anabaptiſt whom he had converted. He married her at Straſburgh, by the advice of Martin Bucer his Patron (76). She had ſome children by her firſt huſband, John Strordeur a native of Leige (77), and died in the beginning of the year 1549. Calvin was extreamly afflicted at this loſs (78), and continued a widower all the reſt of his life. See what he anſwers for himſelf, to the charge brought againſt the Reformers, that they made war againſt Rome, as the Greeks did againſt Troy, for the ſake of a woman. *Fingunt adverſarii nos mulierum cauſa quaſi Trojanum bellum moviſſe. Ut alios in præſentia omittam; me ſaltem ab hoc probro immunem eſſe concedant neceſſe eſt. Quò mihi ad refellendam eorum putidam garrulitatem major ſuppetit libertas: Cum ſemper ad ducendam uxorem ſub Papæ Tyrannide liber fuerim, ex quo me inde eripuit Dominus, per annos complures ſponte calebs vixi; mortuâ uxore, ſingularis expli Fœminâ, jam ſeſquiannus eſt ex quo non invitus cœlibatum rurſus colo* (79). i. e. " Our adverſaries pre- " tend, that we make a kind of Trojan war for the " ſake of women. But not to mention the others " now, the adverſaries muſt confeſs that I am at leaſt " free of that blame. I am ſo much the more at li- " berty to confute their ridiculous clamours, that I " always was free to marry, whilſt I lived under the " tyranny of the Pope, from which it pleaſed the " Lord to deliver me, ſince which time I have lived " ſingle ſeveral years, tho' I might have married, if " I had had a mind to it; and ſince the death of my " wife, who was a bright example amongſt the wo- " men, I have now again lived a year and a half ſin- " gle, though not againſt my will." He had by his wife a ſon, who died before, a circumſtance which he told the public in his anſwer to thoſe, who upbraided him with being childleſs (80). *Crimen ἀστοργίας ſibi objectum diluere volens* (Balduinus) *orbitatem mihi exprobrat. Dederat mihi Deus filiolum, abſtulit; hoc quoque recenſet inter probra liberis me carere. Atqui mihi filiorum ſunt myriades in toto orbe Chriſtiano* (81). i. e. " Balduinus, in order to vindicate himſelf of the " crime of hard-heartedneſs, upbraids me with my " being childleſs. The Lord had given me a ſon; " and he took him from me again. This then muſt " be a ſhame to me, that I have no children. But I " have millions of children over the whole Chriſtian " world." If Papyrius Maſſo had been acquainted with this paſſage, he would not have ſaid that Calvin could get no children. *Eum ſibi matrimonio junxit irritâ ſpe prolis & liberorum, nullos enim ſuſcipere potuit.* Mr. de Sponde has repeated the ſame thing, and has even added this obſervation to it, that Calvin's wife had children by another huſband. *Ideletam Buriam ſibi junxit & multis annis cum eâ vixit, nullis tamen ſuſceptis liberis, quamvis illa ex priori marito nonnullos haberet* (82) Florimond de Remond had already ſaid before them, that *theſe were nuptials condemned to a perpetual ſterility, tho' Ideletta was both young and beautiful* (83). But who would be ſurprized at the falſhood aſſerted by theſe three Authors, when he obſerves, that a Miniſter of a very extenſive reading, did not know, that Calvin had been a father? This Miniſter is Mr. Rivet. In order to confute the ſtory of the pretended cure made on Calvin's ſon at the interceſſion of St. Hubert, Rivet ſaid amongſt other things, that he did not think, it could be proved that Calvin ever had a child. *Vanus ego ſim, ſi ille vel quiſquam alius unquam probet Calvinum fuiſſe filii parentem, nedum ut filium ſuum miſerit Huberto ſanandum, quod nemo etiam crediturus eſſet mente ſanus, vel ſi decem liberos habuiſſet Calvinus. Ergo Bartholomæus ille non* Honorius, *ſed inglorius & infamis manebit, qui ſecum miſerum Loyolitam in participationem infamiæ pertraxit* (84). In another place, he flatly denies that Calvin ever had a ſon. *Claudit miraculorum Huberti ſpecimine in filio Calvini, qui nunquam fuit in rerum natura.*

(79) Calvinus, *in Tractatu de Scandalis*, pag. 100. This Treatiſe is dated July the 10th 1550. See the *Critique generale du Calviniſme de Maimbourg*, pag. 155 of the 3d edition.

(80) *Tractat. Theolog.* pag. 369.

(81) See how Mr. de Meaux, *Hiſt. de Variations*, liv. 9. num. 78. makes uſe of theſe words, to charge Calvin with pride, and what Mr. Drelincourt anſwered to thoſe who had already upbraided Calvin with this. *Defenſe de Calvin*, pag. 313.

(82) Spond. *Annal.* 1538, num. 12.

(83) Flor. de Remond, *Hiſt. de la Naiſſ. de l'Hereſie*, liv. 7. cap. 17. pag. m. 926.

(84) Rivet. Caſtig. *Notarum Silveſtri Petroſanctæ*, cap. 1. Oper. tom. 3. pag. 495.

(75) Papyrius Maſſo, *Elog.* pag. 418.

(76) Beza, *in Vita Calv.* pag. 370.

(77) Papyrius Maſſo, *Elog.* pag. 418.

(78) See among his Letters, the 101ſt, and 102d.

[T] *Authors of ſome reputation relate with the utmoſt gravity, that Calvin would make people believe, that he raiſed the dead.*] Claude Deſpenſe was certainly a learned man, and one of the moſt celebrated Clergymen in the ſixteenth Century; and yet he has been weak enough to publiſh that ſilly tale. *Alii etiam illum neſcio quem vivum pro mortuo cadavere excitando univerſo etiam teſte populo ſuppoſuiſſe fabulantur, quod non minus putidum mendacium, quam ſi Romæ Papa fuiſſe diceretur, auſus eſt rapſodus ille Sorbonicus Claudius Spenſa maledicentiſſimo quodam libro inculcare* (86). i. e. " Some fabulouſly report, that he ſuppoſed I do " not know what perſon, who was alive, inſtead of a " corps, which he pretended to reſtore to life even " in preſence of the whole people; which as fooliſh a " ſtory,

(85) Ibid. cap. 19. num. 5. pag. 558.

(86) Beza, *in Vita Calvini, ſub finem.*

having expreſſed ſome where a very brutiſh thought, but being challenged to quote the paſſage, which he boaſted to have read, he did not anſwer the challenge (*k*), ſo that his accuſation may be ranked amongſt the notorious calumnies. Moreri is not ſo erroneous in this article as might have been expected [*U*]. He does not deny that Calvin had ſeveral good qualities. There would be a great many perſons amongſt the Roman Catholics, who would do Calvin juſtice, if they dared to ſpeak their mind. Guy Patin gives

(*k*) See he *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for June 1685, pag. 688 of the ſecond edition. N. B. The paſſage is not in th firſt edition.

" ſtory, as tho' it were ſaid, that he had been a Pope " at Rome. This that ſcribbler Claude Deſpenſe a " Doctor of the Sorbonne dared to publiſh in a very " malicious libel." If there had been at that time Miſſionaries, who were Cutlers or Shoemakers by trade, one would not be ſurprized, that they ſhould have diverted the mob on holy days in the corners of the ſtreets, by ſo ridiculous a tale. But one cannot ſufficiently wonder that grave men ſhould tell it ſeriouſly. They who had this weakneſs do not raiſe our compaſſion, when we ſee them ſeverely cenſured by Beza (87). If it was upon ſome other account, the cenſure would appear too ſevere. If the ſtory mentioned by Bolſec in his XIIIth Chapter had happened to Calvin, if he had attempted *to raiſe one, who feigned to be dead, and who was found to be really dead*, Baudouin would not have ſpared him (88), he would have expoſed him to all the ſhame, which ſo odious and criminal a cheat deſerved. Yet he did not mention it either directly or indirectly; let us therefore infer from this Hiſtorian's ſilence, that this is nothing but a ridiculous ſtory. The only witneſs Bolſec quotes for it is a woman, who had been baniſhed from Geneva. She was, ſays he, the widow of him, who promiſed to perſonate the dead, and to revive when Calvin ſhould ſpeak the word. This was indeed a very creditable witneſs! She might be judged and condemned by her own words. She owned, that in order to have a ſhare in the alms of the Church, ſhe entered into an engagement with Calvin, to aſſiſt him in this abominable cheat, and that ſhe acted her part, till the death of her huſband obliged her to diſcover the whole trick. Was not this confeſſing very plainly, that ſhe was capable of calumniating Calvin, in favour of thoſe, who would pay her for it (89)? And muſt not a man be as weak, as ſhe was wicked, or even as wicked as herſelf, to lay any ſtreſs upon ſuch a ſtory? And yet a great many writers have related it. The Continuator of Baronius is of that number (90). Father Labbe ſets down the year in which this pretended prodigy happened, and if one was inclined to cavil with him, one might maintain that he even mentions the day; for he expreſſes himſelf thus under the year 1553. " Calvin " cauſes Michael Servetus to be burnt at Geneva Oct. " the 27th, and pretending by his prayers to raiſe a " poor man from the dead, whom he had bribed, " to feign himſelf dead, he was really the oc- " caſion of his death (91)." Mr. Varillas had wit enough to underſtand how ridiculous this ſtory is, but he was not bold enough, to publiſh his opinion: he left out of his Hiſtory of Francis I what he had ſaid upon this ſubject; but as there were copies of his Manuſcript, it has been poſſible to know his thoughts, and to impart them to the publick, in the edition of his Hiſtory, printed in Holland. Here follows what he had written, and what he durſt not publiſh. *Calvin was very far from undertaking to raiſe the dead, ſince he maintained that true Miracles were entirely uſeleſs, ſince the firſt publication of Chriſtianity; or from lending money out upon uſury, ſince he was contented with a ſalary of a hundred crowns for the ſupport of his family* (92). All this is borrowed from Papyrius Maſſo. See his life of Calvin, p. 431, 432.

(87) See the foregoing quotation.

(88) *See* Papyrius Maſſo, *in vita Calvini*, pag. 432.

(89) This obſervation is not ſufficiently minded in thoſe countries, where the witneſſes retract ſo often what they ſay, and inform againſt thoſe who have bribed them.

(90) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1553, num. 15.

(91) *Chronologue François*, tom. 5. pag. 766.

(92) You will find this paſſage in a parentheſis, in the *Hiſtoire de François I.* tom. 2. liv. 7. pag. 255. of the edition printed at the Hague in 1690.

[*V*] *Moreri is not ſo erroneous in this article, as might have been expected.*] I ſhall confine my ſelf to thoſe errors only, which concern ſome facts, and even amongſt theſe, I ſhall take notice only of ſuch lies, as I can confute otherwiſe, than by oppoſing the praiſes, which Calvin's friends have beſtowed upon him, to the injuries with which his enemies have loaded him. I ſay then in the Iſt place, that Moreri deſerves to be cenſured for what he ſays concerning Calvin's return into France after his parting with Du Tillet the Canon. It ſeems even that Moreri has taken more liberties than other writers; for he ſuppoſes, that Calvin dogmatized ſince his return not only at Poitiers, and at Bordeaux, but alſo at Angouléme, where, according to Maimbourg, he durſt not appear any more ſince the converſion of Lewis du Tillet (93). II. Moreri ſays, that *Calvin fell in love with a very pretty woman*, called *Idelette de Bure*, married to an Anabaptiſt of Leige, and that *ſhe happening to become a widow ſome time after, he married her*. I know of no Author (94) who ſays that this woman was pretty, nor that Calvin loved her before ſhe was a widow. Bucer engaged him to marry her, ſo that it was not a marriage made for love-ſake. III. *Bolſec . . . relates ſome things very particular* concerning Calvin's marriage; *perhaps he ſays too much to be credited, however he deſcribes well enough the places and perſons, having been acquainted with them.* This is what Moreri ſays: now it is certain, that Bolſec does not mention Calvin's marriage, and that he does not ſay a word either for or againſt Ideletta. IV. *Calvin had no children by this woman.* I have ſhewed above (95) that this is falſe. V. *He publiſhed at Baſil his Books of the Inſtitution in* 1534, under the name of *Alcuin*, which is the anagram of his name. I have ſaid already, that the dedication of this work is dated from Baſil Auguſt the 1ſt, 1536, but I have owned at the ſame time, that it is impoſſible to make this date agree, with what Beza tells us of Calvin's travels, from the publication of this Book to his ſettlement at Geneva with the title of a Miniſter in Auguſt 1536. The beſt way to ſolve this difficulty is, I think, by ſuppoſing that inſtead of 1536 in the date of the dedication, it muſt be 1535 (96); for Calvin's Inſtitution muſt of neceſſity have been publiſhed in 1535. The artifices, which were made uſe of in Germany, to palliate the ſufferings of the Lutherans in France, whom Francis I had put to death, determined Calvin to publiſh this work (97), as he tells us himſelf. *Quum incognitus Baſiliæ laterem, quia multis piis hominibus in Gallia exuſtis grave paſſim apud Germanos odium ignes illi excitaverant, ſparſi ſunt ejus reſtinguendi cauſa improbi & mendaces libelli, non alios tam crudeliter tractari quam Anabvptiſtas, ac turbulentos homines, qui perverſis deliriis non religionem modo, ſed totum ordinem politicum convellerent. Ego hoc ab aulicis artificibus agi videns, non modo ut indigna ſanguinis innoxii effuſio falſa ſanctorum martyrum infamia ſepeliretur, ſed ut poſthac per cædes quaſlibet abſque ullius miſericordia graſſari liceret, ſilentium meum non poſſe a perfidia excuſari cenſui, niſi me pro virili opponerem. Hæc mihi edendæ inſtitutionis Cauſa fuit* (98). i. e. " Whilſt I lived unknown at " Baſil, it happened, that the burning of a great num- " ber of pious men in France raiſed the indignation " of the Germans; to remove which, there were ſpread " ſome wicked Pamphlets, full of lies, in which it " was aſſerted, that none were treated thus cruelly but " Anabaptiſts, and turbulent men, who by their wicked " conceits laboured to overthrow, not only Religion, " but the State it ſelf. I, finding that by this arti- " fice the Courtiers intended not only to palliate the " ſpilling of innocent blood by an undeſerved infamy " caſt upon the Holy Martyrs, but alſo that for the " future no body ſhould have the leaſt compaſſion for " thoſe, whom they ſhould put to death; ſeeing this, " I ſay, I thought that my ſilence could not be free " from perfidiouſneſs, if I did not oppoſe them as " much as lay in my power. And this is, what " determined me to publiſh my Inſtitution." Now the martyrdom of theſe Lutherans happened in January 1535; ſo that this work muſt have been ſent to the preſs ſince the month of January 1535; whence it follows, that the year 1534, ſet down by Moreri, is a miſtake. The Edition cannot be of the year 1536, ſince it is certain, that ſoon after this work was publiſhed, Calvin went into Italy to the Ducheſs of Ferrara, whence being returned into France, and deſigning to go towards the Rhine, he went to Geneva, where he ſettled in Auguſt 1536. Beza is not the only Author who ſays, that Calvin left Baſil after the publication

(93) See the Remark [*D*].

(94) Except Florimond de Remond. See above, quotation (83).

(95) In the remark [*S*].

(96) Spond. *ad ann.* 1535, num. 6. ſays, that year, Auguſt the firſt, Calvin publiſhed his *Inſtitution* for the firſt time, Beza, *Hiſt. Eccleſ. des Egliſ. Reform.* liv. 1. pag. 22. places the firſt publication of this book in the year 1535, and obſerves that this ſame year is ſet down at the end of the dedication in ſome editions; as for inſtance in the French edition printed at Geneva in 1566, fo. io.

(97) Beza, *in vita Calvini*, pag. 367.

(98) Calvin, *Præf. in Pſalmos.*

gives us room to think ſo [X]; he was the occaſion that the Life of this Reformer written by Papyrius Maſſo has been publiſhed [Y]. That Life has been very detrimental to

publication of his Book; Calvin himſelf tells us the ſame, adding this circumſtance, that nobody knew him to be the Author of it (99). Read the Preface, where he ſays this, and where he alſo acquaints the publick, that his natural baſhfulneſs engaged him to ſhun glory, and to live retired, without caring for reputation. With regard to the name of Alcuin, ſee the Remark [BB].

(99) *An propoſitum eſſet mihi famam aucupari, patuit ex brevi diſceſſu, præſertim cum nemo illic ſciverit me authorem eſſe.* Calvinus, *Præf. in Pſalmos.*

There is in the Supplement to Moreri an Article of Calvin, tranſcribed word for word from Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm; it would be therefore repeating the ſame things over again, if we were to criticize here upon that Article. This has already been done in the foregoing Remarks.

[X] *A great many Roman Catholics . . . would do Calvin juſtice, if they dared. . . . Guy Patin gives us room to think ſo.*] "As for Calvin, I am very well "acquainted with the worth of his wit. It is a great "while ſince Monſieur Turenne openly praiſed it to "me: I was then but twenty years of age. Joſeph "Scaliger ſaid, that Calvin was the greateſt wit that "appeared in the world ſince the Apoſtles (100). . . . "No man was ever ſo well verſed in Eccleſiaſtical "Hiſtory, as Calvin. At the age of 32 he was the "moſt learned man in Europe. I happened to be "once at a feaſt of one of our candidates for the "Doctorſhip, where one of our old Doctors, named "Baſin, ſaid, that Calvin had entirely falſified the "Holy Scriptures; but I took the good old man to "taſk, and made him appear ſo ridiculous, that "Monſieur Guenant the younger, who ſat next to "me, told me that I preſſed too hard upon him, "and that I ought to pity his age and weakneſs. "John de Monluc, Biſhop of Valence, uſed to ſay, "that Calvin was the greateſt Divine in the world; "do not think, that they would ſay the ſame at "Rome (101)."

(100) I don't believe that Scaliger made uſe of an expreſſion ſo improper, and which ſuppoſes, that the Apoſtles were great wits, which is abſolutely falſe.

(101) Patin, Letter 24. of the firſt edition, and 39. of the 2d.

[Y] *Patin was the occaſion, that the life of Calvin, written by Papirius Maſſo has been publiſhed.*] Patin acquaints us with this particular in the letter we have juſt now quoted. *As for Papyrius Maſſo*, ſays he, *he wrote his* (Calvin's) *life by it ſelf, and the Author's brother, who was a Canon, gave it me in* 1619; *but as ſince that time, they printed here a Collection of Papyrius Maſſo's Elogies, I obtained, tho' with great difficulty, that this life ſhould be added to them. The Bookſeller had aſked advice from the Jeſuits, who forbad him to print that life, yet he believed me, when I told him, that this addition would make his book ſell the better.* The text of this remark evidently ſhews, that I have not depended too much upon Varillas. I have examined with the utmoſt attention all that he ſays of the life of Calvin printed with Papyrius Maſſo's Elogies, and I have not found that it could in the leaſt ballance the teſtimony of Guy Patin. The Reader will judge of my conduct in this reſpect, after having compared the paſſage from Varillas, and my obſervations upon it.

An examination of a paſſage of Mr. Varillas, concerning the Life of John Calvin by Papyrius Maſſo.

"Baleſdans cauſed the Elogies of Papyrius Maſſo "to be printed, and inſerted amongſt them a life "of Calvin, becauſe having found it amongſt the "papers of that Author, he thought it was of his "compoſing. His error is ſo much the leſs pardona"ble, that the manner in which this Life is written, "differs ſo much from that in which Maſſo's other "works are written, that a very ſuperficial knowledge "in the Latin Tongue, is ſufficient to obſerve the dif"ference. But I cannot ſufficiently wonder, that the "famous Sponde Biſhop of Pamiers, ſhould have been "impoſed upon by Baleſdans, who thought that Maſſo "was the real author of this Life, and ſhould have "choſen to ſubmit to the opinions of others, rather "than to follow his own judgment. I heard from "Meſſieurs Dupuy, that this Life was written by the "celebrated James Gillot, Councellor Clerc in the "great Chamber of the Parliament of Paris, who had "ſo great a ſhare in the works of the Wits of his time, "tho' he would not have his name publiſhed in them; "and indeed that Life ſeems to me every way wor"thy ſo great a man; it is a maſter-piece in its kind, "and if there are ſome longer, there are none more "elaborate, nor oftener reviſed. Yet it has not been "of great uſe to me, becauſe it contains rather a "confutation of what Balduin the Civilian, and Weſt"falius the Divine have reproached Calvin with, than "a particular account of his actions (102)." This is Mr. de Varillas's paſſage; here follow my obſervations upon it. I. This Life of Calvin was not found amongſt the papers of Maſſo by Baleſdans: we have heard Patin, who aſſerts that it was himſelf who furniſhed the Bookſeller with this Life, and perſuaded him to add to it Papyrius Maſſo's Elogies. This is not all: Maſſo and his brother had made a preſent of this Life to Guy Patin, and did not doubt but his brother had compoſed it; he even added ſome things to it, which he had learnt by tradition, whilſt he was a Canon at Angouleme. II. The manner in which this Life is written does not differ from Maſſo's other works, but only as an Hiſtorical Life muſt differ from a mere Elogium. If Mr. de Varillas had compared this Life of Calvin with the Lives of Charles IX, Dante, Petrarch, and Boccace, written by Maſſo, I am certain he would have found a great conformity between theſe Lives, and that of Calvin. You meet in all theſe Lives with the ſame order and diſpoſition of the ſubjects, the ſame diviſion of the chapters, the ſame ſtyle, the ſame genius, the ſame manners. This together with the clear and poſitive teſtimony of Guy Patin would be ſufficient to perſuade me, either that Meſſieurs Dupuy were miſtaken, or that Mr. de Varillas did not well remember what he heard them ſay. But I have another very ſtrong argument. The Author of this Life of John Calvin had ſtudied the Law under Baudouin (103). This can perfectly well be applied to Maſſo (104), but not, as I think, to the illuſtrious Mr. Gillot. We read in that Life, that Baudouin ſilenced Calvin, and that it was a very mortifying ſilence for the latter (105); what Papyrius Maſſo obſerves in Baudouin's Elogium (106) agrees perfectly well with this. III. Baleſdans and Sponde are not therefore to blame, for having thought that this Life was compoſed by Maſſo. IV. It does not deſerve the praiſes, which Varillas beſtows upon it with ſo much profuſion. I appeal for this to the judgment of all thoſe, who have any ſkill in this kind of writings. V. It is by no means *a Confutation of what Baudouin the Civilian, and Weſtfalius the Divine, have reproached Calvin with.* That Civilian is often quoted in it, without being contradicted; for on the contrary, the deſcription he makes of his peeviſh, paſſionate and proud temper is ſupported by the authority of Baudouin (107). So that I cannot imagine after what manner Mr. de Varillas uſed to read a book; he was the only man in the world, who after having read this Life of Calvin, could ſay, that the Author's chief deſign was to confute that Civilian.

(102) Varillas, Preface to the 1ſt vol. of the *Hiſtoire de l'Hereſie.*

(103) *Sic enim Balduinus Præceptor meus in Jure Civili.* pag. 418.

(104) See the Elogium of Baudouin, amongſt thoſe of Papyrius Maſſo, pag. 263.

(105) *Ipſi ſilentium Balduinus Juriſconſultus impoſuit ſeni, magno dolore Calvini*, pag. 421.

(106) *Ferunt Calvinum nullius linguam, ſtylum, eruditionem, magis horruiſſe quam hujus Atrebatis.* pag. 262.

(107) See the pages 428, 430, 455.

If Mr. de Vigneul-Marville will be at the pains of conſidering this carefully, and eſpecially of comparing according to the rules of Critics, the other pieces of Papyrius Maſſo with this Life of Calvin, I am perſuaded, that he will no longer believe, that *we have an Elogium of Calvin, written in Latin by Mr. Gillot, and which has been without reaſon printed at the end of Papyrius Maſſo's* Illuſtrious Men (108).

(108) *Melanges, d'Hiſtoire & de Literature recueilles par Mr. De Vigneul-Marville*, pag. 201.

I have been miſtaken in my conjecture; Mr. de Vigneul-Marville has ſeen this, and yet he perſiſts in his former opinion. He ſays, that *what I alledge, viz. that this Elogium was found amongſt the papers of Papyrius Maſſo after his death, as his brother told the late Mr. Patin, does not prove any thing: For every day the writings of one Author paſs from one ſtudy into another, and yet one cannot infer any thing from it. As for the ſtyle, that of Calvin's Life is not at all like that of Papyrius Maſſo, who did not write with ſo much politeneſs, nor with ſuch a delicacy, nor did he paſs his judgment upon the ſubject he treated as Mr. Gillot does. Beſides there is ſomething at the end of the work, which does not ſuit the character of Papyrius Maſſo, tho' it agrees perfectly well with the genius of Mr. Gillot, who did not take the affairs of thoſe times ſo much to heart* (109). I have examined all this with all the attention I am capable of, and yet I am ſtill of the ſame opinion, as I was before; and that the reader may ſee it is not without reaſon, I obſerve, I, That a man, who had read Mr. de Vigneul-Marville's words, and not

(109) Ibid. tom. 2. pag. 36. edit. of Holland.

to the Tranſcribers of Bolſec; for one cannot read it, without laughing at thoſe who have been ſo imprudent as to accuſe this Miniſter of having been a lover of wine, good cheer, money, &c. An artful ſlanderer would have owned that Calvin was ſober by his conſtitution, and that he did not care to hoard up riches [Z]. They who deſire to ſee a full and curious vindication of this great man, may read what Monſieur Drelincourt publiſhed upon this ſubject at Geneva in 1667.

I ſhall ſay ſomething concerning a fact, which I overlooked in Moreri, when I publiſhed the firſt edition of this work; it related to the judgment which Eraſmus is ſaid to have made of Calvin, after he had conferred with him upon the controverſies of thoſe times. The Hiſtorian who relates this particular, commits ſo many blunders, that they can ſerve only to render his account doubtful [AA]. The many reproaches with which Calvin

not my Dictionary, will not certainly think, that the only argument, or at leaſt the chief argument I inſiſted upon was, that this Life of Calvin had been found amongſt Papyrius Maſſo's papers; whereas the truth of the matter is, that I did not make uſe of this argument. I know very well, that I have exploded as a falſhood, what Mr. de Varillas relates, namely, that Baleſdans had found this Elogium *amongſt Papyrius Maſſo's papers*; and I own that in order to prove the falſhood of this, I have maintained that the manuſcript had been communicated to the Bookſeller by Guy Patin, who had it from Papyrius Maſſo's brother; but none of my arguments are grounded upon the work's having been found amongſt the papers of the writer, whom I think the author of it. To give a true account of my argument, it ſhould have been ſaid, that Papyrius Maſſo's brother gave the manuſcript to Guy Patin, as a work of his brother. Mr. de Vigneul-Marville's reflection does not in the leaſt affect this proof; for one can eaſily think, that men of letters know very well how to diſtinguiſh, amongſt the papers of a brother (110), the pieces he compoſed himſelf, from thoſe which are written in another hand. I omit ſaying, that Papyrius Maſſo had probably told his brother, what manuſcripts of his own compoſing would be found amongſt his papers. As for the ſtyle, I appeal again to thoſe who will be at the pains of comparing this Life of Calvin with any other Life written by Papyrius Maſſo; and this is my ſecond obſervation. The third and laſt is, that Mr. Gillot's character, *who did not take the affairs of thoſe times much at heart*, is ſo far from being an argument againſt me, that on the contrary it is a proof of my opinion. For here follows, what we find at the end of the work. *Hæc de vita Calvini ſcribimus, neque amici neque inimici, quem ſi labem & perniciem Galliæ dixero, nihil mentiar. Atque utinam aut nunquam natus eſſet, aut in pueritia mortuus! Tantum enim malorum intulit in patriam, ut cunabula ejus meritò deteſtari atque odiſſe debeas* (111). i. e. This is what I had to ſay of Calvin's Life, being "neither a friend nor an enemy to him, tho' if I "ſhould call him the Plague and Bane of France, I "ſhould but ſpeak the truth. And would to God he "had never been born, or had died in his cradle! For "he has been the occaſion of ſuch great misfortunes to "his Country, that you muſt hate and abhor his birth." This is the ſtyle of a rank Papiſt, and not of a Roman Catholick like Gillot, who hated the Leaguers, and all the Monks, and had a great friendſhip for Scaliger, and for a great many other Proteſtants.

(110) Papyrius Maſſo's brother was a Canon.

(111) Papyrius Maſſo. *Elog.* pag. 455.

[Z] *He did not care to hoard up riches.*] That a man, who had acquired ſo great a reputation, and ſuch an authority, ſhould yet have had but an hundred crowns ſalary, and ſhould have refuſed to accept more, and that having lived till the age of about fifty five with the utmoſt frugality and temperance, he ſhould have left to his heirs only three hundred crowns, even including the price of his Library, which was ſold very dear; all this, I ſay, is ſomething ſo heroical, that none but baſe and inſenſible minds can forbear admiring it. *Accumulandis ſcilicet opibus ſtuduit, cujus bona omnia, care etiam divendita ipſius Bibliotheca, vix trecentos aureos æquârant, ut non minus ſcitè quam verè calumniam iſtam longe impudentiſſimam refellens, hæc verba uſurpavit* (in Præfat. in Comment. in Pſalm.) *Me non eſſe pecunioſum, ſi quibuſdam vivus non perſuadeo, mors tamen oſtendit* (α). *Teſtari certe poteſt Senatus, cum perexigua eſſent ejus ſtipendia, tantum abfuiſſe, ut in iis non acquieſceret, ut ampliora etiam oblata pertinaciter recuſârit* (112). This is one of the moſt admirable victories, which virtue and an exalted ſoul can gain over nature, even in thoſe, who perform the functions of Miniſters of the Goſpel. Calvin has found imitators with regard to his activity, his zeal, and his love for his party; they employ their tongues, pens, ſteps, ſollicitations, for the eſtabliſhing of God's Kingdom, but they don't forget themſelves, and they are, generally ſpeaking, a proof, that the Church is a tender mother, in whoſe ſervice there nothing is loſt; they verify St. Paul's aſſertion, that Godlineſs *has promiſe of the Life that is now, and of that which is to come.* In a word, God pours his bleſſings ſo abundantly upon the diligence, with which they take care of their domeſtic affairs, that we ſee them enjoy conſiderable penſions, and leave a large eſtate to their heirs. They diſtribute alms, and are very charitable; but that is not very difficult for them, ſince the ſums which other people deſign for charitable uſes are depoſited into their hands, without their being accountable for them. In a word a Teſtament like that of Calvin, a diſintereſtedneſs like his, is a very uncommon thing, and proper to make them, who caſt an eye upon the Philoſophers of ancient Greece, cry out; *Non inveni tantam fidem in Iſrael.* "I have not found ſo great a "faith, no not in Iſrael." When Calvin took his leave of thoſe of Straſburgh in order to go to Geneva, they would continue him his freedom as a Citizen, and the income of a Prebend, which had been aſſigned to him. He accepted the firſt of theſe offers as an honour, but refuſed the income. *Ii tandem Argentinenſes conceſſerant, ea tamen conditione, ut jus civitatis honorarium, quod in Calvinum contulerant, ſalvum eſſet, & præbendæ, quam vocant, annuos reditus retineret: quorum illud probavit Calvinus, iſtud verò ut acciperet nunquam ab eo extorqueri potuit, ut qui nihil minus quam opes curaret* (113). He had brought one of his brothers with him to Geneva, but he had no thoughts of raiſing him to any honourable poſt, as others would have done, had they had the ſame intereſt as he had. He took indeed care of the honour of his brother's family, for he laboured to diſingage him from a wife who was guilty of adultery (114), and obtained him the permiſſion of marrying another wife: but his own enemies relate, that *he made him learn the trade of a Bookbinder, which he followed all his life-time* (115). Take notice of the marginal quotation (116).

(113) Ibid. pag. 370, *ad ann.* 1541.

(114) Idem, ib id. pag. 387. See the remark [CC].

(115) Varillas, *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, liv. 10. pag. 337.

(116) I have ſaid nothing of a great many groſs errors concerning Calvin, which Mr. Drelincourt has confuted.

[AA] *I ſhall ſay ſomething concerning . . the judgment, which Eraſmus is ſaid to have made of Calvin. . . . The Hiſtorian, who relates it . . . commits ſo many blunders, that they can ſerve only to render his account doubtful.*] "Calvin ſtopt ſometime at Baſil, and Bucer "having preſented him to Eraſmus, this great man, "who could diſtinguiſh the characters of thoſe he con"verſed with, having talked of Religion with Calvin, "ſaid with a loud voice; The Church has brought up "in the perſon of this young man a plague, which "will prove fatal to her." Theſe are Moreri's words; I do not believe he conſulted the firſt Author of this report, I mean Florimond de Remond; in all likelihood he did not go higher up than the Annals of Mr. De Sponde (117). However that be, let us quote the original and primitive Author of this particular (118). *The Regiſter of the Parliament of Paris, being very much concerned for his brother's fault, follows him far into the country, and brings him back into France, leaving Calvin in Germany, who entered into the ſervice of Rouſſel, whom I have mentioned before. There he ſaw thoſe, who worked upon the people's conſcience, and amongſt them Bucer, who preſented him to Eraſmus, who was obſerving how things would go at laſt, without ſuffering himſelf to be led away by the multitude. As Bucer had given him a very great character of Calvin's*

(117) Spondani *ad ann.* 1534, num. 11. pag. 424.

(118) Florim. de Remond, *Hiſt. de la Naiſſance de l'Hereſie*, liv. 7. chap. 10. pag. m. 889, 890.

(α) That is, "If whilſt I "am ſtill alive "I cannot con"vince ſome, "that I am not "rich, yet my "death will "ſhew it." The ſenſe of the reſt of this paſſage is given before.

(112) Beza, *in vita Calvini*, pag. 387, *ſub fin.*

Calvin has been loaded on account of his changing his name, will give us an opportunity of making a remark, in which we ſhall clear up ſeveral circumſtances of his life, and which will be a ſupplement to ſome of the foregoing obſervations, and eſpecially to the

vin's parts, Eraſmus conferred for ſome time with him upon the moſt difficult points of Religion, and being aſtoniſhed at what he had obſerved in that ſoul, be ſaid to Bucer, pointing to Calvin, Video magnam peſtem oriri in Eccleſia adverſus Eccleſiam, *I ſee a great plague riſe in the Church againſt the Church.* Take particular notice of Florimond de Remond's marginal note, for he ſays, *Beza in his Preface upon Joſhua places this voyage in the year* 1534. Obſerve this well, I ſay, as a proof that he admits this Chronological circumſtance. We ſhall ſoon ſee that it is to his coſt; for thirty pages after this, he relates, that *Calvin fearing to be ſurprized at Poitiers,* went to Nerac to ſee Rouſſel and Le Fevre; and that he obſerves again, that Calvin had been Rouſſel's ſervant *in the journey to Germany* (119). *Calvin,* continues he (120), having taken his leave of them, returned to Paris, whence for fear of the fire, he retired with a torch in his hand, and an exaſperated ſoul, being reſolved to ſet his own country on a blaze, which he never ſaw afterwards; ungrateful country, to refuſe him a reſting place, as he ſaid. He went to Straſburgh, where for two years he was Bucer's ſcholar, who received him as a man, whom he immediately judged proper to raiſe a commotion in the Church. . . . Calvin communicated his Inſtitution to him; it was there and at Baſil, that he put the laſt hand to it; he dedicated it to Francis I. . . . The firſt print he prefixed to his Inſtitution was an Emblem, the body of *which was a Flaming Sword, and the motto, theſe words,* non veni mittere pacem ſed gladium. . . . . Whilſt he was at Straſburgh he aſſiſted and confuted the French, who fled from the fires kindled in their country; and from that time he began to gain ſome reputation and authority. . . . . Having been told, that the Ducheſs *of Ferrara began to know the truth, he went to ſee her,* and after he had rambled enough, he went to Geneva, where he had already made himſelf known, when he paſſed there with Du Tillet; and at the Inſtigation of Farel (121), he took upon him the function of *teaching Divinity, and of making ſome exhortations to the Refugees.* Let us obſerve, that Florimond de Remond ſays in the margin, that *the firſt Edition* of Calvin's Inſtitution, was *made in* 1534. We have here the origin of Mr. De Varillas's ſhameful anachroniſms, which we have already obſerved (122).

They are ſtill more glaring in Florimond de Remond's account; of which I hope to convince the moſt unreaſonable perſons: and firſt I obſerve, that Rouſſel's journey into Germany was a conſequence or an effect of the firſt diſperſion of thoſe, who preached up a Reformation. It is an event, which happened in 1523 (123); Farel, one of them, went into Switzerland; Faber Stapulenſis *into Guienne* . . . . and as for *Rouſſel he went into Germany, out of a deſire to ſee Luther, that great man, of whom all the world talked ſo much* (124). I borrow all this from Florimond de Remond, who adds, that Rouſſel *returning from his travels* (125) was very kindly received in Bearn by the Queen of Navarre, followed her to Paris, preached there (126), was put in priſon, and after his releaſe went to Nerac, and paſſed the reſt of his life in France. Calvin ſaw him at Nerac, as this Author told us above (127). It follows from all this, that if Calvin had been Rouſſel's ſervant in the journey to Germany, it muſt have been in the year 1523. But it is certain that he was then upon his ſtudies at Paris, and that he continued there for ſome years, having a Chapel at Noyon (128). It muſt be well remembered, that the Author admits Beza's Chronology, namely, that Calvin and du Tillet went out of France in 1534. Since then he aſſerts, that du Tillet, being prevailed upon by his brother, who had followed him very far into the country, left *his Calvin in Germany who put himſelf in Rouſſels ſervice* (129), he muſt pretend that Calvin was Rouſſel's ſervant in Germany, in the year 1530; an egregious blunder, ſince he himſelf places this journey of Rouſſel under the year 1523. Obſerve alſo, I. that he relates, that Calvin's Inſtitution was printed for the firſt time in 1534 (130), and that the Author had drawn the plan of it at Angouléme (131); and has communicated it to Le Ferre at Nerac. II. That after this communication he makes him go to Paris, and then to Straſburg, to be there a diſciple of Bucer. How is it poſſible, at this rate, that in 1534 Calvin ſhould have accompanied Rouſſel as his ſervant in a journey to Germany? But more, how could it be poſſible that Calvin being gone into Germany that year, and having continued at Straſburg two full years hearing Bucer's lectures, he ſhould have finiſhed at Baſil his Chriſtian Inſtitution, printed in 1534? How is it poſſible again, that after he had been for two years Bucer's diſciple at Straſburgh, he ſhould have took a journey into Italy, he ſhould ramble enough, and taking Geneva in his way, he ſhould have ſtopt in that city, in the year 1536 (132)? This is not all; for this ſame Hiſtorian, ſtill admitting Beza's Chronology, aſſerts, that Calvin, being twenty three years old, dogmatized at Paris, but did not continue long in that city, *becauſe it was too hot there for thoſe who held erroneous opinions; . . . he went therefore away by ſtealth, . . . and retired to Angouléme, where he thought he ſhould be more ſafe, and was there maintained during three years at the expence of Lewis du Tillet* (133) . . . , *who having his head full of the opinions, with which Calvin had inſpired him* (134), went into Germany with him, and left him by the way. The other continued his journey, went to meet Bucer, had a conference with Eraſmus, and *being returned into France, he choſe Poitiers for the place of his reſidence* (135), made ſeveral diſciples there, held there his firſt Council (136), celebrated there the Lord's Supper for the firſt time after his own way, and there alſo he took meaſures for ſpreading his opinions over the whole Kingdom. But *fearing leſt he ſhould be ſeiz'd at Poitiers, where his deſigns had been diſcovered, . . . he left the place privately, and went to Nerac to ſee Rouſſel and le Ferre* (137). . . . *and having took his leave of them, he returned to Paris, whence for fear of the fire . . . . he retired to Straſburgh, . . . and it was there and at Baſil, that he put the laſt hand* to his Inſtitution printed in 1534 (138). This account is ſo full of blunders, that it is not ſurprizing, that an infinite number of Roman Catholick Authors have tranſcribed it; yet it is very ſtrange, that none of the Proteſtant Authors, as far as I know, ſhould have undertaken to confute it. It was a very eaſy taſk; obſerve only this chronological Touch-ſtone: Calvin was born July the 10th, 1509 (139), and made his eſcape from Paris to Angouléme at the age of twenty three (140). Florimond de Remond admits theſe two facts: He muſt therefore place Calvin's eſcape from Paris under the year 1532. Now he ſuppoſes, that the firſt edition of Calvin's Inſtitution was publiſhed in the year 1534: he finds then between theſe two years (1532 and 1534), a ſtay of three years at Angouléme, a journey into Germany, a return into France, a ſtay at Poitiers, long enough to lay the foundations of a clandeſtine Church, to celebrate the Lord's Supper, to hold a Synod, &c. a voyage to Nerac, another to Paris, and a ſtay of two full years at Straſburgh. Can there be any thing more monſtrous? Let us not forget to obſerve, that he ſuppoſes, that Charles le Sage, a teaching Doctor at Poitiers, and a native of Noyon, was one of Calvin's diſciples, whom he converted after his journey into Germany, which happened three or four years after his eſcape from Paris, in the year 1532. Since then he pretends that this *le Sage was a man for whom the Queen Regent, the King's Mother, had a very great value, and by whom ſhe was like to be ſeduced* (141), he would have us believe, that this Doctor, who was himſelf perverted in the year 1536, endeavoured afterwards to ſeduce the Queen Regent, who yet died in 1531.

This is the Writer, who aſſerts, that Eraſmus paſſed that judgment upon Calvin, which we have mentioned in the text of this remark. Let my readers judge, whether the authority of ſuch a man be of any weight, of a man, I ſay, who contradicts himſelf ſo egregiouſly, who forgets in one place, what he has ſaid in another, who does not obſerve in his own writings the moſt palpable abſurdities and impoſſibilities, which

(119) Ibid. chap. 17. pag. 921.
(120) Ibid. pag. 922.
(121) Ibid. pag. 924.
(122) In the remark [G].
(123) Florem. de Remond. *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie,* liv. 10. chap. 3. pag. 846.
(124) Ibid. pag. 847.
(125) Ibid. pag. 849.
(126) Ibid. pag. 850.
(127) See quotation (119).
(128) *See* Mr. Drelincourt, *Defenſe de Calvin,* pag. 160, &c.
(129) Flor. de Rem. lib. 7. cap. 10. pag. 889.
(130) Ibid. pag. 922.
(131) Ibid. pag. 921.
(132) Flor. de Remond, liv. 7. chap. 10. pag. 923.
(133) Ibid. pag. 883.
(134) Ibid. pag. 889.
(135) Ibid. pag. 890.
(136) Ibid. pag. 892.
(137) Ibid. pag. 920.
(138) Ibid. pag. 922.
(139) Ibid. chap. 8. pag. 880.
(140) Ibid. chap. 9. pag. 883.
(141) Ibid. chap. 11. pag. 891.

the paſſage where I mention his famous work of the *Chriſtian Inſtitution* [*BB*]. Men have collected, with ſo much eagerneſs, all the ſlanders publiſhed againſt this Reformer, that

which ſtare in every reader's face. Such an Hiſtorian muſt be dealt with like inſolvent Merchants, who have loſt all their credit; no money is lent to them but upon good pledges, or unqueſtionable ſecurities. We ſhould therefore be very weak, if we were to believe Florimond de Remond, as long as he does not quote his vouchers, nor alledge his proofs of any kind whatſoever. It would be very imprudent to truſt him, and we ſhould well deſerve to be impoſed upon, if we were to make ſo ill an uſe of our well-meaning honeſty. I thought therefore that a criticiſm on this Author's lies was a proper preliminary, and that after this my readers would be much better qualified to form a true judgment of the fact in queſtion. And we may be perſuaded, that this man is the only witneſs that can be produced in this affair; for the Author, who took ſo much pains to prove that Eraſmus was a very good Roman Catholic, and who could have reaped a great benefit to his cauſe from this fact, yet was not able to quote any other authority for it, than that of Florimond de Remond (142). After all this judgment of Eraſmus cannot but be very much to the honour of Calvin in the opinion of the Proteſtants, ſince it would be an argument, that he diſcovered very eminent qualities in the young man.

(142) See the book printed at Cologne, with the title of *Sentimens d'Eraſme de Rotterdam conformes à ceux de l'Egliſe Catholique*, in 1638, pag. 308, 309.

I would not have given my ſelf ſo much trouble to lay before the reader Florimond de Remond's blunders, had I not obſerved, that they are tranſcribed from one book into another, and that the moſt celebrated Authors render them in a manner immortal by admitting them. I have found them in Father Alexander's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, in the laſt volume of the folio edition, which is an edition corrected and enlarged. I am perſuaded, that this famous Writer would not have tranſcribed Mr. Sponde, the tranſcriber of Florimond de Remond, had he known that this laſt Writer had undergone a critick, like that, which has been read above. If the Proteſtants complain, that Father Alexander revived that confuſed heap of blunders, and put them in a condition of being better received in the world, than they were under the protection of their firſt Father, he may complain in his turn, that the Proteſtants had neglected to expoſe theſe impertinencies. It is ſometimes very difficult to deprive errors of immortality, even by confuting them in the moſt ſolid manner; how much more, if they are paſſed over unobſerved?

[*BB*] *The reproaches, with which Calvin has been loaded on account of his changing his name, will furniſh us with an opportunity of making a remark . . which will be a ſupplement to the paſſage, where I mention his Chriſtian Inſtitution.*] Some people have thought it very ill, that inſtead of calling him *Cauvin*, which was the name of his family, he took that of *Calvin*. Monſieur Drelincourt has very well juſtified him in this reſpect, not only by quoting ſeveral inſtances of the ſame nature (143), but alſo by a very ſtrong reaſon. *After all* (ſays he (144), *the changing of one letter in the name of Calvin is not conſiderable, and may even be ſaid to be none at all. For being to tranſlate into Latin the name of* Cauvin, *in order to give it an air and a termination ſuitable to the genius of that language, he could not be tranſlated otherwiſe than by* Calvinus. *For as inſtead of* Cauve, *in the dialect of Picardy, and* Chauve † *in French, all good writers ſay* Calvus *in Latin; ſo inſtead of* Cauvin *in the dialect of Picardy, and* Chauvin *in French, we cannot ſay otherwiſe in Latin but* Calvinus. *Now the firſt works of this man of God having been written in Latin, and he being known every where by the name of* Calvinus, *if when he wrote in French he had taken another name than that of* Calvin, *it had been thought that a work publiſhed under ſuch another name had been written by another Author, which would have been a great prejudice both to the Public, and to the Printers.* Here follows an account of much more conſiderable changes of names. "The moſt notorious "impoſtor amongſt all the hereſiarchs with regard to "diſguiſing one's ſelf, was John Calvin, who in the "beginning of his revolt being animated with a reſtleſs ſpirit, and fearing his own ſhadow, changed "his name oftener than his lodgings. For, 1. In the "year 1539, having half lick'd that little bear of "his, I mean his firſt Inſtitutions, he preſented them "to King Francis I under the name of JOANNES "ALCVINUS, which was the anagram of his name, "and they were printed with that name *at Straſburgh, "per Vindelinum Ribelium menſe Auguſto, Anno* 1539. "2. In the year 1543 he called himſelf JOANNES "CALIDOENIUS, a name partly Greek, and partly "Latin, as it were *Joannes de Calido Vino*; and thus "he ſigned his name at the end of the works of "Pacianus, in the Epiſtle he wrote to his friend Boygard; *Boygardo* JOANNES CALIDOENIUS. This "name is thought to anſwer exactly to that of his family, for *Calidæmius* may be tranſlated into French "by *Chauvin* *, this is really believed to have been "the name of his father. 3. In the year 1548, he "took the name of JOANNES CARVINUS, as if it "were *Chervin* ††, and thus he ſtiled himſelf at the "end of Orus Apollo's *Ænigma'ſ*, or Riddles, printed at Paris for Chriſtian Wechel in 1548, *per Jo"annem Mercerum*, who was the firſt Tranſlator of "them; for at the end of this Tranſlation there is an "Epigram intitled, JOANNIS CARVINI *ad Mer"cerum Epigramma*. 4. Since the year 1550 he "would be called by his friends CHARLES DE HAP"PEVILLE **, which was a fatal omen, ſays Mat"thew Launoy in his reply, that Calvin and his fol"lowers would one day ſnap and take towns by treaſon and ſurprize, and hide themſelves within our "walls, as an experience of fifty years has ſhewed "us, at the expence of ſo much noble blood, which "has been ſpilt to force theſe traitors to ſurrender the "towns, which they have held till this time. 5. Laſtly, that he might not be wavering in a contiinual fantaſticalneſs, he took the name of JOHN "CALVIN; and that name he keeps ſtill (145)."

* *Chaud* in French ſignifies *calidus*, *warm*, as *vin* ſignifies οἶνος, *vinum wine*.

†† *Carum vinum*, dear wine.

** As much as to ſay *Snaptown*.

(145) Garaſſe, *Doctrine Curieuſe*, pag. 1023, 1024.

Theſe words of Garaſſe are very proper to puzzle all the critics, who have not the opportunity of conſulting large Libraries; and this being my caſe, I own, that I don't find myſelf capable of confuting this paſſage as it ought to be done. I don't doubt but it is full of errors, but wanting the neceſſary books, which might furniſh me with literal and demonſtrative arguments againſt that Author, I can object to him nothing but probable conjectures. The firſt article will be examined below; I can ſay nothing againſt the ſecond; but I dare venture to affirm that he is miſtaken in the third; for what likelihood is there, that in the year 1548 Calvin would have ſpent his time in writing an Epigram upon a Book like that of Orus Apollo? It is infinitely more probable that *Joannes Carvinus* is the true name of him who wrote that Epigram. Florimond de Remond aſſerts, that one of the Apoſtles of Calviniſm was one *John Carvin, who came from the Province of Artois*, was a School-maſter *at Ville-neuve in the County of Agenois* ††, and acted *the part of a Miniſter under the gown of a School-maſter* (146); he is probably the ſame Joannes Carvinus, a Phyſician of Montauban, who publiſhed ſeven Dialogues *de Sanguine* (concerning the Blood) at Lyons, printed for Sebaſtian Gryphius, in 1562 (147). We may ſafely contradict Garaſſe upon his fourth article; for how ridiculous would it not be to ſuppoſe, that after the year 1550 Calvin would have made himſelf known by the name of Charles de Happeville? What occaſion had he to diſguiſe himſelf at that time? He lived with the utmoſt ſecurity at Geneva, he was known every where under his true name, he prefixed it to his books, and had made it venerable amongſt the whole Proteſtant Party. Garaſſe miſtakes the times with the utmoſt ignorance; he ſhould have choſen another period of time, as Papyrius Maſſo has done, who aſſerts, that Calvin took the name of Hepeville, when he went into Italy to pay a viſit to the Ducheſs of Ferrara (148). The fifth of Garaſſe's articles is the moſt abſurd of all. A man muſt be prodigiouſly ſtupid, who dares to publiſh, that the laſt name, which this Miniſter took, was that of John Calvin, after he had bore that of Charles Happeville ſince the year 1546. Monſ. de Sponde charges him with having taken the name of *Carolus Hepevillus* only on his journey to Italy (149); obſerve that he alſo charges him with having called himſelf

†† A County of the Province of Guienne in France.

(146) Flor. de Remond, *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, chap. 11. pag. 894.

(147) Merklin. *in Lindenio renovato*, pag. 549.

(148) *Dimiſſoque Calvini verbo, Hepevillum ſe appellabat.* Papyr. Maſſo, *Elog.* tom. 2. pag. 416.

(149) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1535, num. 7. pag. 430.

(143) Drelin. *Defenſe de Calvin*, pag. 202, &c.

(144) Ibid. pag. 204, 205.

† *Bald.*

that they have even upbraided him with the wretched life of his brother's wife [*GG*]. They

himself *Deparcan* in 1534 at Angouléme (150). Papyrius Maſſo's brother ſays the ſame thing (151).

We have ſeen already (152) that Moreri pretends, that Calvin prefixed the name of Alcuin *to his Books of the Inſtitutions*, printed at Baſil in 1534 (153). I cannot tell whether he be miſtaken or not. I could find no where a copy of the firſt edition of this work of Calvin, but what prevents me from determining any thing is, that according to Mr. de Sponde, it was only in the Straſburg edition, printed in 1539, that the Anagram of Alcuinus was made uſe of. *Ipſe ex paterno cognomine, in Latinam formam mutato, ex Calvino aliquando tranſpoſitis literis*, Alcuinum *ſeſe nominavit, uti in inſtitutionis ſuæ editione Argentorati* 1539; *nomen emulatus Magni illius Alcuini, qui Caroli Magni Præceptor fuit, ei Pariſienſem Academiam inſtituit. Qui potius alia tranſpoſitione* Lucianum *ſe dicere debuiſſet* (154). Theſe Latin words are only a looſe tranſlation of the following paſſage of Florimond de Remond. "His name was John Chauvin; . . . but "as Luther altered his name, he alſo thought it pro- "per to take the name of Calvin. And as tho' that "name had not yet been honourable enough for him, "and rather, as it was unfortunate, ſince the anagram "of Calvin is *Lucian*, he took the name of Alcuin, "the learned Preceptor of Charlemagne; and his firſt "Inſtitution, printed at Straſburgh in 1539, had that "name prefixed to it (155)." Garaſſe, as we have ſeen above, has ſpoke more accurately of this fact, for he mentions even the name of the Printer. I dare not deny this; for I could not procure a copy of the edition of that of Straſburgh in 1539, no more than of that of Baſil in 1535. But I venture to ſay, that if this work was ever publiſhed under the name of Alcuin, it is much more probable that it was the firſt edition of it, rather than in that of Straſburgh in 1539; ſince in 1539 Calvin, being a Miniſter and a Profeſſor at Straſburgh, had not the ſame reaſons to diſguiſe himſelf, which might have induced him to take the name of Alcuin in 1535. Obſerve, that he is accuſed of having forged a book for Alcuin Charlemagne's Preceptor, that is, of having compoſed it himſelf, and publiſhed it under the name of this Alcuin. The Inquiſition of Rome, and that of Spain, condemned this book as being the work of Calvin, falſely aſcribed to Alcuin. It was a book upon the *Trinity*. *Alcuinus ſeu potius Calvinus. Ejus Commentarii in Libros de Trinitate omnino prohibentur* (156). They mention neither the year in which it was publiſhed, nor the place where it was printed. Theophilus Raynaud ſpeaks (157) of this in ſuch general terms, that one may very well believe this ſtep of the Inquiſition has no foundation at all.

The Inſtitution of Calvin has not only been cenſured as a *pſeudonymous* work, that is, a work publiſhed under a falſe name, but they have alſo found fault with the figure, which he is ſuppoſed to have prefixed to it, and it has moreover been ſaid, that the whole work was nothing but a piece of plagiariſm. The figure, they ſay, was a ſword, ſurrounded with flames, and with theſe words, *Non veni mittere pacem ſed gladium* (158). Several Authors have aſſerted, that this was the Motto; but Monſieur Drelincourt maintains, that it is falſe, and that *the proof they bring for it, is ridiculous*. It is, continues he (159), as tho' they would object to me the emblematical figures, which have been prefixed without my knowledge, to ſome of my books, and perſuade me that it is my device or emblem. We are not accountable for the liberties, which the Printers take on ſuch occaſions, who think that all is permitted to them as well as to Poets and Painters. When I conſider this Motto with more attention, I find that it is neither Calvin's, nor his Printer's, but that of Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, who ſays expreſly, that he did not come to ſend peace on earth but the ſword, war, and fire. So that all the ſtrokes and invectives of the Jeſuit (160) are levelled at Jeſus Chriſt our Saviour himſelf, and furniſh the Atheiſts with arms againſt his holy doctrine (161). As for the plagiariſm, with which this great Author is charged, read only the following words of Mr. de Sponde. *Secedens Angoliſmam ibi triennium . . . commoratus, peſtilentem ſuam Inſtitutionem fabricare cœpit ex locis communibus Melanchthonis, Heperii Sarcerii* (162) *& id genus quiſquiliis magna parte conſarcinatum: quamquam Weſtphalus Lutheranus ſcribens poſtea adverſus eum, meram Oecolampadii doctrinam, ſed immutatum paululum atque amplificatam in ea contineri ait* (163). This Annaliſt has only tranſlated the following paſſage of another Writer: *It was at Angouléme, that Calvin, in order to impoſe upon the Chriſtian World, firſt drew up his* Inſtitution, *which may be called the* Alcoran, *or rather the* Talmud *of Hereſy, being a collection of almoſt all the errors of former times, and thoſe which, I think, will be for the future, which he gathered partly from Melanchthon's common places, from Heperius, and from Sarcier* (Sarcerius). *Weſtphalus the Lutheran ſays, that it is only the doctrine of Oecolampadius a little diſguiſed and enlarged* (164). It is certain, that the ſecond edition of this work of Calvin was finiſhed, when Heperius lived ſtill in obſcurity, and before he made himſelf known by theological works. I do not ſay quite the ſame with regard to Eraſmus Sarcier, I know that he had publiſhed ſome books before the year 1539: but all thoſe, who are capable of judging, if they compare Calvin's Inſtitution with Sarcier's work, will ſoon find, that the former had not the leaſt occaſion to tranſcribe the latter, and that he would have ſeemed to become a plagiary at ſuch a rate. There is ſuch a maſterly hand in his work, and ſuch an eminent genius, that the charge of plagiariſm cannot but appear ridiculous to all good judges. Length of time has not abated the eſteem in which the Inſtitution was at firſt: ſeveral of thoſe, who cannot read it in the learned language, are ſorry to find the old French Tranſlation obſolete. 'Tis in their favour that a Refugee Miniſter has undertaken a new Tranſlation of it. He has already turned the firſt and ſecond Books into modern French (165), and he continues that work. But with their leave, they ſhew themſelves either too nice, or too ignorant. The French ſtile of Calvin, which was very good in his time, is not yet unintelligible. I know men of a very good taſte, who read with a great deal of pleaſure the tranſlation he made himſelf of his work; the beſt edition of which is, I think, that of Geneva in 1560 folio, printed for Conrad Badius, or rather that, which was publiſhed in the ſame city two years after (166). Let us confirm by a paſſage of Paſquier, one of the things we juſt now mentioned. *Calvin was a man who wrote very well, both in Latin and French, and to whom our French language is very much indebted for an infinite number of fine ſtrokes, with which he has enriched it* (167).

[*CC*] *They have upbraided him with the wicked life of his brother's wife.*] Let us quote the words of the writer of his life. *Exprobrant ei alii, quod illius frater Antonius Calvinus priorem uxorem ſuam ob adulterium, cognita cauſa repudiarit. Quid ergo dicerent illi, ſi adulteram foviſſet? Quod ſi in eum redundat hoc impudicæ mulieris dedecus, quid fiet Jacobi, Davidis, ipſius denique Filii Dei familiæ, in qua ipſemet Diabolum ex ſuis unum diſerte notavit* (168). i. e. "Others reproach him, that his brother Anthony "Calvin was divorced from his wife who had been con- "victed of adultery. What would they then have "ſaid, if he had countenanced this adultereſs? But "if that lewd woman's ſhame muſt reflect upon him, "what will become of the families of Jacob, David, "and even of the Son of God himſelf, who expreſly "called one of his a devil." You ſee in this paſſage that Calvin's ſiſter-in-law was divorced from her huſband for the crime of adultery. But Florimond de Remond ſpeaks only of a niece of Calvin, who was puniſhed for that crime (169). "He alſo married his "brother Anthony Calvin to the daughter of one, "who had been a bankrupt at Antwerp, whoſe name "was Nicholas de Fer, and who had made his eſ- "cape to Geneva, where the Holy Ghoſt opened "the gates to all. He turned Bookſeller, in or- "der to ſell the books written by his brother. But "this Anthony was unhappy in his marriage, for his "daughter having been guilty of Adultery, ſhe was "whipped at Geneva by the common hang-man, "which made Calvin almoſt die for grief. Beza does "clearly hint this in his Preface upon Joſhua, "where he ſays that Calvin's houſe was free from for- "nication. *It is true*, ſays he, *that God exerciſed "him* (he means, tried his patience) *that way in the "perſon of thoſe who were nearly related to him: but "ſomething*

(150) Idem, *ad ann.* 1534, num. 1. pag. 424.
(151) *In Addit. ad* cap. 4. *Vitæ Calvini*, pag. 456. *Elog.* Pap. Maſſo, tom. 2.
(152) In the remark [*U*] numb. 5.
(153) He ſhould have ſaid 1535.
(154) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1544, num. 9. pag. 423.
(155) Flor. de Remond, *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, liv. 7. chap. 8. pag. 880.
(156) *Index Libr. prohibit. & expurgand.* juxta exemplar Madriti, pag. m. 36. See alſo pag. 3. of the 2d volume containing the Index publiſhed at Rome by order of Pope Alexander VII.
(157) Theophil. Raynaud, *de malis ac bonis Libris*, num. 267. pag. m. 163.
(158) See the remark [*F*] quotation (36) and the remark [*AA*] quotation (120).
(159) Drelincourt, *Triomphe de l'Egliſe*, Part 2. pag. 428.
(160) That is to ſay father Cauſſin.
(161) Drelincourt, *Triomphe de l'Egliſe*, Part 2. pag. 428.
(162) In my edition of Spondanus there is no comma between *Harperii* and *Sarcerii*, which is a great error.
(163) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1534, num. 2. pag. 424.
(164) Flor. de Remond, *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, pag. 883.
(165) The firſt book was printed at Brémen in 1696, 4to; and the 2d with a large dedication to the Elector of Brandenburgh, was printed in the ſame City the following year.
(166) The marginal quotations have been corrected in that edition by Auguſtin Marlorat, who has added two Indexes to it.
(167) Paſquier, *Recherches de la France*, liv. 8. chap. 55. pag. m. 768.
(168) Beza, *in vita Calvini, ſub fin.* pag. 387.
(169) Flor. de Remond, *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, liv. 7. chap. 17. pag. 926.

They have triumphed in the return of one of his nephews to the Catholic Church [*DD*]. The report which was ſpread at Augſburgh, when the Diet of the Empire was held, about the year 1559, that Calvin was turned again a Roman Catholick (*l*), that report, I ſay, was credited, more than it ſhould have been, even by ſome Proteſtant Princes. He complained of it, as of an ingratitude, which his conſtancy ſo often put to the ſevereſt trials did not deſerve (*m*). Thuanus obſerves that Calvin ſhewed ſomewhere in his works, that he was extremely diſpleaſed at the title of *Head of the Church* given to the King of England (*n*). Mr. Ancillon has quoted that paſſage of Calvin, and does not cenſure thoſe who thought it had been the occaſion of a libel which was publiſhed againſt that Miniſter [*EE*].

(*l*) See the Preface to his *Chriſtian Inſtitut.* ed. 1559.

(*m*) *Hæc eſt ſcilicet eorum gratitudo, quoi certè non latent plurima conſtantiæ meæ experimenta.* Ibid.

(*n*) Thuan. lib. 1. pag. 92. edit. Pariſ. 1604, 8vo.

I ſhall begin my ſupplements with obſerving, that Beza wrote the Life of Calvin in Latin and in French. That which is in French was prefixed by way of preface to Calvin's Commentary upon Joſhua, and was alſo printed by itſelf. The firſt edition is not ſo large nor ſo exact as the following editions. I have compared it with that publiſhed in 1565 (*o*), and have found in the latter ſeveral new facts, and ſome other ſet in a clearer light, and the circumſtances of time are much better obſerved in it. I ſhall give ſome inſtances of all this [*FF*]. This edition has almoſt all theſe advantages above the Latin Life,

(*o*) At Geneva, by Francis Perrin, with the *Commentary upon Joſhua*, in folio.

" *ſomething worſe happened to Jacob, and to David.* " The ſame misfortune befel the niece of Beza, her " name was Deniſe, and ſhe was the wife of Corne- " lius (170) Reader of the Hebrew Tongue at Ge- " neva. It is true, that whether Beza had a greater " intereſt in the city, or that the laws were grown " more remiſs, ſhe was not whipped through the city " as the other was."

(170) Cornelius Bertram, whoſe article I have given. I have ſaid above that he was married with the niece of Beza's firſt wife. I have read no where but in Florimond de Remond, that ſhe led a bad life.

[*DD*] *They have triumphed in the return of one of his nephews to the Catholick Church.*] Gaſpar de la Favergne going from Chambery to Geneva, in order to pay a viſit to one of his uncles, who was turned Proteſtant, embraced there the Proteſtant Religion, and married Rochel de St. André Anthony Calvin's niece. From this marriage came Stephen de la Favergne, *who after the death of his parents was brought up in the family of the Calvins*, and ſent to Heidelberg by Anthony Calvin *his Guardian . . . Having finiſhed his ſtudies, he returned to Geneva, where at the age of thirty, he was admitted into the Council . . . of the two hundred. Having been to pay a viſit to one of his relations in Savoy*, he went there to hear Francis de Sales preach, *and had even ſome converſations with him concerning ſeveral Doctrines of Religion. He had alſo ſome diſputes with two Franciſcan Fryars.* In 1600 he took a journey to Rome to ſee the ceremonies of the Jubilee. *He was robbed* on the road *by his fellow traveller, and laboured under a continual fever. As ſoon as he arrived at Rome he ſent for a Phyſician, who came to him, but would not return a ſecond time, till, (according to the cuſtom of Rome) he had a certificate in writing, that he had confeſt to a Prieſt.* The Patient ſent to the Convent of the Franciſcans to know, whether there was *any Monk from Savoy, who could come and viſit a Gentleman of that Country.* Father Cherubin, *whom he had ſeen in Savoy, came to him*, and recommended him to Father Peter of the Mother of God † Commiſſionary General of the barefooted Carmelites of the Congregation of Italy. This Monk viſited him, and cauſed ſome conſiderable alms to be given him from the Pope. *This act of Charity touched the Patient's heart.* He propoſed his doubts to the Franciſcans, and to the Carmelite, and reſolved to turn Roman Catholic. The Pope promiſed him a penſion of 800 Crowns, *and put him under the care of Cardinal Baronius to be inſtructed.* The Carmelite gave him the life of St. Thereſa to read. Laſtly, the Proſelyte would be a bare footed Carmelite, tho' the Pope diſſuaded him from it, and as ſoon as his probation time was finiſhed, he *was admitted to make his Profeſſion July the 14th*, 1602. He then took the name of Clement de Sainte Marie; he was raiſed to a great many offices in his Order, and died in the Convent of Avignon in the year 1643 (171).

† *Au Pere Pierre de la Mere de Dieu.*

(171) Taken from a book printed at Antwerp in 1670, intitled, *Les Fleurs du Carmel, cueillies du Parterre des Carmes déchauſſez de France. . . Par le Reverend Pierre de la Mere de Dieu, Carme déchauſſé*, pag. 81, &c.

[*EE*] *Mr. Ancillon has quoted a paſſage of Calvin, and does not cenſure thoſe, who thought it had been the occaſion of a Libel publiſhed againſt that Miniſter.*] I muſt make ſome ſhort obſervations upon this, for the inſtruction of my Readers. *The paſſage, in which Calvin complains* that the flatterers of King Henry VIII called him the ſupreme head of the Church *is in his Commentary upon verſe the 13th of the VIIth Chapter of the Prophet Amos, where Calvin has the following words.* Qui initio tantopere extulerunt Henricum Regem Angliæ, certè fuerunt inconſiderati homines, dederuntque illi ſummam rerum omnium poteſtatem, & hoc me ſemper graviter vulneravit. Erant enim Blaſphemi, cum vocarent ſummum Caput Eccleſiæ ſub Chriſto; hoc certe fuit nimium. i. e. " They, who in the begin- " ning raiſed Henry King of England ſo high, were " certainly inconſiderate men, ſince they gave him a " ſovereign power over every thing; which has al- " ways grieved me very much. For they were blaſ- " phemous, when they ſtiled him the Head of the " Church under Chriſt: this was really too much." *I don't know whether it was not this paſſage, that vexed a certain Engliſhman, and whether it was not, as ſome believe, the pretence of a libel, which was publiſhed againſt Calvin, and in which that Engliſhman, who was John Brerley, a Miſſionary Prieſt in England, charges him with having ſaid in his Commentary upon Daniel, that we muſt ſpit in the face of Roman Catholic Kings rather than obey them; in anſwer to which Libel there was publiſhed a Letter, which is inſerted in the firſt collection of the memorable things, which happen'd during the league, &c. That letter is intitled*, Lettre d'un Gentilhomme François contenant bréve réponſe aux Calomnies d'un certain pretendu Anglois. (i. e. " A letter from a French Gentleman, containing " a ſhort anſwer to the calumnies of a certain pre- " tended Engliſhman.") *They ſhew in that letter that Calvin in his Commentary meant Nebuchadnezzar, who would have his ſtatue worſhipped* (172). I ſay in the firſt place, that the Libel, which is confuted in the *Letter of a French Gentleman* inſerted in the firſt volume of the *Memoires de la Ligue*, was not written againſt Calvin, but in general againſt the Proteſtant Party, and in order to hinder Henry de Bourbon Navarre from ſucceeding to the Crown of France. Calvin is not mentioned in it but occaſionally, and in a few words. I ſay in the ſecond place, that the Author of that Libel was not an Engliſhman, every body knows that Lewis d'Orleans compoſed it. The method he followed was, to ſuppoſe, that the Roman Catholics of England warned thoſe of France, not to ſuffer that an Heretical King ſhould ſucceed Henry the IIId. III. Neither John Brerley, nor any other Engliſh Papiſt could be angry with Calvin for his obſervation concerning Henry the VIIIth. All the Roman Catholics ought to have approved his opinion, and might make uſe of it againſt Queen Elizabeth; and really, if he had writ nothing but in that ſtrain, he would have been very little expoſed to the ſlanders of the Papiſts, and much leſs to the Libels of the Engliſh Prieſts, than to thoſe of the Prieſts of any other nation. IV. I obſerve laſtly, that the anſwer, inſerted in the firſt volume of the *Mémoires de la Ligue*, is that which Monſieur de Pleſſis-Mornay wrote to Lewis d'Orleans's Libel (173), and which I have quoted in another place (174).

(172) Ancillon, *Melange Critique*, tom. 2. pag. 51, 52.

(173) It is the firſt volume of the *Memoires de Mornai*, pag. 619, &c.

(174) Quotation (17) of the article BROCARD.

[*FF*] *His Life . . . in French . . . of the Edition of 1565 . . . contains ſeveral new facts, and ſome others ſet in a clearer light, and the circumſtances of time are much better obſerved in it. I ſhall give ſome inſtances of all this.*] We do not find in the Edition of 1564, in 12*mo*, what I have tranſcribed from the *folio* Edition

Life, but on the other hand, there are ſome things in this, which are not in the French (*p*). The ſupplement I have to give concerning the editions of the *Inſtitution*, will be found in the remark [*D*] of the article SCHULTINGIUS. I have ſaid already (*q*) that a great clamour was raiſed againſt Calvin, becauſe he charged the Popes and the Cardinals with ridiculing the Chriſtian Religion [*GG*]. I ſhall make ſome new obſervations upon all this.

(*p*) For inſtance, what relates to the diſſolute life of Bolſec's wife. See the remark [*F*] in the article of BOLSEC.

(*q*) In the remark [*H*] of the article of CASTELLANUS.

of 1565, when I ſaid, that the grandſon of a baſtard of Philip the good Duke of Burgundy forſook the Church of Rome (175). We do not read there, that in March 1559, *Peter Viret, for very good reaſons, and ſome others with him, left the place where they were,* (that is Lauſanne) *and retired to Geneva, where the Magiſtrates, as well as Calvin and the other Miniſters, deſired him to perform the functions of a Paſtor of the Church* (176), and that *the Magiſtrates and the Governor of the City, by Calvin's advice, were encouraged to lay ſome foundations for a ſchool, and for public Profeſſorſhips for the chief languages, having then in their city very able men amongſt thoſe who retired to Geneva with Mr. Peter Viret* (177). This confirms my conjecture, that Viret left Lauſanne for ſome particular reaſons, which he did not think it proper to explain (178). This gives me alſo ſome hints to conjecture why Beza left Lauſanne; for we muſt be perſuaded that he was amongſt thoſe, who went away with Viret *for very good reaſons*. The circumſtance of the time perſuades me of it. For in 1559 he began to teach in the Univerſity of Geneva; and he tells us, that the Profeſſors were choſen amongſt thoſe, who retired to Geneva with Viret. Now, ſince he retired from Lauſanne with ſo great a man, and for the ſame reaſons, I infer from this, that it was not for ſome ſcandalous action, as his adverſaries have aſſerted (179); and I conjecture that the whole was nothing elſe, but an academical or conſiſtorial faction. Obſerve, that the Paſſage, from which I infer all this, is not in the Latin life of Calvin.

(175) In the addition to the remark [*G*] of the article of that Duke; and obſerve, that this is not found in the Latin Life of John Calvin.

(176) Beza, *Preface ſur Joſué*, edit. de Geneve, 1565, pag. 30.

(177) Ibid. pag. 31.

(178) See the remark [*A*] of the article VIRET.

(179) See the remark [*D*] of the article BEZA.

Neither that, nor the French of 1564, in 12*mo*, contain what I am going to tranſcribe. "In 1546 Calvin wrote in French a little book of advices, in "which he ſhews, how profitable it would be, to "make an inventory of all the relicks, which the Papiſts value ſo much, in France, Italy, Germany, "Spain, and other countries. There he diſplays not "only the abuſes and idolatry occaſioned by them, but "alſo the glaring lies of the Prieſts, who all pretend "to have the ſame thing in different Churches, Cities, and Countries. He has not mentioned all thoſe "relicks, but only quoted ſome inſtances, and even a "good many, and of ſuch things, as cannot be denied. Yet he intended to enlarge his book, if he "could have had a particular account of ſuch relicks, "from the countries we have mentioned, and which "abound with them. And indeed he uſed ſometimes "to rebuke his friends, tho' in a bantering manner, "for not having procured him fuller accounts of ſuch "relicks. However, there was little to be expected "that way from France, God be praiſed; for the war "has furniſhed ſo many opportunities of breaking "and deſtroying that rubbiſh, that there remains nothing more to be done, than to pray God, that he be "pleaſed to take away, what may ſtill remain of it, "either in France, or in any other country, and that "by ſome method leſs detrimental to the people "(180)."

(180) Beza, Pref. upon Calvin's *Commentary on Joſhua*, pag. 15.

There is in this Edition of 1565, a more particular account of Calvin's diſputes with Bolſec, with Caſtalio, and with Gentilis, &c. than in the Latin Life, and than in the firſt Edition of the French life.

The Author had committed a few errors, which he corrected afterwards. He had ſaid, that Calvin publiſhed his inſtitution at Baſil in 1534 (181); we do not find that in the Edition of 1565. He had ſaid, that Calvin married the widow of John Strordeur, *called Idelette de Bure, with whom he lived ſo peaceably, till the Lord took her away from him in* 1548, *having had no children by him* (182): but his words in the Edition of 1595 are, *he always lived peaceably with her*, till the Lord took her away, without any children; for tho' ſhe had had a child by him (183), yet it died immediately (184). Some pages after he obſerves (185), that ſhe died in March 1549.

(181) Beza, *Hiſt. de la Vie & de la Mort de Calvin*, fol. m. ciii. *verſo*, edit. 1564, 12mo.

(182) Ibid. the laſt leaf of the ſheet C.

(183) See above, the remark [*S*].

(184) Beza, *Pref. ſur Joſue*, pag. 21.

(185) pag. 17.

He did not correct all that he ſhould have corrected; for he ſays in the Edition of 1565, as well as in the preceding, and in the Latin life, that Calvin being twenty four years old dedicated his *Commentary upon Seneca's book concerning* Clemency, *to one of the Lords de Mommor, with whom he had been maintained in the ſchools at Paris, tho' not at that Lord's expence* (186). Now is it certain that this Book was dedicated April the 4th 1532, to Claude Hangeſt, Abbot of St. Eloi at Noyon: Calvin was not then quite twenty three years old. See the Remark [*B*].

(186) Ibid. pag. 6.

[*GG*] *A great clamour was raiſed againſt Calvin, becauſe he charged the Popes and the Cardinals with ridiculing the Chriſtian Religion.*] I have mentioned in another place (187) how the Jeſuit John Hay relates the words of this charge: Mr. de Sponde relates them in the ſame manner, but he obſerves, that Calvin adds, *that tho' all are not of that opinion, and tho' few ſpeak thus, yet it is long ſince that Religion* * *began to be in uſe with the Pope, as is well known to thoſe, who are acquainted with the Court of Rome* (188). "Did he "not bluſh, continues Mr. de Sponde, when he wrote "theſe blaſphemies? Or rather did he not turn pale, "for fear God ſhould tear off the hand that wrote "them? If this were true, and he believed it was ſo, "why did he not bring in his proofs for it, ſince he "was ſo zealous for our ſalvation. The Miniſter "Coladon, who gave an Edition of his Inſtitution in "the year 1576, acknowledging that this was an offenſive paſſage, endeavoured to ſupport it by the authority of Eraſmus in a letter to one Steuchus †, "where he ſays, *There may be ſome in Germany, who "do not forbear blaſpheming againſt God, but they are "condemned to very terrible puniſhments. But I have "myſelf heard ſome at Rome, who uttered abominable "blaſphemies againſt Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and "that in preſence of ſeveral other perſons, who heard "them as well as I, and yet they were not puniſhed.* "I have not at preſent Eraſmus's Book at hand; but "it is eaſy to judge, from the paſſage quoted by Coladon, that Eraſmus ſpeaks of the diſſolute mob, "which at Rome as well as all over the world, is "uſed to blaſpheme, and the Reformed themſelves "know, how many there are even amongſt them, "who are guilty of that crime. There may be ſome "at Rome; and even ſome men worſe than blaſphemers; but that this is a point of ſecret doctrine, "is what Calvin can never prove, and that paſſage "alone of his works, ſhews him to have been a man "obſtinately reſolved to proſecute his deſigns ††."

(187) In the remark [*H*] of the article CASTELLANUS.

* That there is no God, and that all that is contained in the Bible are mere fables.

(188) Spond. *Declaration des principaux motifs*, pag. 203. edit. of Antwerp 1595.

† Eraſm. *Epiſt. ad Steuchum.*

†† That is, of calumniating the Roman Catholics.

It is certain, that Eraſmus does not ſpeak of a diſſolute mob: for he mentions ſome Prieſts of the Pope's Palace. Let us tranſcribe the whole paſſage, and obobſerve by the way, that he brings it as an anſwer to the charge of impiety, which Steuchus had loaded the Proteſtants with. *Interdum ſtilum odioſius ſtringis, mea ſententia, quam par eſt in Germanos, veluti Deuteronomii capite ſexto, quum is locus non porrigat anſam incandeſcendi.* Neque enim, *inquis*, hoc dicimus, quorundam Germanorum imitati procacitatem, qui ſibi omnibus & Diis, & hominibus, & humanis, & divinis rebus maledicendi licentiam uſurparunt. *Ita tu quidem. Fieri poteſt, ut in Germaniâ ſint, qui non temperent a blaſphemiis in Deum; ſed in hos horrendis ſupplíciis animadvertitur. At ego Romæ his auribus audivi quoſdam abominandis blaſphemiis debacchantes in Chriſtum, & in illius Apoſtolos, idque multis mecum audientibus, & quidem impunè. Ibidem multos novi, qui commemorabant, ſe dicta horrenda audiſſe a quibuſdam Sacerdotibus aulæ Pontificiæ miniſtris, idque in ipſa Miſſâ, tam clarè, ut ea vox ad multorum aures pervenerit* (189).

(189) Eraſmus, Epiſt. 34. lib. 26. pag. 1456.

☞CALVISIUS (SETH), a celebrated Chronologer in the beginning of the ſeventeenth Century, was born in a village called Gorſchleben near Saxoburg in Thuringia, February

February the 21ſt 1556 of honeſt parents, though in very low circumſtances [*A*]. His father dying while he was very young, his mother gave him as good an education as her circumſtances would permit, finding that his genius led him to learning, though ſome perſons would have perſuaded her to put him to a trade. He went to Franchuſe at thirteen years of age, and three years after removed to Magdeburg, in both which places he ſupported himſelf chiefly by ſinging from door to door with others of his companions; and by this means ſaved money enough to maintain himſelf in the Univerſity of Helmſtadt, after he had lived ſeven years at Magdeburg. He went to Helmſtadt in 1579, and the year following removed to Leipſic, and was appointed Chantor in the illuſtrious *Schola Portenſis ad Salam* in November 1582 [*B*]. In this ſtation he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Hiſtory and Chronology, and laid the foundation of that great work of Chronology, which he afterwards finiſhed at Leipſic [*C*]. Having continued eleven years and an half in the ſchool abovemention'd he was choſen by the Senate of Leipſic Governor of the Choir of Muſick in the *Schola Thomana* in that City in May 1594. In this province he diſtinguiſhed himſelf to great advantage by his ſkill in Muſic, his diligence and ſucceſs in the inſtruction of the youth in the ſchool, and his uncommon knowledge

[*A*] *Of honeſt parents, tho' in very low circumſtances.*] His father James Kalwitz, was an huſband-man, and ſupported himſelf and his family by his labour, in a tolerable manner, though with difficulty. His mother Elizabeth Krumin, after her huſband's death, practiſed midwifry for thirty years. *Parentibus honeſtis quidem ac probis, ſed non magnâ cum re, ſicut de Ennio quoque alicubi Cicero meminit. Pater fuit Jacobus Kalwitz, loci illius incola, vir bonus, qui, quoad vixit, ruſticis operis ſe ſuoſque laborioſe & difficulter, attamen honeſtè ſuſtentavit. Mater, Elizabetha Krumin, honeſta quoque fœmina, quæ poſt mariti obitum ad puerperia iis in locis eſt adhibita feliciter annos ſupra xxx* (1).

(1) *Programma Rectoris Academiæ Lipſienſis in funus B. Autoris* prefixed to Calviſius's *Chronology*, edit. Francfort 1685, in fol.

[*B*] *Appointed Chantor of the illuſtrious* Schola Portenſis ad Salam *in Nov.* 1582.] He continued in this laborious employment almoſt twelve years with that fidelity, diligence, and ſucceſs in the inſtruction of the youth, that he was univerſally approved. He publiſh'd there a Tract upon Muſic, which was greatly applauded; and beſides Muſic he taught likewiſe in that School the Elements of the Hebrew Tongue (2).

(2) Ibid.

[*C*] *Laid the foundation of that great work of Chronology, which he afterwards finiſhed at Leipſic.*] The firſt edition of it was publiſhed at Francfort in folio, In his *Apology* for it dated October 5, 1604, and addreſſed to the Governors of the Univerſity of Leipſic, printed in the *Appendix* to the edition of his *Chronology* at Francfort 1685 in fol. he obſerves, that while he lived in the illuſtrious *Schola Portenſis*, where he enjoyed a good deal of leiſure, and a large Library, he applied himſelf to Hiſtory, and noted down the particular periods of the moſt conſiderable events; but was not able to draw up a Syſtem of Chronology, till Joſeph Scaliger's Book *de Emendatione Temporum* was reprinted at Francfort in 1593. Upon this he read over and examined that work with great attention, and compared it with all the Chronologers, whom he could procure, and enquired into the reaſons of the ſeveral diſagreements in Chronology. At laſt he found that all the certainty of it depends upon the laws of Aſtronomy, and that thoſe Chronologers, who neglect aſtronomical Calculations, have fallen into the moſt palpable miſtakes. For this reaſon he undertook to explain in an obvious and popular method, what Scaliger had performed with greater ſubtilty and abſtruſeneſs; and he examined all the ſeveral epocha's with the utmoſt accuracy, enquired into the grounds of their certainty, confirmed them by proper demonſtrations, and ſolidly and clearly refuted whatever might be objected. *Quapropter ipſe aggreſſus rem, quæ Joſephus Scaliger ſubtilius perſecutus fuerat, populari & omnibus obvio modo explicare conatus ſum, omnes epochas diligentiſſimè excuſſi, quæ cauſa certitudinis earundem eſſet, inveſtigavi, demonſtrationibus eaſdem munivi, & quæ contradici poſſent, ſolidè & evidenter refutavi.* This coſt him a prodigious deal of labour, ſince he was obliged to calculate above an hundred and fifty eclipſes, that is, all that were mentioned by the Hiſtorians, in order to determine the times of the particular events. He drew up likewiſe Aſtronomical Tables, by which the equable motion of the Moon may be eaſily diſcovered with regard both to the longitude and latitude, ſo that by theſe Tables any perſon, tho' ignorant of Aſtronomy, may certainly affirm, that the eclipſes mentioned by Hiſtorians to mark out any particular event, happened at the time aſſigned. To theſe he added the proceſſion of the Equinoxes and Solſtices, and ſeveral other Tables; and ſhewed by tables or the moſt certain rules how any epocha may be rightly compared with any other; which was never done by any Chronologer before him. He added to all theſe a Chronology from the beginning of the world to his own time; in which he inſerted the Hiſtory of all Ages, deſcribed by ſuch circumſtances, that even children might comprehend in their minds a continued ſeries or ſynopſis of Hiſtory. *Adjunxi hiſce omnibus Praxin, hoc eſt, Chronologiam à condito mundo ad noſtra uſque tempora deductam, cui hiſtorias omnium temporum admiſcui, ejuſmodi circumſtantiis deſcriptas, ut adoleſcentes vel pueri continuam hiſtoriarum ſeriem vel ſynopſin animo concipere & comprehendere poſſent.* When he had finiſhed this work, he determined to publiſh it at the perſuaſion of his friends; upon which he delivered it to the Profeſſor of Hiſtory in the Univerſity of Leipſic for his opinion, who having kept it about a month, at laſt committed it to Dr. Meurer, the Mathematical Profeſſor, for his judgment, becauſe there were a great many Aſtronomical Calculations in it. Dr. Meurer having examined it, declared that the Aſtronomical Calculations were right. Calviſius thought the whole affair was now concluded, but it happened otherwiſe; for the Profeſſor of Hiſtory reſolving to ſuppreſs this Chronology, had recourſe to the Governors of the Univerſity to prevent the publication of it, ſince nothing is ſuffered to be printed there without their permiſſion. He complained, as our Author obſerves in his Letter to Joſeph Scaliger dated at Leipſic Jan. 4th 1606, that there were a great many innovations in it contrary to the received doctrine; that ſeveral weak arguments were made uſe of; that the youth would be thrown into confuſion by it in their ſtudies; that Calviſius had uſurped another man's province, ſince he was not the Profeſſor of Hiſtory. And by ſuch arguments as theſe he prevailed upon the Governors of the Univerſity to prohibit the impreſſion of it. *M. D. igitur hiſtoricus, cui ex lege cenſenda venerat mea Chronologia, cauſatus multa ineſſe contra publicam doctrinam novata; argumenta proferri infirma, quæ facilè convelli poſſunt; turbari diſcentium ſtudia; me curare ἀλλότρια, cum profeſſio hiſtoriarum mihi demandata non ſit; & talia hujuſmodi perſuadet Academicis, ut interdicant.* Our Author wrote the abovementioned *Apology* to the Governors of the Univerſity, and appealed to others and offered to demonſtrate his Scheme by Aſtronomy. At laſt after the Academical Council had been called ſeveral times, he gained his cauſe, not ſo much by the ſuffrages of the Judges, as by the favour of ſome perſons, who were for following Gamaliel's advice in this point; ſuch was the influence that his antagoniſt's authority had over many of them. *Quid facerem? Scribo Apologiam ad Academicos. Provoco etiam ad alios. Offero me ad demonſtrationem aſtronomicam; & tandem cum Concilium Academicum aliquoties convocatum eſſet, cauſam obtineo, non tamen tam judicantium ſuffragiis ex re ſumptis, quam quorundam benevolentiâ, Gamalielis conſilium hîc ſequendum putantium; adeò* M. D.

ledge in the moſt abſtruſe parts of Aſtronomy and Chronology. He wrote ſeveral excellent Treatiſes upon Muſic, and compiled a *Theſaurus* of the Latin tongue for the uſe of the youth. His writings gained him ſo great a reputation, that ſeveral Univerſities and States made him very conſiderable offers to ſettle among them, particularly the Univerſity of Wittemberg, which offered him the Profeſſorſhip of Mathematics, and that of Francfort, which propoſed to him honourable conditions. But he preferred his humble and laborious ſtation at Leipſic to the moſt ſplendid titles in other places, and lived in a very frugal and modeſt manner. He married Magdalen the daughter of John Junigen, a Citizen of Leipſic, February the 10th 1595, by whom he had three ſons and one daughter. One of his ſons died in his infancy. Our Author died at Leipſic November the 23d 1615, with great ſentiments of devotion, and was interred there the 27th of the ſame month (*a*). Beſides the works abovementioned he publiſhed at Erford 1610 in 4to, *Enodatio duarum Quæſtionum, viz. circa Annum Nativitatis & Tempus Miniſterii Chriſti*; and in 1612 *Elenchus Calendarii Gregoriani, & duplex Calendarii melioris Forma. Franc. Marchionum* in 4to. In this *Elenchus* he propoſes two points; firſt to explode the Gregorian Calendar by the principles of Aſtronomy, and next to point out a truer and more convenient form of a Calendar. Our Author is reckoned among the Heretics of the firſt rank in the *Index Expurgatorius* publiſhed at Madrid in 1667.

(*a*) Ex *Programmate Rectoris Academiæ Lipſienſis in funus B. Authoris*, prefixed to Calviſius's *Chronology*, edit. Francfort 1685.

M. D. autoritas & opinio ſani judicii prævalebat. Dr. David Pareus, Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Heidelberg, and Elias Reuſner, Profeſſor of Hiſtory in the Univerſity of Jena, and John Kepler the celebrated Mathematician, wrote againſt this work of our Author; but without any conſiderable ſucceſs. It was highly approved of by Joſeph Scaliger, as appears from ſeveral of his Letters. In his 115th Letter addreſſed to Iſaac Caſaubon he ſtiles it a moſt accurate Chronicle, *accuratiſſimum Chronicon*; and in his 117th Letter addreſſed to Caſaubon he ſays, that it is the only work, which after ſo many Ages was worthy of the title of a Chronology, and deſerved to be immortal. *Solum illud eſt, quod poſt tot ſæcula Chronologiæ nomine dignum ſit, & ſanè meretur immortalitatem.* In his 240th Letter, addreſſed to Richard Thomſon, he ſtiles our Author a very learned German, though before the publication of his book unknown to him, and obſerves that his Chronology was excellent, being confirmed throughout by his (Scaliger's) reaſons; and that he was a very good and learned man, and the firſt among the Chronologers, who ceaſed to triſle, his work being admirable, uſeful, and full of all kinds of learning. *Alo tibi, doctiſſimum Germanum, aliàs ignotum mihi, Sethum Calviſium, eximium Chronicon rationibus noſtris per omnia munitum edidiſſe, cujus exemplar ad me miſit. . . Solus ille optimus & eruditiſſimus vir repertus eſt, qui inter chronologos nugari deſiverit. Opus eſt præſtantiſſimum, utiliſſimum, & omni doctrinâ refertiſſimum.* In his 439th letter addreſſed to John de Laet, he obſerves that ever ſince he had publiſhed his works with relation to Chronology, which had been ſo long neglected before, no perſon had ſpent an hour in reading his books, or examining his reaſons, till at laſt Seth Calviſius aroſe, who was worth all the reſt, being an accurate maſter of that ſubject, and publiſhed a moſt learned and complete Chronology, which entirely depended upon his reaſonings, and was an heroic work, and worthy immortality. *Ex quo tempore Chronologica tamdiu ignorata publicavimus, nemo extitit, qui aut horam lectioni Librorum noſtrorum impendere, aut rationes noſtras probare voluerit. Unus tandem, qui inſtar omnium erit, accuratiſſimus, & harum literarum peritiſſimus Sethus Calviſius, Germanus, nuper eruditiſſimum & conſummatiſſimum Chronicon edidit, quod totum rationum noſtrarum inſiſtit munimentis, opus heroicum & æternitate dignum.* See likewiſe his 308th Letter. Theodorus Spizelius in his *Templum Honoris reſeratum* (3) tells us, that our Author in this exquiſite work has ſhewn ſo much acuteneſs and judgment, that if he has any equals, he appears to have had none ſuperior to him in our age in that ſcience. He obſerves likewiſe, that Calviſius ſpent twenty years intirely in this work, which he confirmed by demonſtrations in ſuch a manner, that his induſtry is not only highly applauded in all parts of Germany, but alſo among foreign nations, and that among all the diſputes of Chronologers there will not be any one eaſily found, who has ſhewn by Aſtronomical reaſoning, that our Author has been guilty of any groſs error. *Sethus Calviſius tantam in exquiſitiſſimo opere ſuo Chronico oſtendit ingenii acrimoniam ac judicii dexteritatem, ut ſi pares aliquos in hoc genere, ſuperiores ſane ævo noſtro nullos habuiſſe videatur. Totos viginti annos accuratæ operis ſui Chronologici impendit elaborationi, idque hujuſmodi firmavit demonſtrationibus, ut non ſolum in tota Germania, ſed etiam apud exteras nationes mirificè commendata ſit Viri induſtria, nec quiſquam in tantis Chronologorum diſſenſionibus facile inventus fuerit, qui craſſæ cujuſdam falſitatis Calviſii Chronologiam arguere aut convincere Aſtronomicâ potuerit Veritate.* Degory Whear in his *Reflectiones Hyemales de ratione & methodo legendi utraſque Hiſtoricas, Civiles & Eccleſiaſticas* (4) tells us, that Calviſius exerted himſelf with ſo much induſtry in the late Edition of his work, that he has omitted nothing, but given us a true ſyſtem of Chronology in an exquiſite manner. . . . *Sethum Calviſium, qui nuperâ ſuæ Chronologiæ editione operoſam adeo diligentiam adhibuit, ut nihil quicquam omiſerit, quo verum Hiſtoriarum tempus exquiſite doceatur.* Dr. Richard Montague, Biſhop of Chicheſter, in his *Apparatus II.* (5) obſerves that Calviſius was without controverſy a man excellently well ſkilled in Chronology, but too fond of innovations. *Sethus Calviſius, vir citra controverſiam in re Chronologicâ verſatiſſimus, ſed nimium pronus ad innovandum.* T.

(3) *Apud* Blount, *Cenſur. Celebriorum Authorum*, pag. 897. edit. Genev. 1694, in 4to.

(4) Sect. 6. pag. 44. edit. Oxon. 1637.

(5) Sect. 41.

CAMALDOLI (AMBROSE DE) *Ambroſius Camaldulenſis*, ſo called becauſe he was Abbot General of the Order of Camaldoli, was one of the moſt learned men of the fifteenth Century. He was born near Florence at Portico, a ſmall City in Romagna (*a*); he learnt the Greek tongue under Emanuel Chryſoloras, who taught it at Venice (*b*). He entered into the Order of Camaldoli at the age of fourteen, and was made General of it in 1431 (*c*). He had had other employments before this in that Order, in which he had then lived thirty years (*d*). Pope Eugenius IV, who had a great eſteem for him, ſent him to the Council of Baſil, and had reaſon to be ſatisfied with his zeal for the ſupport of the authority of the See of Rome. This General continued to exert the ſame zeal in the Councils of Ferrara and Florence, in which he diſputed with great ardour againſt the Greeks. At Ferrara he addreſſed in 1437 a Greek Oration to John (*e*) Paleologus Emperor of Conſtantinople, and obliged the Greeks to own, that none amongſt the Latins underſtood their language better than he did (*f*). Pope Eugenius ſent him to Florence, in order to prevail with the inhabitants, that the Council of Ferrara might be transferred to their City. He obtained from them what the Pope deſired, and was choſen to draw

(*a*) Volater. lib. 21.
(*b*) Wharton, *Append. ad* Cave, *Hiſt. Liter. Script. Eccleſ.*
(*c*) Idem, ibid.

(*d*) *Hodæporicon*, Ambr. Camaldul. pag. 1.

(*e*) Voſſius, who calls him Emanuel, *De Hiſt. Latin.* pag. 555. is miſtaken.
(*f*) Sguropulus, *Hiſt. Concil. Flor.* Sect. 10. cap. 2.

draw up the articles of union between the Latin and Greek Churches (*g*). Sguropulus charges him not only with an extreme partiality in favour of the Pope, but alſo with hypocriſy and knavery (*b*)[*A*]. Ambroſe diſtributed amongſt the poor Greeks, the ſmall ſums which the Pope allowed them. He collected a very large Library in the Convent of St. Mary de Angelis, where he lived (*i*), and tranſlated a great many books out of Greek into Latin, as thoſe of Dionyſius Areopagita *de cæleſti Hierarchia*, thoſe of Manuel Calecas againſt the errors of the Greeks, the Life of St. Chryſoſtom by Palladius, the Theophraſtus of Æneas Gaza [*B*], the *Pratum* of John Moſchus, St. John Climacus, ſeveral Sermons of St. Ephrem, &c. It is ſaid that Gerard Voſſius, Provoſt of Tongres, has been guilty of an enormous piece of Plagiariſm with regard to this laſt Tranſlation (*k*). Ambroſe did not content himſelf with tranſlating the writings of ſeveral Fathers of the Church; he would alſo try his ſkill upon Heathen Authors, and choſe one who is none of the eaſieſt, I mean Diogenes Laertius, nor indeed did he ſucceed very well in that Tranſlation (*l*). The works of his own compoſing are a Chronicle of the Abbey of Mount Caſſino, an Hiſtory of his own actions, whilſt he was General of the Order of Camaldoli, the Lives of ſome Saints, ſome Orations, a Treatiſe *de Sacramento admirabili corporis Chriſti, &c.* Some add to theſe a Treatiſe of the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt [*C*]. As he had wrote a vaſt number of Letters, Coſmus de Medicis, who had a very great eſteem for him (*m*), had them collected into one volume by a Monk of Camaldoli. This volume has not yet been publiſhed (*α*), it is kept in the Library of Florence; we are in hopes that it will be publiſhed with the notes of Nicholas Bartholini, who has already publiſhed Ambroſe's *Hodæporicon*, a work which ſhews, both that the Author was an honeſt man, and that he lived in a very corrupt age [*D*]. They who ſay he died in 1490 (*n*) are miſtaken

(*b*) Ἀνὴρ ποικίλος μὲν καὶ πανοῦργος πρόσχημα δὲ περικείμενος εὐλαβείας. Sguropul. *Hiſt. Concil. Florent.* Sect. 7. cap. 1.

(*g*) Wharton; *Append. ad* Cave, *Hiſt. Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.*

(*i*) Jovius *in Elog.*

(*k*) Wharton; *Append. ad* Cave; *Hiſt. Script. Eccl.*

(*l*) See the Preface of Valentine Curio upon Diogenes Laertius, edit. 1544, *apud* Geſner, *Biblioth.* folio 32.

(*m*) *Hodæporicon Ambroſii, ſub fin.*

(*n*) Bellarm. *De Scriptor. Eccleſ.* & *Ibi* Phil. Labbe, Hofman, Moreri, Konig, Baillet.

[*A*] *Sguropulus charges him . . . with hypocriſy and knavery.*] There are few perſons but have ſpoken of this Author in a quite different manner. We meet with ſome ſtrokes in his works, which entirely confute Sguropulus's calumny; and after all, it is certain, that one of the moſt ſatyrical writers of his time, gave a moſt authenthic teſtimony, of our Ambroſius's honeſty. I mean Poggius of Florence. Here follows what he ſays of Ambroſius, in his Dialogue againſt the Hypocrites, in which he levels his ſtrokes every way againſt the moſt illuſtrious men. *Quid, Carolus inquit, de noſtro Ambroſio judicatis? rectâne an tortuoſâ philoſophabatur viâ? nunquid vobis hypocriſim redolebat? Nequaquam, Hieronymus inquit; fuit enim vir optimus, meo judicio, ac probatiſſimus, qui in ſuo cœnobio literis deditus multa ſcripſit magnâ cum laude & Doctrinâ. Summa certe fuit præditus humanitate ac virtute. Laudo vitam illius, Carolus inquit, & exiſtimo extra hypocriſim fuiſſe, &c.* i. e. "What do "you think, ſaid Charles, of our Ambroſius? has he "philoſophized the right way or not? did he alſo ſa"vour hypocriſy? Not at all, anſwered Jerom, for "he was, in my opinion, a very good and honeſt "man; who ſtudying in his Convent, gained a great "reputation by his many learned writings. He was "a very polite and virtuous man. I commend his "manner of living, ſaid Charles, and believe that "he was not guilty of hypocriſy, &c." Father Nicholas Bartholini quotes this paſſage at the end of the *Hodæporicon*, and tells us, that this Dialogue of Poggius was going to be printed under the care of ſome Frenchmen, to whoſe requeſts Mr. Magliabecchi could not refuſe it. Paul Jovius, who ſometimes ſpeaks more evil than good of thoſe, whoſe Elogiums he writes, acknowledges, that the General of Camaldoli, by an uncommon happineſs, united together piety with good humour, and that he was ſo free from envy, and from a ſpirit of contradiction, that when he endeavoured to reconcile Poggius with Laurence Valla, he declared to them, that they acted neither as true men of letters, nor like Chriſtians, ſince they diſgraced the dignity of the ſciences by their ſatirical writings. *Fuit hic vir, quod rarò evenit, ſine oris triſtitia, ſanctus, ſemper utique ſuavis, atque ſerenus; ita procul a livore contentioneque, ut cum Vallæ Poggium reconciliare conaretur, eos neque plane literatos, neque item Chriſtianos videri diceret, qui inducta ſimultate ſacroſanctum literarum decus probroſis libellis importunè defædarent* (1).

(1) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 11.

[*B*] *He tranſlated . . .* The Theophraſtus of Æneas Gaza.] I make a remark upon this Tranſlation only that I may have an opportunity of obſerving, that our Ambroſe made a voyage, which few people have mentioned. I ſay then, that he went to Conſtantinople with Guarini and Philelphus, in order to improve himſelf in the Greek Tongue; and that on his return he paſſed thro' the Iſland of Scio, where Andreolo Juſtiniani, who was a great lover of learning, and a patron of the learned, received our travellers with the greateſt kindneſs. Ambroſe dedicated to him his Tranſlation of Æneas Gaza, a proof of his gratitude (2).

(2) See the Dedication of Auguſtine Juſtiniani, grandſon of Andreolo, prefixed to that Tranſlation, in the edition of Venice 1513. See alſo the Tranſlator's dedication.

[*C*] *Some reckon among his works a Treatiſe of the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt.*] Voſſius (3), after he had obſerved, that Poſſevinus, Trithemius and ſome others (4), aſcribe to the General of the Camaldoli a Book concerning the Holy Ghoſt, adds, that they ſeem to have taken for a work of this General, what is only a tranſlation. Mr. Wharton, who wrote a great while after Voſſius, yet aſcribes the original of that work to Ambroſe; he alſo makes him the author of a work *contra vituperatores monaſticæ vitæ*; (againſt the deſpiſers of a monaſtic life), which is, ſays he (5), amongſt the manuſcripts of the Library of St. Juſtin at Padua, and which neither Bellarminus nor Poncianicius have mentioned. But I don't doubt, but that work is only the tranſlation of Chryſoſtom's three Books *adverſus vitæ monaſticæ vituperatores*, which Volaterranus did not forget to mention, when he ſpoke of our Author. See alſo Father Labbe (6) in the account of the fourth volume of St. Chryſoſtom's works, according to the Paris edition 1614: and Geſner's Bibliotheca, in the account of the works of the ſame Father printed at Baſil in 1530. This work, as tranſlated by our Ambroſe, is mentioned in both theſe editions.

(3) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Latin.* pag. 556.

(4) Volaterranus, and Bellarminus are of that number.

(5) *Ex* Tomaſino.

(6) *De Scriptoribus. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. 1. pag. 534.

* (*α*) *That volume has not yet been publiſhed.*] It has been ſince inſerted in the third volume of the Fathers Martenne's and Durand's *work, intitled, Veterum Scriptorum & Monumentorum Collectio.* Paris, 1724. *fol.* Ambroſe, at the perſuaſion of his friends, had begun to make a collection of the Letters, which he wrote to ſeveral perſons, and his diſciples finiſhed that collection. But the Manuſcripts, which have been kept of them, are not compleat. Father Mabillon being in Italy got a copy tranſcribed from the manuſcript, which he thought the moſt compleat; it contained 548 letters divided into eighteen Books. He alſo cauſed thoſe letters to be tranſcribed from other manuſcripts, which were wanting in that. The Fathers Martenne and Durand have collected them in two other Books which contain 89 Letters; ſo that there are in all 637 Letters divided into 20 Books. Moſt of theſe Letters relate only to the particular affairs of his order, and therefore cannot be very diverting, nor material. Thoſe of the firſt Book, which are addreſſed to Pope Eugenius IV, are more important, becauſe they contain ſeveral particulars concerning the Councils of Baſil and Florence. We alſo meet in theſe letters with a few hints concerning the lives and characters of the learned men of his time. The Editors of theſe letters have added to them the Prefaces, which Ambroſe prefixed to his ſeveral tranſlations (*α*) ADD. REM.

(*α*) Niceron, *Mem. pour ſervir à l'Hiſt. des Hom. illuſt.* tom. 19. pag. 18, 19.

[*D*] *His* Hodœporicon *ſhews, both that the Author was an honeſt man, and that he lived in a very corrupt age.*] This work contains an account of a journey,

miſtaken [*E*], nor is it very probable that thoſe are in the right, who pretend that he died at Conſtance. His corps is depoſited in the Oratory of Camaldoli, without any epitaph

ney, which Ambroſe made to ſeveral parts of Italy in the years 1431, and 1432. He ſet out from his Convent October the 11th 1431, to go to the general chapter of the Order of Camaldoli. That chapter depoſed the General, and choſe our Ambroſe in his ſtead, who went afterwards to viſit ſeveral Monaſteries of his Order. He found every where an extreme corruption of manners. Some Nunneries were perfect bawdy-houſes; which our Author choſe to expreſs in Greek, rather than in Latin; *deprehendi* ἐπιτήδια *in monaſterio commorari, non ſanctimoniales* (7). He inveighs bitterly againſt ſuch a diſorder; and the Abbeſs owned at laſt, that the Nuns did not behave as they ought in that Convent; but that neither ſhe, nor ſome of the moſt aged ſiſters followed the bad example. He was not ſilly enough to be ſatisfied with ſuch an imperfect confeſſion; he found out the whole extent of the evil; he ſtrictly forbad the Nuns to admit any Monk or any Layman in their Monaſtery, and threatened them to have it pulled down, and burnt, if the ill reports ſhould continue. It is probable that he was not ſo cunning, or ſo happy with regard to another Convent; he had at firſt a bad opinion of it; but upon enquiry, he thought he had found things better than he expected. But when he was gone away, he was aſſured, that his enquiry had been very imperfect, and that almoſt all the Nuns of that Convent were Ladies of pleaſure; *omnes fermè* πόρναι εἶναι (8). He was extremely vexed at it, tho' he could not perſuade himſelf, that they had evaded his reſearches. He returned to the Convent, and diſcovered, that a Prior had debauched a Nun, who made her eſcape afterwards; the Abbeſs owned to him, that ſhe had had a child; *Ejus confeſſione ſimplici* τέκνον ποιήσαι *eam comperimus* (9): Afterwards he contents himſelf with ſaying only in general, that he had found ſeveral things, which deſerved correction. *Plurima ibi quæ correctione digna eſſent, invenimus.* He did not find leſs irregularity in the Convents of men. There were ſome in which the Monks had fought with ſticks and ſwords, and where the Prior was accuſed of ſo many lewd actions, that it was not thought proper to come to law-proceedings (10). Things were examined, and the criminal was convicted as ſecretly as could be; and after a pretty favourable ſentence, and ſome written regulations for the future, the criminal was cenſured by word of mouth for his crime, and only before a very few witneſſes; and care was taken, for the honour of the Convent, that nothing ſhould be left in writing upon that ſubject (11). Sometimes he ventures to ſpeak plain, without having recourſe to the Greek tongue. *Et ex matre Domini, & ex pleriſque aliis perceperamus* PROSTIBULUM *illud eſſe. Deprehendimus rem opinione etiam deteriorem* (12). i. e. "By the account of the Convent of the Lord's Mother, and of "ſeveral others, we have found, that they are down-"right *bawdy-houſes*, things have been found even "worſe than we expected." On another occaſion he was to declare, that the Prior of a Monaſtery had had a baſtard, and he chuſes to make uſe of the Greek word υἱὸς rather than of the Latin *Filius* (13). The Abbot de la Roque commends *our Ambroſe's prudence, for having choſen to expreſs* theſe great diſorders *in a language leſs known than the Latin, in order that they ſhould not be ſo public* (14). But he ſhould not have made that reflection, if he intended to concur with our Ambroſe; for they, who will know his precaution, will now more eaſily find out thoſe tickliſh paſſages, than they would have done; they have only to look for the Greek words, and they will immediately find, where the joke lies. There are few men, but are able to look for the ſenſe of a Greek word, when they can underſtand a Latin Book. The inſtance, which this General gives of the power of jealouſy is remarkable (15). An old Prieſt, who had been for a long time in love with an Abbeſs, fell in ſuch a paſſion, when he found himſelf diſappointed and ſupplanted by his rival, that he informed againſt the Nun, and ſhewed ſeveral ſmutty letters, which he had written to her. It did not appear by theſe letters, that the Abbeſs had yielded to his deſires, yet Ambroſe kept them, and objected them to her as a convincing proof. She did not own that ſhe had done any thing againſt her reputation, but ſhe confeſſed that ſhe had received the letters of the laſcivious old man.

This *Hodœporicon* was printed at Florence from a Manuſcript communicated by the famous Magliabecchi to F. Nicholas Bartholini, regular Clerk of the Congregation of the Lord's Mother. The year in which it was printed is not ſet down in the copy of which I make uſe, but it muſt have been in the year 1680, 1681, or 1682. Mr. Wharton had probably a copy of it, in which the title was different from that which is prefixed to my copy. For he tranſcribes it thus (16). *Hodœporicon, ſeu deſcriptio Itineris Eugenii Papæ auctoritate anno* 1431 *a ſe per Italiam ſuſcepti, ut corruptos Monachorum & Virginum clauſtralium mores emendaret.* There is nothing like this in my copy. I do not know what reaſons Mr. de la Roque had, to believe, that there had been already an Edition of this Work, and *that the ſtile of it is elegant.* It muſt be owned, that Ambroſe wrote well enough for a man of his profeſſion, and conſidering the time he lived in. But let us not ſay, as Monſieur Varillas does, that he *tranſlated* the Hierarchy aſcribed to St. Denys *with ſo much eloquence and clearneſs of ſtile, that no body could ſince that time come near his manner of writing* (17).

[*E*] *They who ſay he died in* 1490, *are miſtaken.*] I. If he had died in the year 1490, he would have lived to the age of an hundred and three years. Now, if he had come to ſo uncommon a period of life, it would certainly have been obſerved in an infinite number of Books, which ſpeak of him, or of learned men who lived very long. Since therefore no writer whatſoever obſerved this, we may infer from it, that he did not live ſo long (18). The proof of his having lived a hundred and three years, as is pretended, is as follows. He was fourteen years old when he became a Monk, and had already lived thirty years in his Convent when in 1431 he was ſent a Deputy to the General Chapter of his Order. He ſays it himſelf in the beginning of his *Hodœporicon*. II. The dedication of his letters ſpeaks of him as of a man who was not then living; and we are told there, that Coſmus de Medicis had made choice of a Monk of Camaldoli to make a collection of theſe letters. The Monk having acquitted himſelf of this commiſſion, dedicated the work to Coſmus de Medicis. All this ſuppoſes, that there paſſed ſome years ſince the Author's death, and the time when the dedication of his letters was written. Now that dedication was made before the year 1464, in which Coſmus died. III. Poggius of Florence, as Voſſius tells us (19), made the Funeral Oration of the General of Camaldoli; now, Poggius died in 1459; ſo that that General died long before the year 1490. What Voſſius ſays, that Poggius had been Ambroſe's diſciple, ſeems a little doubtful to me. For Poggius muſt have made a figure in the world before Ambroſe was known, and he was older than him. He began to be Secretary of the *Briefs* about the year 1407; he was a man of conſequence when the Council of Conſtance was held, when he gave an account of the puniſhment of John Stas in 1416; and ſince he died in 1459 at the age of fourſcore, it follows that he was born in the year 1229. Now Ambroſe was ſtill an obſcure mark, when the Council of Conſtance was held, and he was born in the year 1586, or 1587. Sandius is in the right to think, that Poggius was rather Ambroſe's ſchool-fellow in the ſtudy of the Greek tongue, than his ſcholar (20), but he ought not to have confuted Voſſius with regard to the Funeral Oration, ſince his argument, tho' conditionally propoſed, is grounded upon this falſe ſuppoſition, that Ambroſe lived till the year 1490. I ſhall obſerve by the way, a miſtake of Moreri; he ſays, tho' in a prepoſterous order, that Ambroſe *aſſiſted at the Councils of Baſil and Conſtance.* How could he prove this with regard to the laſt fact? IV. Bartholine (21) tells us, that Pope Eugenius VI, having been acquainted with the death of the General of Camaldoli, was very ſorry for it. *Dum ejus primum inaudita morte ſubita vi doloris abreptus in lachrymas & aliquandiu quoque ingemiſcens, cum ex nomine vocare non ceſſaret, in has voces indentidem erumpens,* AMBROSI *fili,*

(7) *Hodœporicon Ambroſii*, pag. 4.

(8) Pag. 26.

(9) Pag. 29.

(10) Pag. 30, 31.

(11) *Præcepta ſecretiora tradidimus, quæ ſcriptis ligare ob illius & noſtrum, ipſiuſque monaſterii honorem nolueramus* περὶ τῆς τῶν νέων συνουσίας, *& aliis hujuſmodi quibuſdam.*

(12) *Hodœporicon Ambroſii*, pag. 48.

(13) *Viſitavimus Priorem ipſius Monaſterii, & quæ de illo fama vulgaverat, vera eſſe deprehendimus, namque υἱὸν habuit, juvenem ingenii non mali, à quo ſcriptam Orationem acceperamus.* Hodœporicon Ambroſii, pag. 35.

(14) *Journal des Savans*, for March 2, 1682.

(15) *Hodœporicon Ambroſii*, pag. 64.

(16) Wharton, *Append. ad* Cave, *Hiſt. Scriptor. Eccleſ.*

(17) Varillas, *Anecdot. de Florence*, pag. 164.

(18) See the Remark [*A*] of the article CONRARUS.

(19) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 556.

(20) Sandius, *Not. in Voſſium, de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 212.

(21) *Hodœporicon Ambroſii*, pag. ult.

epitaph nor ornament [*F*]. A large account of his life, written by Auguſtin of Florence, is annexed to the Hiſtory of Camaldoli, containing three books, written by the ſame Auguſtin. Father Labbe was miſtaken, when he ſaid, that this Author wrote three books of that life (*o*). Mr. Wharton has cenſured that error.

(*o*) Labbe, *De Script. Eccleſ.* tom. 1. pag. 45.

fili, quis te mihi eripuit, quis Ecclesiæ Lumen *adeò intempeſtive extinxit?* i. e. "Hearing of the death of "Ambroſius, which had not been told him before, he "was ſeized on a ſudden with ſuch a grief, that he "could not forbear ſhedding tears, and now and then "he uſed to ſigh, calling him conſtantly, and crying "out, O Ambrose my ſon, who has ſnatched thee "from me, who has extinguiſhed that Light of the "Church ſo unſeaſonably?" This Pope died in 1447. If Ambroſe died before him, what do ſo many Authors mean, who obſerve with one accord, that he lived very long (22)? And what reaſon had Paul Jovius to ſay, that Ambroſius was admired by Eugenius IV, and Nicholas V (23)? Some pretend that both theſe Popes had a mind to make him a Cardinal (24). However that be, they are miſtaken, who ſuppoſe there was an intercourſe of friendſhip between him and Poljtian (25); for the latter was not born till the year 1454.

They were printing this, when a friend of mine (26), whom I had deſired to conſult *Auguſtinus Florentinus*, let me know, 1. That we read there, that Ambroſe died October the firſt 1439, on his return from the Council of Florence, to which he had ſubſcribed (27), and that he enter'd into the Order at the age of fourteen years and twenty two days, in the year 1400 (28). 2. That Don Thomas de Minis a Florentine, who publiſhed the Catalogue of the Saints of the Order of Camaldoli in 1606 at Florence, ſays in page 45, that Ambroſe the thirty fifth General died in 1539. I wonder, that Mr. Wharton, who had the work of Auguſtinus Florentinus in his hands, ſhould have made our Ambroſe flouriſh in the year 1440, and ſhould have repreſented him as living ſtill longer. Voſſius, who made him flouriſh in the year 1450, was not well acquainted with this whole affair, nor did he rightly quote Jacobus Bergamenſis, who mentions our Ambroſe under the year 1431, and not as Voſſius ſays, under the year 1449.

(22) *Exceſſit è vitâ plane ſenex.* Jovius. *Obiit valde grandævus, non ſine ſanctitatis opinione.* Wharton.
(23) He ſucceeded Eugenius IV.
(24) Varillas, *Anecdot. de Florence.* Wharton, *Append. ad* Cave *de Script. Eccleſ.*
(25) Val. Curio, *Præf. in* Diogen. Laert. *apud* Geſn. *Biblioth.* folio 30.
(26) Monſieur de Larroque.
(27) Aug. Florentinus, *in vitâ Ambroſii*, cap. 29.
(28) Idem, cap. 4.

[*F*] *His corps is depoſited in the Oratory of Camaldoli without any epitaph, or ornament.*] Dom Mabillon ſhews his indignation at this by the following reflexion, which he made on that account, and which he relates in his *Muſæum Italicum*. *In Oratorio*, ſays he (29), *ſepultus eſt ſine lapide & titulo magnus ille Ambroſius, Camaldulenſium quondam ſummus præpoſitus, tum Cœnobitarum, tum Eremitarum, qui ſub Petro Delphino a Cœnobitis diſceſſionem fecerunt. Subit indignatio, ut cum Plinio Juniori loquamur *, tanti viri poſt tot annos reliquias neglectumque cinerem ſine titulo, ſine nomine jacere, cujus memoria orbem terrarum gloria pervagata eſt. Sed potior Ambroſii apud Deum gloria eſt ac memoria.* i. e. "The great Ambroſe lies buried in the Oratory, "without any tomb-ſtone, without any inſcription; "he who was General of the Order of Camaldoli, as "well of thoſe who lived in common, as of thoſe "who led the life of hermits, after they were ſepa"rated from the others under Peter Delfini. It is "with indignation, to ſpeak with Pliny, that I ſee "the remains and aſhes of ſo great a man lie neglect"ed after ſo many years, without any inſcription, not "ſo much as of his name; he whoſe memory has been "ſpread with Glory over the whole world. But "Ambroſe enjoys now a better glory with God."

(29) *Muſæum Ital.* tom. 1. pag. 180.
* Plinius, lib. 6. Epiſt. 10.

CAMDEN (WILLIAM) one of the moſt able and illuſtrious men of his age, was born at London, the 2d of May 1551, of a mean family [*A*]. At the age of fifteen he was ſent to Oxford. He ſtudied there for five years, without taking any degree [*B*], and then he returned to London, where he found among other Patrons Gabriel and Jeoffry Goodman. Theſe were two brothers, who perceiving Camden's extraordinary parts, took a great deal of pleaſure in affording him means to cultivate them. One of them (*a*), being Dean of Weſtminſter, gave him in 1575 the place of Under-maſter in the ſchool which Queen Elizabeth had founded in Weſtminſter Abbey (*b*). Camden, who was Humaniſt ſufficient to acquit himſelf worthily of this employment, diſcharged all the functions of it with exactneſs, and yet omitted not to employ himſelf in more elevated ſtudies. By natural inclination he applied himſelf chiefly to ſearch into the Antiquities of his own country; and as the fineneſs of his genius and the profoundneſs of his judgment made him ſoon diſcover the full extent of this deſign, and all the helps which were neceſſary for him to ſucceed therein, he turned all his thoughts and all his labours towards making preparations for the Work he had in view. It was the Hiſtory of the ancient inhabitants of Britain: he deſigned to treat exactly of their origin, their manners, and their laws. For this end it was neceſſary for him not only to underſtand whatever the Greek and Latin Writers have left us concerning Great Britain, but alſo the old Language of that Iſland, the old Britiſh, and the old Saxon. It was alſo neceſſary for him to examine the ancient Itineraries, to ſearch Records, and to conſult an infinite number of old Papers. He neglected nothing of all this: his diligence and application were extraordinary,

(*a*) It was Gabriel.
(*b*) *Regiæ Scholæ in hoc illuſtri Collegio à ſereniſſimâ Reginâ Elizabethâ beatæ memoriæ fundato... Hypodidaſculum..? conſtituit.* Thomas Smithus, *in Vita Camdeni*, pag. 8.

[*A*] *He was but of a mean family.*] His father, who was a native of Litchfield in the County of Staffordſhire, came and ſettled in London, where he followed the trade of a Houſe-painter. He left but little at his death; ſo that his ſon, who was yet a child, was maintained in the Orphan-houſe. Camden in his great elevation was ſo far from endeavouring to conceal the obſcurity of his family from the knowledge of the public, that he left by his will a ſilver-gilt cup (1) to the company of Painter-ſtainers with this inſcription, *Gul. Camdenus Clarenceus, filius Samſonis, Pictoris Londinenſis, dono dedit.* i. e. "The gift of Will. Camden "Clarenceux, the ſon of Samſon, Painter-ſtainer of "London." It is one of the cups uſed at the feaſts of that company on ſolemn occaſions. Camden, on his mother's ſide, was related to an ancient (2) family (3).

(1) It coſt 16 pounds ſterling.
(2) That of the Curwens, deſcended from Goſpatric, Earl of Northumberland.
(3) *Ex Vitâ Camdeni, Autore* Thoma Smitho, pag. 2.

[*B*] *He ſtudied at Oxford, without taking any degree.*] I obſerve this, that I may have an opportunity of ſaying, that in 1588, when his reputation had ſet him above the degree of Maſter of Arts, which the Univerſity of Oxford is uſed to confer on thoſe who are of ſeven years ſtanding, he deſired to be admitted to it: they anſwered, that he ſhould be admitted, provided he preſented himſelf, according to cuſtom, at the next meeting of the Univerſity. He had not time to go thither; but in 1613, he made his appearance in the Univerſity, having taken a journey to Oxford to attend the funeral of Sir Thomas Bodley, and he received the title of Maſter of Arts. It was a great honour to that illuſtrious Univerſity, that a man of his age and reputation ſhould deſire to have that title (4).

Take notice that there are ſome writers who aſſure us the Univerſity offered it him, but that he did not think he then wanted it, and there is great probability he did not accept it. This is the opinion of Biſhop Gibſon (5), and he ſupports it by the authority of Mr. Wood.

(4) *Ex eodem* Tho. Smitho, ibid. pag. 6, 7.
(5) Gibſon's *Life of Camden.* See below the citation (35).

extraordinary, and the fruit he reaped thence was ſo likewiſe; and as his reputation had ſpread itſelf even into foreign countries, all thoſe who knew how to judge of things eſteemed him ſingularly capable of executing this great deſign, and encouraged and aſſiſted him therein, every one according to his abilities. He reſolved to acquaint himſelf with the ſituation of places by his own eyes, and there was never a corner in England which he did not carefully viſit. All theſe labours at the end of ten years produced his *Britannia*, which he publiſhed at London in 1586 [C]. This Work anſwered the expectation which the Learned had conceived of it: it ſold ſo well, that they were obliged to reprint it the year following (c), and that beſides the German Editions, we may reckon thoſe of England in the years 1590, 1594, 1600, and 1607 (d). They who know the nature of this kind of Works, need not be informed that the new Editions were conſtantly improved [D]. The great ſucceſs of this Book, and the praiſes which it drew from all ſides on its Author, abated nothing of the natural modeſty of Camden, nor inſpired him with the deſire of quitting the drudgery of the School, where he had been Under-maſter a long time. If his friends had not taken more care of his fortune than himſelf, his nation and age would at this day have borne the ſhame of having neglected ſo great a man (e). But this was provided againſt: for in the year 1588 the Biſhop of Saliſbury (f) conferred on him the Prebend of Ilfarcombe, which Camden enjoyed during his life without reſidence, and without having been promoted to holy Orders. In 1593 he ſucceeded Edward Grant, who had been Head-Maſter of Weſtminſter School, and he compoſed a new

(c) See the Remark [L] at the end.

(d) Smith. *in Vitâ Camdeni*, pag. 78.

(e) *Nullo aut ambitionis aut avaritiæ æſtro percitus, ſui plus æquo negligentior. Amici non icem, ut ſeculum apud poſteros abſolverent, quaſi optimè meritos, inter quos Camdenus jure recenſendus, neglexiſſet.* Smith. *in Vita Camderi*, pag. 17.

(f) His name was John Piers.

[C] *He publiſhed his* Britannia *at London in* 1586.] This date refutes thoſe who ſay that King James ordered William Camden to make a Deſcription of England. This Deſcription was printed five times one after another at London, before the death of Queen Elizabeth. It does not appear that that Princeſs entred into the Author's deſign: he was engaged in thoſe inquiries by the taſte or natural turn of his genius, and he employed his ſteps and his ſtudies in the execution of his plan, without the leaſt appearance, as I have already ſaid, that the Court had given him any commiſſion on that head, or promiſed him any ſalary (6). There is a fault therefore in the paſſage I am going to cite: I ſhall ſet it down a little at large, becauſe it contains an elogy which cannot be ſuſpected: the public remembers the juſt complaints occaſioned by the relation of Sorbiere (7). "England is the beſt "known of any country in the world; becauſe Cam- "den by King James's order made a deſcription of "it, in the doing of which he ſpent ſeveral years in "travels undertaken for that very purpoſe. He fol- "lowed the courſe of the rivers, and deſcribed what- "ever he met with to the right and left. He made "ſeveral incurſions into the champain country, he pe- "netrated the foreſts, and traverſed the mountains. "So that he diſcovered what was remarkable there, "took the exact poſitions of the ſmalleſt caſtles, and "by the way gave the Hiſtory, the Genealogy, and "the Alliances of all the conſiderable families. His "work makes one of the moſt curious parts of Bleau's "Atlas (8)." Dr. Smith obſerves, that Camden's *Britannia* makes the fourth part of the Atlas of Janſſonius, printed at Amſterdam in the year 1659, but that it is very much altered in that collection: the Author's method is not kept, the whole is not ſaid that he has ſaid, and they have tacked to his work here and there what others have ſaid, without taking notice what belongs to him, and what belongs to another writer. *Nitidiſſimis quidem characteribus, ſed ordine planè diverſo: multis omiſſis, multis quoque è Johannis Speedi aliorumque ſcriptis interpoſitis adjectiſque, ut quid ipſe Camdenus quidve illi ſcripſerint meritò ambigatur* (9). If any one would reprint this work, he might be furniſhed with ſeveral corrections and additions made by the Author (10). See the Remark [E] towards the end.

(6) Dr. Smith, pag. 10. *gives us only to underſtand that Sir Philip Sidney encouraged the Author, and made him an offer of his friendſhip.*

(7) Dr. Sprat publiſhed a Treatiſe in Engliſh againſt *Sorbiere's Relation*, which Treatiſe being tranſlated into French and augmented by the Author, was printed at Amſterdam in 1675.

(8) Sorbiere, *Relation d'Angleterre*, pag. 19. of the Dutch edition of 1666.

(9) Smith. *in Vitâ Camdeni*, pag. 78.

(10) Idem, ibid.

[D] . . . . *It was reprinted ſeveral times . . . . the new Editions were conſtantly improved.*] It contains matters which are inexhauſtible: ſomething may always be added, becauſe ſomething is always forgotten which might have been ſaid. This is the fate of Dictionaries. There are other ſubjects ſo difficult, ſo obſcure, and loaded with ſo many acceſſories, that all that can be done is to avoid frequent miſtakes. In a word, there are ſeveral reaſons why a book grows perfect by being often printed and reprinted. Frequently, from a very bad book at its firſt appearance, it becomes a good one. It is, however, a diſadvantage to the Author; for he may be told that he made a little too much haſte, and that this work was at firſt but a poor untimely production. This is not our Camden's caſe. The laſt Edition of his *Britannia* is incomparably better than the firſt; but the firſt is notwithſtanding a good performance. I ſet down the words of Dr. Smith, and I aſſure my ſelf that readers of capacity will not condemn this remark: it is very proper to inſtruct people how they ought to judge of works of a certain nature. And what is there more neceſſary than to form a Reader's judgment, by placing before his eyes certain looſe thoughts choſen from another book? This is the motive which induces me to inſert ſuch kind of detached reflections in this Dictionary; which I deſire may be ſaid once for all. My quotation follows. *Cum enim opus ejuſmodi ex argumentorum, quæ in illo tractantur, varietate continui incrementi capax ſit, & tam ingenti rerum hactenus incognitarum, quarum origo aut obſcura aut incerta, copiâ & apparatu referciatur, nemo, qui de biſce ſtudiis rectè, & prout par eſt, judicandi facultate pollet, errores, ſi qui in primis Editionibus reperirentur, non ex levitate & inconſtantiâ mentis, non ex præcipiti inſulſas & nulli fundamento innixas conjecturas, venditandi audaciâ aut inani pruritu, ſed ex defectu debitæ auctoritatis aut mentis non ſemper attentæ variiſque cogitationibus diſtractæ laſſitudine admiſſos, qui vel vigilantiſſimo obrepere poſſint, exprobrare, aut illud omnibus numeris nondum fuiſſe abſolutum miſtis querelis mirari debet. In hoc fœcundi ingenii partu pulchra quidem lineamenta apparuere, & nullo vitio diſtorta compages, quibus novos colores integrumque vigorem inductura eſſet maturior ætas. Hoc nempe erat plurium annorum & cumulatioris experientiæ negotium, ut lucubrationes iſtæ, ſæpè repetitis curis recognitæ, limâque accuratiori perpolitæ, novis auctariis in juſtam decoramque molem demum creſcerent* (11). i. e. "For ſince a "work of this kind, by reaſon of the variety of "matters therein treated, is capable of continual ad- "dition, and comprehends ſo vaſt an abundance and "apparatus of things hitherto unknown, the origi- "nal whereof is either obſcure or uncertain, if any "faults ſhould happen to be found in the firſt edi- "tions, which proceed not from levity or inconſtancy "of mind, or from a precipitate boldneſs, or vain "itch of putting off filly and groundleſs conjectures, "but from want of due authority, or the laſſitude of a "mind not perpetually attentive and diverted by va- "rious thoughts, and which may ſurprize the moſt "vigilant writer, no man, who is able to judge right- "ly and equitably of theſe ſtudies, ought to upbraid "the Author with them, or to wonder, and at the ſame "time complain, that his performance is not com- "plete in every reſpect. In this offſpring of a fruit- "ful genius many beautiful lineaments appeared, and "a frame diſtorted by no deformity, which was to "receive new colours and perfect vigour from a riper "age. For this was the buſineſs of many years, and "of more accumulated experience, namely, that theſe "lucubrations, being frequently reviewed with repeat- "ed care, and poliſhed with greater exactneſs, might "at length by new acceſſions riſe to a juſt and decent "ſize." This whole paſſage deſerves to be well weighed.

(11) Idem, ibid. pag. 15.

new Greek Grammar, which appeared in 1597, and was received not only in the School under his own direction, but in all the other public Schools in England. He was taken from this Pedagogue's life the ſame year, to ſucceed Richard Leigh, who had been Clarenceux King at Arms. This dignity expoſed him to the anger of a man, who thinking he deſerved it, and not doubting but that it would be conferred on him, looked on the diſpoſition which was made thereof in favour of another as an affront. To diſſipate his ill humour, and revenge himſelf for the injury he pretended to have received, he attacked Camden's work, and publiſhed (*g*) a Criticiſm on it full of ſharpneſs and paſſion [*E*]. Camden anſwered him with a great deal of moderation, juſtified himſelf very learnedly, and convinced him of ſeveral groſs miſtakes. After this he thought he could not employ his leiſure to better purpoſe, than in ſearching after the ancient Hiſtorians of his own Nation; of which he collected ſeveral, and publiſhed them in Germany in the year 1603. It is time I ſhould ſpeak of his *Annals of Queen Elizabeth*, a Work which has gained him not much leſs reputation than his *Britannia*. So ſoon as Camden had been promoted to the dignity of King at Arms in the year 1597, Sir William Cecil deſired him to write that Queen's Hiſtory, and promiſed him all ſorts of Memorials: Camden engaged in it; but the death of Cecil, which happened the year following, greatly cooled the ardour with which he had already applied himſelf to that Work, in hopes that ſome other, among ſo many perſons of ability who had been loaden with that Princeſs's favours, would have undertaken it: but ſeeing that no one entered the liſts to publiſh the Hiſtory of ſo glorious a Reign, he reaſſumed his firſt deſign with ardour, omitted no reſearches which might furniſh him with valuable materials, and publiſhed in 1615 the *Annals*

(*g*) In the year 1599.

[*E*] *An irritated man . . . attacked his* Britannia, *and publiſhed a Criticiſm thereon full . . . of paſſion.*] This man, whoſe name was Ralph Brooke, was a Herald at Arms by the title of York. Having ſpent two years in examining William Camden's Britannia, he publiſhed a Book in Engliſh intitled, *A Diſcovery of certain Errors in the much commended* Britannia, *very prejudicial to the diſcents and ſucceſſions of the ancient Nobility of this Realm.* He publiſhed it without permiſſion, and without naming either the Bookſeller or Printer. He was not ſatisfied with attacking Camden as to genealogical matters, he alſo accuſed him of plagiariſm with reſpect to all the other, that is to ſay, with having pillaged the writings of the learned Leland. Dr. Smith complains that the Author who has publiſhed an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of England has renewed this accuſation of Ralph Brooke, without examining any farther: *Cujus ſolius auctoritate fultus ſcriptor quidam ex noſtratibus, utinam ob mentis ſolertiam & judicium pariter ac ob ingenium & induſtriam commendandus, eamdem calumniam credulè reque penitus inexploratâ arripit* (12); and he acquaints us that Camden's anſwer ſerved for an Appendix to the fifth Edition of the *Britannia*, which appeared in the year 1600, dedicated to Queen Elizabeth (13). This Author touched genealogical matters at firſt only ſuperficially; but after he was made King at Arms, he ſtudied them exactly (14), his Office required it, and by this means he rendered himſelf capable of clearing up learnedly in his anſwer a thouſand obſcurities on that head. He owned the charge when he found he had been miſtaken, and denied not but that he had peruſed thoſe writers who had treated of the Art of Heraldry; but ſince he had mentioned them with honour, what room was there for complaint? What I have juſt now ſaid ſhews that the Edition of 1600 excells the preceding ones; but it was much inferior to that of 1607. Therein Camden ſurpaſſed himſelf, and it was then that he principally merited the elogies which have been given him of the Britiſh Varro, Strabo, and Pauſanias. This laſt Edition was accompanied with maps and cuts (15). There is an Abridgment of this work, and an Engliſh Tranſlation. Reinerius Vitellius of Ziric-zee is the Author of the Abridgment; and Philemon Holland, an Engliſh Phyſician, is the Author of the Tranſlation (16). There was an Author who took upon him to diſcover an infinite number of faults in Camden's *Britannia*, but it has not yet appeared that he ever made good his promiſe. [*Illud ditiſſimum & uberrimum Antiquitatum Britannicarum penu, non minore fide & judicio quam curâ & methodo digeſtum ordinatumque, omnes harum rerum ſtudioſi bonique judices agnoverunt,*] *excepto unico D. Simondſio Deweſio, qui neſcio quo invidiæ æſtro percitus, ſe in* Magnæ Britanniæ, *quam dolitus eſt,* Hiſtoria, vix unam in ipſius Camdeni toties celebratâ Britanniâ paginam ſuis carere erroribus *oſtenſurum contendit. Sed hoc decantatum opus Hiſtoricum nec ipſe nec alii poſt quinquaginta annos hactenus in lucem produxerunt* (17). i. e. [" All lovers and competent judges " of theſe things allowed that work to be a moſt rich " and plentiful ſtorehouſe of Britiſh Antiquities, di- " geſted and methodized with no leſs fidelity and judg- " ment than care and order,] except only Sir Symonds " D'Ewes, who ſtung with envy, gave out that in " the *Hiſtory of Great Britain*, which he was prepar- " ing, he would demonſtrate *that there was ſcarce a* " *page in Camden's ſo much celebrated Britannia with-* " *out its faults.* But this boaſted Hiſtorical perfor- " mance has not as yet, after fifty years expectation, " been publiſhed either by himſelf or any body " elſe."

(12) Smith. *in Vitâ Camdeni*, pag. 24. He puts in the margin, *in Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſticâ Britanniæ (hoc enim magnifico titulo iſtam Rhapſodiam inſignire placuit)* Libro 5. pag. 198.

(13) The firſt edition was dedicated to Sir William Cecil.

(14) Smith. pag. 25.

(15) It was in folio; the three firſt were in 8vo, and the two following in 4to. Idem, pag. 78.

(16) Idem, ibid.

(17) Idem, ibid. pag. 45, 46: he puts in the margin, *in literis ad Jac. Uſſer.* 28 *Sept. datis quæ exſtant in Uſſerianarum Epiſtolarum Sylloge*, pag. 496. It was D'Ewes therefore who was to ſhew ſo many faults.

Since the firſt Edition of this Dictionary, I have ſeen a work in folio, printed at London in the year 1695, and intitled, *Camden's Britannia newly tranſlated into Engliſh: with large Additions and Improvements, publiſhed by Edmund Gibſon, of Queen's College in Oxford.* One of the motives which induced the publication of this new Engliſh Tranſlation (18) was that Dr. Holland, who had done the other, had inſerted therein ſeveral things of his own. Theſe interpolations, which a great many Readers could not diſtinguiſh, have occaſioned ſome Writers to alledge the authority and teſtimony of Camden to prove facts which he never advanced. They took that for the original which ſhould only have been conſidered as patches tacked to it by the Tranſlator. Mr. Gibſon was therefore of opinion, that to prevent any one's falling into this inconvenience for the future, it was neceſſary to give a Tranſlation of Camden purged from all foreign interpolations. So that for the time to come they who have a mind to cite Camden will run no riſque of making a falſe quotation. But becauſe Dr. Holland's Additions are ſometimes good, and it was generally believed that he had conſulted Camden himſelf when he met with any obſcurities, Mr. Gibſon has preſerved them, and placed them under the text in a ſmaller character. Here are ſome other things which greatly inhance the value of this new verſion. Remarks have been added at the end of each County, either to confirm what Camden had advanced, or elſe to give a more particular account of the places which he had deſcribed, or the deſcription of places which he had not ſpoken of. Every part of the text to which theſe Additions refer is marked with a letter, whereby the Commentary belonging to it may be eaſily found. Mr. Gibſon has given a liſt of the perſons who have furniſhed him with materials. It is enough of it ſelf to prevent one in favour of his Remarks, and to ſhew that great pains are taken in England in illuſtrating the Antiquities of that country, and making the moſt exact Topographies. He has alſo given a Life of our Camden, which is little more than an Abridgment of that publiſhed by Dr. Smith. Take notice he obſerves, that in the ſpace of three years, he publiſhed at London three Editions of Camden's *Britannia*.

(18) It was done by ſeveral hands. A new edition of it was publiſhed in 1722.

Annals of England and Ireland, from the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, to the year 1689. This Work, which is in Latin, was received with applauſe, and it muſt be acknowledged that the matter could not have been treated with more judgment and gravity, with more exactneſs, or with greater clearneſs of ſtyle. The continuation of theſe Annals, finiſhed about the year 1607, appeared not till after the Author's death (*b*). He would never conſent to publiſh it in his life-time, and to prevent all ſorts of accidents, he ſent a copy of it to Peter du Puy at Paris (*i*). Some have pretended that King James had made him ſtrike out and add ſeveral things in the firſt Part in favour of the Queen his mother [*F*]; and this ſtory, true or falſe, keeps up Hiſtorical Pyrrhoniſm with regard

(*b*) The whole Work has been tranſlated into French by *Paul de Belligent*, Advocate in the Parliament of Paris. It is alſo tranſlated into Engliſh.

(*i*) See the Remark [*H*], citation (40).

[*F*] *Some have pretended that King James had made him ſtrike out and add ſeveral things in the firſt part of his* Annals *in favour of the Queen his mother.*] Lewis du Moulin, a truſty ſervant of Cromwell's, and a violent Independent, aſſerted in an Oration which he pronounced at Oxford in praiſe of Camden, that the flatterers of King James had abominably defiled Camden's Hiſtory, by thruſting into it ſeveral things contrary to the Author's ſentiment. *Criminantur alii, inter quos* * *Ludovicus Molinæus, in rebus Angliæ turbandis a primis impii belli civilis incendiis occupatiſſimus, tyrannidis Cromwellianæ ſtrenuus aſſertor, & poſt auſpicatiſſimum R. Caroli II reditum adverſus Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ ritus & diſciplinam ſcriptor maledicentiſſimus,* aliam manum acceſſiſſe, præter haud dubio mentem Auctoris, unde opus fœdè commaculatum ſuit, *hiſce corruptelis* in Aulæ Regiæ adulatores, *ut ille pro ſolito candore & modeſtiâ loquitur, traductis derivatiſque* (19). Dr. Smith rejects this as a notorious calumny, and maintains that Camden might as an honeſt man and a faithful Hiſtorian relate the Revolution of Scotland, and the adventures of the unfortunate Queen Mary, in another manner than Buchanan has done: and that therefore ſincerity and prudence both concurred in obliging him to ſay ſome things which tend to the juſtification of that Princeſs. He adds, that it is to be preſumed, if Camden ſubmitted his book to the cenſure of the King his Maſter, that it was only with a view of rectifying what might have been not ſtrictly conformable to truth. *Neque aliâ de cauſâ Sereniſſimi Regis Jacobi aut illius Nobiliſſimi Viri a Rege fortean deputati, ad quem ſcripſit . . . . cenſuræ Annalium Supplementum, ut par eſt credere, ſubjecit, quàm ut veritas magis magiſque eruueretur, & ſi quicquam ipſi minus intento aut non probè edocto ſubrepſiſſet, regiis caris limatum emendaretur* (20). It is certain that Lewis du Moulin is not the firſt who has ſaid that Additions were made to Camden's Book: for ſo early as the year 1620, there was a Scottiſh Gentleman †, whoſe father was deeply concerned in the troubles of Scotland, who complained of the Annals of William Camden on that very account. *Quinquennio poſt emiſſam in dii luminis auram Hiſtoriam D. Metallanus de patris ſui Baronis Lidingtoniæ, qui turbatiſſimis Scotiæ rebus, RR. Maria & Jacobo regnantibus, multum momenti & ponderis authoritate ſuâ & conſiliis addiderat, famâ ſolicitus, Camdeno moleſtiam faceſſivit, ac ſi non motu proprio & ex ſe, ſed ex aliorum invidiâ & in parentem malignitate clauſulis inſititiis eam exagitâſſet* (21).

* *Oratione in laudem G. Camdeni*, habitâ Oxonii, x Julii 1652.

(19) Smith. *in Vitâ Camdeni*, pag. 54.

(20) Ibid. pag. 55.

† His name was *Maitland*: he was ſon to the Lord Lidington.

(21) Ibid. pag. 57.

Dr. Smith (22) complains of a modern Author, who accuſes Camden of having blown hot and cold, I mean of having furniſhed Thuanus with Memoirs very different from what he afterwards publiſhed in his Annals. The modern Author pretends that Thuanus complained of it, and reproached Camden with this inconſtancy with ſome indignation. This principally regards the troubles of Scotland, and it is on this head only that the friends of Buchanan, and the enemies of King James's mother, maintain that Camden's Annals were altered. Dr. Smith firſt takes notice that this envious adverſary of William Camden produces no reaſon which can give any ſhadow of certainty to this reproach; and then he obſerves, that Mr. de Liſle having in 1606 (23) ſettled a friendly and epiſtolary correſpondence between Thuanus and Camden, the latter ſincerely anſwered the requeſt which Thuanus had made him. Thuanus aſked him whether he liked his Hiſtory: Camden anſwered him, that he had found therein ſeveral particulars relating to the affairs of Scotland which had no foundation, or but a weak one, and which had been borrowed from a Writer ‡ who had ſet all his malice and wit at work to blacken Queen Mary. *Pro amore veritatis & amicitiæ jure, id quoque rogatus, monet quaſdam rerum Scoticarum narrationes aut nullo aut debili prorſus fundamento niti, Buchanumque, a quo illas acceperat, omnes tum ingenii tum malitiæ nervos contendiſſe ut Mariæ Reginæ famam ſpurciſſimis convitiis læderet* (24). Dr. Smith adds, I, that Thuanus teſtified a great deal of regret for having incurred the cenſure and anger of King James, by adhering to Buchanan's Hiſtory. II, That Camden by order of King James his maſter made a Liſt of the falſhoods which had been found in Thuanus, with reſpect to the troubles of Scotland (25), and ſent it to that great Hiſtorian. III, That if Thuanus had received theſe informations time enough, he would not have been ſo partial againſt Queen Mary, and for the Earl of Murray; nor would he afterwards have had recourſe to the vain excuſes which he formed. IV, That all who weigh theſe Remarks well, will be convinced that Camden did not write things to Thuanus different from what he afterwards publiſhed in his Annals of Queen Elizabeth. *Hæc ſeriò penſitanti non aliter Camdenum ad Thuanum, aut ab iis diverſa quæ poſt in Annalibus poſuit, olim ſcripſiſſe, quicquid in contrarium fingitur, vero verius eſſe videbitur* (26).

(23) *Literis per D. Inſulanum . . . anno* M.DC.VI. *miſſis.* Smith. *in vitâ Camdeni*, pag. 52. If there is not a fault of the preſs here, Thuanus's firſt Letter to Camden is not rightly dated. See below the Citation (27).

‡ Buchanan.

(24) Smith. *in Vitâ Camdeni*, pag. 52.

(25) This liſt is printed at the end of Camden's *Letters*.

(26) Smith. *in Vitâ Camdeni*, pag. 54.

It muſt be confeſſed that theſe Conſiderations have ſome force: for, I, the Letter which Thuanus wrote to Camden in the month of February 1605, ſhews that they were not yet acquainted. *Vix ſperaveram, ut rogatus à me faceres quod ſolâ D. Inſulani amiciſſimi viri commendatione feciſti. Quid enim ſum ut ſeria tua ſtudia tantiſper remorer? Camdenum in meis legendis jacturam bonarum horarum feciſſe? tanto hominem ſibi* IGNOTUM *beneficio devinxiſſe* (27)? Camden had read Thuanus's Books at the requeſt of Mr. de Liſle: Thuanus admiring that Camden had taken that pains for an Author who was unknown to him, and who had not himſelf requeſted it of him, returns him the more hearty thanks. We may be ſure, therefore, that it was the firſt time he wrote to him. But at that time the Books of his Hiſtory which treat of the troubles of Scotland were already in the preſs (28); wherefore he had not compoſed them from the Memoirs of Camden. II. He conſults him in the ſame Letter: he knows that King James is angry with Buchanan, he knows not whether Buchanan was not too bitter (29), he would not offend the Engliſh Court, but he cannot prevail on himſelf to ſuppreſs real facts: he therefore deſires Camden to aſſiſt him with his counſel in ſo delicate a conjuncture. He aſks him for no Memoirs (30), but only a word of advice: *Scribe, & amico conſilii inopi tuum ne denega. Innuere* VERBO *potes, nec opus eſt ut* DISTINCTIUS *ſcribas* (31). III. The particulars of Camden's Anſwer are not known; but we know that he adviſed him to obſerve a great deal of moderation: for when Thuanus towards the end of July 1606, ſent him the ſecond volume of his Hiſtory, he tells him that he is apprehenſive of not having every where kept the temperament which he (Camden) had adviſed him to (32); and thereupon he draws up a very ſpecious Apology for the Earl of Murray, in order to ſhelter himſelf under it. IV. The event ſhewed him that his apprehenſion was but too well grounded. King James was highly exaſperated againſt him, and ordered William Camden to ſend him a Liſt of faults relating to the troubles of Scotland. V. It appears from a Letter of Thuanus, dated the 13th of April 1608, that Camden had not yet furniſhed him with any Memoirs, if you except only what he had ſent him concerning Ireland: for Thuanus teſtifies that he would very gladly have received the like inſtructions with reſpect to England and Scotland; and in that caſe he doubted not but he ſhould have kept ſuch meaſures as would have ſatisfied the Court of England. What can be deſired more deciſive againſt thoſe who have given out that Camden communicated

(27) Pag. 68 *Epiſtolar. Camdeni.*

(28) Ibid.

(29) *Acerbius hæc* FORTASSE *à Buchanano ſcripta, & audio diſcipulum præceptori ob id ſuccenſere, & tamen quia geſta ſunt citra flagitium diſſimulari non poſſunt.* Pag. 68 Epiſtolar. Camdeni.

(30) *Obſerve, however, that he asks of him ſome Memoirs for Ireland, and promiſes to make good uſe of the Remarks which he had received from him on the Volume already printed; to make good uſe of them, I ſay, in the next Edition.*

(31) Pag. 68 *Epiſtolar. Camdeni.*

(32) *Mitto ad te . . . ſecundum Hiſtoriarum noſtrarum tomum, ſed valdè vereor ut temperamentum illud de quo moneras in rerum Scoticarum narratione ubique ſervaverim.* Pag. 73 Epiſtol. Camdeni.

gard to the adventures of that Princeſs [*G*]. The ſending the copy to Peter du Puy miniſters occaſion to ſome ſuſpicions [*H*]. Camden, not contented with having employed his

communicated to Thuanus certain particulars which he did not afterwards put into his own Annals? We ſhall ſee preſently that Thuanus laments, that for want of Camden's aſſiſtance, he had been obliged ſolely to follow Buchanan. *In Hibernicis jam multum profeci.... Utinam quæ veſtra ſunt, & ad univerſam Britanniam ſpectant, pari compendio & ſimplicitate ſcripſiſſes. Sic enim factum eſſet, ut temperamentum, quod in Scoticis à me quidam fortaſſe ſunt deſideraturi, tuis veſtigiis inſiſtens, facilius ſecutus eſſem, & in veſtratium Magnatum offenſionem, quam vitatam cupiebam, non incurriſſem. Sed cum neminem haberem præter Buchananum, neceſſe mihi omninò fuit ſeriem illius tragicæ narrationis per alios eoſque Religioni Proteſtantium minimè addictos antea adprobatæ, petere: cæterum omni inſectatione omiſſâ* (33). VI. A Letter (34), which Thuanus wrote to Camden in the year 1613, ſhews indeed that he had received ſome Memoirs from England; wherein Camden had a conſiderable ſhare; but it was Sir Robert Cotton who had ſent them to him by the order of King James: from whence we ought to conclude, that theſe Memoirs were conformable to thoſe which Camden has followed in his Annals. What therefore could occaſion the reproaches which it is pretended Thuanus made him? VII. To conclude, among the Letters written to Camden, and publiſhed by Dr. Smith, there is not one of Thuanus's, or of Mr. du Puy's, or from any body elſe, which makes mention of thoſe reproaches. See the remark [*H*].

Biſhop Gibſon has vigorouſly oppoſed the report which has been ſpread of theſe pretended complaints of the French Hiſtorian. He examines the circumſtances very cloſely, and draws ſtrong reaſons from them. His argument is to this effect: Thuanus writing to Camden, when he ſent him the ſecond Volume of his Hiſtory, begins by making his excuſes to him, and tells him he is afraid he has not exactly followed his advice in the account of the affairs of Scotland; and towards the end of the ſame Letter he ſays, that he has related thoſe things as he had learnt them from ſome Scots-men who were eye-witneſſes, and by whoſe ſcale he had weighed the Writings of Buchanan. Is it not a proof, either that he had not received any Memoir from William Camden, or that he had made no uſe of what he might have received from him? Add to this, that if he had fallen into any miſtake, and if he had offended his Britannic Majeſty by having followed Camden's informations, he had reaſon to promiſe himſelf that this latter would have excuſed him for it to that Prince. Candour and good manners required in that caſe, that William Camden ſhould have made his excuſes to Thuanus in a very particular manner, and have acknowledged himſelf to have been then in a miſtake; but that his diſcourſes with the King, and reading of the public Records, had made him acquainted with the truth. This doubtleſs is what Camden ought to have done ſome where or other in his Critical Remarks on Thuanus's Hiſtory: but he has not done it; he only criticiſes; he mixes ſome ſharpneſs in his cenſure; and greatly blames Thuanus for having followed Buchanan more cloſely than he ought. Can one reaſonably believe that Thuanus, attacked in this manner, would not have ſhewn his reſentment, and have written to his Cenſurer, *If I have been miſtaken, it is your ſelf who is the cauſe of it?* He muſt even ſo early as then have reproached him with what it is ſaid he did not reproach him till after he had read the firſt volume of the Annals of Queen Elizabeth (35). There are a thouſand traditions of this nature, which are received for ages together throughout a whole Kingdom, without having any other foundation than the fancies of a prejudiced party, full of ſuſpicion and artifice. Examine them a little cloſely, take the trouble to ſearch for proofs to the contrary, and they vaniſh into ſmoke.

[*G*] ... *And this ſtory ... keeps up hiſtorical Pyrrhoniſm with regard to the adventures of Mary Stuart.*] Thoſe who favour the cauſe of the Scots cite Buchanan, and thoſe who favour Queen Mary cite Camden. In this competition the prejudices would be againſt Buchanan. I. A rambling gadding life, as his was, and ſo many Verſes written by him, ſatyrical on one hand, laſcivious and immodeſt on the other, do not at all prevent one in his favour, and hinder us at leaſt from conceiving ſo good an opinion of his probity, as of the virtue of Camden, who always lived like a prudent man and without reproach. II. Beſides, Camden was not perſonally intereſted in the juſtification of Queen Mary, as Buchanan was perſonally intereſted in the blackening of her. Buchanan was very deeply engaged in the faction which dethroned and expelled that Queen: he was a party concerned therefore in a conduct which would become moſt execrable, if that Queen was not extremely guilty; whereas the more abominable the crimes of that Princeſs were, the leſs would thoſe be blamed who expelled her. I have elſewhere (36) touched on this conſideration: Dr. Smith has not forgotten it; I quote him in the margin (37). III. Buchanan had for his patron the head of the party which dethroned Mary Stuart; and on the other ſide, Camden had a thouſand obligations to Queen Elizabeth. Therefore Buchanan writes a Manifeſto for his Mæcenas, by loading Queen Mary; but what Camden owns in diſcharge of Mary is a ſtain in the memory of Queen Elizabeth. IV. To conclude, Buchanan is an enemy to the Roman Catholics, and Camden alſo. This conformity of Religion puts a great inequality between their teſtimonies; Buchanan's is weakened by it; but Camden's is ſtrengthened: The Roman Catholic Writers, who are extravagant Panegyriſts of Mary, have not failed to make their adverſaries obſerve that they juſtified her, not by citing the work of ſome Monk, or zealous Papiſt, but by citing a Heretic, the Hiſtoriographer of Queen Elizabeth his benefactreſs.

If there were nothing to ſet againſt this, they who are determined by the greater probability would not continue one moment in Hiſtorical Pyrrhoniſm: but we may alledge againſt them that Camden wrote under a Prince, who, as ſon to Mary, ought to wiſh that Elizabeth's reign were blackened rather than his mother's; and that no one therefore ought to wonder at that Annaliſt's having in certain particulars ſacrificed the glory of the late Queen to the affection of the reigning Prince. Beſides, Camden was not the leſs adverſe to the Scottiſh Puritans, for being an enemy to the Catholics. Every body knows in what manner the Epiſcoparians do even at this day treat the maxims of Buchanan and his faction (38). This is what may be ſaid to invalidate the teſtimony of Camden, and this is what they actually ſay. They ſay his Work was caſtrated by King James's order, and that the gaps which this made ſerved to receive other paſſages more agreeable to that Prince's mind. On this ſuppoſition, all the advantages which the Catholics pretend to draw from the Annals of Queen Elizabeth are overturned. But is this ſuppoſition true? I cannot tell. Is it certain? If it were, Dr. Smith, a Prieſt of the Church of England, would not have dared to deny it. Is it a ſubject of Pyrrhoniſm? Without doubt; ſince even at London ſome deny it, and others affirm it. We are going to ſpeak of a thing that renders it probable; which is that Camden ſent a Copy of his ſecond Volume to Paris. Is it not a ſign he was afraid that his manuſcript would be altered? Was not this fear a ſufficient mark that he had already paſſed through that trial? If it be not a ſufficient mark, is it not at leaſt a pretext for contention, and a prop to diſpute?

[*H*] *The ſending the Copy to Peter du Puy miniſters occaſion to ſome ſuſpicions.*] This is all that can reaſonably be ſaid, ſince there are ſeveral other conſiderations, which might determine the Author to act in that manner. And indeed Dr. Smith mentions two or three without ſo much as thinking of that which others aſſign

" *to reaſon by compulſion, if they offend againſt the Laws, that the people and inferior*
" *Magiſtrates may reform Religion and the Commonwealth by force of arms, in ſpite*
" *of thoſe who enjoy the ſupreme power*, and other maxims of this kind, which de-
" ſtroy Religion itſelf, and bring certain ruin on mankind; and hence did theſe
" calumnies againſt Queen Mary publiſhed in the Hiſtory of Scotland, and eſpeci-
" ally in that infamous Libel, intitled the *Detection*, take their birth." *Smith.* in *Vitâ Camdeni, pag.* 53. *edit. Londin.* 1691.

(33) *In Epiſt. Camdeni*, pag. 97.

(34) Ibid. pag. 139.

(35) Extracted from the *Life of Camden*, written by Biſhop (then Mr.) Gibſon, and prefixed to the new Engliſh Tranſlation of *Camden's Britannia.*

(36) In the Remark [C] of the Article BUCHANAN.

(37) *Buchananum a quo illas acceperat, omnes tum ingenii tum malitiæ nervos contendiſſe, ut Mariæ Reginæ famam ſpurciſſimis convitiis læderet: qui non aliter ſperare poterat, ſe perfidiam & flagitioſa rebellium ſubditorum, qui vindicandæ Religionis & Legum Scotiæ violatarum ſpecie & prætextu arma ſumpſiſſent, facinora poſſe tueri.* Smith. *in Vita Camdeni*, pag. 52, 53.

(38) Hinc iſta impia dogmata, *omne jus regnandi à populo, Reges in ordinem cogendos, ſi contra leges deliquerint, licere populo & inferioribus magiſtratibus vi & armis religionem & rempubliçam, invitis qui ſummo imperio potiuntur, reformare*, & ejuſmodi reliqua, quæ ipſam religionem tollunt, certamque humano generi perniciem inferunt: hinc in rerum Scoticarum Hiſtoriâ & potiſſimum in iſto infami Libello, qui *Detectio* inſcribitur, calumniæ in R. Mariam enatæ. i. e. "Hence, *that is to ſay, from what had been done in Scotland againſt Mary Stuart*, " have " proceeded thoſe " impious doc- " trines, *that all* " *right of Sove-* " *reignty proceeds* " *from the people,* " *that Kings* " *muſt be brought*

his pen in the ſervice of the Republic of Letters, reſolved alſo to beſtow part of his Eſtate in founding a Lecture in Hiſtory in the Univerſity of Oxford. He delivered the Deeds of this new foundation in 1622, and named Degory Whear for the firſt Profeſſor. He died the 9th of November 1623, at a houſe in the country (*k*), where, from the year 1609, he had paſſed all the time he could be abſent from London. He had directed by his will that he ſhould be buried where he died; but the Executors of that Will did not follow his intention in that particular: they interred him pompouſly in Weſtminſter Abbey. The Univerſity of Oxford paid him great honours, and continue ſo to do. Let us conclude with ſaying that he was not leſs illuſtrious for his virtues than for his learning. He was firm to his Religion (*l*), and ſo modeſt that he refuſed the title of Knight. He was ſincere, of a ſweet temper, affable, and a good friend: he hated ſlander, both from the tongue

(*k*) It was at Chiſſelhurſt, ten miles from London.

(*l*) It was that of the Epiſcopal Church.

aſſign as the only one; I mean, he has not dropped the leaſt word which may inſinuate that paſt experience made Camden believe that King James would give the other part of his Annals to be corrected. I ſhall ſet down Dr. Smith's words and citations. [*Cum verò moleſtiam, invidiam, obtrectationem, & odium à quibuſdam malevolis, fato cum cæteris Hiſtoriarum Scriptoribus qui veritati litârunt communi, inde ſibi quoque ex vitio & malignitate ſui ſeculi creari offendiſſet,*] *mentem contra alterius tomi, dum viveret, editionem nullis machinamentis expugnandum obſirmavit. Ut poſteritati tamen, quæ abſque affectu ſolet judicare, integer ſervaretur, nec incendio aut quocunque triſti caſu deletus, aut malignorum hominum invidiâ ſuppreſſus intercideret, Apographum fideliſſimè exſcriptum (Archetypo, quod in Bibliothecâ Cottonianâ conſervatur, apud ſe retento) tanquam ſacrum depoſitum Petri Puteani curæ & fidei concredidit* †, *& eò quidem libentiùs, magni Thuani exemplum ſibi ob oculos ponens, cujus Hiſtoriarum reliqua pars ante mortem inedita, cum eam publicæ luci donare Curatoribus Teſtamenti non liceret* (39), *forſan periiſſet, niſi mens periculi præſaga, exemplari* † *apud Virum integerrimum nobiliſſimumque Georgium Michaelem Lingelſhemium relicto, iſtud damnum prudentiſſimè antevertiſſet* (40). i. e. "[But when he found that, by a fate common to other "Hiſtorians who have religiouſly adhered to truth, the "vice and malignity of his own age had thence alſo cre-"ated him trouble, envy, detraction, and ill will from "ſome malevolent people,] he ſet a firm and unconquer-"able reſolution not to publiſh the ſecond Part in his life-"time. However, that it might be preſerved entire "for poſterity, which is accuſtomed to judge without "affection, and might neither be deſtroyed by fire or "any other ſad miſchance, nor be ſuppreſſed by the "envy of malicious men, he intruſted a very faithful "Copy, (retaining the Original, which is now preſerv-"ed in the Cotton Library, in his own hands,) as a "ſacred Depoſitum, to the care and fidelity of Peter "du Puy; and this he the rather did, as he ſet be-"fore his eyes the example of the great Thuanus, the "remaining part of whoſe Hiſtory, not printed be-"fore his death, which the Executors of his Will "were not allowed (39) to publiſh, would probably "have periſhed, had not he, foreſeeing the danger, "very wiſely prevented that loſs by leaving a copy "with the upright and noble George Michael Lingelſ-"heim." It is even true that the Annaliſt might fear leſt the Continuation of his Work might be altered, though he had not experienced the like with reſpect to the firſt Volume: for a Book is much more ſubject to accidents after the Author's death than during his life; and Camden had reſolved to hinder the Continuation of his Annals from being printed ſo long as he lived: I add, that they frighted him with the riſque which Thuanus's Hiſtory had ran, and exhorted him to imitate that Preſident's precaution. Here is what Peireſkius wrote to him in the year 1620. "If that of "Thuanus had been to be found no where but in his "own ſtudy, it ran the hazard of being ſuppreſſed; "for his Executors, who were Guardians to his chil-"dren, had a mind to throw it into the fire for "ſome private ends. Mr. Lingelſheim, with whom "Thuanus had intruſted a Copy, has ſaved all. If "Grotius had believed me above ſix months before his "misfortune, there would have been a copy of his "Hiſtory in this Kingdom, which would be no longer "at the diſcretion of his enemies or of thoſe who en-"vied him. For God's ſake think of your own, "and if you do not care to put it to the preſs in your "life-time, let there be more than one copy of it, "and let them not be all on your ſide the water (41)." It is very poſſible Camden might apprehend, not the ſtriking out or adding of a few lines, but a total ſuppreſſion, ſuch as that which Thuanus's manuſcript would have undergone, if timely proviſion had not been made againſt it. However it be, let us give an account of a Diſpute which made ſome noiſe in the year 1687.

† *V. etiam* V. Cl. Petri Puteani Vitam, à Rigaltio *conſcriptam, Pariſiis*, 1652, 4to, pag. 50, & Epiſtolâ CCLVII pag. 310.

(39) *Non liberet*, i. e. *were not willing*, would agree better with the paſſage of Peireskius which will be quoted immediately.

† *V.* Epiſt. CCXLVI. pag. 310.

(40) Smith. *in Vitâ Camdeni*, pag. 58.

(41) *Camden's Letters*, pag. 310.

It was occaſioned by theſe words: "Camden has "written this Hiſtory with ſo much judgment, and ſo "little partiality, that it got him the friendſhip and "eſteem of Thuanus, who after Camden's death pub-"liſhed the ſecond Volume of his Work, from a ma-"nuſcript copy of it, which had been ſent him by "the Author (42)." They were anſwered in the following manner: *It is not true that Mr. de Thou was the perſon who publiſhed after Camden's death the laſt Part of his Hiſtory; and the ſame Camden, according to the character which is given of him, was too diſcreet a man to burden a Preſident au Mortier with a piece of work ſo unworthy of him as the publiſhing his Book would have been. I have often heard the laſt Mr. du Puy ſay that it was himſelf to whom Camden had applied for that purpoſe, and that he had diſcharged himſelf of that truſt with his own hand. It is no proof that Camden's Hiſtory is not partial, becauſe Mr. de Thou cauſed it to be reprinted: on the contrary, it is the greateſt mark of his partiality that can be produced, ſince all the world knows that Preſident tranſcribed whatever he relates of the affairs of England and Scotland, to the year 1570, from Buchanan, who paſſes for the moſt partial of the modern Writers. The late Mr. le Chere de St. Martin has ſeveral times declared in my preſence, that in the vacation of the year 1620, going with Mr. de Thou's eldeſt ſon to ſalute King James at his palace of Whiteball, his Majeſty made the ſame Mr. de Thou ſo bitter a reproach for what his father had written in prejudice of the truth againſt Queen Mary Stuart his mother, that it coſt him a fit of ſickneſs of three months* (43). A reply was made to this which I am going to copy: "I am here obliged to relate the Hiſtory of Camden's "manuſcript in a more particular manner than I had "at firſt judged neceſſary. Mr. de Thou, having "formed the deſign of writing his General Hiſtory, "eſtabliſhed correſpondences throughout all Europe, "with people who in appearance were able to give "him exact information of what he deſired to "know. He kept a very ſtrict one with Camden, "and when the firſt volume of that Author appeared, "he wrote to him and reproached him, that he found "his Hiſtory agreed not with what he had written to "Mr. de Thou in his Letters, and particularly in "what concerned the affair of the Queen of Scots. "Upon this, Camden told him the truth, which was "that King James would abſolutely review that Hi-"ſtory himſelf, and had afterwards put it into the "hands of the Earl of Northampton, brother to the "Duke of Norfolk, who had been beheaded for that "very affair, ſo that ſeveral things had been ſtruck "out of his book, and ſeveral others had been altered. "This touched Camden to the quick: he took care "the ſecond part ſhould not run the ſame riſque, and "ſent it into France to Mr. de Thou, to the end it "might be faithfully printed after his death. This is "a fact well known in England, and the care which "he took to ſend this ſecond part beyond ſea to a "ſtranger, may eaſily convince one that the true "cauſe of it has been now aſſigned. I do not believe, "indeed, that a Preſident au Mortier went to the "Bookſellers of that time to ſell the Manuſcript, or "to correct the preſs. If a man of Mr. du Puy's "quality and learning took care that it ſhould be "faithfully printed, Mr. de Thou did nothing beneath "his dignity, when he agreed to become the Depo-"ſitary of ſo excellent a piece; and he perfectly well "acquitted himſelf of all that he was obliged to do

(42) Dr. Burnet's Reflections on Mr. Varillas's Hiſtory of the Revolutions, &c. Or *Critique du IX Livre de Mr. Varillas*, pag. 33. of the Amſterdam edition of 1686.

(43) *Reponſe de Mr. Varillas à la Critique de Mr. Burnet*, pag. 77. of the Dutch edition of 1687.

tongue and from the pen: he bore no envy to his neighbour, and was not at all revengeful. With theſe good qualities it is no wonder that he had ſo great a number of illuſtrious friends in England, and in foreign countries. His application to ſtudy hindred him from travelling abroad, or engaging himſelf in a married ſtate (*m*) [*I*]. Several Letters, which he had received or written, were publiſhed at London, in the year 1691, by Dr. Smith, who has joined thereto a Piece of his own, which is very curious and well written; I mean the Life of William Camden. A great many particulars are to be found therein; among which that concerning the reſentment of a Gentleman, who had a female Relation mentioned with diſhonour in the Books of this able Writer, is not the leaſt conſiderable [*K*]. We alſo find there that our Author did not always put his name to the Books which he publiſhed [*L*]; and that the loſs of one part of the Memoirs which he made uſe of in compoſing his Annals [*M*] has been very ſenſible to all the curious. We

(*m*) Extracted from his Life, written by Dr. Thomas Smith, and prefixed to his *Letters*, publiſhed by the ſame Author at London, in 1691, in 4to.

" with regard to that Depoſit, when he entruſted his " couſin with it. It is true that King James reproached Mr. de Thou the ſon with his father's having " copied the invectives of Buchanan againſt Queen " Mary; but Mr. de Thou muſt have been very ſenſible, to be ſick three months on that account (44)." The firſt of theſe three paſſages has not been well criticiſed, and we may very well place to the Critic's account, by reaſon of his ſilence, theſe two miſtakes: firſt, that the publiſhing of the Annals procured William Camden the friendſhip of Thuanus; and ſecondly, that Thuanus ſurvived Camden. I have ſhewn in the Remark [*F*], that the friendſhip and epiſtolary correſpondence between theſe two great Hiſtorians began in the year 1605, ten years before the Annals of Queen Elizabeth had ſeen the light. It is certain that Thuanus died the 17th of May 1617, above ſix years before Camden. I do not know what the ſame Critic would have ſaid as to the third paſſage, in caſe he had rejoined; but I am ſure he would not have produced the real proofs which ſhew that Thuanus was not concerned in the Edition of the ſecond Volume of Camden, nor was the Depoſitary of the Manuſcript. The beſt proofs of this are to be found, not in the Life of Peter du Puy (45), but in Camden's Letters. The CXLVII was written to him by Peter du Puy, a few days before the death of Thuanus (46). At that time Peter du Puy knew by hear-ſay only that the Annals of Queen Elizabeth were finiſhed: he tells the Author that the Continuation of them was daily expected. He wrote the ſame thing to him ſome months after (47). We have ſeen above what Peireſkius wrote to him in the year 1620. Peter du Puy wrote to him in the month of November the ſame year. He had not yet that Manuſcript depoſited with him, but he expected it. *Cum de Hiſtoria tua agis, & de me depoſitario cogitas, non malè certè cogitas, fidelem enim & verè amicum hac in re experieris: tantum effice ut tutò ad me perferatur* (48). i. e. " When you ſpeak of your Hiſtory, and think of me for the depoſitary, you " certainly do not think amiſs; for you ſhall find me " a truſty and real friend in this affair: only take care " that it be conveyed ſafely to me." I belive he ſent it to Holland after the Author's death: it was printed at Leyden in the year 1625.

(44) Defence of the Reflections &c. Or *Defenſe de la Critique de Mr. Varillas*, pag. 60. of the Amſterdam edition of 1688.

(45) *Servavit etiam* (Petrus Puteanus) *Camdeni partem alteram Elizabethæ Britannorum Reginæ, quam Auctor ſe vivo edere non auſus penes Puteanum deponi curaverat.* i. e. " He (*Peter du Puy*) alſo preſerved the ſecond part of Camden's Elizabeth, which the Author not daring to publiſh in his life-time, had taken care to depoſit with Du Puy." Rigaltius *in Vita Puteani*, pag. 663. in *Collectione Bateſii*. If this is not the beſt proof, it is at leaſt a good one.

(46) *IV Kal. Junii* 1617.

(47) *III Kal. VIIbris* 1617.

(48) *Epiſt. Camd.* pag. 310.

(49) Smith. *in Vita Camdeni*, pag. 72.

(50) This Letter is the XCVIIth among thoſe of Camden, pag. 137.

[*I*] *His application to ſtudy hindred him from travelling abroad, or ingaging in marriage.*] With regard to the latter, theſe are the words of Dr. Smith. *Ut a literis neutiquam avocaretur, Ortelii, Joſephi Scaligeri, Nicolai Fabri, aliorumque, quorum fama melius ſcriptis ex fœcundiſſimo cerebro prognatis quam longâ nepotum ſerie in omne ævum propagabitur, exempla æmulatus, opulentis matrimoniis, quæ multa ſtudiorum impedimenta allatura prævidiſſet, vitam prætulit cælibem, ſancti propoſiti uſque & uſque retinentiſſimus* (49). i. e. " That " nothing might take him off from *his Books*, in imitation of Ortelius, Joſeph Scaliger, Nicholas Faber, " and others, whoſe fame will be tranſmitted to future ages by their writings, the offſpring of their " fertile brain, better than by a long ſeries of deſcendants, he choſe to lead a ſingle life rather than to " marry advantageouſly, foreſeeing that matrimony " would bring along with it many hindrances to ſtudy; " and he kept his good reſolution to the laſt." As to travelling, the Author of his Life obſerves that Claudius Joubert was miſtaken, when he wrote to Camden from Dijon, in the year 1612 (50), that he called to mind with pleaſure the time they had paſſed together at Padua; Camden having never ſtirred out of England. *Licet per negotioſam vitam patrio ſolo adfixus, ne pedem quidem unquam extra Angliam moviſſet: quod adnotari maximè oportuit, ne quiſpiam D. Joubertii, ex lapſu memoriæ alium pro alio ſubſtituentis, literis deceptus, illum olim Patavii ſtuduiſſe crederet* (51). A great many people boaſt of having been familiarly acquainted at the Univerſities with ſuch or ſuch a perſon who is become famous by his Writings: they boaſt of it, I ſay, though the thing be not true (52); but there are few who write ſo to that perſon, as Joubert did to Camden.

(51) Smith. *in Vita Camdeni*, pag. 75.

(52) See the *Letters of Des Cartes*, tom. 2. pag. 454.

[*K*] *We find . . . in the Life of Camden the reſentment of a Gentleman who had a female Relation mentioned with diſhonour in the Books of that Hiſtorian.*] Camden had made mention of a Lady, without naming her, who had ſhewn her regard for a Gentleman ſo far as to grant him the laſt favour, without having been able to avoid thoſe diſagreeable conſequences which are talked of at Court and about town, with more pleaſure than ſcandal. The Gentleman became illuſtrious by his valour and learning, and repaired the Lady's honour in the uſual way; for he married her. One of the girl's relations pretended Camden had diſhonoured their family, and was ſo tranſported with rage againſt that Hiſtorian, that he broke the noſe of his ſtatue placed over his tomb in Weſtminſter Abbey (53). This is what Hiſtorians who flatter not, and who ſpeak the truth, make themſelves liable to; and this is the reaſon why there are ſo few Hiſtories wherein they dare ſpeak plainly of thoſe who are living, or who have left children of any conſideration behind them. Camden, by having been ſincere and faithful, had made himſelf ſo many enemies, that this was the reaſon why he would not let the Continuation of his Annals be printed in his life time. At leaſt he wiſhed, in caſe the King ordered it otherwiſe, that they ſhould not ſuffer his Annals to be tranſlated into Engliſh during his Life. He was afraid he ſhould find fewer equitable Readers among the vulgar than among the learned. *Crebrâ experientiâ didicerat, ſtudium veritatis eruendæ in Annalibus ipſi odium & obtrectationem peperiſſe; ideo de parte alterâ in lucem publicam edendâ, quod ſupra monui, non ſolicitus, vel potius ne ederetur, niſi poſt cineres conditos, totum id Regiæ Majeſtatis arbitrio commiſit, obnixè deprecans, ne, ſi ita ſtatuiſſet Rex optimus, in vernaculum ſermonem opus iſtud Hiſtoricum ipſo vivente verteretur, ſatis gnarus, indoctos è vulgo Lectores iniquiſſimis cenſuris in Hiſtoriarum Scriptores, ut ut veritati ex integro lita-verint, dum vita adhuc ſupereſt, pro fatuitate & malitiâ ſuâ fieri ſolere* (54).

(53) Smith. *in Vita Camdeni*, pag. 75, 76.

(54) Ibid. pag. 75.

[*L*] *He did not always put his name to the Books which he publiſhed.*] He prefixed only the two letters M. N. to an Engliſh Book which he publiſhed in the year 1604, under the title of *Reliquiarum de Britannia* (55). He had printed in the year 1600 a Collection of Inſcriptions and Epitaphs, which are to be read in Weſtminſter Abbey &c. to which he did not ſet his name; but he ſet it to the Latin Tranſlation of Father Garnet's Tryal, publiſhed at London in 1607.

(55) Ibid. pag. 40.

[*M*] *One part of the Memoirs which he made uſe of in compoſing his Annals has been loſt.*] Godfrey Goodman, the ſon and nephew of two perſons to whom Camden had great obligations, and who was afterwards advanced to the Biſhoprick of Glouceſter, deſired that he would leave him his papers of that ſort by his will, and wrote to him on that head. Camden aſſured him that he would have left them to him with all his heart, if he had not a long time before promiſed them to Richard Bancroft Archbiſhop of Canterbury. After that Archbiſhop's death, his right was tranſmitted

to

We ſhould be in the wrong, in my opinion, to imagine, from a Paſſage of Caſaubon, that Camden did no more than turn the Annals of Queen Elizabeth into Latin [*N*].

to George Abbot his Succeſſor, who, as it is ſaid, put all thoſe papers into a room in Lambeth Palace. What is become of them is not now known: however, theſe were not the Memoirs which concerned civil affairs, for they are to be found in the Cotton Library: theſe were the Memoirs which concerned Eccleſiaſtical affairs. Dr. Smith ſuppoſes they were loſt when Archbiſhop Laud was impriſoned. As he was accuſed of ſeveral imaginary crimes, ſays he, William Prynne, who was pilloried for his ſeditious Libels, took away all that Prelate's papers, to ſee whether any thing might be found in them either to ſupport the accuſations which were brought againſt him, or to clear him from them. Afterwards, Thomas Scott, one of the Demagogues in the Rebellion, and Hugh Peters, who were both executed for the murder of Charles I, plundered Laud's Library. *Poſtea Thomas Scottus e Demagogis Parliamentariis lingua & manu promptus audaxque; & Hugo Petri infamis & impurus homuncio, quorum uterque ob Regicidium meritiſſimas ſuſpendii pœnas vindice juſtitiâ poſt duodecennium luebat, Bibliothecam diripuerunt* (56). After the Reſtoration of the Royal Family, William Sancroft Archbiſhop of Canterbury collected all the ſcattered remains, and ſearched every where after them. He found a great many papers in the room where Camden's ſhould have been; but the latter were quite gone, nor could they be traced at all (57).

(56) Ibid. pag. 56.

(57) Idem, ibid. pag. 55, & ſeq.

[*N*] *We ſhould be in the wrong to imagine, from a paſſage of Caſaubon, that Camden did no more than put the Annals of Queen Elizabeth into Latin.*] The paſſage of Caſaubon (58) is in a letter to Thuanus; which is the CCXCIV. Caſaubon's words follow: *Scripſi aliquoties ad te Cottonium ab urbe abeſſe, in contexendâ Hiſtoria occupatum. Nuper cum mihi Ser. Rex indicaſſet ipſum eſſe in urbe, memor mandatorum tuorum adii: reſpondit ſe totum in eo eſſe ut cœptam Hiſtoriam abſolvat quam ille Anglico Sermone compoſuit, Camdenus Latinam fecit.* i. e. "I have wrote to you more than once "that Sir Robert Cotton was out of town, and buſy "in preparing his Hiſtory. Being lately informed "by the King that he was in town, I went to him "purſuant to your deſire: he anſwered that he was "wholly taken up in finiſhing the Hiſtory he had be-"gun, which he has written in Engliſh, and Camden "has turned into Latin."

(58) It was pointed out and ſent to me by Mr. Hill, the learned Miniſter of the Engliſh Church at Rotterdam.

☞ CAMERARIUS (JOACHIM), one of the moſt learned Writers of the ſixteenth Century, was born April the 12th in the year 1500 at Bamberg, a City of Franconia. He was ſon of John Camerarius [*A*], a Senator of that City, who lived to eighty years of age without ever having taken Phyſic or let Blood, by Martha Wecelia, a native of Steinfurt (*a*). He began his ſtudies in his own country under a Maſter, who was eſteemed a perſon of conſiderable abilities at that time; and in a ſhort ſpace he made ſo great a progreſs, that when he was but thirteen years old, his Maſter declared that he could teach him no further. Upon this he was ſent to Leipſic to ſtudy under George Heltus, who being charmed with his genius and diſpoſition, took the ſame care of him as if he had been his own ſon. We may judge what advances he made in learning from this circumſtance, that Richard Crocus, under whom he ſtudied the Greek Language, being ſometimes obliged to be abſent, he left our Author to read the Lectures in his room, though he was then but ſixteen years of age (*b*). He had a peculiar affection for that Language, and was particularly charmed with Herodotus [*B*], whom he read over frequently with the utmoſt attention. Peter Moſellanus ſucceeding Crocus in the Profeſſorſhip of the Greek Tongue, our Author continued his ſtudies under him with ſo much vigour, that he ſoon became ſuperior to his Maſters in the knowledge of moſt Arts and Languages. After he ſtaid five years at Leipſic he went at eighteen years of age to Erford, where he was admitted Maſter of Arts in 1521. The troubles of that City, and the Plague which raged there, obliging him to leave it, he was induced by the reputation of Luther and Melancthon to go to Wittemberg to viſit them [*C*]. The war of the Peaſants, which laid Germany waſte in 1525, not ſuffering him to enjoy the repoſe and tranquillity which he wiſhed at Wittemberg, he went to Pruſſia with James Fuxius, a Gentleman of Franconia, where he was received with the utmoſt civility, not only by the men of learning, but even the Magiſtrates and Princes. The year following Melancthon being deſired by

(a) Melchior. Adam. *Vitæ Germanorum Philoſophorum*, pag. 258. edit. Francofurti 1663, in 8vo.

(b) Idem, pag. 258, 259.

[*A*] *He was ſon of John Camerarius.*] The antient name of the family was *Leibhard*; but it was afterwards changed into that of *Cammermeiſter*, in Latin *Camerarius*, from the Office, which one of his anceſtors had held at Court in the time of Henry the Lame (1).

(1) Melch. Adami, *Vitæ Germanor. Philoſoph.* pag. 251. edit. Francofurti 1663 in 8vo.

[*B*] *He had a peculiar affection for that language, and was particularly charmed with Herodotus.*] At that time there was a great ſcarcity of Greek books; and it was eſteemed a prodigious piece of good fortune, when learning firſt revived in Germany, to be poſſeſſed of, or to have the opportunity of reading Homer or Herodotus, or other Greek Writers. When Camerarius had copied with his own hand a great part of thoſe Authors, he met with Aldus's firſt edition of Herodotus (2), upon which he congratulated himſelf as if he had found a treaſure; and was ſo highly fond of it, that when the inhabitants of Leipſic roſe upon the ſtudents there, he took no care of any thing but his Edition of Herodotus, which he concealed under his gown; and by reading that Writer often over he made himſelf maſter of the Greek Language. *Magna erat tum Græcorum voluminum penuria, enatiſque primum in Germaniâ literis, Homerum aut Herodotum, alioſve Graii oris Autores habuiſſe & volutâſſe magnum erat. Quare illorum non exiguam cum partem ſuâ deſcripſiſſet manu, mirum quam de primâ Herodoti Editione Aldinâ, velut Pactoli aut Tagi opibus, ſibi fuerit gratulatus, adeò quidem ut in Panico Civium adverſum Studioſos tumultu, de reliquo parum anxius, unum ſuum Herodotum ſub veſte teneret; è quo Scriptore ſæpius percurſo Græca poſtmodum addidicit* (3).

(2) It was printed at Venice in 1502.

(3) Melch. Adam. pag. 259.

[*C*] *He was induced by the reputation of Luther and Melancthon to go to Wittemberg to viſit them.*] At Wittemberg every one, who was capable of forming a good judgment of his excellent abilities and diſpoſition, ſhewed him the utmoſt civility and reſpect, and eſpecially Melancthon, to whom he was known before, and who conſidered him in the ſame light, as Cicero did Atticus, and lived ever after in the utmoſt friendſhip and confidence with him. With the ſame facility, when he was but in the four and twentieth year of his age, he procured himſelf the acquaintance of Eraſmus, as he tells us in his Commentaries upon the firſt Book of the *Tuſculan Queſtions*. *Hic quotquot de ingeniis aliquid poterant judicare, amore ipſum complecti, præcipuè verò Melancthon, cui jam antea innotuerat Camerarius, quod Cicero olim Atticum, id ipſe Camerarium ſibi exiſtimare; eoque ſic ſequentibus vitæ annis uti, ut nec familiarius ullo, nec libentius. Eadem facilitate anno ætatis vigeſimo quarto aditum ſibi ad Eraſmi notitiam patefecit & muniit; de quâ ipſe in Commentariis ſuper Tuſculanarum Quæſtionum librum primum* (4).

(4) Idem, pag. 260.

by the Senate of Nuremberg to erect a College in their City, and to ſuch Profeſſors there, as might give it reputation, he engaged Camerarius, who was juſt returned from Pruſſia, to teach the Latin and Greek Tongues there. He entered upon this Province with his Collegues the ſame year [*D*]. And his writings, of which he publiſhed a great number in the courſe of a long life, raiſed him a diſtinguiſhed character [*E*]. The Diet of Spires, which was then held, thinking proper to ſend an Embaſſy to the Emperor Charles V, who was at that time in Spain, nominated Albert Count Mansfeld for that purpoſe, and appointed our Author for his Latin Interpreter. This was highly agreeable to Camerarius, who had a ſtrong deſire to ſee Spain; but he went no further than Eſlingen, becauſe the Embaſſy was ſuſpended till another time (*c*). Upon his return to Nuremberg he married in 1527 Anne Truchſes of Grunſperg of a noble and antient family, with whom he lived in the utmoſt harmony for forty ſix years, and had nine children by her. He had the ſame year the misfortune of loſing his father and one of his brothers (*d*). In 1530 the Senate of Nuremberg ſent him with ſome other perſons to the Diet of Augſburg; and four years after choſe him for their Secretary; but he refuſed that poſt, tho' of great profit (*e*). In 1538 Ulric Duke of Wirtemberg ſent for him to Tubing, in order to reſtore the Univerſity, which had been extremely diſordered by the war; and he continued there five years, during which time he recovered it to its former luſtre. He ſeems to have been peculiarly deſigned for the reſtoration of Univerſities; for he had ſcarce re-eſtabliſhed that of Tubing, when he was ſent for in 1541 to Leipſic by the Duke of Saxony for the ſame purpoſe. He taught there during the remainder of his life, but with ſome interruption; for the war obliging him to depart, he removed from one place to another till 1547, when affairs being brought to a ſtate of tranquillity, he returned and reſumed his former employments. In 1555 he went to the Diet of Augſbourg, and afterwards with Melancthon to Nuremberg upon affairs of Religion. The year following he accompanied that learned man, who repoſed the moſt unreſerved confidence in him, to the Diet of Ratiſbon. The year 1557 was very unfortunate to him; for he loſt two of

(c) Idem, pag. 259, 260, 261.

(d) Idem, pag. 261.

(e) Idem, pag. 262.

[*D*] *He entered upon this Province with his Collegues the ſame year.*] His Collegues were Helius Eobanus Heſſus, a celebrated Poet, Michael Rotingus, and Jo. Schoner, an eminent Mathematician (5). Our Author ſoon procured himſelf a prodigious reputation by his lectures; and his Auditors, among whom were ſome of the Senators themſelves, received the utmoſt advantage from them. *Statimque ſingularem ipſe Laudem, Auditores verò, de quòrum numero nonnulli etiam ex Senatorio ordine fuerunt, maximum ſenſerunt fructum* (6).

(5) Idem, ibid.

(6) Idem, pag. 261.

[*E*] *And his Writings, of which he publiſhed a great number in the courſe of a long life, raiſed him a diſtinguiſhed character.*] His Works are almoſt infinite in number, tho' the greateſt part of them, as Mr. Baillet obſerves (7), are become very ſcarce, becauſe men of taſte and judgment purchaſe them as ſoon as ever they meet with them. Geſner in his *Bibliotheca* has given us a Catalogue of his works; and Father Niceron in his *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire des Hommes illuſtres* (8), has mentioned 150 Books either written or tranſlated by him. He tranſlated into Latin Herodotus, Demoſthenes, Xenophon, Euclid, Homer, Theocritus, Sophocles, Lucian, Theodoret, Nicephorus, and Gregory Nyſſen, &c. He publiſhed a Catalogue of the Biſhops of the principal Sees; Greek Epiſtles; accounts of his journies in Latin Verſe; Epigrams of the ancient Greek Poets; a Commentary on Plautus; the lives of Helius Eobanus Heſſus and Philip Melancthon, &c. We ſhall now conſider the judgments, which have been paſſed by the learned upon our Author. Hadrian Turnebus in his *Adverſaria* (9) ſtiles him the glory and ornament not only of Germany, but even of all Europe. *Non ſuæ tantum Germaniæ, ſed etiam totius noſtræ Europæ decus & ornamentum, Joachimus Camerarius.* Henry Stephens in his *Preface to Macrobius*, gives him the title of the luminary and pillar of Polite Literature in Germany. Lipſius in his letter to our Author's ſon, Joachim, aſſerts, that he had no equal in all Germany. *Grati mihi Camerarii ob unum illum virum, quem Germania veſtra habuit ſine pari.* Taubman (10) calls him the Prince of Writers in the Latin and Greek Tongues. Theodore Beza in his *Icon illuſtrium Virorum* tells us, that it was generally agreed among the learned, that Germany had no Writer more ſkilled than him in the Greek Language, and but few more elegant in Latin, and not one more exact, as appears from his Works. *Eo provectus eſt Eruditionis, ut communi Doctorum omnium conſenſu, peritiorem Linguæ Græcæ neminem, in Latinâ verò Linguâ diſertiores perpaucos, exactiorem autem nullum ſcripto-rem habuerit Germania, ſicut plurima ipſius monumenta teſtantur.* Joſeph Scaliger in the *Scaligerana prima* (11) ſays, that his tranſlations of Authors were not ill done. *Camerarius vir bonus, qui non malè Authores interpretabatur.* And in the *Scaligerana ſecunda* he ſays, that our Author was one of the greateſt men in Germany in his time. *Camerarius fuit unus è maximis ætatis ſuæ Germanis.* Paulus Jovius in his *Elogia* tells us, that he was ſo well ſkilled in the Greek and Latin tongues, that in his Writings he imitated Cicero with great ſucceſs. *Eſt in celebri famâ Joachimus Camerarius, Græcæ atque Latinæ linguæ ita peritus, ut ſcribendo pernobilis Ciceronis imitator evaſerit.* Eraſmus in the 45th Epiſtle Lib. XXVI (12) obſerves, that he owed more to his induſtry than to nature. *Joachimus plus habere videtur curæ quam naturæ.* Schioppius in his Book *de Arte Critica* (13) affirms, that the ſervices which he did to the Republic of Letters, were innumerable; and that the envious attempts of others have not been able in the leaſt to injure his character. *Nota Joachimi Camerarii innumera in rem literariam benè promerita; quemque nequicquam ingrati Lucumones rodere conantur.* Gerard Voſſius in his Book *de Scientiis Mathematicis* (14) tells us, that he is ſuperior to all the praiſes, which have been given him; and that he was the Phœnix of Germany, not only in the opinion of his own country, but even that of foreign nations; that Jovius, Turnebus, Lipſius, and all the beſt and moſt learned men have extolled his merits; ſo that any perſon, who ſhould not have the greateſt eſteem for him, would upon the ſureſt grounds deſerve immediately to be placed among men of no learning, or of no virtue. *Profectò vir hic nunquam ſatis laudatus, ſi alius quiſquam, verè Germaniæ ſuæ Phœnix fuit, non gentis ſuæ judicio ſolum, ſed etiam exterarum. Quantis enim præconiis eum extollunt Jovius, Turnebus, Lipſius, ac optimus & doctiſſimus quiſque, uſque adeo, ut qui eum non maximi faciat, is certiſſimo indicio, vel inter indoctos, vel improbos referri mereatur.* Gabriel Naudæus in his *Bibliographia Politica* mentioning our Author and Zuingerus, aſſerts that no perſon ever read them without great improvement: *à quorum Lectione nemo unquam niſi doctior receſſit*; and in another place he tells us, that Camerarius and Giphanius never attempted any thing in Literature in an abſurd manner: *Camerarius & Giphanius nihil unquam inepte moliti ſunt.* Olaus Borrichius in his *Diſſertatio de Poetis Latinis* (15) obſerves, that beſides the other ſervices which he did the youth of Germany, he ſucceeded likewiſe extremely well in verſe, eſpecially of the elegiac kind, in which he was inferior

(7) *Jugemens des Savans*, tom. 2. num. 380. pag. 170. edit. Amſterdam 1725, in 4to.

(8) Tom. 19. pag. 84--120. edit. de Paris 1732.

(9) Lib. 4. cap. 1.

(10) *Apud* Baillet, *ubi ſupra.*

(11) Pag. 41.

(12) *Apud* Blount, *Cenſur. Celebrior. Autborum*, pag. 591. edit. Geneva 1694. in 4to.

(13) Pag. 7.

(14) Cap. 65. §. 14. pag. 377.

(15) pag. 127.

of his daughters, and his dear friend Melancthon, and Sabinus, Lotichius, and Gerbelius, with whom he lived in great familiarity (*f*). In 1568 the Emperor Maximilian II sent for him to Vienna, and conferred with him upon several points of Religion, and dismissed him with considerable marks of his favour (*g*). He lost his wife July 15th 1573, and from that time his health began every day to decline, till at last he died April 17th 1574, aged 74 years (*h*). We shall give Melchior Adamus's character of him in the note [*E*].

(*f*) Idem, pag. 262, 263.

(*g*) Idem, pag. 264.

(*h*) Idem, ibid.

inferior to few Poets, with respect to invention, ease, propriety, or numbers. *Joachimus Camerarius reliquis in juventutem Germanicam meritis adjunxit & Carminis gloriam, præsertim elegiaci, quâ paucis adeò cedit, sive inventionem consideres, sive facilitatem, proprietatem, numerum.* Monsieur Huet, afterwards Bishop of Avranches in France, in his Book *de claris Interpretibus* tells us, that he deserved prodigiously well of Polite Literature, and was the singular ornament of Germany; that his stile is chaste and perspicuous, and if his translation be compared with the Greek original, it will appear to be just and accurate, and never diffuse, except when it is necessary to explain some obscure passages, and that but seldom and to a very small degree. *Vir de politiori Literaturâ præclarè meritus Joachimus Camerarius, suæque adeò Germaniæ singulare Ornamentum. Castus sermo & perspicuus, & quem si cum Græcis conferas, sincerum atque sanum, & nonnisi obscurioribus declarandis, idque raro & leviter, excurrentem agnoscas.*

[*F*] *We shall give Melchior Adamus's character of him in the Note.*] He tells us (16), that our Author was well made in his person, and of firm health, which he endeavoured to preserve by the proper exercises of the body. He was very agreeable and facetious in his conversation among his friends; but at home he was very grave, tho' without any severity, and seldom spoke to his children but in monosyllables. He was a strict lover of truth, and so averse to lying, that he could not bear fiction even in raillery. *Sermones, quos Græci* Διατριβὰς *vocant, ut in conviviis amicorum cum ingenio ferebat, ita domi suæ, sine oris tamen tristitiâ, gravis erat, & liberis, quod aiunt, monosyllabus. Veritatem spirabat semper, & suos ad eam aspirare in omni vitâ cupiebat. A mendacio tantum aberat, ut ne jocosum quidem ferre posset, omnibusque iis, quibus animi sensus sub linguâ potius, quam in linguâ, inimicum se acerrimum & assiduum adversarium profiteretur.* (16) pag. 264, 265.

He was very simple and modest in his dress, and never regarded the change of the fashion, tho' it sometimes exposed him to the raillery of his friends. He was never sollicitous to heap up riches, but committed the care of his affairs to his wife and children. And tho' he did not require them to live in a sordid way, yet if he saw any of his family desire things, which were not necessary, he used that expression of Socrates, *Learn to want. Opum congerendarum nunquam appetens, rei familiaris curam universam conjugi & liberis commendabat. Sordes nullo imperabat modo; quod si tamen domesticos animadverteret interdum non necessaria expetere, Socraticum hoc in ore habebat,* Discè carere. He cultivated a friendship with the most eminent Men of that Age, and particularly Baumgartner, Carolovitius, Melancthon, Peter Victorius, Hadrian Turnebus, and Jerom Wolfius; and he was so warm in his friendships, that the death of any of his friends gave him the most exquisite regret. When he wrote Letters, even to his children, he kept a copy of them. He was so constant in his studies, that he did not discontinue them, even when he travelled; for what he had meditated either on horseback, or at night, he afterwards set down in writing. He applied himself to the French and Italian Languages, when he was far advanced in years; and made some progress in the Hebrew. But with respect to the Greek and Latin Tongues, he was inferior to no Writer of his Age. He had read over with great application the Historians, Poets, Orators, Physicians, Civilians, and Divines in Greek and Latin. *Studia nunquam remittebat, ne inter peregrinandum quidem, sed quæ absente Bibliothecâ, vel inter vias, dum equitaret, vel de nocte animo concepisset, arrepto deinde calamo annotabat. Linguam Gallicam & Italicam jam senex attigit, & Hebraicam etiam degustavit. In Græcâ familiam duxit: in Latinâ cessit nemini. Historicos, poetas, oratores, medicos, jurisconsultos, theologos Græcos & Latinos excussit.* T.

CAMERON (JOHN) one of the most famous Divines of the seventeenth Century amongst the Protestants of France, was born at Glasgow in Scotland, where he taught the Greek Tongue as soon as he had finished his Course of Polite Literature and Philosophy. Having read Lectures upon that Language for a year, he had a mind to travel into foreign countries, and went to Bourdeaux in 1600, being then a little above twenty years old. The Ministers of that City (*a*) were so well pleased with his wit, his learning, and his polite behaviour, that they procured him the Mastership of a College for teaching the Greek and Latin Tongue, which they established at Bergerac. They justly wondered, that being so young, he could speak Greek *extempore* as readily and with as much elegance, as others do Latin. The Duke of Bouillon took him from Bergerac to make him Professor of Philosophy at Sedan. Cameron having performed the functions of a Professor for two years, took his leave of the Duke, and went to Paris, and from Paris to Bourdeaux, where he arrived the latter end of the year 1604. The Church of that City resolved to provide for his maintenance during four years, whenever he would go to study Divinity, and he promised that at the end of that term he would serve that Church in the quality of a Minister. During these four years he was Tutor to the children of the Chancellor of Navarre (*b*); the first year at their father's house at Paris, the two following at Geneva, and the fourth at Heidelberg. In the year 1608 the Church of Bourdeaux recalled him, and chose him to fill up the place of a Minister, whom she had lately lost (*c*). He served that Church for ten years following with so much reputation, that the University of Saumur judged him worthy to succeed Gomarus in the Professorship of Divinity. He accepted their office, and performed all the functions of his post with wonderful success till the year 1630, when the University was almost entirely dispersed by the civil war, which the difference of Religion occasioned [*A*]. He retired into England with his family,

(*a*) They were two, the one called *Renaud*, was a Frenchman, the other, named *Primerose*, was a Scotsman.

(*b*) His name was *Calignon*.

(*c*) It was Monsieur *Renaud*.

[*A*] *He accepted the Professorship of Divinity at Saumur, and performed the functions of it... till the University was ... dispersed by the civil war, which the difference of Religion occasioned.*] He began his lectures June the 13th, 1618 (1), but he was not installed till two months after (2); the Synod of Poitou made some objections against his being admitted, because he was of Piscator's opinion concerning the Imputation of Christ's righteousness. But this opposition was declared void by the National Synod held at Alez in the year 1620. Take notice

(1) Blondel, *Actes Authentiques*, pag. 15.

(2) August the 18th 1618.

mily, and ſettled at London, where he obtained leave to teach Divinity at home; but he did not continue long in this ſtation, for King James gave him the Maſterſhip of a College, and made him Profeſſor of Divinity at Glaſgow [*B*]. This favour did not ſuit his taſte; he had not been a full year at Glaſgow but he longed to ſee France again, and returned to Saumur with his whole family, and read private Lectures there, for the Court had forbidden him to teach publickly. Having paſſed thus a year at Saumur, he went to Montauban towards the latter end of the year 1624, having been choſen Profeſſor of Divinity in that City; but he did not enjoy that employment a long time; as he would not be of the reigning party, he expoſed himſelf to a thouſand vexations, which did not end but with his life in the year 1625 [*C*]; he was then about forty ſix years old. He had

notice of what follows. When Du Pleſſis Mornay had been deprived of the government of Saumur 1621 (3), Cameron retired to Paris, and was conducted to a houſe called *l'Ile*, near Orleans, where he had a conference with Tilenus, who had declared himſelf for the Arminian party. An account of this diſpute *was immediately printed at Leiden, and received with an incredible applauſe.* Cameron repreſented to the National Synod, held at Charenton in 1623, that *he was out of employments, and had not wherewithal to maintain his family*, ſince the King *would not for the preſent give him leave to take again upon him the functions either of a Miniſter or of a Profeſſor.* Hereupon the Aſſembly granted him a thouſand livres (4). Some time after the King gave him leave to ſerve the Church as he had done before. Thus Blondel relates this affair: but his great memory has not been very exact on this occaſion. It is true indeed, that when Cameron left Saumur in 1621, he went to Paris, but he did not continue long there, for he ſoon retired to London; nor was it from Paris that he was conducted to l'Iſle, in order to confer with Tilenus; nor had he that conference after the diſperſion of the Univerſity of Saumur. The whole affair paſſed in the following manner. Cameron having been acquainted that Daniel Tilenus deſired to confer with him concerning the Doctrines of Grace and Free-will, they appointed the time and place when and where they ſhould meet; accordingly Cameron went from Saumur to Orleans, where he arrived April the 18th 1620. Tilenus did not come till five days after. The conference was held at l'Iſle a country-houſe of Monſieur Groſlot near Orleans, and laſted from April the 24th to the 28th of the ſame month (5). The account of this diſpute, which is printed amongſt Cameron's works, is intitled, *Amica collatio de gratiæ & voluntatis humanæ concurſu in vocatione, & quibuſdam annexis, inſtituta inter Cl. V. Danielem Tilenum & Johannem Cameronem.* It was printed at Leiden in 1621 without the Approbation of the Profeſſors of Divinity, who on the contrary diſliked ſome paſſages in it (6).

[*B*] *King James gave him the Maſterſhip of a College . . . at Glaſgow.*] It is pretended that Cameron was very kindly received by the Biſhop of Ely and by the other Court-Biſhops; becauſe in his expoſition of theſe famous paſſages, *Thou art Peter, and tell it unto the Church*, he had approved the Hierarchy. It was for this reaſon that they recommended him to King James, and that the King, by the advice of the Biſhop of Ely ſent him into Scotland, and gave him the place which Trochoregius had, a man whom the Prelates did not at all like; wherefore they were glad to take him from Glaſgow, where he taught Divinity, and to confer that employment with the Maſterſhip of the College on Cameron (7). This rendred Cameron a little odious to the Puritans; ſo that finding himſelf a ſtranger in his own Country, he ſoon reſolved to return into France. The Author, who tells us this, quotes a Scots Writer, who cenſures and confutes John Cameron more than once in a Book publiſhed in 1637 againſt the Ceremonies of the Church of England. The ſame Author obſerves that King James, tho' he was very generous, never gave any thing to Cameron but good words and fair promiſes, which made this Miniſter boaſt, that he enjoyed the King's friendſhip; *This I can affirm*, he uſed to ſay to his friends, *the King is my friend* (8).

[*C*] *His vexations ended with his life in* 1625.] The Author of the *Icon Johannis Cameronis* has omitted the tragical circumſtances of Cameron's death; perhaps from a principle of charity towards the city of Montauban, and even towards the whole party of the Reformers in France; for after all it is a blemiſh in their reputation, that ſo great a man ſhould have been treated as he was, and that the villain, who attempted to murther him, ſhould not, for ought we know, have been puniſhed as he deſerved. I would readily leave this particular in the darkneſs, under which the Author of the *Icon* thought fit to bury it; but what would this avail now, ſince Peter du Moulin has publiſhed it to the whole world, and ſince it is inſerted in the works of Andrew Rivet? Let us ſay then, that Cameron having declared himſelf too openly againſt the party, which preached up the civil war, expoſed himſelf to the hatred of a great many perſons, amongſt whom there was a paſſionate villain, who gave him ſo many blows, that he left him for dead. Cameron retired to Moiſſac, a town in the neighbourhood of Montauban; but finding that the change of air neither reſtored his health, nor removed his ſadneſs, he returned to Montauban, where he continued to pine away, and ſoon after died with grief. Here follow the words of my Author. *Cum ibi incurſaret obvios, & popularis æſtus torrenti obniteretur, increpant eos, in quos incidebat, tantum odium populi in ſe contraxit, ut a cive quodam, homine cerebroſo, pugnis & fuſtibus horrendum in modum cæſus pænè animam efflaverit. Dicebat autem verberanti,* Feri miſer, *pectus nudum diſlocato thorace objicient. Sic male acceptus ceſſit Montalbano, & ſe recipit Moſſacum, quod eſt oppidum in proximo, ut corpus malè affectum refocillaret. Indè paulò poſt rediit Montalbanum, ubi paucis poſt diebus ex animi ægritudine diem clauſit, & tranquille obdormivit in Domino* (9). According to William Rivet (10), it was not whilſt Cameron received the blows that he ſhewed his naked breaſt, and ſaid, *Strike, ſtrike, villain*; it was when he was threatened to be killed; the perſon who threatened him did not heſitate long, but ſeizing him immediately, threw him down, and would certainly have killed him, had not a woman ſtept between them, and covered his body with her own. *Eorum uni, qui mortem interminatus eſſet, laxatis continuò thoracis fibulis, pectus renudatum objicienti, dixerit,* feri, miſer. *Quo dicto a miſero illo violenter in terram dejectus, interfectus fuiſſet, ni mulier accurrens Cameroni jacenti innixa, corpus ejus corpore ſuo contegens, a' ictibus prohibuiſſet.* This is what he got by preaching moderation in a city, where the Emiſſaries of the Duke de Rohan encouraged the inhabitants to take up arms. Who would have thought that a Scotſman would have expoſed himſelf to blows for the ſake of Paſſive Obedience and Non-Reſiſtance? They were not well acquainted with Cameron's character, who would make him paſs for a man *full of the maxims which he learned in his own country, and according to which he made no difference between an abſolute Authority and Tyranny* (11). Du Moulin does not ſay when Cameron was ſo ill treated; but it is eaſy to conjecture it, if it be remembred, that he died either in the year 1625, according to the Author of his *Icon*, or in the beginning of 1626, according to Blondel (12). Let us obſerve, that tho' he always declared that he honoured and revered the Authority of Kings (13), yet Tilenus accuſed him publickly of being a ſeditious man, and an enemy of Monarchy, and of having preached republican principles at Charenton, which, added Tilenus, obliged him to make his eſcape. Upon this Cameron wrote a very fine Letter to King James, in which he declares, that this accuſation is entirely falſe and groundleſs; he did not deny, that the mob at Paris ſearched after him, in order to kill him, and that he went away ſecretly at the earneſt deſire of his friends: but he maintained, that the Magiſtrates had not the leaſt thought of bringing him into trouble, and that he obtained a very good paſſport, which he ſhewed at Dieppe to thoſe who required it. He alledges his witneſſes for all this.

(3) Blondel, *Actes Authentiques*, pag. 17.

(4) Ibid.

(5) See the Preface of the *Amica Collatio*, amongſt Cameron's Works.

(6) *See* Rivetus, *Oper.* tom. 3. pag. 845. *and* Cameron's *Works*, pag. 709. edit. 1692.

(7) *De Elienſis conſilio ab eo rege in Scotiam miſſus eſt, at pulſo Roberto Bodio a Trocho-regia olim in Salmurienſi ſchola Profeſſore digniſſimo, viro certè Doctiſſimo qui Epiſcopis nimium Orthodoxis vel purus videretur in Glaſcuenſi Gymnaſii Præfectura ſuccederet.* Guil. Rivetus, *Epiſt. Apologet.* ad Tho. Roſſellum, *in Operib.* And. Riveti, tom. 3. pag. 900. *See alſo* Du Moulin, in his book intitled, *De Moſis Amyraldi Libro Judicium*, pag. 228.

(8) *Sed ab amico Rege, Principe alioqui profuſo, rediit vacuus.* Idem, Guil. Rivet. Ibid. Concerning the reproaches made to Cameron, ſee Blondel's Anſwer in the *Actes Authent.* pag. 45, 46.

(9) Du Moulin, *de M. Amyraldi Libro judicium*, pag. 229.

(10) Guil. Rivet. *in Oper.* A. Riveti, tom. 3. pag. 898.

(11) See the *Hiſt. de l'edit. de Nantes*, tom. 2. pag. 191.

(12) Blondel, *Actes Authentiques.* pag. 17.

(13) *Pro certo habeo tum ſacris edoctus literis, tum recta Ratione adductus, & ipſa admonitus experientia & rerum uſu, Regum Authoritate illa ſumma, quæ nullius hominum, ſolius Dei judicio obnoxia eſt, ſemel contempta, neque Deum ritè coli, neque Eccleſiæ pacem, Reipublicæve otium conſtare ulla ratione poſſe. Sed nec aliter ſenſi unquam. Nam ex puero . . . Poſtquam vero ad Paſtoris munus primum, tum deinde Profeſſoris Sacrarum Literarum ſum vocatus, publicè privatimque, pro concione, in ſcholis, in congreſſibus, ubi res & occaſio poſcebat, eam profeſſus ſum, & pro virili parte defendi.* Cameron. *Oper.* pag. 713. edit. Genev. 1692.

had been twice married. The Churches took care of his family [D]. He was a man of a great deal of wit and judgment, had a happy memory, was very learned, a good Philoſopher, of a chearful temper, and ready to communicate not only his knowledge, but even his money (d) [E]; he was a great talker, a long Preacher [F]; little acquainted

(d) Taken from the *Icon Joh. Cameronis*, which is prefixed to his Works.

[D] *The Churches took care of his family.*] His firſt wife was of Tonneins, and was married to him in 1611. He had by her four daughters and one ſon, who lived but two years; ſhe died at Saumur in March 1634. He married his ſecond wife at Montauban, but he had no children by her. Three of his daughters by his firſt wife ſurvived him, and it was in their behalf, and in conſideration of his writings, that the National Synod, held at Caſtres in 1626, paſſed an Act, the tenor of which is, that *in order to honour the memory of the late Mr. Cameron the ſum of ſeven hundred livres was granted to his children, with another ſum, which the Sieur du Candal is to give them yearly, till the meeting of the next National Synod. And the Aſſembly entreats the Province of Anjou to procure the printing of the laſt volume of Cameron's Theological Works, promiſing that the Aſſembly would take into conſideration the expences, which were neceſſary for the printing of that volume* (14). I have ſaid already, that in 1613 the National Synod granted Cameron the ſum of a thouſand livres (15).

(14) *See* Blondel, *Act. Authent.* pag. 17.

(15) Blondel, ibid. *and* Will. Rivet. *in Oper.* And. Riveti, tom. 3. pag. 900. aſſert it.

[E] *He was ready to communicate not only his knowledge, but even his money.*] The Learned do not always care to relate in company what they know; and there have been ſome Profeſſors who kept the ſolutions of the greateſt difficulties for thoſe diſciples only, who could pay a certain price for them. This was not Cameron's character: he uſed to tell all that he knew to the firſt perſon who deſired to be inſtructed by him. *Doctrinæ ſuæ non minus quàm τῶν χρημάτων καὶ βιωτικῶν κοινωνικὸς, & liberalis largiter; volentes à ſe diſcere nil celabat, quin facile quicquid ſingulare aut inconditum habuit, iis communicabat* (16). This however is more common, than to ſee a learned man, who generouſly aſſiſts thoſe who are in neceſſity. Cameron was ſo little ſcrupulous in that reſpect, that he went beyond the bounds of generoſity, and was even prodigal. *A φιλαργυρίᾳ & μικρολογίᾳ alieniſſimus, imò verò pecuniæ minus & pro fortunæ ſuæ conditione nimius contemptor, & in erogando ſupra modum facilis, ne profuſum dicam* (17). i. e. "He was very far from avarice and the love of money; nay, he had a wonderful, and, conſidering his circumſtances, an exceſſive contempt for money, which he uſed to give away too eaſily, not to ſay, in a prodigal manner." Some Divines, who were no friends to him, have blamed him for his want of œconomy; they ſaid, that he diſperſed his money like water, and that he thought it below him ever to bargain in ſhops or inns; he always gave the price he was aſked, and never ſaid a word to have the leaſt farthing bated. This gave his enemies an opportunity of putting him in mind of the time, when he was maintained in Scotland at a public expence, for which he was to do the ſame low ſervices, which are required of thoſe, who are ſervitors, as he was. *Exigua hæc ei ſumma fuit* (18). *Nam ſuæ originis oblitus, & ejus temporis immemor, quo in eorum numerum cooptatus, qui viginti quinque Marcarum annua penſione* pauperum *aliquot* civium filiis *deſtinata* (for poorens citizens ſoones *, *ut habet formula conceſſionis) fruerentur, ea conditione ut, inter ſe diſtributis temporibus, tintinnabulum pulſarent, præceptoribuſque famularentur in libris deferendis quum ad templum irent; vel iis diebus, quibus ludebatur, arma ut vocabant, campeſtria, hoc eſt Arcus, Pharetras, Sclophas, &c. portarent; ejus temporis, inquam, immemor, regius amicus* (19), *de imperio & regno theologico, cujus altas in animis diſcipulorum fixerat radices, tantùm cogitans, pecuniam ut aquam profundebat. Et de taberna ſi quid emeret, aut ſi hoſpiti expenſa numeraret, de poſtulato precio quicquam demere, aut vel verbulo intercedere, ſe indignum cenſebat* (20). i. e. "This was but a ſmall ſum for him: (the thouſand livres granted by the Synod in 1623.) for having forgotten his origin and the time, when he was admitted to enjoy the penſion of twenty five marks, deſigned for poor Citizen's ſons (as it is ſaid in the Grant) upon condition, that they ſhould by turns ring the bell, and wait on their Teachers at church, carrying their books; or on holy-days, carry the arms, as the bows, quivers, guns, &c.

(16) *In Icone Joh. Cameronis.*

(17) Ibid.

(18) That is, the thouſand livres, which he obtained from the National Synod in 1623.

* Thus theſe words are ſpelt in all the French editions of Bayle's Dictionary.

(19) See the Remark [B] quotation (8).

(20) Guil. Rivetus, *in A. Riveti Operib.* pag. 900.

forgetting, I ſay, that time, this friend of the King, thinking of nothing but his Theological Empire and Kingdom, which he had rooted very deep into his diſciple's mind, he threw his money away like water. If he bought any thing at a ſhop, or paid his reckoning at an inn, he thought it below him to bate any thing of the price they aſked him, or to ſay the leaſt word by way of bargain."

[F] *A great talker, a long Preacher.*] The Author, who tells us this, adds (21), that Cameron would not be interrupted. *Nunquam erat ſeſſus loquendo, indefatigabilis ſermocinator, qui vel Bollanum enecaret tædio. Nam ſi nactus eſſet hominem, qui ei præberet aures attentas, a ſummo mane uſque ad veſperam ſermonem ſine intermiſſione proſecutus fuiſſet. Cum eſſem Lutetiæ, me ſæpe inviſebat, habens ſemper Milleterium comitem, affixum ejus lateri, & admiratorem. Mihi aſſidens ordiebatur ſermonem infinitæ longitudinis. Ego vero ſummo cum ſilentio aures ei accommodabam. Nam interloquentem non patiebatur. Cumque mihi ſemel contigiſſet pauca verba interfari, ille corrugans frontem ex indignatione dixit,* ne me obturba; laiſſes moy parler. *Demitto auriculas, &c. Loquebatur autem de ſuis dictis aut factis; narrabat quos ſermones habuiſſet cum illo mercatore aut Cauſidico, aut Theologo, & qua occaſione; & quomodo ab eo digreſſus ad eum miſiſſet carmina a ſe raptim conſcripta, quæ memoriter recitabat, non ſine audientium tædio* (22). i. e. "He was never tired with ſpeaking, and was an indefatigable Preacher, who would have tired even Bollanus to death. For if he happened to meet with a man, who would hear him, he would talk from morning till night without interruption. When I was at Paris he viſited me often, accompanied by Milletiere who never left him, and was his admirer. I hearkened to him in a great ſilence: for he could not bear to be interrupted; and as I once happened to drop a word, he frowned, and ſaid with indignation, *don't interrupt me, let me ſpeak.* Whereupon I humbly ſubmitted, &c. He uſed to talk of what he had ſaid or done: he related what diſcourſe he had had with ſuch a Merchant, ſuch a Lawyer, ſuch a Divine, and how having left him he compoſed immediately ſome verſes, which he recited, not without tiring his hearers." Du Moulin adds, that the Divines of England, who ſaw Cameron, were extremely fatigued with his inexhauſtible talk. *Eos diſſentientes & adverſos expertus eſt: nam præter novitatem Dogmatum, non ferebant illud Cameronis ἀμετροεπὲς et ἀδυρόγλωσσον, & incredibilem loquendi libidinem* (23). i. e. "He found by experience that they (the Engliſh Divines) were not of his opinion, nor favourable to him; for beſides the novelty of his doctrines, they could not bear his continual chattering and talkative temper."

(21) Du Moulin *in Judicio de Amyraldi Libro.*

(22) Idem, ibid. pag. 212.

(23) Idem, ibid

His manner of preaching was diſliked on many accounts; for beſides that his ſermons laſted two full hours, he uſed to digreſs and ramble from his text, and entertained his audience upon ſubjects, of which they underſtood nothing, and which he ſeemed to deliver like an Enthuſiaſt. Whilſt he was a preaching, he unbuttoned his coat, ſpread his handkerchief about him like a napkin, and uncovered his head. *Cauſæ cur ejus conciones non eſſent acceptæ in vulgus, hæ erant: quod ſuas conciones in duas horas extenderat, quod in longas & intricatas digreſſiones excurrens quaſi enthuſiaſmo abreptus diceret non intelligibilia; quod aliquando media in concione ſolveret fibulas thoracis, & præ ſe ſudarium quaſi mappam extenderet. Quandoque etiam inter concionandum caput nudaret, & pileum poneret ſuper ſuggeſtu* (24). He did not know that he tired his audience; on the contrary, he imagined that they were extremely pleaſed with his eloquence: but having one day prevailed upon a tradeſman to tell him freely, how his Sermons were eſteemed, he learnt a piece of news which vexed him prodigiouſly. Since you force me, Sir, ſaid the honeſt tradeſman, to tell you what are the diſcourſes and the opinion of your flock, I muſt own, that your Sermons are not at all ſuited to the taſte of the people; they never hear you preach, but they are prodigiouſly tired (25). Cameron,

(24) Du Moulin, *in Judicio de Amyraldi Libro*, pag. 225, 226. See alſo what Blondel obſerves upon this ſubject, *Actus Authent.* pag. 45, 46.

(25) *Profecto, Domine, tuæ conciones non ſunt ad Populi guſtum, & te populus audit maximo cum tædio.* Du Moulin, *in Judicio de Amyraldi Libro*, pag. 225.

(f) *Bezæ magnus poteſt appellari, quem quidem in ſuis prælectionibus vocat doctiſſimum interpretem, ſemper tamen ſe opponens ejus ſententiæ.* Molinæus, *in Judicio de Amyraldi Libro.*

(g) From the ſame Molinæus, ibid.

ed with the works of the Fathers (e), obſtinate in his opinions [G], and ſomewhat troubleſome. He frankly owned to his friends, that he found ſeveral things ſtill to reform in the Reformed Churches [H]. He took a delight in publiſhing particular opinions, and in going out of the beaten road; he gave inſtances of it when he was ſtill but a youth. It was in his Theſes *De Tribus Fœderibus*, which he publiſhed and maintained at Heidelberg, being yet but a *Propoſant* *; he mixed ſome novelties in all the Theological queſtions, which he examined; and when in explaining ſome paſſages of the holy Scripture, he met with ſome very great difficulties, he took very zealouſly all opportunities to contradict the other Divines, and eſpecially Beza (f); for he pretended that they had not penetrated into the very marrow of that Science (g). It was from him that Monſieur Amyraut

(e) *In Lectiones Patrum hoſpes, & inſolens.* Petrus Molinæus *in Judicio de Amyraldi Libro.*

* A candidate for the Miniſtry, who having been once examined, is admitted to preach, but not to adminiſter the Sacraments.

meron, who expected quite another anſwer, retired with the utmoſt grief. This diſcourſe had extremely vexed him; he grieved at it for ſeveral days, he grew pale and dull, and could not forbear telling his Collegue the cauſe of his melancholy. His Collegue (26), who was his intimate friend, took the right method to comfort him. What is become of your courage? ſaid he, do you mind the opinion of a fool! Are you vexed at ſuch a trifle? Be perſuaded, that all the people of faſhion in your congregation, who have any learning, hear you with a great deal of pleaſure, and reap a conſiderable benefit from your Sermons. This plaiſter did very much allay the pain, but did not heal the wound entirely; Cameron's uneaſineſs returned upon him, and he had his recourſe to a new enquiry; he propoſed to a Lawyer the ſame queſtion he had aſked the tradeſman, and received the ſame anſwer; which made him quite deſperate, he reſolved to leave Bordeaux, and to employ all his intereſt in order to procure to himſelf a more agreeable condition ſomewhere elſe (27).

(26) It was Primeroſe.

(27) From Du Moulin, *in Judicio de Amyraldi Libro.*

[G] *Obſtinate in his opinions.*] This appeared in the National Synod held at Tonneins in 1614. In that Synod Cameron refuſed to ſubſcribe the article concerning juſtification; upon which ſeveral of the members voted that the laws of the eccleſiaſtical diſcipline ſhould be put in execution againſt him; but the Synod, in order to do nothing raſhly, reſolved to ſend him a deputation of two Miniſters, namely Andrew Rivet Secretary to the Synod, and another Miniſter named Bouchereau. They intreated him to conform to the determinations of the Synod; but he anſwered, that he would rather die, than alter his opinion. All that they could get from him, was, that he promiſed he would never teach his private opinion either by word of mouth, nor in writing. Rivet prevailed upon the Synod to be ſatisfied with a promiſe, which they were accordingly, in conſideration of the many ſervices, which a man of Cameron's talent would do to the Church (28). It is pretended that he contracted that obſtinacy by having been in his youth addicted to the ſect of the Ramiſts (29).

(28) *See* Lewis Du Moulin, in his preface to his *Paræneſis ad Ædificatores Imperii in Imperio. See alſo* Guil. Rivet. *Epiſt. Apolog. ad* Roſſil, *in Operib.* Andr. Riveti, tom. 3. pag. 898.

(29) Guil. Rivet. Ibid. pag. 897.

[H] *He found ſeveral things ſtill to reform in the Reformed Church.*] Let us quote the words of the great du Moulin. *Fuit ingenio inquieto, ſemperque aliquid novi animo volutabat & nominabat, nec diſſimulabat inter amicos (quorum ego unus eram) multa eſſe in religione noſtra quæ cuperet immutata* (30). i. e. "He was of "a reſtleſs ſpirit, and always invented and ſaid ſome"thing new; and he uſed to confeſs amongſt his friends "(of whom I was one) that there were ſeveral things "in our Religion, which he wiſhed were changed." Obſerve that he did not think, that the time for this new reformation was yet come. "*Id ipſe profitetur Epiſtola* "*ad Ludovicum Capellum, ubi ait,* multa ſibi occur"rere, quæ promere & Chartæ committere nec ani"mus ejus, nec temporis ratio patiebatur (31)." i. e. "This he owns himſelf in a Letter to Lewis Cappel, "when he ſays, that he had thought of ſeveral things, "which he had no mind to publiſh nor to write "down, nor was it yet time to do it." He thought that St. Peter was the foundation of the Church; and he could not bear thoſe who maintained, that one cannot be ſaved in the Church of Rome. It vexed him, that he durſt not ſpeak more freely, and that the Miniſters, who had the greateſt power and credit, made themſelves formidable to the innovators; *conquerens quod paucos haberet* συμφρονοῦντας *& approbatores ſuæ ſententiæ*, non eſt, *inquit*, qui tantam vim ſuſtineat. *Et paulo poſt*, Nos in ea tempora incidimus, quibus ne in doctrinæ quidem methodo ἀπὸ τῶν δοκίτων εἶναι τυλοῦ fas eſt diſcedere. *Non obſcurè ſugillans, & naſo ſuſpendens optimos quoſque Paſtores Eccleſiarum noſtrarum* (32), i. e. "He complained that few per"ſons approved and admitted his opinions. *Who can* "*reſiſt ſuch a violence*, ſaid he; and a little after, *We* "*happened to live in thoſe times, in which it is not per*"*mitted to differ, no not even in the method and way* "*of teaching, from thoſe who pretend to be the Pillars* "*of the Church.* Thus bantering and ridiculing all "the moſt eminent Paſtors of our Churches." It has been reported, that his character as a Miniſter, for which he had from his heart a very great veneration, ſeemed to him an obſtacle againſt his enquiring after truth, and publiſhing what he thought true. He imagined, that if he had not been a Miniſter he might have been more at liberty to ſpeak his mind, and that he could have done it in a more uſeful manner. But the fear of being excommunicated and depoſed ſtopped his mouth, and reſtrained his pen. The Author who publiſhed theſe things, did a great injury to Cameron's memory. For as this Author had been very intimate with Cameron, and came very near to the opinions of the Roman Catholics, till having been excommunicated by the Proteſtants he openly embraced the Popiſh Religion, it was believed, that he began to be perverted by Cameron's truſting him with his moſt private opinions. *Poſtquam vir præſtans rebus humanis exemptus, res accidit, quæ Cameronis famæ magnam labem inuſſit. Nam paulò poſt Cameronis obitum, Milleterius ejus Achates & individuus comes, ſemper pendens narrantis ab ore, peperit monſtra, quæ ſub Cameronis diſciplina conceperat. Edidit enim librum in Molinæum, nihil tali expectantem; quo defendit merita & juſtificationem per opera, & de Sacramento Euchariſtiæ ſic loquitur, ut qui in Tranſubſtantiationem eſſet pronior, & de Eccleſia Romana honorifice loquitur, dicens eum omnia Fidei Chriſtianæ capita pura & illibata conſervaſſe; etſi in quibuſdam à recto tramite aberret. Profitebatur autem ſe hæc omnia habere a Camerone viro incomparabili .... Verba ejus ſunt, p. 26, 27.* "Quod appellat "Cameroniſmum, eſt elucidatio ſolida plurimarum dif"ficultatum; quam nobis reliquit ſummum illud in"genium non minus raræ pietatis quam doctrinæ. "Fateor cum laude quam ei debeo, eum mihi viam "delineaſſe, & me ejus veſtigiis inſtitiſſe. *Et paulo* "*poſt.* Scio eum ad eundem ſcopum, quem mihi pro"pono, collineaſſe, eumque ſuſcepturum fuiſſe id quod "animo conceperat, ſi Miniſter non fuiſſet. Sed expe"rientia ſimilis zeli, quo poſt obitum ſuum condemna"tur, efficiebat ut provideret ſi tale quid ſuſcepiſſet, "mox ſequuturam exauthorationem cum anathemate "ſuper caput ipſius. O quoties cum ea de re age"remus, mihi in aurem dixit, tanquam amicorum "intimo, ſe utilius talento, quod à Deo acceperat, ni"ſi Miniſter fuiſſet, uſurum fuiſſe. Non quod pro"feſſionem illam animitus non proſequeretur honore, "ſed ob conſequentiam eorum, quæ credebat à ſe uti"lius fieri poſſe, ſi liberior fuiſſet." *Nempe hæc eadem ſunt, quæ ipſe Cameron ſcripſit Cappello, ante à nobis citata, ubi ait, ſe multa habere, quæ promere & chartæ committere, temporis ratio non patiebatur* (33). i. e. "After the death of this eminent man, there hap"pened a thing which very much blemiſhed Cameron's "reputation. For ſoon after his death Milletiere, "his conſtant friend and attendant, who was very "attentive to all that he ſaid, brought forth thoſe "monſters, which he had conceived under Cameron's "diſcipline. For he publiſhed a Book againſt du Mou"lin, who expected nothing like it; wherein he main"tains the merit of good works, and the juſtifi"cation by works; and ſpeaks of the Sacrament "of

(30) Du Moulin, *in Judicio de Amyraldi Libro*, pag. 211.

(31) Idem, ibid.

(32) Idem, ibid. pag. 224.

(33) Du Moulin, *in Judicio de Amyraldi Libro*, pag. 230.

Amyraut learned the doctrine of univerſal Grace [*I*], which occaſioned ſo many diſputes in France. He loved to meditate, but not to write down his meditations, ſo that he would never have printed any thing, nor put any thing in a condition to be publiſhed, had he not, in a manner, been forced to it (*b*). It would have been a great loſs; for we have very good things of him [*K*]. When he was a Miniſter at Bourdeaux, he publiſhed a Letter, which was condemned to be burnt by a decree of the Parliament [*L*] of that City.

(*b*) *In Icone Joh. Cameronis.*

" of the Lord's Supper in a manner which ſeems to " favour Tranſubſtantiation; he alſo ſpeaks very ho- " nourably of the Church of Rome, ſaying that ſhe " has kept entire all the articles of the Chriſtian Re- " ligion, tho' in ſome points ſhe has gone aſtray. " He declared that he had learnt all this from that in- " comparable man Cameron. His words in p. 26, and " 27, are as follow. *What he calls Cameroniſm is a* " *very good explication of ſeveral difficulties, which was* " *left me by that great wit no leſs eminent for his piety,* " *than his learning. I gratefully acknowledge that* " *he ſhewed me the way, and that I follow his ſteps.* " And a little after he ſays. *I know, that he had the* " *ſame deſign that I have, and that he would have* " *performed it, had he not been a Miniſter. But the* " *experience he had of ſuch a zeal like that, by which* " *he is condemned after his death, made him foreſee,* " *that if he undertook any ſuch thing, he ſhould be im-* " *mediately depoſed and excommunicated. O how of-* " *ten did he tell me as an intimate friend, when we* " *talked together of theſe matters, that if he had not* " *been a Miniſter, he would have made a much better* " *uſe of the gifts, he had received from heaven! Not* " *but that he had a very great veneration for his pro-* " *feſſion, but he thought that if he had been more at* " *liberty he could have done things of greater importance.* " This is what Cameron wrote himſelf to Cappel, " and what we have quoted above, namely, that he " had ſeveral things, which it was not yet time to " publiſh or to write down." Here follows what a Divine of London wrote to a Miniſter of Nerac. We have ſeen Mr. Cameron paſſing through this city, he is a man of a deep melancholy, and capable of maintaining an hereſy (34).

(34) *Vir eſt profundæ melancholiæ, & qui par eſſet hereſi tuendæ.* Molinæus, ibid.

[*I*] *It was from him that Monſieur Amyraut learned the Doctrine of univerſal grace.*] Never had a diſciple more veneration for his maſter, than Monſieur Amyraut had for Cameron. It was ſaid, that he imitated even Cameron's voice, and a certain motion of his head, and that when he made a ſpeech to Lewis XIII, the King took him for a foreigner, or at leaſt, found that he had a foreign accent. *Is totum imbibit Cameronem, & ſupra omnes alios eum exacte imitari ſedulo annixus eſt, imo vel etiam in geſtu demittendi capitis* (25), *& in pronunciatione adeo, ſeu vocis tono & modulatione quadam, ſic perfecte imitari didicit, ut homo Gallus a glorioſiſſimæ memoriæ Rege Ludovico XIII, judicii magni & admirandæ imaginationis Principe, extraneus habitus ſit. Cum enim anno* 1631 *a Synodo Nationali cum aliis ad Regem delegatus eſſet, & apud Majeſtatem ejus verba feciſſet, Rex qui vultu indicavit viri facundi brevem orationem ſibi gratam fuiſſe, ad magnatem pone ſtantem converſus, ſubmiſſiore voce dixit,* extraneus eſt. *Illo vero reſpondente Gallum eſſe, in tractu Salmurienſi natum*; atqui, *(replicavit Regia Majeſtas)* peregrini aliquid in ejus pronunciatione obſervari. *Quod ex Collegatis unum qui audiverat, quùm Carentonum rediiſſet, narrare memini* (36). i. e. " He " was a great admirer of Cameron, and laboured " more than any body elſe to imitate him in every " thing, even in his manner of holding his head; " and he had ſo well acquired his voice and pronun- " ciation, that King Lewis the XIIIth, a Prince of a " great judgment and wonderful wit, took him for a " foreigner, For when in the year 1631 the Natio- " nal Synod ſent him with ſome others to the King, " and he had delivered an Oration before the King; his " Majeſty diſcovered by his looks that he approved " the ſhort diſcourſe of that eloquent man; but turn- " ing to a Nobleman, who ſtood behind him, he told " him ſoftly, *He is a ſtranger*; upon which the No- " bleman anſwered that he was a Frenchman, born " near Saumur: *But*, replied the King, *I have obſerved* " *ſomething of a Foreigner in his accent.* I remember " that one of the Deputies told this, when he was " returned to Charenton."

(35) Compare this with what has been ſaid of Alexander. *Citatiorem greſſum Leonidæ* (he was Alexander's Tutor) *vitium fuiſſe ferunt, ex ipſius conſuetudine id hæſiſſe Alexandro, quod poſtea, cum enixè vellet corrigere, non potuerit.* Freinſhemius, *in Supplementis Q. Curtii*, lib. 1. cap. 2. i. e. " It is ſaid " that Leonidas " (Alexander's " Tutor) had " too quick a " gate; which " defect Alex- " ander imitated " from him, and " could not af- " terwards get " rid of it."

(36) Guil. Rivetus, *in Operib.* Andr. Rivets, tom. 3. pag. 896.

[*K*] *We have very good things of him.*] His Theological Lectures upon very important ſubjects have been publiſhed at Saumur in three volumes in 4to. The firſt volume was printed in 1626, and the two others in 1628. Lewis Cappel, his diſciple, had the care of this edition. He alſo compoſed the *Icon Johannis Cameronis* (37), which I have quoted above. Some years after theſe three volumes were reprinted at Geneva; they added to them whatever could be found of this Author's Miſcellaneous Pieces, ſome of which, that had been publiſhed in French (as ſeven Sermons upon the VIth Chapter of St. John's Goſpel) were tranſlated into Latin. All this made one volume in *folio*. Frederick Spanheim, who was then Profeſſor of Divinity at Geneva, took care of this Edition, and added a Preface to it. They did not forget to print with it the anſwer (38), which Cameron wrote to a letter of Epiſcopius. The ſame Lewis Cappel publiſhed in 1632 Cameron's *Myrothecium Evangelicum.*

(37) Colomiés, *Bibliotheque Choiſie*, pag. 73.

(38) See upon this *Epiſtol.* 633 *Præſtant. & Erudit. Viror.* edit. 1684.

[*L*] *He publiſhed a letter, which was condemned to be burnt by a decree of the Parliament.*] In the year 1617 the Parliament of Bourdeaux condemned two Captains, accuſed of piracy, to death. As they were of the Proteſtant Religion, they petitioned to be referred to the *Chambre mipartie* *, but the Parliament rejected their petition, under this pretence, that the privileges granted by the *Edict* (of Nantz) *were not deſigned for pyrates* (39). They went to the place of execution *with ſo much courage, and gave ſuch proofs of a Chriſtian Reſignation, that Cameron thought it was proper to honour their memory by a ſhort account of what paſſed at their death. It was caſting an indirect reflection upon the Parliament, to write a Book in praiſe of thoſe, whom the Parliament had condemned: he even dropt ſome reflections which were directly levelled againſt that body, becauſe the Proteſtants pretended their privileges had been infringed. So that the Parliament revenged itſelf upon the work, till an opportunity ſhould offer to be revenged upon the Author himſelf.* The French Mercury relates ſeveral circumſtances concerning this fact. The two Captains were broken alive upon the wheel June the 20th, having each of them a paper Crown upon their heads, on which were *written the following words.* Captains of Pirates, traitors and rebellious to the King, *and their remains were put upon the towers along the port of Bourdeaux . . . . This Parliament having given Cameron leave to comfort them in priſon, before they were taken out of it, and at the place of execution, but not in their way to it, this Miniſter publiſhed afterwards a libel by way of letter* (40), *which he entitled,* Conſtance, Foy, & Reſolution à la mort des Captaines Blanquet & Gaillard. i. e. " The Conſtancy, Faith, " and Reſolution of the Captains Blanquet and Gail- " lard at their death." *This coming to the knowledge of the Parliament, an exact enquiry was made after the libel or letter, and a decree was paſſed, by which it was ordered, that the libel ſhould be burnt by the common executioner.* By the ſame decree Cameron *was ſtrictly forbidden for the future to write or publiſh ſuch letters, calculated to raiſe a ſedition, to miſrepreſent the decrees of the Parliament, to exaſperate the King's ſubjects againſt the Sovereign Courts of Judicature, and to render his Officers deſpicable; under the penalty of being exemplarily puniſhed and proſecuted as a perturbator of the public peace* (41). See in the Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantz (42), the Proceedings of the ſame Parliament againſt Cameron and his fellow-Miniſter Primeroſe in 1615.

* A Court of Juſtice, in which the Judges were one half Roman Catholicks, and the other half Proteſtants.

(39) *Hiſtoire de l'Edit. de Nantes*, tom. 2. pag. 195.

(40) Written to Palinier, Miniſter of Mornac, and dated June the 21ſt 1617.

(41) *Mercure François*, tom. 5. pag. m. 39, 40.

(42) Tom. 2. pag. 195.

CAMILLUS (MARCUS FURIUS) was the firſt who rendered the family of *Furia* very illuſtrious. He triumphed four times, was five times Dictator, and was honoured

honoured with the title of the ſecond Founder of Rome; in a word, he acquired all the glory a man can gain in his own country. During his Cenſorſhip he found means to oblige all the ſingle men of Rome to marry the widows of thoſe who had been killed in the war; he employed for that purpoſe the moſt friendly perſuaſions, and when they proved ineffectual, he made uſe of a fine. He was created Dictator the tenth year of the ſiege of Veii (*a*), and had the glory of putting an end to it by the taking of that City, the ancient rival of Rome. When he ſaw the Ruins of Veii, he ſaid a thing very remarkable [*A*]. He returned triumphant to Rome, but his triumphal Chariot drawn by four white horſes appeared an innovation too proud [*B*]; and as ſome time after he rendered ineffectual the prayers of the people, who deſired that part of the inhabitants of Rome might be tranſported to Veii, this drew upon him the hatred of his fellow Citizens, who ſoon found an opportunity to be revenged. He had voted the tenths of the ſpoil of Veii to Apollo, and forgot to lay them by. The Senate being acquainted by the *Aruſpices* or Diviners, that the Gods were angry, ordered that every ſoldier ſhould reſtore the tenth of his portion of the ſpoil. This exaſperated the people extremely againſt Camillus. The Roman Ladies did on this occaſion a very generous action [*C*]. Some time after the war againſt the Faliſci broke out (*b*), and it was then that Camillus did the noble action mentioned by Moreri (*c*); the enemies were ſo charmed with it, that they voluntarily ſubmitted to the Romans; by which means the ſoldiers were deprived of the ſpoil they expected; this gave the people a new opportunity of exclaiming againſt Camillus; at laſt they loſt all patience when Camillus had cauſed the propoſition of ſending ſome of the inhabitants to Veii, to be entirely rejected. Lucius Apuleius one of the Tribunes proſecuted him, to make him give an account of the ſpoils taken at Veii. Camillus prevented his condemnation, and baniſhed himſelf voluntarily (*d*); he was condemned to pay a very large fine. It was during his baniſhment that he performed the moſt noble action he ever did; for inſtead of rejoicing at the devaſtation of Rome by the Gauls, and of joining with them in order to be revenged of the injury his Country had done him, he exerted all his wiſdom and courage to drive the enemy away, and yet kept with the utmoſt ſtrictneſs the ſacred Law of Rome, in refuſing to accept the Command, which ſeveral private perſons offered him (*e*). He waited for the orders of the people, who were repreſented by the few inhabitants of Rome, who ſtill held out in the Capitol. But before this he had raiſed troops in the place of his baniſhment (*f*), and had gained ſome advantages over the enemy. The Romans, who were beſieged in the Capitol created him a Dictator in the year 366, in which poſt he acted with ſo much bravery and conduct, that he entirely drove the army of the Gauls out of the territories of the Commonwealth. This conſiderable ſervice, together with ſeveral other victories he gained afterwards, could not however ſecure him from the injuries of the Tribunes; for even during his Dictatorſhip in 389, they ſent a common Officer to ſummon him, who even ventured to lay hands upon him. He appeared before the people attended by the whole Senate; and as after great diſputes, the affair was determined in favour of the people (*g*), Camillus was conducted home with great ſhouts and acclamations; he

(*a*) This was A. U. 359, according to Calviſius.

(*b*) A. U. 361.

(*c*) He ſent back to the beſieged their children, whom their School-maſter had delivered to him.

(*d*) A. U. 365.

(*e*) *See* Valerius Max. lib. 4. cap. 1. num. 2.

(*f*) He was retired to Ardea.

(*g*) The people required that one of the Conſuls be of a Plebeian family.

[*A*] *When he ſaw the ruins of Veii, he ſaid a thing very remarkable.*] It appears from a thouſand paſſages in the Ancients, that the Heathens imagined, there were ſome Deities, who were jealous of the proſperity of men, and therefore never failed to ſend ſoon or late ſome great misfortune to thoſe who had gained ſome conſiderable advantage. Camillus being full of this thought could not behold the happineſs of Rome in the ſpoil of Veii, without fearing thoſe unhappy compenſations, which that kind of Gods were pleaſed to make between good and evil. Therefore he prayed, that if the proſperity of Rome was to be ballanced by ſome misfortune, he alone, and not his Country, might ſuffer it. Can there be any thing more heroical than this? What a great mind did he not diſcover on this occaſion? *Dictator Camillus, capta Vejorum urbe, præcones edicere jubet, ut ab inermi turba abſtineatur; is finis ſanguinis fuit; dedi inde inermes cœpti, & ad prædam miles permiſſu Dictatoris diſcurrit; quæ cum ante oculos ejus aliquanto ſpe atque opinione major, majoriſque pretii rerum ferretur, dicitur manus ad cœlum tollens precatus eſſe Dictator, ut ſi cui hominum Deorumque nimia ſua fortuna populique Romani videretur, ut eam invidiam lenire ſuo privato incommodo, quam minimo publico populique Romani liceret* (1). i. e. "The city "of Veii being taken, Camillus the Dictator ordered "the public Criers to declare, that the ſoldiers ſhould "not moleſt the unarmed multitude. This put an "end to the bloodſhed; and all they who were unarmed began to ſurrender: and the ſoldiers were permitted to plunder. When Camillus beheld the "ſpoils, which were more conſiderable than was "expected, it is ſaid, that lifting up his hands to "heaven, he prayed the Gods, that if his happineſs "or that of the Romans ſeemed too great either to "men or Gods, their envy might be ſatisfied by his "own private misfortunes, rather than by the leaſt "evil, that might fall upon the State." Plutarch obſerves, that when Camillus beheld the devaſtation of ſo flouriſhing a City, he fell a crying before he made his prayer. Ἀλώσης δὲ τῆς πόλεως κατὰ κράτος, καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀγόντων καὶ φερόντων ἄπειρόν τινα πλοῦτον, ἐφορᾷ ὁ Κάμιλλος ἀπὸ τῆς ἄκρας τὰ πραττόμενα, πρῶτον μὲν ἰσχὺς ἐδάκρυσεν, εἶτα μακαριδεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν παρόντων, ἄνοιξε τὰς χεῖρας τοῖς Θεοῖς καὶ προσευχόμενος εἶπε (2).

(1) Livius, lib. 5. cap. 21. *See alſo* Plutarch. *in Camillo*, pag. 131, F. *and* Valerius Maximus, lib. 1. cap. 5. num. 2.

(2) Plutarch. *in Camillo*, pag. 131, F.

[*B*] *His triumphal Chariot drawn by four white horſes, appeared an innovation too proud.*] According to Plutarch never had a General triumphed thus before him, nor was the example ever followed afterwards; ſo much were people perſuaded, that ſuch a Chariot belonged only to the ſovereign Maſter of Gods and Men. Τὰ τὰ ἄλλα σοφῶς ἐθριάμβευσε, καὶ τέτριππον ὑποζευξάμενος λευκοπῶλον ἁρμα, καὶ διελάσας τῆς Ῥώμης, ἐδοκεῖ τοῦτο ποιήσαι τοῖς ἡγεμόσι προτερον, οὐ ὕστερον. ἦν γὰρ ἀγῶνίας τὸ τοιοῦτον ὄχημα, τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ πατρὶ τῶν Θεῶν ἐπιφημισμένον (3).

(3) Idem, ibid. pag. 132. C.

[*C*] *The Roman Ladies did on this occaſion a very generous action.*] Notwithſtanding all the complaints, every one was obliged to contribute his ſhare for accompliſhing Camillus's vow; but as it was reſolved to ſend a golden veſſel to Delphos, and that there was no gold in the city, the Magiſtrates were at a loſs how to get the veſſel made. The Roman Ladies delivered them out of their perplexity; they met together, and reſolved to conſecrate all their jewels for the making of the veſſel. To acknowledge this ſacrifice, the Senate granted them the honour of funeral Orations, which till that time the men only had enjoyed (4).

(4) Ibid. pag. 143, B.

(b) From Plutarch in the *Life of Camillus.*

he died of the plague the following year (*b*). There has been said a thing which is very glorious to him, namely, that wherever Camillus was, there was Rome: the Latin words which I quote (*i*) express this in a much stronger manner. He left sons behind him, who were preferred to high posts in the Commonwealth [*D*]; but his descendants lived afterwards in obscurity to the time of Tiberius [*E*]. It has been found that Tacitus was not very accurate when he made this observation (*k*). The glory of this family fell to the *Distaff*, that is to the women, and continued thus till the time of St. Jerom [*F*].

(*k*) See the Remark [*E*].

(*i*) *Tarpeia sede peruſta Gallorum facibus Veioſque habitante Camillo. Illic Roma fuit.* Lucan. *Pharſal.* lib. 5. ver. 27. That is, "When Gallic flames the burning City felt, At Veiæ Rome with her Camillus dwelt." Rowe.

CAMOENS

[*D*] *He left ſons, who were preferred to high poſts in the Commonwealth.*] Spurius Furius Camillus, one of them, was created Prætor, the ſame year that this office was eſtabliſhed at Rome, namely in 389, when the Conſulſhip began to be divided between the Patricians and the Plebeians (5). His brother Lucius Furius Camillus appears oftener in Hiſtory. He was created a Dictator in the year 403 ſince the building of Rome; and becauſe he reſtored the Conſulſhip to the Patricians he gained their favour ſo much, that they procured him to be choſen Conſul the next year. He vanquiſhed the Gauls, and it was during his Conſulſhip, that Marcus Valerius in a ſingle combat againſt a Gaul, vanquiſhed him by the aſſiſtance (6) of a raven (7). Glandorpius pretends, that this L. Furius Camillus was Conſul eleven years later, A. U. 411 (8); but Sigonius proves this to be falſe, by the Tables of the Capitol, in which the Conſul Lucius Furius Camillus, who triumphed in the year of Rome 415, is called the ſon of Spurius and grandſon of Marcus. This Camillus, who was Conſul in the year 415, had Caius Mænius for his collegue; they both triumphed, and, by a privilege then very ſeldom granted, they obtained, that their ſtatues ſhould be placed in the Forum (9). I omit the other actions of this Lucius Furius Camillus; they who deſire to know them may conſult Livy.

(5) Livius, lib. 7. *init.*

(6) Valerius was for this reaſon ſurnamed *Corvinus.*

(7) Sigonius, *in Faſtis, ex Livio.*

(8) Onomaſtic. pag. 364. The year 417 which he ſets down, is the 415th according to Sigonius.

(9) *Livius additum triumpho honorem ſcribit, ut Statuæ Conſulibus, rara illa ætate res, in foro ponerentur.* Sigon. *in Faſtis ex Livio*; he alſo quotes Eutropius, *and* Plin. lib. 34. cap. 5.

[*E*] *His deſcendants lived in obſcurity.*] We read in Tacitus, that Furius Camillus Proconſul of Africa under Tiberius obtained the triumphal ornaments, for having vanquiſhed the Numidians; upon which the Hiſtorian obſerves, that ſince the famous Camillus, the deliverer of his Country, to this Proconſul of Africa, none of that family ever commanded armies, beſides the ſon of the Deliverer. He adds that the Proconſul of Africa was not eſteemed a great Warrior, for which reaſon Tiberius very much commended him before the Senate. *Fuſi Numidæ, multoſque poſt annos Furio nomini partum decus militiæ. Nam poſt illum recuperatorem urbis, filiumque ejus Camillum, penes alias familias imperatoria laus fuerat. Atque hic, quem memoravimus, bellorum expers habebatur; eò pronior Tiberius res geſtas apud Senatum celebravit, & decrevere patres triumphalia inſignia, quod Camillo ob modeſtiam vitæ impune fuit* (10). Lipſius pretends that Tacitus was ignorant of two triumphs in the family of *Furia.* P. Furius, ſays he (11), triumphed over the Gauls, in the year 530, and Lucius Furius Purpureo alſo triumphed over the Gauls in 553. Father Strada alſo objects theſe two triumphs to Tacitus; and that he may not appear barely to tranſcribe Lipſius, he quotes Polybius and Oroſius for the victory of P. Furius, and Plutarch for the triumph of the ſame Furius; and Livy and the Capitoline Tables for the triumph of 553 (12). It is certain that according to Polybius the Romans gained a great victory over the Gauls under the Conſulſhip of P. Furius and C. Flaminius; it is alſo certain, that he obſerves that the Conſuls entered with an army into the country of the enemy (13); but when he deſcribes the battle, he mentions only the Conſul Flaminius, and does not ſay, that either of the Conſuls triumphed. 'Tis not therefore a great accuracy, to quote Polybius as a voucher for the victory of P. Furius. The other Hiſtorians quoted by Strada are ſtill leſs proper to prove his aſſertion; for Oroſius aſcribes the whole victory to Flaminius (14), and does not ſay a word of Furius. As for Plutarch, he ſays that the Conſuls Flaminius and Furius led the army into the country of the Inſubrian Gauls, and that the Senate being acquainted, that there had been ſomething irregular in their election, wrote to them to come back immediately to lay down their office; but that Flaminius did not open the Letter till he had routed the enemy; and that he was like to have been deprived of the honours of a triumph, becauſe he did not ſhew more regard to the Senate's Letter (15). Plutarch adds, that as ſoon as Flaminius had triumphed, he and his collegue were deprived of the Conſulſhip. All this ſeems to hint, that Furius commanded ſome ſeparate body of troops, which did not vanquiſh the enemy; however that be, there is nothing in Plutarch, that can prove, that Furius triumphed. Father Strada has better ſucceeded in the quotations concerning the Triumph of L. Furius Purpureo.

(10) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 52. *ad ann. Ro.* 770.

(11) Lipſ. *in Tacit.* Ibid.

(12) Fam. Strada, *Proluſionum Academicarum*, lib. 1. Proluſ. ii. pag. m. 50.

(13) Polyb. lib. 2. cap. 32, 33.

(14) Oroſ. lib. 4. cap. 13.

(15) Plutarch. *in Marcello, circa init.* pag. 199.

But it ſeems to me, that in order to cenſure Tacitus rightly, we ought to know two things; firſt what he means by *Furium nomen*, ſecondly, what he means by *imperatoria Laus.* If his ſenſe be, that ſince the ſon of the great Camillus, to the time of Tiberius, none of the Houſe of Furia commanded armies; he has not been ſufficiently criticized upon by Lipſius, and by Famianus Strada; they might have objected to him C. Furius Pacilus Conſul of Rome in 502, who commanded ſome time in Sicily (16). But if Tacitus meant only the deſcendants of the Great Camillus, the cenſure of theſe two Authors is of no weight. For neither the Conſul of the year 530, nor he who triumphed in 553 were of the branch of Camillus; one was ſurnamed *Philo*, and the other *Purpureo.* To act rightly, they ſhould have objected to Tacitus a grandſon of the great Camillus.

(16) Polybius, *apud* Sigon. *in Faſtis.*

[*F*] *The glory of this family fell to the diſtaff, . . . and continued thus till the time of St. Jerom.*] I don't pretend to ſay, that the women deſcended from Camillus ſignalized themſelves in the wars; I ſpeak only of a glory ſuitable to their ſex. Chaſtity and continence were ſo well kept by the Ladies of that family, that ſcarce one widow amongſt them ever married again. This is what St. Jerom tells us, in a Letter to a Lady, who was deſcended from Camillus; and who aſked his advice concerning the deſign ſhe had formed of continuing a widow all her life-time. *Obſervas literis, & ſuppliciter deprecaris ut tibi reſcribam, imo ſcribam, quomodo vivere debeas, & viduitatis coronam illæſæ pudicitiæ nomine conſervare* (17). She was the daughter of a Lady who lived in continency, tho' ſhe was married. *Gaudet animus, exultant viſcera, geſtit affectus, hoc te cupere eſſe poſt virum, quod ſanctæ memoriæ mater tua Titiana multo tempore fuit ſub marito. Exauditæ ſunt preces & orationes ejus; impetravit in unica filia, quod vivens ipſa poſſederat. Habes præterea generis tui grande privilegium, quod exinde a Camillo vel nulla vel rara veſtræ familiæ ſcribitur ſecundos noſſe concubitus; ut non tam laudanda ſis, ſi vidua perſeveres, quam execranda, ſi id Chriſtiana non ſerves, quod per tanta ſæcula gentiles fœminæ cuſtodierunt. Taceo de Paulâ, de Euſtochio, ſtirpis veſtræ floribus, ne per occaſionem exhortationis tuæ illas laudare videar* (18). i. e. "You deſire me to write to you how you ought to live, and to "keep the Crown of widowhood chaſte and untainted. "I am pleaſed from my heart, and rejoice exceedingly, that you ſhould deſire to be after the death of "your huſband, what Titiana your mother of bleſſed "memory was, even during the life of her huſband. "Her prayers have been granted: ſhe has obtained "for her only daughter, what ſhe enjoyed herſelf in "her life time. Conſider beſides, the great privilege "annexed to your family; for it is written that ſince "Camillus none or very few of that family married "again. So that you will not ſo much deſerve "to be praiſed, if you continue a widow, as you "would be abhorred, if being among Chriſtians you "could not keep that continence, which Heathen wo"men have kept for ſo many centuries. I will not "mention Paula nor Euſtochium to you, thoſe flowers "of your family, leſt I ſhould be thought to have "made uſe of this exhortation to you in order to "praiſe them."

(17) Hieronymus ad Furiam, *de Viduitate ſervanda.*

(18) Idem, Ibid.

☞ CAMOENS (LUIS DE) a very famous Poet, was a Portugueze, and born in Liſbon [A] (a), about 1517 (b), or rather 1526, or 1527, of Simon Vaz de Camoens, and Anne Macedo (c). His family was very antient, and had made a conſpicuous figure [B]. His father was a Captain of a Ship, and when our Poet was very young, was ſhipwreck'd on the Coaſt of Goa, and caſt away, together with his little fortune (d), ſo that our Camoens was unfortunate from his infant years. He ſtudied in the Univerſity of Coimbra [C], and afterwards came to Liſbon, where he firſt made himſelf known by ſome verſes in an amorous ſtrain, which were approved by the Court, and won him the favour of ſome Ladies of the greateſt quality (e). He was as agreeable in his perſon as in his converſation and writings [D]. His too amorous complexion, like that of Ovid, occaſioned his being baniſhed the Court [E]. It is not exactly known whither he retired after this; but it is generally thought that he withdrew to Santaren, the place of his mother's birth, and where ſome of his relations lived, as he himſelf ſeems to hint in one of his beautiful Elegies (f). Camoens growing weary of an unactive life, and being naturally very brave, he went to Ceuta in Africa, where a war was carrying on between the Portugueze and Moors. Here he ſignalized himſelf on many occaſions, and ſhewed, that he could entwine the lawrels of Mars with thoſe of the Muſes. He diſplayed his valour chiefly in a ſea-fight, when, ruſhing upon the moſt dreadful dangers, he loſt his right eye (g). He wrote ſeveral beautiful pieces during his ſtay in Africa [F]. Our

(a) Nicholas Antonio, *Bibliotb. Hiſpan.* tom. 2. pag. 20.
(b) *La Luſiade du Camoens, traduit de Portugais, par M. du Perron du Caſtera.* vol. 1. pag. 20. of *La Vie de Camoens*, Amſterdam 1735, 12mo. If Camoens lived but 52. or 53 years, as he died in 1570, he conſequently muſt have been born, not in 1517, but in 1526, or 1527.
(c) *Bibliotb. Hiſp.* ibid.
(d) *La Luſiade du Camoens*, vol. 1. pag. 24. *dans ſa Vie.*
(e) Ibid. pag. 25.
(f) Ibid. pag. 30.
(g) *Bibliotb. Hiſpan. ubi ſupra*, and *La Luſiade du Camoens*, pag. 31.

[A] *Born in Liſbon.*] This is what we are told by Nicholas Antonio (1); but a late French Writer (2) ſays, that the Portugueze themſelves are not agreed upon the place of his birth; ſome making him a native of Coimbra, and others of Santaren. However, he inclines to believe that our Poet was rather born in Liſbon, becauſe Emanuel de Correa, his intimate friend, who had lived a great many years with him, declares, that he was born in that city (3).

[B] *His family was very ancient and had made a conſpicuous figure.*] Nicholas Antonio, in the page abovementioned ſays, *Camoens ex nobili parente Simone . . natus.* His family came originally from Spain; and it appears from ancient Records, that it flouriſhed in Galicia, under the name of Caamans, before the end of the tenth Century (4). That name was changed to Camoens in 1370, when Vaſco Perez de Camoens having been diſgraced in his own country, fled to Portugal, to the Court of Don Ferdinand, who made him a Privy-Councellor, and gave him ſeveral Lordſhips (5). His fortune afterwards changed; and dying, he left two ſons, who divided the family of Camoens into two branches, the eldeſt of which made ſo conſpicuous a figure, that ſome of the Blood Royal of Portugal did not ſcruple to marry into it (6). The younger branch never made any figure, except by giving birth to our Author, in which however it will be immortalized (7).

[C] *He ſtudied in the Univerſity of Coimbra.*] Here he not only applied himſelf to the Claſſics, but alſo to Philoſophy. *Literas autem Latinas & Philoſophiam doctus Conimbricæ* (8). We may form a judgment of the progreſs he made in this place, from the beauty and excellence of his compoſitions, and the deep erudition that adorns every page of them. The learned languages had nothing hidden with regard to Camoens; the moſt remote antiquity was preſent to his eye; and, as to Phyſicks, he was perfectly well verſed in them, as taught in that Age (9). Nicholas Antonio is more particular in the character he gives of Camoens. He tells us, that he was born a Poet; that his compoſitions were eaſy, copious, lively and ſublime; that he ſet all his thoughts in the moſt learned and ſtrongeſt light, either in lyric or epic numbers; he ſinging as happily the delights *of Love*, as the acts of heroes, as is allowed by all perſons of taſte of all nations. In his deſcriptions of perſons and places, art ſeems to rival nature. His ſimiles are very juſt. His Epiſodes beautiful, and tho' very various, they yet are all relative to the chief ſubject. He was exceedingly well verſed in the ancient Poets, and had a great knowledge of antiquity, as appears from all his compoſitions. *Ad Poeſim verè natum, facile, copioſum, ſublime, vividum, & quod omnia mentis cogitata (erant autem hæc plurima, inſigniaque) diſertiſſimis atque animi plenis exprimeret ſive lyricis ſive epicis verſibus. Æqualem enim ubique plauſum tam amatorii luſus pathetice, ac ſuaviter, quàm fortia Ducum facta ſublimiter, ac pro argumenti Majeſtate utraque vero ingenioſiſſimè ab eo pertractata, non intra Luſitaniæ duntaxat limites, ſed ubi ſenſus boni & perfecti eſt omnino aliquis, reportavere. In Geographicis & Proſopographicis deſcriptionibus naturam ferè æquavit arte; comparavit valde appoſitè; atque epiſodiorum varietatibus, veluti amœnis quibuſdam ab incepto diverticulis factorum ſeriem fabellarum digreſſiunculis, abſque tamen ſummæ, quâ res geſtas carmine complexus eſt, fidei jacturâ pulcherrimè diſtinxit. Præterquam quod eruditum ſe eſſe prodidit ſatis ſuperque in omnium veterum Poetarum, antiquitatiſque & graviorum etiam diſciplinarum cognitione. Adeo in ejus carminibus omnia hæc emicant atque eruditorum mentes feriunt authorique eorum arctiſſima reddunt complexione devinctas* (10).

[D] *He was as agreeable in his perſon as in his converſation and writings.*] He had large lively eyes, that ſeemed expreſſive of nothing but love and pleaſure (11). He had fair hair, a ſpacious forehead, a Roman noſe, a fine ſet of teeth; lips as red as coral, a full face, a fair complexion heightened by red, which diffuſed over his whole countenance a florid air of health. He was finely ſhaped, of a middle ſtature, and a ſmiling aſpect. In ſhort, his whole perſon was ſo agreeable, that this alone ſpoke very advantageouſly in his favour (12). The picture of Camoens, as drawn by Nicholas Antonio, is not ſo flattering. *Mediocri ſtatura fuit, & carne plenâ, capillis uſque ad Croci colorem flaveſcentibus, maximè in juventute. Eminebat ei frons & medius naſus cætera longus, & in fine craſſiuſculus* (13).

[E] *His too amorous complexion, like that of Ovid, occaſioned his being ſent into baniſhment.*] Some Ladies of the higheſt diſtinction had a paſſion for Camoens; which was enough to ruin him in a country, where the men are ſo extremely jealous. We do not directly know the Ladies who were the objects of his affection; and it is very probable that the families to which they were related, uſed their utmoſt endeavours to ſuppreſs the remembrance of theſe amours. Our Poet himſelf mentions thoſe Ladies under fictitious names; ſometimes under that of the beautiful Violante, and at other times under that of the lovely Natercia, which ſome ſuppoſe to be the beautiful Catherine of Almada his relation, and that it is ſhe who is hinted at in one of his ſonnets which begins thus,

Liſo paſtor num campo verde
Natercia crua Nympha ſo buſcav (14).
That is,
The ſhepherd Liſus, in a flow'ry mead,
Sought his too cruel, tho' ador'd, Natercia.

[F] *He wrote ſeveral beautiful pieces during his ſtay in Africa.*] Among the reſt he compoſed a Sonnet, in imitation of Petrach. It is an excellent deſcription of the evils which love made him ſuffer; and it appears from the following lines, that he conſidered that paſſion as the only cauſe of his misfortunes.

Fes me deixar ô patrio ninho amado
Paſſando ô longo mar, que ameçeando, &

Agora

(1) *Bibliotheca Hiſpan.* vol. 2. pag. 20. col. 1.
(2) Du Perron de Caſtera, prefixed to his Tranſlation of the *Luſiad*, vol. 1. pag. 19, 20. of his *Vie du Camoens*, Amſterdam 1735, 12mo. Idem, pag. 20.
(3) *Doct. Joan. Salgado in Nobiliar. Galic.* quoted in *la Vie du Camoens*, pag. 21. prefixed to *La Luſiade, par Du Perron de Caſtera.*
(4) Ibid. pag. 21, 22.
(5) Ibid. pag. 22, 23.
(6) Ibid. pag. 23.
(7) Nic. Antonio, ibid.
(8) *Luſiade du Camoens*, pag. 25.
(9) *Luſiade du Camoens*, vol. 1. pag. 27, 28.
(10) Nicholas Anton. ibid. *ut ſupra.*
(11) Manuel de Faria *in Vita Poet.* quoted in *La Luſiade du Camoens*, pag. 26.
(12) Manuel Severin. *and* Manuel de Correa, cited in *La Luſiade du Camoens*, pag. 26.
(13) *Bibliotb. Hiſpan.* ibid. *ut ſupra.*
(14) *Luſiade du Camoens*, vol. 1. pag. 27, 28.

Our valiant Poet now obtained leave to return to Court, where he flattered himſelf with the hopes of being rewarded for his military toils; however, he met only with ingratitude, and fortune was as cruel to him on this occaſion, as in moſt other incidents of his life. To add to his infelicity, his former flame broke out anew, which raiſing the jealouſy of ſeveral perſons, he thought it prudent to leave Liſbon voluntarily, for fear leſt he ſhould be baniſhed a ſecond time [G]. Accordingly he embarked for India, where he arrived ſafe at the time that Don Alonzo de Norogna was Viceroy there. Here he found his countrymen engaged in a war againſt the King of Pimenta, who had diſpoſſeſſed the people of Cochin and Porca, their Allies, of ſome Iſlands. Our martial Poet, immediately after his landing, reſolved to ſhare in the glory of this expedition; and it is affirmed that he behaved on this as on all other occaſions, with the utmoſt bravery; but at the ſame time had ſo much modeſty as to make only a tranſient mention of it in his writings (*b*). We find that the Portugueze gained the victory. He engaged in a ſecond expedition the year following [H]. At his return from it he lived happily for ſome time in Goa, the Muſes forming his chief employment and delight. But happening afterwards to write ſome ſatyrical pieces, he was baniſhed to China by Don Franciſco Barreto, at that time Viceroy of the Indies [I] (*i*). Our Poet was not altogether unfortunate in his exile, he being ſent to Macao in a conſiderable employment (*k*). In theſe remote regions he compleated his admirable Poem entitled the *Luſiad*, the firſt Cantos of which he had compoſed in his youth, in his native country [K] (*l*). Having got a little money in his poſt, he went on board a ſhip with the deſign of returning to Goa; hoping to meet with a kind reception from Don Conſtantine de Braganza the new Viceroy of the Indies. His voyage was very unfortunate, the ſhip being caſt away in a dreadful ſtorm, and himſelf eſcaping with nothing but his Poem, with which he ſwam to ſhore [L] (*m*). The Camboyans who inhabit the banks of the river Mecon, ſuccoured our Poet with the utmoſt humanity, and he reſided for ſome time among them; but having an opportunity of ſailing to Goa, he returned to that City, where Don Conſtantine de Braganza, the Viceroy, honoured him with his friendſhip; but the government of this

(*b*) *La Luſiade du Camoens*, vol. 1. pag. 35, 36.

(*i*) Ibid. pag. 39. and *Bibliothec. Hiſpan.* ibid.

(*k*) *La Luſiade du Camoens*, pag. 41.

(*l*) Ibid. pag. 41. See the Note [X] where ſome account is given of the *Luſiad*. The Portugueze are called *Luſiads*, (according to the fabulous writers) either from Luſus the 17th King of Spain, or from Luſus, the ſon and companion of Bacchus, who conquered India.

(*m*) *Bibliotb. Hiſpan.* ibid. and *La Luſiade du Camoens*, pag. 42, 43.

Agora experimentando à furia rara
De Marte, que co os olhos quis que logo
Viſſe, è tocaſſe o acerbo fruto ſeu &c.

That is,

" Thou, Cupid, mad'ſt me fly my much-lov'd coun-
" try,
" And tempt the horrors of the boundleſs ocean.
" To thy fierce enmity alone is owing,
" That now I want an eye.——

[G] *For fear leſt he ſhould be baniſhed Liſbon a ſecond time.*] Notwithſtanding the loſs of his eye, he ſtill was ſo much the idol of the fair, that many were jealous on that account. This prompted him to leave Liſbon, which he did in great diſguſt, and with a firm reſolution never to return back to it, as appears from the following words of Scipio Africanus repeated by Camoens: *Ingrata patria non poſſedebis oſſa mea* (15). i. e. " Ungrateful Country! thou ſhalt not " poſſeſs my aſhes." Nicholas Antonio does not mention this return of our Poet to Liſbon; and he obſerves, that the loſs of his eye had diſfigured him very much. *Luminis tamen orbitate ſpecies totius oris non parum dehoneſtabatur* (16).

(15) Idem, pag. 33, 34.

(16) *Bibliotb. Hiſpan. ubi ſupra.*

[H] *He engaged in a ſecond expedition the year following.*] This was under Captain Emanuel Vaſconcellos in the ſtraits of Mecca. It was here he had a ſight of Mount-Fælix, and all that part of Africa which he has deſcribed ſo beautifully, in one of his ſongs in the Italian taſte, where he bewails his own misfortunes and the abſence of his miſtreſs (7).

(17) *La Luſiade du Camoens*, vol. 1. pag. 37.

[I] *He was baniſhed to China, by the Viceroy of the Indies.*] Camoens had been ſo imprudent, as to compoſe ſome Pieces in which he ſtrongly ſatyrized ſeveral perſons of the greateſt diſtinction in Goa. However, he looked upon this puniſhment as very unjuſt; ſo that, in one of his Poems, he deſires nothing more, in order to revenge himſelf of Don Franciſco Bareto and to cover him with eternal infamy, than to immortalize the memory of his rigour.

A Pena deſte deſterro
Que eu mais deſejo eſculpida
Em pedra, ou em duro ferro (18).

(18) Idem, pag. 39, 40.

It is however a juſtice due to this viceroy, to obſerve, that he is highly applauded in Hiſtory, for his adminiſtration.

[K] *The Luſiad, the firſt Cantos of which he had compoſed . . . . in his native Country.*] Thus, ſays the late Author of the life of Cameons, " this piece, which " is very little inferiour to the Æneid, was, like that " Poem, the fruit of many years labour, but with this " difference; Virgil was bleſſed with the ſmiles of " fortune whilſt he was compoſing the Æneid, where- " as the whole life of Camoens was an uninterrupted " ſeries of vexations and calamities. Hence we have " the greater reaſon to admire his ſtrength of mind; " which enabled him to trample, as it were, upon " fortune, and kept his genius from drooping; a " rare and unuſual circumſtance (19)."

(19) Idem, pag. 41, 42.

[L] *Eſcaping with nothing but his Poem with which he ſwam to ſhore.*] This dreadful ſtorm aroſe when they were off of Camboia. The ſhip was ſwallowed up by the waves, and Camoens ſwam with his Luſiad and other Poems (20), as far as the * Mehon in the gulph, where this river, one of the largeſt in China, empties itſelf into the ſea (21). Nicholas Antonio obſerves, that this famous Poem had the ſame fate with the Commentaries of Julius Cæſar, the Hero as well as the Poet being oblig'd to ſave themſelves and their works by ſwimming. *Hoc enim clariſſimum ingenii ſui monumentum ſive effectum ſive jam eo tempore perfectum, lævâ, ut quondam Cæſar Julius, elatâ, dum remigio dextræ utitur, exitio eripuit* (22). " Thus heaven would have " theſe celebrated works to be ſaved from ſhipwreck " by their Authors, who reſembled one another in ele- " vation of genius and the nobleſt acquirements; in " intrepidity in the moſt formidable dangers, in great- " neſs of ſoul, and in the calamities which befell " them." Camoens has eternized the remembrance of this incident, in the tenth Canto of his Luſiad, where he makes Thetis ſay, by way of prediction,

(20) Nichol. Antonio, *ubi ſupra*, ſays, that Camoens ſaved nothing but his *Luſiad*; *jacturâ omnium, præterquam quod ſui Luſiadum, . . . operis factâ.*

* Or rather *Mecon.*

(21) *La Luſiade du Camoens*, pag. 42.

(22) *Bibliotb. Hiſpan. ubi ſupra.*

Eſte receberà placido è brando
No ſeu regaço o Canto, que molhado
Vem do Naufragio triſte e miſerando,
Dos proceloſos baxos eſcapado
Das fomes dos Perigos grandes (23).

(23) *La Luſiade du Camoens*, pag. 43, 44.

Thus tranſlated by Sir Richard Fanſhaw.

" Upon his * ſoft and charitable brim
" The wet and ſhipwreckt SONG receive ſhall he,
" Which, in a lamentable plight ſhall ſwim
" From ſhoals and quickſands of tempeſtuous ſea,
" (The dire effect of exile) when on him
" Is executed the unjuſt decree;
" Whoſe repercuſſive lyre ſhall have the fate
" To be renowned more than fortunate.

* The River *Mecon.*

this Nobleman was very ſhort; and the calm and eaſe which Camoens had enjoyed under the ſhade of his protection, vaniſhed like a dream. Scarce had Count Redondo ſucceeded Don Conſtantine, but our Poet's enemies accuſed him of male-adminiſtration in the exerciſe of his employment abovementioned, ſo that he was thrown into priſon [*M*]. Having afterwards obtained his liberty he ſailed for Sofala, with a * Gentleman who was appointed Governor of a fortreſs in that Kingdom, and had made him very advantageous offers. However the promiſes of this man came to nothing, he having taken our Poet with him, with no other view but to divert himſelf by the delightful converſation of Camoens in that wild country. But this was not all, for he treated Camoens with great inhumanity [*N*], ſo that he at laſt left the Indies, and returned again to Liſbon in 1569 (*n*), after having been ſixteen years abſent from Portugal, and devoted to a military life (*o*). Beſides the deſire he had to ſee again his native country, there was a ſtill ſtronger motive for him to reviſit it, and this was to preſent his *Luſiad* to King Sebaſtian, though but a child (*p*). But notwithſtanding he had deſerved ſo well from his King and Country, by his admirable compoſitions, he yet had not an opportunity of riſing to any tolerable condition of life (*q*); ſo that after paſſing ten years more in the extremes of miſery, with ſcarce a bed to lie on, he died in 1579, at upwards of fifty years of age (*r*). The late French Tranſlator of the *Luſiad*, differs from Nicholas Antonio on this occaſion, he aſſuring us, that King Sebaſtian, as a reward for our Poet's dedicating the *Luſiad* to him, gave him a yearly penſion of four thouſand Reals (amounting to about fourteen hundred French Livres); but upon condition that he ſhould ſpend the remainder of his days at Court; an evident proof of the high eſteem which this young Auguſtus had for his Virgil (*s*). This penſion, and the ſmiles of Majeſty, would have enabled Camoens to ſpend his later days in peace and comfort, had it not been for the troubles which broke out in Portugal; for King Sebaſtian, being too ſtrongly hurried away by his valour, carried his arms into Africa, and was killed fighting againſt the Moors in the battle of Alcazer (*t*). Cardinal Don Henriquez aſcending the Throne of Portugal, and being very far advanced in years, he was not able to ſuppreſs the inteſtine feuds and civil broils which at that time infeſted Portugal. In this tumult and confuſion the voice of Camoens was not heard, and his penſion was cut off; after which his life was truly miſerable [*O*]. He left no children behind him, having always lived a ſingle life (*u*). The younger branch of his family was extinct in him. He was buried privately in St. Anne's Church, and an Epitaph was inſcribed over his grave [*P*]. Afterwards two Latin Epitaphs were compoſed in his honour, and placed over his tomb [*Q*]. Many Poems were addreſſed

* Peter Barreto.

(*n*) *La Luſiade du Camoens*, pag. 47, 48.
(*o*) *Biblioth. Hiſpan. ubi ſupra.*
(*p*) Idem, ibid.
(*q*) Idem, ibid.
(*r*) Idem, ibid. According to the French Tranſlator *de la Luſiade du Camoens*, he died in an Hoſpital, or in a poor lodging he had hired. See the Note [*O*].
(*s*) *La Luſiade du Camoens*, pag. 48, 49.
(*t*) Idem, pag. 48, 49, 50.
(*u*) *Biblioth. Hiſpan.* idem, ibid.

[*M*] *He was thrown into priſon.*] The new Viceroy had the higheſt eſteem for Camoens, yet this could not ſecure him from a priſon, to which he was dragged like a criminal, tho' he had nothing to reproach himſelf with, as to the execution of his office, which he eaſily proved to the confuſion of thoſe who envied him. However, his creditors, (for he had contracted ſome debts) all laid their actions againſt him to a man; by which means he was detained a conſiderable time in priſon (†). This is but too often the fate of thoſe who labour under the like misfortune.

(†) *La Luſiade du Camoens*, pag. 46.

[*N*] *He treated Camoens with great inhumanity.*] When the Governor brought him into this country, ſo far from endeavouring to make his life eaſy, he rendered it as uncomfortable as poſſible. Camoens was ſoon diſguſted at this barbarous uſage, which made him again wiſh for his native country; and tho' he had ſwore never to return thither, he nevertheleſs reſolved to go on board a ſhip that was bound for Liſbon, on which occaſion, ſome Portugueze Gentlemen of great diſtinction, were very deſirous of having him go along with them. The Governor exaſperated at Camoens for his deſign of leaving him, was ſo baſe as to demand two hundred crowns for his board and other particulars; and even threatened to impriſon him, in caſe he refuſed payment. The unhappy Camoens would never have eſcaped out of the clutches of this miſer, had he not been ſatisfied by the Gentlemen above hinted at, who then carried Camoens with them to Liſbon (24).

(24) Idem, pag. 46, 47, 48.

[*O*] *After which his life was truly miſerable.*] His grief at the barbarous treatment he met with, encreaſed his other infirmities; ſo that at laſt, being deſtitute of all ſuccour, he was obliged to ſhelter himſelf in an hoſpital; or, according to ſome Hiſtorians, in a poor hovel, whence he writ the following remarkable words, which were the laſt that came from his pen. *Quem ouvio dizer nunca que em tam pequeno Teatro, como o de hum pobre leyto, quis eſſe à fortuna repreſentar tam grandes deſaventuras? e eu, como ſe ellas nam baſtaſſem, me ponho abinda de ſua parte, porque procurar reſiſtir à tantos males, pareceria eſpecie de deſavergonhamento.* i. e. "Wretched fate! to be thus lying on a miſerable bed, a true theatre of miſery! Did fortune ever exhibit ſuch tragical, ſuch cruel adventures as mine? but I myſelf will join with that ſavage Goddeſs, as tho' her fury were not ſufficient to cruſh me; for the bare attempting to combat ſuch an uninterrupted ſeries of calamities would be next to inſolence (25)." Camoens bewails the little encouragement given by the great men of Portugal to merit, and his ill fortune, in the moſt pathetic ſtrains, in the fifth Canto of his *Luſiad*, which is thus tranſlated by a modern hand.

(25) Cited in *La Luſiade du Camoens*, vol. 1. pag. 50, 51, 52.

Mournful I ſpeak it, to my Country's ſhame,
Want of excitement keeps its genius low:
Our rude and boiſt'rous Lords are deaf to fame,
And ſeem, as careleſs to be known, as know.
Dull and of groſs deſires, their empty pride,
Dark and contracted, taſtes not what is writ;
For how alas! ſhould lameneſs learn to ſtride?
Or he, who underſtands not, cheriſh wit!
Bleſt let the Muſes be, by thoſe I ſing,
That I, for no reward, but honour, born,
Have, for my Country's Glory, touch'd the ſtring,
And laugh her titled arrogance to ſcorn.
While on the fame of Luſitania bent,
Your Charms, ye Nymphs of Tagus, I reveal,
Fortune the frame of my proud hope has rent,
And drags me friendleſs at her Chariot Wheel.
Degraded, at another's board to eat,
A rock of want! ſurrounded by my woes;
Ingratitude itſelf, unmov'd I meet,
And riſe, the ſtronger, againſt envy's blows.
See, Nymphs! what learned Lords your Tagus boaſts!
What Patrons of the noble arts we find!
Such is their worth, who fill the public Poſts!
And ſuch the prize, that crowns a generous Mind (26)!

(26) *The Plain-Dealer, being ſelect Eſſays on ſeveral curious Subjects*, num. 16. vol. 1. London 1730, 8vo.

[*P*] *An Epitaph was inſcribed over his grave.*]

Here lies Lewis de Camoens,
Prince of the Poets of his time.
He lived poor and miſerable, and died ſuch,
Anno Domini, 1579.

[*Q*] *Two Latin Epitaphs were compoſed in his*

ſed to his memory, in Latin, Italian, Spaniſh and Portugueze, and among others, a Sonnet by the famous Taſſo [*R*]. Camoens wrote a great many Pieces beſides his *Luſiad*, as Songs, Sonnets, Epigrams, Eclogues, Elegies, Satyrs, Odes *, and Comedies [*S*]. Philip II King of Spain was ſenſible of his great merit; inſomuch that when he had conquered Portugal, upon his enquiring into the affairs of that Kingdom, he aſked very earneſtly after Camoens, intending to ſettle a handſome penſion upon him: and was deeply afflicted at hearing that he was dead (*w*). With regard to his character, he was affable in ſociety, and kind to his inferiors; reſpectful, without debaſing himſelf, towards ſuch great men as treated him with affability; and free, without pride, towards thoſe who uſed him arrogantly. His converſation was upon ſublime or gay ſubjects, according to the genius and inclination of thoſe with whom he was in company. He was modeſt in proſperity, patient in adverſity, and ſupported good or ill fortune with an equal temper. We have already taken notice of his valour. His intrepidity was not the effect of an impetuous diſpoſition or a brutal fury; but aroſe from a greatneſs of ſoul, that had a full ſenſe of true Glory, and which at the ſame time made Camoens ſeek it leſs for his own ſake than for that of his Country. This noble principle alone prompted him to celebrate the exploits of his Countrymen, in ſpite of the ingratitude with which they repaid his learned toils. His affliction to ſee liberty breathe its laſt in his native Country, after King Sebaſtian's death, haſtned his end, as appears from a paſſage in one of his Letters [*T*].

* All theſe leſſer Pieces have been frequently printed together in Liſbon in 4to, and entitled *Rimas de Luis de Camoens.*

(*w*) *Bibliotb. Hiſpan.* idem, ibid.

Camoens

his honour.] The firſt is a kind of Dialogue between the Monument and the paſſenger, and was written by Don Emanuel de Souza Coutino, one of the greateſt genius's in Portugal. He therein declares, that the genius of Ovid, Virgil, Sophocles and Pindar were united in Camoens: he expreſſes his wonder at his being able to compoſe pieces of ſo various a kind: ſays, that the ſcepter of Poeſy was juſtly ſwayed by Camoens: that he had brought Helicon into Portugal, and made it a perfect Elyſium: and concludes with aſſerting, that he ſurpaſſed Orpheus, and would have performed ſtill greater wonders, had the Greek been his native language.

Quod Maro ſublimi, quod grandi Pindarus alto,
Quod Sophocles, ſuavi Naſo quod ore canit,
Mœſtitiam, riſus, horrentia prælia, amores,
Juncta ſimul, cantu ſed meliore damus.
Quiſnam Author? Camonius. Unde hic protulit illum?
Lyſia in Eoas imperioſa plagas.
Unus tanta dedit? Dedit, & majora daturus,
Ni celeri fato corriperetur, erat.
Ultimus hic choreis Muſarum præfuit, illo
Plenior Aonidum nobiliorque chorus.
Flos veteris, virtuſque novæ fuit ille Camoenæ,
Debita jure ſibi ſceptra poëſis habet.
In Luſitanos Heliconis culmina tractus
Tranſtulit, antra, lyras, ſerta, fluenta, Deas.
Currere Caſtalios noſtrâ de rupe liquores
Juſſit, & invito prata virere ſolo.
Cerne per incultos Tempe jucunda receſſus,
Cerne ſatas ſterili ceſpite veris opes.
Omnibus occidui tibi rident floribus horti,
Non ego jam Lyſios credo, ſed Elyſios.
Orpheus attonitas dulci modulamine cautes
Traxit, & ab ſtygio ſquallida monſtra freto
Mæonios, Lodoice, ſacro cum culmine montes,
Pieridum trahis, cœlituumque choros.
Sunt majora tuæ Orphæis miracula vocis,
Attica, quid faceres, ſi tibi lingua foret (27)!

(27) *La Luſiade du Camoens*, vol. 1. pag. 53, 54.

As theſe Epitaphs are partly hiſtorical, the learned reader will not be diſpleaſed at the length of them; and for this reaſon I ſhall introduce another from Nicholas Antonio, eſpecially as his work is but in few nds.

Naſo elegis, Flaccus lyricis, epigrammate Marcus,
Hic jacet heroo Carmine Virgilius;
Enſe ſimul, Calamoque auxit tibi, Lyſia, famam:
Unam nobilitant Mars & Apollo manum.
Caſtalium fontem traxit modulamine, at Indo
Et Gangi telis obſtupefecit aquas.
Lyſia mirata eſt, quando aurea Carmina lucrum
Ingenii, haud gazas, ex oriente tulit.
Sic bene de patria meruit dum fulminat enſe
At plus dum calamo bellica facta refert.
Hunc Itali, Galli, Hiſpani vertêre Poëtam,
Quælibet hunc vellet terra vocare ſuum.
Vertere fas, æquare nefas, æquabilis uni
Eſt ſibi, par nemo, nemo ſecundus erit (28).

(28) *Bibliotb. Hiſpan. ubi ſupra.*

This Epitaph, which was not put up till ſome years after Camoens's death, was written by the learned Father Matthew of Cardoſo, a Jeſuit, Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Ebora. He ſays, that Camoens poſſeſſed the various talents of the famous Poets of Antiquity: That Mars had put the ſword, and Apollo the pen, into his hand: That Portugal was ſurprized at the rich treaſures (his Compoſitions) which Camoens brought from India: That all Nations would naturalize this Poet, and have him ſpeak their language: That they might tranſlate, but could never equal him.

[*R*] *A Sonnet by the famous Taſſo.*] It was wrote ſome years after the Luſiad appeared in public, and before his *Jeruſalem* was ſent to preſs: and will be an everlaſting monument of the veneration which this great Italian Poet had for Camoens. It is addreſſed to Vaſco de Gama.

Vaſco, le cui felici, ardite antenne
In contro al ſol, che ne riporta il giorno
Spiegar' le vele, è fer' colà ritorno,
Dove egli par che di cadere accenne:

Non più di te per aſpro mar ſoſtenne
Quel, che fece al Ciclope oltraggio, è ſcorno:
Ne chi turbo l'Arpie nel ſuo ſoggiorno,
Ne diè più bel ſeggetto à colte penne.

Et hor quella del colto, è buon' Luigi
Tant' oltrè ſtende il glorioſo volo
Che i tuoi ſpalmati legni andar' men' lungi.

Und' a quelli, à cui s'alza il noſtro polo,
Et à chi ferma in contra i ſuoi veſtigi
Per lui del corſo tuo la fama aggiunge (29).

(29) *Opera di Taſſo.*

This is a very noble compliment, the ſenſe of which is; "Thou Vaſco, braving the horrors of the deep, "carriedſt thy ſhips to the moſt diſtant regions where "the Sun riſes. Neither the exploits of Ulyſſes who "defied the Cyclops, nor of Jaſon who drove away "the Harpies, were comparable to thine. But how "great ſoever thy fame be, thou art obliged for it "chiefly to Camoens, whoſe admirable voice has "ſpread farther than thy ſails: and it is wholly ow-"ing to his Muſe, that thy name has reached the moſt "remote Countries."

[*S*] *And Comedies.*] Theſe are the amours of Philodemus and Amphytrion, imitated from Plautus (30). This does not agree exactly with Nicholas Antonio, who tells us, that he wrote ſome Comedies according to the genius of thoſe times; and was ſaid to have tranſlated Plautus's Amphytrion and other Comedies into Portugueze (31).

(30) *La Luſiade du Camoens*, vol. 1. pag. 62.

(31) *Bibliotb. Hiſpan.* ibid.

[*T*] *From a paſſage in one of his Letters.*] It is as follows: *Em fim accabarey à vida, è verram todos que fuy tam afeiçoado à minha patria, que nam ſomente me contentei de morrer nella, mas de morrer com ella* (32). i. e. "I ſhall at laſt finiſh my courſe, and the whole "world ſhall know how tenderly I loved my country.

(32) Cited in *La Luſiade du Camoens*, pag. 64, 65.

Camoens was naturally jocoſe, and often very humourous in his gayer moments [*V*]. He was never idle, but was for ever either ſtudying or compoſing; and neither priſons, the moſt barbarous climates, or the moſt cruel misfortunes could damp the fire of his genius. His intimate friends aſſure us, that he was very ſober, and would never drink to exceſs (*x*). The writer from whom I borrow this character of our Poet, is not a little partial to him, as appears from what follows. With regard to his amours with ſome Ladies of diſtinction, this was only a tribute he paid to youth and the Portugueze blood, which is naturally inclined to love (*y*). Camoens is accuſed of ſome errors which contributed to his calamities. The firſt was his ſatyrical vein, which ſometimes carried him to ſuch lengths, that he did not ſpare perſons of the higheſt diſtinction, not excepting Kings; and his cenſure was ſometimes unjuſt. His ſecond error was a too great extravagance and profuſion. He would be ſo overjoyed at the leaſt ſucceſs, that he fondly imagined he was then raiſed above all the future inſults of fortune; when, hurried along by this wild notion, he would throw away his money by handfulls, and ſo ſquandred what would otherwiſe have ſecured him from the dreadful poverty into which he fell in his later days (*z*). The laſt cited Author makes a very humane reflection on this occaſion [*W*]. The *Luſiad*, the ſubject of which is the diſcovery of the Eaſt-Indies by the Portugueze, and the Hero of it the famous Vaſco de Gama [*X*], has gained our Poet a name,

(*x*) *La Luſiade du Camoens*, vol. 1. pag. 66.

(*y*) Idem, pag. 66, 67.

(*z*) Idem, pag. 67, 68, 69.

" It will be found that I was reſolved, not only to " die in its boſom, but with it."

[*V*] *Was often very humourous in his gayer moments.*] It is ſaid that Camoens paſſing thro' one of the ſtreets of Liſbon by a China Shop, and hearing the maſter of it murther ſome of his Verſes as he ſung 'em: Immediately he flew into the ſhop, and after breaking ſeveral pieces of China, he cried: *Friend, you maim my works, and I demoliſh your goods; this is but tit for tat.* However he paid for the damage he had done (33). The like incident is related of a Greek Author. The laſt cited French Writer obſerves, that as our Poet imitated ſo carefully the Antients in things of a majeſtic kind, he alſo might have imitated them in their gayer flights (34). One was certainly much more laudable than the other.

(33) Idem, pag. 65.

(34) Idem, pag. 66.

[*W*] *Makes a very humane reflection on this occaſion.*] " Such, *ſays he*, is the condition of human nature; " ſome ſpot ever diſfigures the picture of our virtues. " The moſt perfect are thoſe who have the feweſt im- " perfections: however, this ought not to prevent our " admiring theſe great Genius's, as well as the maſter- " pieces of great Painters, which notwithſtanding " ſome blemiſhes are yet highly eſteemed by all " judges (35)."

(35) Idem, pag. 69.

[*X*] *The Luſiad . . .*] Emanuel the ſecond, King of Portugal, being deſirous of diſcovering a new way to the Eaſt-Indies, by the Ocean, ſent Velaſco de Gama (36) with a Fleet in the year 1497, to that undertaking, which being new, was accounted raſh and impracticable, and which of courſe gained him a great reputation when it ſucceeded. Camoens followed Velaſco (Vaſco) de Gama in that dangerous voyage, led by his friendſhip to him, and by a noble curioſity, which ſeldom fails to be the character of men born with a great imagination. He took his voyage for the ſubject of his Poem; he enjoyed the ſenſible pleaſure which nobody had known before him, to celebrate his friend, and the things which he was an eye-witneſs of. He wrote his Poem, part on the Atlantic Sea, and part on the Indian Shore. . . . Such a new ſubject managed by an uncommon Genius, could not but produce a ſort of epick Poetry unheard of before (37). The Engliſh Tranſlator of the Luſiad is of opinion, that the poetical rapture in Petronius hinted to Camoens the manner of conducting his Luſiad. The Tranſlator in queſtion prefixed a verſion of Petronius's little Poem, to that of the Luſiad, on which occaſion he ſays, *Only making ſo much uſe thereof* (Petronius's piece) *as to ſhew the rule and model, which indubitably guided our Camoens in the raiſing his great building; and which, except himſelf, that I know of, no Poet ever followed that wrought in great, whether antient or modern: For, to ſay no more, the Greek Homer, the Latin Virgil, our Spencer, and even the Italian Taſſo . . . are in effect wholly fabulous; and Lucan, tho' worthily admired, is as much cenſured by ſome on the other ſide, for ſticking too cloſe to truth* (38). There (39) no bloody wars are fought, no Heroes wounded in a thouſand different ways: no woman enticed away, and the world overturned for her cauſe; no Empire founded; in ſhort, nothing of what was deemed before the only ſubject of Poetry. The Poet conducts the Portugueze Fleet to the mouth of the Ganges, round the coaſts of Africk. He takes notice in the way of many Nations who live upon the African Shore. He interweaves artfully the Hiſtory of Portugal (40). We are told the ſubject of the *Luſiad*, in the two firſt Stanzas of it, as tranſlated by R. Fanſhaw Eſq; (afterwards Sir Richard).

(36) Here Mr. de Voltaire is in an error; it ſhould be *Vaſco de Gama*. The words *followed Velaſco* ſeem a little ambiguous. Mr. de Voltaire could not mean that Camoens accompanied Vaſco de Gama in his diſcovery, ſince that was made before our Poet was born.

(37) Voltaire's *Eſſays on the Epic Poetry of the European Nations*, pag. 71, 72. 2d edit. London 1728, 12mo.

(38) The *Poſtſcript* to the Tranſlation of the *Luſiad*, or *Portugal's Hiſtorical Poem*, by Richard Fanſhaw, Eſq; London 1655.

(39) In the *Luſiad*.

(40) Voltaire's *Eſſays on the Epic Poetry &c.* pag. 72, 73.

Arms, and the men above the vulgar file,
Who from the Weſtern Luſitanian Shore
Paſt even beyond the Trapobanian Iſle (41),
Through Seas which never ſhip had ſail'd before:
Who brave in action, patient in long toil,
Beyond what ſtrength of human nature bore.)
'Mongſt Nations, under other Stars, acquir'd
A modern Scepter which to Heaven aſpir'd.

II.

Likewiſe thoſe Kings of glorious memory,
Who ſow'd and propagated where they paſt
The Faith with the new Empire, making dry
The breaſts of Aſia, and laying waſte
Black Africk's vicious Glebe, and thoſe who by
Their deeds at home left not their names defac'd,
My ſong ſhall ſpread where ever there are men,
If wit and art will ſo much guide my pen (42).

(41) Now called *Ceylan*, and by others thought to be *Sumatra*.

(42) *The Luſiad, or Portugal's Hiſtorical Poem*, pag. 1.

The ſimplicity of the ſubject of the Poem is raiſed by ſome fictions of different kinds. . . . When the Fleet is ſailing in ſight of the Cape of Good-Hope, called then the Cape of the Storms, a formidable ſhape (43) appears to them, walking in the depth of the Sea; his head reaches to the clouds; the ſtorms, the winds, the thunders and the lightnings hang about him; his arms are extended over the waves. It is the guardian of that foreign Ocean unplough'd before by any ſhip. He complains of his being obliged to ſubmit to fate, and to the audacious undertaking of the Portugueze, and foretells them all the misfortunes which they muſt undergo in the Indies. . . . I believe that ſuch a fiction would be thought noble and proper in all Ages and in all Nations (44). Mr. de Voltaire has here given us a noble deſcription of this airy form. Camoens calls it ADAMASTOR (45). It is in the fifth Canto, and forms one of the nobleſt epiſodes that was ever introduced in an epic Poem. Preparatory to it, a thick cloud is ſuppoſed to riſe over the æther, which eclipſes the luſtre of the Stars; and at the ſame time a horrid ſound is heard. After this Prelude, the Phantom (Adamaſtor) riſes, whoſe ſize is declared to be infinitely more enormous than that of the Coloſſus of Rhodes. He is particularly deſcribed: He ſpeaks, and his thundering voice ſeems to riſe out of the deep abyſs. . . After exclaiming againſt the Portugueze for their unheard of boldneſs, in thus daring to brave all the horrors of an Ocean unploughed before; he tells them in a prophetic ſtrain the dreadful calamities which would befal them, and all who ſhould venture afterwards on thoſe Seas. Among other illuſtrious perſonages who ſhould come thither, he ſpeaks of a Gentleman (46) and his much loved Lady.

(43) Or rather *Figure*, or *Phantom*.

(44) Voltaire's *ut ſupra*, pag. 73.

(45) The late French Tranſlator of the *Luſiad* ſuppoſes this imaginary Being to be Mahomet. See his Reaſons (which perhaps are not very natural) vol. 2. pag. 163, *& ſeq.*

(46) Don Emanuel de Souza, or Sepulveda, Governor of Diu in India, who, with all his family, was caſt away off the Cape of Good Hope.

To

a name, which in all probability will deſcend to lateſt poſterity. It has borne a great number of impreſſions, been tranſlated into many Languages [*Y*], and illuſtrated by various Commentaries [*Z*]. Father Rapin has made ſome ſevere reflections on it [*AA*]. Mr. de Voltaire has applauded and cenſured it [*BB*]; and his Criticiſms have been anſwered

To this far-diſtant Region next ſhall come
A lover, with the nympth his ſoul adores.
Ill fated both: for after they've eſcap'd
The ſtorms and dreadful ſurges, both ſhall reach
A barbarous Land.

Here, continues our Poet, they ſhall be plunged into a ſeries of calamities, the bare recital of which makes me my ſelf almoſt ſhudder: They ſhall ſee their offſpring die with hunger; their dear children, who had been ſo tenderly brought up in the midſt of delights, and form'd as it were for happineſs; they themſelves ſhall be ſtript naked by the inhuman ſavages: the huſband ſhall ſee the body of his darling wife, her beautiful and charming body, expoſed to the inclemencies of the weather; parched in the day-time by the burning rays of the Sun; and froze in the night by the piercing cold. In fine, after ſuffering the moſt unheard of afflictions, theſe unhappy lovers ſhall expire in each others arms; ſhedding at the ſame time over each other a flood of tears, which might melt the moſt obdurate hearts (47). Adamaſtor here relates his own ſtory to Vaſco de Gama: ſays, that he is the brother of Enceladus and Briareus; that, fired by ambition, he had ſailed over the Ocean in queſt of Neptune, in order to combat that God. That happening to ſee the charming Thetis wantoning, quite naked, on the ſea-ſhore, he was ſeized with the ſtrongeſt paſſion. That all his endeavours to pleaſe her being vain, he employed Doris to ſpeak in his behalf; when Thetis promiſing on a certain night to ſooth his paſſion; he, all in raptures, flew to the rendezvous, where imagining he ſaw his much loved object, he extended his arms to embrace her, but was deluded, it being nothing but a rock; and that at laſt, after roving up and down the Ocean in a frantic manner, he had been metamorphoſed into the Cape of Good-Hope, where they then were (48).

(47) Extracted from the *Luſiad*, Canto 5.

(48) Ibid.

[*Y*] *It has born a great number of impreſſions, and been tranſlated into many languages.*] It was firſt printed at Liſbon in 1572 (49), which edition was followed by a great many others. It has been tranſlated into ſeveral languages. A French Verſion was made of it upwards of an hundred years ago (50). There are two tranſlations of it into Italian, four into Spaniſh, and one into Latin, by Thomas de Faria a Carmelite, Biſhop of Targa in Africa. This Tranſlator having concealed his name, and not informing the Public that it was a tranſlation, many were thence induced to believe, that it had been writ originally in Latin (51).

(49) Conſequently ſeven years before the Author died.

(50) The laſt French Verſion, (ſo often mentioned here) is in 3 vol. 12mo, and was publiſhed this year, 1735.

(51) *Biblioth. Hiſpan.* pag. 21. and *Jugemens des Savans, par Baillet*, pag. 100. tom. 4. Amſterdam 1725, 4to.

[*Z*] *Illuſtrated by various Commentaries.*] Firſt by Emanuel Correa, whoſe Notes are but ſhort, and which were enlarged by Peter Mariz: Afterwards by Gomez de Tapia; but the moſt conſiderable Commentaries are thoſe of Emanuel Faria de Souſa, written in the Spaniſh Tongue, and printed at Madrid in 1639 in two vol. folio, and are ſaid to abound with great erudition, but are thought a little too prolix. Another volume, in folio, in defence of thoſe Commentaries, was publiſhed the year after in the laſt mentioned city. The abovementioned Faria de Souſa left behind him, at his death in 1650, eight volumes more of Notes, on the other Works of Camoens (52).

(52) Idem, *ut ſupra*.

[*AA*] *Father Rapin has made ſome ſevere reflections on it.*] Speaking of the Diction of Poeſy, which ought to be clear, natural, and harmonious; and ſaying that one of the greateſt vices in writing is obſcurity, he goes on thus: *It is in this that Camoens, whom the Portugueze call their Virgil, is faulty; his verſes being ſo very obſcure, that they ſeem all to contain ſo many myſteries* (53). Saying that, to write a fine epic Poem, the *Author muſt obſerve a proportion in his deſign, juſtneſs in the thought, and not launch into random digreſſions*, he accuſes Camoens of failing in theſe particulars (54). Cenſuring the heterogeneous mixture of Deities and other machines in ſome epic Poems, he ſays that *Camoens introduces very extravagantly Venus, Bacchus and other Pagan Deities in a Chriſtian Poem, blending in this injudicious manner the Heathen fables with our Religion* (55). He paſſes the following general cenſure on the Luſiad. *Camoens, who is the ſole heroic Poet among the Portugueze, has only expreſſed the haughtineſs of his Countrymen, in his Poem on the Conqueſt of India; for he is vehement in Compoſition, but has very little conduct or diſcernment* (56). How different is this character from the following! "The "Luſiad may be conſidered as one of the fineſt "Poems extant, after Homer and Virgil... Its ſub- "ject is grand, and worthy of the *Epopea*.. the uni- "ty of the principal action and that of the Hero are "perfectly obſerved in it; we perceive art in the "whole conduct of it, a ſublime allegory, ſeveral "well-contrived epiſodes, paſſions expreſſed with "ſtrength and delicacy, and lively deſcriptions; in "fine, diction varied ſuitably to the ſubject, now eaſy "and plain, then rapid and majeſtic; always in- "chanting, and never diſfigured with a play of words, "whoſe falſe ſplendor ſometimes vitiates the fineſt Com- "poſitions of the Italians and Spaniards (57)." Father Rapin ſays afterwards, that *Camoens is far from being natural in his Paſtorals and other little Pieces* (58).

(53) *Reflexions ſur l'Eloquence, la Poëtique &c. par le Pere Rapin*, pag. 142. tom. 2. Amſterdam 1686.

(54) Idem, pag. 162.

(55) Idem, pag. 173.

(56) Idem, pag. 179.

(57) *La Luſiade du Camoens, ut ſupra*, vol. 1. Preface, pag. vi, vii.

(58) *Reflexions ſur l'Eloquence, la Poeſie &c.* pag. 202.

[*BB*] *Mr. de Voltaire has applauded and cenſured it.*] We have already taken notice of ſome encomiums beſtowed by him on the *Luſiad* (59). Here follow ſome others. "Camoens was a ſtrong inſtance of the irre- "ſiſtible impulſe of nature, which determines a true "genius to follow the bent of his talents, in ſpite "of all the obſtacles which could check his courſe.... "His infancy loſt amidſt the idleneſs and ignorance "of the Court of Liſbon (60); his youth ſpent in "Romantic loves, or in the wars againſt the Moors; "his long voyages at ſea, in his riper years; his miſ- "fortunes at Court, the revolutions of his country; "none of all theſe could ſuppreſs his genius..... "Camoens in Portugal ſteered a new courſe, and ac- "quired a reputation which laſts ſtill among his "countrymen, who pay as much veneration to his "memory, as the Engliſh to Milton (61)." Here follow ſome cenſures. I. "There is another fiction "(ſays Mr. de Voltaire) which would perhaps have "pleaſed the Italians as well as the Portugueze, but "no other nation beſides: it is an inchanted iſland, "called the iſland of Bliſs *, which the fleet finds "in her way home, juſt riſing from the ſea, for their "comfort and for their reward: Camoens deſcribes "that place, as Taſſo did ſome years after his iſland "of *Armida*. There a ſupernatural power brings in "all the beauties, and preſents all the pleaſures which "nature can afford, and which the heart may wiſh "for; a Goddeſs enamour'd with Velaſco (Vaſco) de "Gama, carries him to the top of a high mountain, "from whence ſhe ſhews him all the Kingdoms of "the earth (62), and foretels the fate of Portugal, "After Camoens hath given a looſe to his fancy, in "the laſcivious deſcription of the pleaſures which "Gama and his crew enjoyed in the iſland, he takes "care to inform the reader, that he ought to un- "derſtand by this fiction, nothing but the ſatisfaction "which the virtuous man feels, and the glory which "accrues to him by the practice of virtue.... But "the beſt excuſe for ſuch an invention is, the charming "ſtile in which it is delivered, (if we may believe "the Portugueze;) for the beauty of the elocution "makes ſome amends for the faults of the Poet, as "the colouring of Rubens makes ſome defects in his "figures paſs unregarded (63)."

(59) In the note [*X*].

(60) The other writers who have wrote on Camoens, don't ſay this.

(61) Voltaire, *Eſſays, ut ſupra*, pag. 71.

* This is a miſtake of Mr. de Voltaire. Camoens does not call it the Iſland of Bliſs.

(62) The hint of this ſeems to be taken from the Devil's carrying our Saviour to the pinacle of the Temple &c.

(63) Voltaire's *Eſſay, ut ſupra*, pag. 74, 75. This fiction is in the 9th Canto of the *Luſiad*.

The next cenſure amounts to much the ſame with what Father Rapin had before taken notice of (64).

"II. There is another kind of machinery conti- "nued throughout all the Poem, which nothing can "excuſe in any country whatſoever; it is an injudi- "cious mixture of the Heathen Gods with our Reli- "gion. Gama in a ſtorm addreſſes his prayers to "Chriſt, but it is Venus who comes to his relief; "the Heroes are Chriſtians, and the Poet a Heathen. "The main deſign which the Portugueze are ſuppoſed "to have, (next to the promoting of their trade (65),) "is to propagate Chriſtianity, yet Jupiter, Bacchus, "and Venus, have in their hands, all the manage- "ment

(64) See the note [*AA*] above, citation (55).

(65) A ſly innuendo.

swered by a late French Writer [*CC*]; Mr. de Voltaire afterwards gives his opinion of the

" ment of the voyage. So incongruous a machinery, " casts a blemish upon the whole Poem; yet shews " at the same time, how prevailing are its beauties, " since the Portugueze like it with all its faults.

" III. Camoens hath a great deal of true wit, and " not a little share of false; his imagination hurries " him into great absurdities. . . . I remember that " after Gama hath related his adventures to the King " of (66) Melinda, *now*, says he, *O King, judge if* " *Ulysses and Æneas, have travelled so far, and un-* " *dergone so many hardships.* As if that barbarous " African, was acquainted with Homer and Vir- " gil (67).

(66) A Kingdom whose Capitol is of the same name. It is in Africa, not far from Mombaza. Its inhabitants were very kind to Vasco de Gama, and furnished him with Pilots, when he sailed to discover the East-Indies.

(67) Voltaire's *Essay, ut supra*, pag. 76.

[*CC*] *Mr. de Voltaire's criticisms have been answered by a late French writer.*] I. With regard to the island of Bliss (as Mr. de Voltaire calls it), the critic answers, " Venus is going to conduct the Portugueze " into a delicious island: The pleasures they are to " taste in it, *tho' painted in the strongest colours of gal-* " *lantry*, will yet be no other but that spiritual plea- " sure, that inward satisfaction, which proves the re- " ward of great men when they have succeeded in their " noble projects; the Sea-Nymphs shall represent " the virtues, as they have represented them on other " occasions. . . . Whatever Mr. de Voltaire's opinion " may be, I do not find any incongruity in this. It " was always the privilege of Poetry to employ cor- " poral images, in order to raise us to the knowledge " of things purely metaphysical or moral; not only " the Greek and Latin Authors, but also David in his " Psalms, and Solomon in his Song, abound with " such allegories; we there see, in every page, the " pleasures of the mind expressed by those of the body. " Now is it not rashness to assert that Camoens has " erred in following such guides (68)? I believe this criticism will not be able to invalidate Mr. de Voltaire's censure of this passage in the *Lusiad*. This island is represented as the most delicious spot in the universe; the flowers, the meads, the groves, the rivulets, the harmony of the birds are inchanting, and above all the Nereids who come ashore on it to sooth the toils of the Portugueze; in a word, the colouring glows with as much warmth and beauty as that of Titian. But whether the pleasures the Portugueze meet with in this island are adapted to raise the mind to spiritual things will appear from the following specimen of them, which I have translated from the *Lusiad*. " He said, " when immediately the Portugueze run with greater " swiftness than stags, after the Nereids, whose charms " had captivated their hearts. The Nereids dart " into the groves . . . . they shriek as they fly; but " that moment they look back on the Portugueze, " with such an agreeable smile as belies their fear: " Zephyr wantons in the ringlets of one of the Ne- " reids; he raises gently the flowing robe of another; " the beauties he reveals and hides the same instant, " are so many delicious objects which inflame the de- " sires of the pursuers. Some of the fugitive Nymphs " fall voluntarily on the verdant turf, and their coun- " tenances shew, that they would not be displeased to " have their lovers fall down by them: farther off, " the Portugueze find some Nereids who are quite " naked, and bathing in the stream: they at first " shriek; their affliction seems so sincere, that one " would not imagine they had waited in expectation " of being thus surprized: one feigning to sacrifice her " modesty to her fears, rises swiftly out of the water, " and flies into a neighbouring thicket, whilst the eye " that pursues her charms, fixes on the roses and lillies " which she refuses to the hand that strives so eagerly to " stop her. . . . Several of the Portugueze plunge into " the silver waves with their clothes on, when the pas- " sion that pervades all their faculties, pants to be im- " mediately gratified, insomuch that the least delay ap- " pears to them an age (69)." Here is a voluptuous picture! fit indeed to be hung up in the temple of Venus, or Mahomet's Paradise. . . . Camoens took the hint of this island from that of Andicheva, which Gama and his companions discovered some days after their departure from Calicut. According to Barros, they put in there, in order to get water and repose themselves, it being an inchanting place and very fruitful. II. As to the injudicious mixture of the Heathen Gods with our Religion, with which Mr. de Voltaire and Father Rapin accuse Camoens: this critick seems, if I mistake not, to answer very lamely. Among other reasons to defend Camoens in opposition to Mr. de Voltaire, he gives the following. " If Boileau is " allowed to introduce, in his *Lutrin, Chicane and* " *Pleasure* who are Goddesses of his creation; I would " fain know why Camoens should be forbid to employ, " in his *Lusiad*, the names of Phœbus and Thetis, " who are already known to the Poets. The allegory " is equal on both sides; and it ought to serve for " a pass-port to the Poet of the (†) Tagus, no less " than to him of the (70) Seine (71)." There is no Reader of taste but sees the weakness of this reasoning. The *Lutrin* is a burlesque Poem, and as such, Chicane and Pleasure were proper and beautiful machines; but it is far otherwise with a serious epic Poem like the *Lusiad*. Hence it will be found that the critick lays too much stress on the allegory; and consequently had no reason to suppose, that under Jupiter, Camoens shadowed God the Father, under Bacchus the Devil, under Venus the Christian Religion which protects the Portugueze in their voyage, under the fatal Sisters or Destinies the Cœlestial Venus, under Mars, our Saviour, under Mercury the Messenger-Angels, and so on. One would rather conclude, that these are faults in the *Lusiad*; and that they were owing, not so much to the Author as to the age he lived in. We find our Chaucer and all the great Poets of those times, blending in this injudicious manner, the Christian and Heathen systems. III. With regard to Mr. de Voltaire's censuring Camoens, for supposing the King of Melinda very well versed in the Grecian Story and Mythology, the critick answers, (among other reasons,) as follows. " Is " it not well known that the Indians had anciently " a correspondence with the Greeks? Did not the Gre- " cian Philosophers travel into every part of the East, " in order to consult the Magi and the Brachmans? " And was it not from them that Pythagoras borrowed " the doctrine of the transmigration of souls? Is it " not likewise universally agreed that Alexander the " Great had a strong passion for Literature, that he " conquered India and made some stay in it? . . . . " We may suppose that his Courtiers, and Officers, " most of whom were Macedonians, imitated their " Monarch in his love for learning. This being " granted, we may naturally conclude, that during " Alexander's stay in India, the nations of it learned " Mythology History, &c; at least after his departure, " since he left a great number of Greeks in the ci- " ties founded by him in India (72). . . . Had not the " Indians also a correspondence with the Romans (73)? " . . . But that which argues chiefly in favour of Ca- " moens, is the invasion of Spain by the Moors and " Arabians. They applied themselves to learning " when settled in the last mentioned country, and " nature having endued them with genius, they made " a swift progress: They translated the best Greek " and Latin Authors into their language; illustrated " them with Commentaries, and writ others of their " own invention. Some centuries after being drove " out of Spain, they carried into Africa and Asia the " several sciences that they had learnt in Europe. With " this knowledge, can Camoens be supposed to have " clashed with verisimilitude or even truth, in intro- " ducing a Moorish King, speaking of Pirithous or " any other subject borrowed from the Grecian Mytho- " logy (74)? Mr. de Voltaire's error proceeded from " his supposing this King an ignorant and savage Afri- " can; whereas he was an Arabian, and as such des- " cended from a nation who had cultivated very assi- " duously all parts of polite literature (75)." This critic is afterwards a little severe. " The mistake, " into which Mr. de Voltaire's great precipitation led " him, ought to serve as a lesson; and teach us, that " there is always less hazard in applauding, than in " blaming great men (76);" but he atones in some measure for the censure he had past, in saying immediately after. " Have we not great reason to dread " the quicksands and rocks in sailing on the ocean " of criticism, when we see so good a vessel shipwreck'd " upon it (77)?

(†) Camoens.

(70) Boileau.

(71) *La Lusiade du Camoens*, vol. 1. pag. 63.

(72) Idem, pag. 172, 173.

(73) Idem, pag. 174.

(74) Idem, pag. 175, 176.

(75) Idem, vol. 2. pag. 175.

(76) Idem, pag. 177.

(77) Idem, ibid.

(68) *La Lusiade du Camoens*, tom. 3. pag. 138.

(69) *Lusiad*, Canto 9.

the Poem in general [*DD*], and takes notice of two of the happieſt thoughts in it [*EE*]. Camoens has a fling at our Henry VIII, in one of his Cantos [*FF*]. We have a tranſlation of this noble Poem by Sir Richard Fanſhaw, but a new one is very much wanted.

[*DD*] *Mr. de Voltaire afterwards gives his opinion of the Poem in general.*] The Luſiad, "in my opinion, "is full of numberleſs faults and beauties, thick ſown "near one another; and almoſt in every page, there "is what to laugh at, and what to be delighted with "(79)." This character is very different from thoſe we have quoted from other Authors. Mr. de Voltaire, ſpeaking of Taſſo, ſays, "Torquato Taſſo began his "Jeruſalem, when Camoens was finiſhing his Luſiada, "he uſed to ſay, that the only rival he feared in Eu-"rope was Camoens. *His fear (if ſincere) was very "ill-grounded; for he was as far ſuperior to him, as "that Portugueze Poet excelled the Poets of his own "Country* (80)." But Sir Richard Fanſhaw ſays in the Dedication of his verſion of the Luſiad, that Camoens might juſtly have ſaid of Taſſo, *if he had not ſeen my Luſiad, he had not excelled it.*

(79) Voltaire's *Eſſay, ut ſupra*, pag. 76.

(80) Idem, pag. 77.

[*EE*] *Takes notice of two of the happieſt thoughts in it.*] "Theſe, *ſays Mr. de Voltaire*, I muſt take notice of, "for the likeneſs which they bear to two moſt cele-"brated paſſages (81) of Waller and Sir John Den-"ham. . . Waller ſays in his Epiſtle to Zelinda.]

(81) Or rather *Thoughts.*

"*Thy matchleſs form will credit bring*
"*To all the wonders I ſhall ſing.*

"Camoens ſays, ſpeaking of the voyages of the Ar-"gonauts and of Ulyſſes, that the undertaking of the "Portugueze ſhall give credit to all thoſe fables, in "ſurpaſſing them. . . Sir John Denham, in his Poem "on Cooper's Hill, ſays to the Thames;

"*O could I flow like thee, and make thy ſtream*
"*My great example, as it is my theme;*
"*Tho' deep, yet clear; tho' gentle, yet not dull,*
"*Strong without rage, without o'erflowing full.*

"Camoens addreſſes the Nymphs of Tagus in the "like manner: "O Nymphs, if ever I ſung of you, "inſpire me now with new and ſtrong lays; let my "ſtyle flow like your waves; let it be deep and clear "as your waters &c. (82)." Mr. de Voltaire however obſerves, that neither Mr. Waller or Sir John Den-ham ought to be conſidered as Plagiaries on this occa-ſion (83). I cannot ſay how Camoens has expreſſed the firſt thought; but with regard to the ſecond, the ingenious Mr. de Voltaire ſeems to have aſcribed more to Camoens than he really ſays; there not being that beautiful contraſt in his addreſs to the Nymphs of the Tagus, as in Sir John Denham's lines to the Thames, and which form the great beauty of the Engliſh lines. This will partly appear from the tranſlation of the Verſes in queſtion of Camoens, by Sir Richard Fan-ſhaw.

(82) Voltaire's *Eſſay*, pag. 76, 77.

(83) Idem, pag. 77.

And you (my Tagus' Nymphs,) ſince ye did raiſe
My wit t'a more than ordinary flame;
If I in low, yet tuneful verſe, the praiſe
Of your ſweet river always did proclaim;
Inſpire me now with high and thundering lays;
Give me them clear and flowing like his ſtream:
That to your waters Phœbus may ordain
They do not envy thoſe of Hippocrene (84).

(84) *The Luſiad, or Portugal's Hiſtorical Poem*, pag. 2.

[*FF*] *Camoens has a fling at our Henry VIII.*] It is in the beginning of the 7th Canto, where he ſpeaks of the ſupetiority of the fame and glory of his country-men, over that of other Nations. On this occaſion he hints chiefly at our Monarch's immoderate love of the Fair-Sex, and his carrying on war againſt the Ro-man Catholics.

Fair England's Monarch, tho' he ſtile himſelf
King of Jeruſalem, ſtill lets the Turk
Oppreſs the city ſanctified by Heaven.
Plung'd in delights, amid the Northern ſnows,
He vainly riots in Aſſyrian pleaſures.
And, if he draws the ſword, 'tis ever aim'd
At truth's bleſt followers. I.

☞ CAMPANELLA (THOMAS) a famous Italian Philoſopher in the beginning of the ſixteenth Century, was born at Stilo in Calabria September the 5th 1568 (*a*), and not about the year 1564, as Monſieur Baillet tells us in his *Enfans Celebres* (*b*). He ſhewed in his infancy what might afterwards be expected from him. He learned with a prodigious quickneſs all that is uſually taught children; and at the age of thirteen he was a perfect maſter of the antient Orators and Poets, and wrote Diſcourſes and Verſes with great facility upon the ſubjects which were propoſed to him. This is the account which he gives us himſelf in his Latin Diſſertation to Gabriel Naudé *concerning his own books, and the right method of ſtudying* [*A*]. When he was fourteen years and an half old, his father propoſed to have ſent him to Naples to ſtudy the Law under Julius Campanella; but he having other views, entered himſelf into the Order of the Dominicans [*B*]. He was afterwards ſent to the Monaſtery of San-Giorgio, in order to go through a Courſe of Logic and Philoſophy [*C*]. We may judge of the progreſs which he made there by this

(*a*) Sir Thomas Pope Blount, *Cenſura celebriorum Authorum*, pag. 936. edit. Genevæ 1694, in 4to, and Niceron, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire des Hommes Illuſtres*, tom. 7. pag. 67. edit. Paris 1729.

(*b*) Num. 67. *Jugemens des Savans.* tom. 5. pag. 70. edit. Amſterd. 1725, in 4to.

[*A*] *This is the account, which he gives us himſelf in his Latin Diſſertation* . . . . concerning his own Books, and the right Method of ſtudying.] This Diſſertation is intitled, *Thomæ Campanellæ de libris propriis & rectâ ratione ſtudendi Syntagma ad Gabrielem Naudæum Pariſinum*; and was publiſhed by Elzivir at Amſterdam 1645 in 12mo in a Collection of Diſſertations upon the Method of ſtudying, intitled, *Hugonis Grotii & aliorum Diſſertationes de ſtudiis inſtituendis.* In the firſt chapter *Artic.* 1. he has the following paſſage, from whence we have extracted what we have ſaid above in the Text of this Article. *Equidem quinquennis adhuc Literulis ac Pietati adeò ſtudioſam operam dedi, ut quicquid Parentes & Avi & Concionatores de divinis eccleſiaſticiſque rebus dicerent, & quicquid Pædagogi docerent, animo conderem. Animo decimo tertio decimo Grammaticorum Dogmata ac verſificatoriæ Artis ita percepe-ram, ut quicquid liberet, proſâ ac metro poſſem eloqui, multaque carmina tunc edidi, haud tamen nervoſa.*

[*B*] *He enter'd himſelf into the Order of the Dominicans.*] He tells us in the *Syntagma* quoted in the preceding Note, that he was induced to enter into that Order by hearing an eloquent Preacher of it, from whom he had learned the principles of Logic, and eſpecially by reading the Hiſtory of St. Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus, with which he was greatly affected. *Anno quaſi decimo quarto cum dimidio, accidit ut Parens Neapolim me vocatum à Julio Campe-nallâ Juriſprudentiæ Lectore, mittere vellet; ſed eodem tempore religionem Dominicanorum, cum ex eâ Concionatorem eloquentem audiviſſem, Logiceſque ab eodem princi-pia præguſtâſſem, maximè autem ſancti Thomæ & Alberti Magni hiſtoriâ affectus fuiſſem, profiteri volui.*

[*C*] *He was afterwards ſent to the Monaſtery of San-Giorgio, in order to go through a courſe of Logic and Philoſophy.*] He tells us in his *Syntagma* that he recited there publicly before a great Aſſembly an Oration in heroic verſe, and an Hymn in ſapphic meaſure, when the Governor of that town entered upon his office, and that he wrote a great number of Verſes, which where inſcribed in the churches and upon the tri-umphal arch there. *Miſſus igitur poſtea ad Cœnobium ſancti;*

this fact which is related of him. His Profeſſor having been invited to diſpute upon ſome theſes, which were to be maintained by the Franciſcans, but finding himſelf indiſpoſed, ſent our Author in his room, who perfectly anſwered the expectations of his maſter, and diſputed with ſo much ſubtilty and force, that every body was charmed with him, and cried out that the genius of Teleſius was tranſmigrated into him. Campanella had never before heard of that Philoſopher, and this was the occaſion of his reading him afterwards, and even entering into his ſentiments (*c*). When his Courſe of Philoſophy was finiſhed, he was ſent to Coſenza to ſtudy Divinity. But his peculiar inclination was to Philoſophy, to which he confined his whole time and application. He began then to form to himſelf a new plan of ſtudy, and to ſhake off the yoak of authority, which reſtrained all the Philoſophers of that age. He called in queſtion the doctrine of his Maſters, and found it to be falſe in ſo many points, that he fell into a kind of Pyrrhoniſm, which led him to doubt of the moſt uncontroverted matters of fact. He confeſſes himſelf, that he doubted whether there ever was ſuch a man in the world as Charlemagne. This is the uſual effect of obliging men to blind obedience: by demanding too much, all is loſt; for mankind will never reſign their reaſon to be governed like beaſts †. He reſolved not to confine himſelf to any particular Author, but to extract whatever was good in each of them promiſcuouſly (*d*). At Altomente he employed the leiſure which he enjoyed there, in reading the works of the antient Philoſophers, and even thoſe of the modern, eſpecially of Teleſius, and formed particular ſyſtems, which muſt undoubtedly appear very ſtrange at a time when Ariſtotle's doctrines paſſed for inconteſtable truths. He was but twenty two years of age when he began to write; and notwithſtanding his youth he thought himſelf able to ſupport the attacks, which his new ſyſtems would infallibly expoſe him to (*e*). In 1590 he went to Naples in order to publiſh ſome of his works, where an old Profeſſor of his Order being jealous of his reputation, conceived a mortal hatred againſt him, and endeavoured to ruin him [*D*]. The works which he publiſhed [*E*] made a prodigious noiſe in the world, and the novelty of his opinions raiſing

(*c*) Janus Nicius Erythræus, *Pinacoth.* 1. pag. 41. edit. Lipſiæ 1712 in 12mo.

† Bernard, *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, for the year 1705.

(*d*) Niceron, pag. 69.

(*e*) Idem, pag. 69, 70.

ſancti Georgii Oppidi, Logicam & Philoſophiam auditurus, orationem metro heroico atque hymnoſapphico, cum dominus oppidi auſpicia dominii primum adiret, in populorum & vicinorum frequentiâ à me compoſitam recitavi, multaque carmina, cum in Eccleſiâ noſtrâ, tum in triumphali Arcu per me condita adhuc viſuntur inſculpta. He wrote likewiſe ſeveral Lectures in Logic and Natural Philoſophy in a very diſtinct and compendious method. But afterwards being anxious, becauſe he thought that the genuine truth was not to be found in the Peripatetic Philoſophy, he examined all the Greek, Latin and Arabian Commentators upon Ariſtotle, and began to heſitate more and more with regard to their doctrines; upon which he reſolved to enquire whether what they have aſſerted is to be read likewiſe in the world, which he found wiſe men had ſtiled the living Book of the Deity. But as the Doctors could not ſatisfy the objections, which he brought againſt their principles, he determined to run over all the writings of Plato, Pliny, Galen, the Stoics, and the followers of Democritus, and eſpecially thoſe of Teleſius, and to compare them with the original Book of the World, in order to diſcover by this compariſon what truth or falſhood was in the copies of it. *Deinde cum eſſem anxius, quod veritas non ſincera, ſed potius falſitas pro veritate, in Peripato verſari mihi videbatur, Ariſtotelis Commentatores Græcos atque Latinos, Arabeſque examinavi omnes, & hæſitare magis cœpi in dogmatis eorum, ideoque perſcrutari volui, an quæ dixerunt ipſi, in mundo etiam legantur, quem codicem eſſe Dei vivum ex doctrinis ſapientum intellexi. Cumque Doctores meis argumentis ſatisfacere non poſſent, quæ contra ipſorum Lectiones promebam, ſtatui ipſe libros omnes percurrere Platonis, Plinii, Galeni, Stoicorum, & Democriticorum, præcipuè verò Teleſianos, ac cum mundi codices primario conferre, ut ex originali & autographo, quid veri exemplaria habent, & quid falſi, agnoſcerem* (1).

(1) *Syntagma, ubi ſupra.*

[*D*] *Where an old Profeſſor of his Order being jealous of his reputation conceived a mortal hatred againſt him, and endeavoured to ruin him.*] He had raiſed himſelf a prodigious character at Naples by this circumſtance, that paſſing by a Convent of the Recollets, and ſeeing a great number of people going in and out, he had the curioſity to enquire what was the occaſion of it; and hearing that ſome theſes in Philoſophy were diſputed there, he went in with the reſt, and having obtained leave to diſpute, he acquitted himſelf to ſo much advantage, that he received the applauſes of the whole Aſſembly, and the Monks of his Order carried him away in triumph to their Convent. Some time after he was preſent at a diſputation in Divinity, where an ancient Profeſſor of his Order having ſaid ſomething, which appeared very judicious, our Author highly commended him for it. But the old man, jealous perhaps of the glory, which Campanella had gained, ſpoke to him in a very contemptuous manner, and bid him be ſilent, ſince it did not belong to a young man, as he was, to interpoſe in queſtions of Divinity. This fired Campanella, who anſwered, that as young as he was, he was able to teach him, and upon that attack'd what the Profeſſor had advanced with ſo much force, that every body adjudged to him the victory. The Profeſſor being exaſperated at this, accuſed our Author to the Inquiſition, as if he had gained by magic that vaſt extent of learning, in which he had not received any previous inſtruction. *Illud verò ſui nominis famam ſupra quam dici poſſet, in immenſum auxit, quod cum illis Diſputationibus Theologorum quoddam placitum in contentionem certamenque deductum eſſet, ac multa doctè argutèque in utramque partem eſſent allata, neſcio quod docti cujuſdam ex ſuo ordine ſenis dictum, utpote verum, cum plauſu excepit, & in cœlum laudibus extulit. At ſenex iratus,* Tace ſis, *inquit,* nec te immiſce: de Theologicis hic rebus ambigitur, quas tu ne primoribus quidem labris attigiſti. *Quo hominis inprimis iracundi dicto exarſit ille, nec tulit:* Ac vide, *inquit,* quam ego ſim harum rerum ignarus & rudis, ut poſſim te decem annos in diſciplina habere, ac poſtea adigere, ut fatearis te nihil ſcire vel intelligere. *Ac reprehenſum ſenis illius Argumentum, & ſanctorum Patrum ſacrarumque Literarum teſtimoniis confirmatum, tanquam amentatam haſtam, ita cœpit ingenii lacertis ac viribus intorquere, ut omnium conceſſu fuerit judicatum, à Campanella ſemper omnes, illo autem die etiam ipſum a ſeſe ſuperatum. Quæ victoria magnos illi in omnem vitam bellorum tumultus excitavit. Primum a ſene illo, cujus contumaciam retuderat, apud Quæſitores Fidei accuſatus, quod tantam vim doctrinæ, cujus ne literam quidem didiciſſet, ex inferorum fontibus hauſtam ebibiſſet* (2).

(2) Jan. Nicii Erythræi, *Pinacotheca* 1. pag. 42, 43. edit. Lipſiæ 1712.

[*E*] *The Works, which he publiſhed.*] We ſhall give a Catalogue of them as follows. I. *Philoſophia ſenſibus demonſtrata, & in octo diſputationes diſtincta adverſus eos, qui proprio arbitratu, non autem ſenſata duce naturæ philoſophati ſunt: ubi Errores Ariſtotelis & Aſſeclarum ex propriis dictis & naturæ decretis convincuntur, & ſingulæ imaginationes pro eâ a Peripateticis fictæ prorſus rejiciuntur, cum verâ defenſione Bernardi Teleſii.* Naples 1591 in 4to. Teleſio of Coſenza had publiſhed at Naples in fol. in 1587 a work intitled, *De rerum Naturâ juxta propria principia Libri IX*; in which

raiſing a great many prejudices againſt him at Naples, he removed to Rome, where he was not received in a better manner; ſo that he went from thence to Florence, and preſented ſome of his works to the Grand Duke Ferdinand I, who was the Patron of Men of Letters. He did not continue there long, but reſolved to go to Padua. As he paſſed through

which he attacked very ſtrongly the blind ſubmiſſion, which was then paid to the authority of Ariſtotle. James Anthony Marta ſollicitous for the reputation of that ancient Philoſopher undertook an Anſwer to this Book. But Campanella having read Teleſio's work was convinced of the truth of his ſentiments, and being charmed with the liberty in Philoſophy, which he endeavoured to introduce, immediately reſolved to deſend him againſt the attacks of his antagoniſt (3). Campanella's Book conſiſted of eight Diſputations; 1. Of the Principles of natural Bodies. 2. Of the Formation of the Fœtus in the Womb. 3. Of the Heaven and World. 4. Of the Elements. 5. Of the Uſe of the oblique Courſe of the Sun. 6. Of the Mixture of the Elements. 7. Of the Qualities of them. 8. Of Things moving and moveable. In this Book he examined the whole Peripatetic Philoſophy, and confuted Marta's *Propugnaculum Ariſtotelis*, and ſhewed that this Writer was ſo far from defending that Philoſopher, as he had pretended, that he even injured his cauſe. *Hic totam Philoſophiam Peripateticam in examen adduxi, Philoſophorum priſcorum & Medicorum decretis, ſimulque Naturæ placitis, & ſenſu conſutavi Propugnaculum iſtius Auctoris, ſic ut quem defendere profitebatur, hunc potius offendere palam oſtenderim* (4). Father Niceron (5) tells us, that in this Book he treated his antagoniſt in a more dogmatical way, than was ſuitable to his age, ſince he was not then twenty two years old; and ſuch a manner of writing was more likely to raiſe him enemies, than to make Converts to his opinions. II. *Prodromus Philoſophiæ inſtaurandæ, id eſt, Diſſertationis de Natura Rerum compendium ſecundum vera principia ex ſcriptis Thomæ Campanellæ præmiſſum.* Francfort 1617 in 4to pagg. 86. Tobias Adam, who publiſhed this piece, wrote the preface to it (6). III. *De ſenſu rerum & Magia Libri IV. mirabilis occultæ Philoſophiæ, ubi demonſtratur mundum eſſe Dei vivam ſtatuam, benèque cognoſcentem, omneſque illius partes partiumque particulas ſenſu donatas eſſe, alias clariori, alias obſcuriori, quantum ſufficit ipſarum conſervationi, ac totius in quo conſentiunt, & fere omnium naturæ Arcanorum Rationes aperiuntur. Tobias Adam recenſuit, & nunc primum evulgavit.* Francfort 1620 in 4to pagg. 371. *Iidem Libri correcti & defenſi à ſtupidorum incolarum Mundi calumniis.* Paris 1636 in 4to pagg. 229. He publiſhed this latter edition himſelf, and dedicated it to Cardinal Richelieu. He endeavours in this Book to prove, that all the bodies which appear to us immoveable and inſenſible, are indued with ſenſe; and that the ſtars, elements, plants, and even dead carcaſſes, and in ſhort, every thing elſe in the world are ſenſible. We are not therefore to be ſurprized after this, that he aſcribes intelligence and reaſon to brutes, and aſſerts, that they have an intelligible language among themſelves. The inſtances, which he brings to prove this, are very curious and amuſing, but as Father Niceron (7) obſerves, contain no ſolid proof in them. He tells us himſelf in his *Syntagma* (8) above quoted, that he wrote this Book in Italian and Latin, and that Tobias Adam publiſhed it at Francfort in 1618. Athanaſius the Rhetorician, a Greek Prieſt of Conſtantinople, who lived at Paris at the ſame time when Campanella did, and who died March the 13th 1663, aged ninety two years, wrote a large treatiſe in Greek againſt this work of our Author, which treatiſe is ſtill in manuſcript in the Library of Monſr. de Coiſlin, and was never printed; but an Abridgment of it was publiſhed in Latin under the following title: *D. Athanaſii Rhetores Preſbyteri Byzantini Anti-Campanella in compendium redactus, adverſus Librum* de Senſu Rerum & Magia. Paris 1655 in 4to (9). Mr. Robert Burton in his *Anatomy of Melancholy* having obſerved (10) that Kepler ſuppoſed the planets to be inhabited, tells us, that Campanella in the 4th Chapter of his *ſecond Book de Senſu Rerum* ſubſcribes to this opinion. "That they are inhabited, ſays Mr. Burton, he certainly ſuppoſeth, "but with what kind of Creatures he cannot ſay; "he labours to prove it by all means; and that there "are infinite worlds, having made an apology for Galileus, and dedicates this treatiſe of his to Cardinal "Cajetanus." IV. *Apologia pro Galileo Mathematico Florentino, ubi diſquiritur utrum ratio Philoſophandi, quam Galileus celebrat, faveat ſacris Scripturis, an adverſetur.* Francfort 1622 in 4to pagg. 58. In this *Apology for Galileo*, the Mathematician of Florence, which was publiſhed by Tobias Adam, he enquires whether that Writer's ſcheme of Philoſophy is agreeable to the Scriptures or not. V. *Realis Philoſophiæ Epilogiſticæ partes quatuor, hoc eſt, de Rerum Naturâ, hominum moribus, politicâ, cui Civitas Solis adjuncta eſt, & œconomicâ, cum annotationibus Phyſiologicis a Tobiâ Adamo nunc primum edita. Quibus accedunt Quæſtionum partes totidem ejuſdem Campanellæ contra omnes Sectas veteres novaſque ad naturalem ac Chriſtianam Philoſophiam hiſce Libris contentam confirmandam.* Francfort 1623 in 4to pagg. 508. This Book is divided into four parts, and contains a ſyſtem of Natural Philoſophy, Ethics, Politics, and OEconomics, with Phyſiological Notes by Tobias Adam, and ſeveral queſtions of Campanella againſt all the ancient and modern Sects, in confirmation of the Natural and Chriſtian Philoſophy contained in this work. He tells us in his *Syntagma* (11) that this Book was written at firſt in the Italian language; and that the *City of the Sun*, which is annexed to the political part of it, contains the idea of the Commonwealth much more excellent than that of Plato's or any other Author's. *Adjecique Ideam Reipublicæ, quam voco* Civitatem Solis, *longè præſtantiorem quam ſit Platonica aut alia quæ vis.* Gabriel Naudæus in his *Bibliographia Politica*, affirms that this Piece is full of new and ſublime ſentiments, and beſides the Philoſophical ſpeculations in it contains many things, by which Commonwealths may be adminiſtered in a better manner, and even the men themſelves improv'd in their manners. Civitatem Solis *delineavit, eâ cogitationum novitate & ſublimitate ſenſuum, ut præter Philoſophicas Speculationes multa etiam contineat, quæ Reipublicæ melius adminiſtrari poſſent, & homines ipſi meliores evadere.* Herman Conringius likewiſe in his Book *De Civili Prudentia* (12) obſerves, that this tract is a valuable one, tho' much inferior to Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*. *Thomæ Campanellæ* Civitas Solis *laude quidem digna, multum eſt tamen infra Th. Mori* Utopiam. Naudæus in his *Bibliographia Politica* above quoted obſerves with regard to the Syſtem of Ethics, which is publiſhed in our Author's *Realis Philoſophia Epilogiſtica* together with his *Natural Philoſophy and Politics*, that tho' this treatiſe is not written in ſo elegant a ſtyle as to pleaſe the Ciceronians, yet it contains ſo many noble ſentiments and acute reflections, that it muſt be highly approved of by all true Philoſophers. *Amicus etiam noſter Thomas Campanella juxta doctrinam ſuarum* Primalitatum Ethicam *novam compoſuit, quæ ſub Epilogiſmi nomine cum Philoſophiâ ſuâ Naturali & Politicâ typis commiſſa fuit a Tobia Adamo, ſtylo quidem non ita compto delineata, ut Ciceronianis arridere poſſet, ſed eâ nobilitate cogitationum, rationumque ſubtilitate, ut omnibus ſapientiæ Myſtis non poſſit eſſe non ſummopere gratiſſima.* VI. *Atheiſmus triumphatus, ſeu contra Antichriſtianiſmum.* Rome 1631 fol. pagg. 182. Paris 1636 in 4to pagg. 273. This ſecond Edition contains likewiſe *Diſputatio contrà murmurantes in Bullas Sexti V. & Urbani VIII. adverſus judiciarios*, &c. He tells us in his *Syntagma* (13), that he gave the *Atheiſmus triumphatus* to Scioppius in the year 1608, when he was ſent by Pope Paul V to procure his liberty, and that Scioppius gave it that title, whereas himſelf had before intitled it, *Recognitio Religionis ſecundum omnes ſcientias contra Anti-Chriſtianiſmum Machiavelliſticum.* He publiſhed the ſecond edition of it himſelf, and made ſeveral alterations in it. It is ſaid, that Campanella under the pretence of confuting the Atheiſts in this work, in reality had a deſign to ſerve their cauſe, by furniſhing them with arguments, which they had never thought of before, and anſwering them in a very weak manners;

(3) Niceron, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſt. des Hommes Illuſtres*, tom. 7. pag. 76, 77. edit. de Paris 1729.

(4) *Campanellæ de Libris propriis & rectâ ratione ſtudendi Syntagm.* cap. 1. Articul. 1.

(5) Pag. 77.

(6) Niceron, pag. 78.

(7) Pag. 79.

(8) Cap. 1. Artic. 3.

(9) Niceron, pag. 79.

(10) Part 2. Sect. 2. Memb. 3. pag. 255. 7th edit. London 1660, in fol.

(11) Cap. 11. Articul. 3.

(12) Cap. 14.

(13) Cap. 1. Artic. 3.

through Bologna, his writings were ſeized, and carried to the Inquiſition at Rome. However he did not diſturb himſelf much at this affair, but continued his journey (*f*). He continued ſome years at Padua, being employed in inſtructing of ſome young Venetians in his doctrines, and compoſing ſome of his works. Upon his return to Rome he met with a better reception than before, and was honoured with the friendſhip of ſeveral Cardinals. In 1598 he went to Naples, where he ſtaid but a ſhort time, and then viſited his

(*f*) *Campanellæ de Libris Propriis & rectâ ratione ſtudendi Syntagma ad Gabriel. Naudæum Pariſ.* cap. 1. Articul. 2.

manner; upon which Herman Conringius, as quoted by Sir Thomas Pope Blount in his *Cenſura Celebriorum Authorum* (14) aſſerts, that his Book ſhould have been intitled *Atheiſmus triumphans*, and that the ſame judgment is to be paſſed upon it as Barlæus did upon *Vanini's Amphitheatrum*. *Scripſit etiam* Atheiſmum triumphatum, *qui tamen rectius eſt* Atheiſmus triumphans, *idemque Judicium de eo ferendum, quod Barlæus* de Amphitheatro *Vanini tulit*. Sorbiere alſo in the *Sorberiana* (15), ſpeaks in very contemptuous terms of it, and aſſures us, that the only thing which he learned from it was never to read any other work of the ſame Author for fear of loſing his time. VII. *De Gentiliſmo non retinendo Quæſtio unica. Utrum liceat novam poſt Gentiles cudere Philoſophiam. Utrum liceat Ariſtoteli contradicere. Utrum liceat jurare in verba Magiſtri.* Paris 1636 in 4to pagg. 63. In this Book he treats Ariſtotle and thoſe who follow blindly that Philoſopher, with great ſeverity. VIII. *De Prædeſtinatione, Electione, Reprobatione, & auxiliis divinæ gratiæ Cento Thomiſticus.* Paris 1636 in 4to pagg. 326. In this work our Author abandons the ſentiments of St. Auſtin and St. Thomas Aquinas, and follows thoſe of Origen. The opinions of the Moliniſts do not pleaſe him more than thoſe of St. Auſtin. He rejects the middle ſcience as uſeleſs and ſubject to many inconveniencies. He is of opinion, that man by the ſtrength of his own nature can put himſelf in a ſtate of recovering Grace; that infants dying without baptiſm are ſaved by the faith of their Parents &c. (16). IX. *Aſtrologicorum Libri ſex, in quibus Aſtrologia omni ſuperſtitione Arabum & Judæorum eliminata, Phyſiologicè tractatur ſecundum ſcripturas & Doctrinam S. Thomæ, & Alberti, & ſummorum Theologorum, ita ut abſque ſuſpicione mala in eccleſiâ Dei multâ cum utilitate legi poſſit:* Lyons 1629 in 4to pagg. 232. In this book he endeavours to treat of Aſtrology in a Phyſiological manner agreeably to the Holy Scriptures and the Doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas, Albertus Magnus, and the greateſt Divines, excluſive of all the ſuperſtition of the Arabians and Jews, ſo that it may without any ill ſuſpicion be read to great advantage in the Church of God. This work was ſcarce printed, when the Bookſeller received from Italy a ſeventh Book *de Fato ſiderali vitando*, which he added to the others, and the whole was publiſhed together at Francfort 1630 in 4to (17). Our Author tells us in his *Syntagma* (18), that a falſe brother having borrowed this laſt Book, delivered it with the other ſix to a Printer at Lyons in order to be publiſhed, that he might expoſe our Author to the reſentment of Urban VIII, who was a very wiſe Pope, and therefore deteſted Aſtrology; and this brother accuſed Campanella of diſobedience on account of the impreſſion of that Book, and of ſuperſtition on account of the things contained in it; upon which he would not acknowledge the laſt book, as it was not printed by himſelf, and wrote an Apology, which was approved of by two Cenſors, who had been appointed. *Item librum* de Fato ſiderali vitando, *quem mutuatum inſidioſus Frater, unà cum ſex* Libris Aſtrologicis, *ut odium Urbani VIII ſapientiſſimi Pontificis, eoque nomine Aſtrologiam deteſtantis, mihi conciliaret, Typographo dedit Lugdunenſi, à quo publicatus eſt; ac ſimul me accuſavit inobedientiæ circa impreſſionem, & ſuperſtitionis circa impreſſas res; quare hunc, ut à me minimè impreſſum, pro meo arripere nolui, & apologiam feci, quam delecti duo Cenſores approbavere.* Father Niceron tells us (19), that he was ſtrongly poſſeſſed with the belief of Judiciary Aſtrology, and undertook to foretel future events by the means of it. X. *Medicinalium juxta propria principia Libri ſeptem.* Lyons 1635 in 4to, pagg. 690. This Work was publiſhed by James Gaffarel. XI. *Philoſophiæ rationalis partes quinque, videlicet Grammatica, Dialectica, Rhetorica, Poetica, Hiſtoriographia juxta propria principia, ſuorum operum Tomus I.* Paris 1638 in 4to. He obſerves in his *Syntagma* (20), that he wrote this work while he was in priſon at Naples. Father Niceron tells us (21),

(14) Pag. 937. edit. Genevæ 1694, in 4to.

(15) Pag. 70. *apud* Niceron, pag. 81.

(16) Niceron, pag. 82.

(17) Niceron, pag. 82, 83.

(18) Artic. 4.

(19) Pag. 83.

(20) Cap. 1. Art. 3.

(21) pag. 83.

that this and the following Books of our Author are of very little value. Monſieur Gibert in his *Jugemens des Savans ſur les Auteurs, qui ont traité de la Rhetorique*, publiſhed the 4th Volume of Monſieur Baillet's *Jugemens des Savans* at Amſterdam 1725 in 4to obſerves (22) with regard to this work of our Author, that he reduces every thing as far as poſſible to metaphyſical ideas; that he borrows the terms of that ſcience; and that his ſtyle is extremely like that of St. Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa Theologiæ*. Mr. Gibert remarks likewiſe (23), that Campanella cenſures Ariſtotle's and Cicero's Definitions of Rhetoric, and defines it to be *an Art, which is inſtrumental in perſuading men to what is good, and diſſuading them from evil; ſo that, according to him, an Orator, who perſuades men to what is evil, ceaſes to be an Orator.* "But he does "not conſider, *ſays Monſieur Gibert*, that there is ſome"times in the Diſcourſe of ſuch an Orator infinitely "more genius and indeed eloquence, than in a Diſ"courſe, which perſuades us to what is good." He afterwards tells us, that Campanella having rejected Ariſtotle's Definition of Rhetoric, viz. that it is *an Extenſion of Logic*, aſſerts that it is *an Extenſion of Magic*; which he founds upon the *marvellous in Eloquence, which*, ſays he, *without any compact with the Devil, without any drug, or potion, turns the mind which way ſoever the Orator thinks proper*. This propoſition of his is not intended by him to be underſtood as a figure, in the ſame manner as Horace conſiders the Dramatic Poets as Magicians, in his Epiſtle to Auguſtus (24), when he ſays,

(22) pag. 243.

(23) pag. 244.

(24) Epiſt. lib. 2. Epiſt. 1. ver. 210, &c.

Ille per extentum funem mihi poſſe videtur
Ire Poeta, meum qui pectus inaniter angit,
Irritat, mulcet, falſis terroribus implet,
Ut Magus, *& modo me Thebis, modo ponit Athenis.*

But he would have it taken in the ſtrict and literal ſenſe; and what he ſays of Rhetoric, he affirms likewiſe of Poetry; and if he founds this only upon the effects of Poetry, it is merely becauſe he cannot ſay more; and it is for the ſame reaſon, that he ſoftens a little his propoſition; *Rhethoricam eſſe quodammodo Magiæ portiunculam.* Monſieur Gibert concludes with obſerving (25), that he does not pretend to ſay, that there is nothing good in our Author; but only that where he has any thing good, it is not new in him; that he advances ſeveral uncommon obſervations, which are of no value; and that what is good, as well as what is bad in him, is expreſſed in a very diſagreeable ſtyle; as appears from the titles of two or three chapters, *De Oratore ex primalitate primâ, De Oratore ex primalitate ſecundâ &c.* XII. *Diſputationum in quatuor partes Philoſophiæ Realis Libri IV: pro Republicâ Litterariâ & Chriſtianâ, id eſt verè rationali ſtabilienda contra Sectarios; ſuorum operum Tom. II & III.* Paris 1637 in fol. XIII. *Univerſalis Philoſophiæ, ſeu Metaphyſicarum Rerum juxta propria dogmata partes tres, Libri XVIII; ſuorum Operum Tom. IV.* Paris 1638 in fol. XIV. *De Monarchiâ Hiſpanicâ Diſcurſus.* Printed at Amſterdam by Elzevir 1640 in 24to. This edition is a very bad one, as Lewis Elzevir informs us in the Preface to the edition in 1641, where he tells us, that it had been reprinted at Harderwic in 1640 with the ſame errors. It was publiſh'd likewiſe at Amſterdam 1653 in 12mo. This Book was tranſlated into High-Dutch, and much enlarged by Beſoldus. There was an Engliſh Tranſlation of it printed at London 1654 in 4to. He tells us in his *Syntagma* (26), that he wrote this Diſcourſe in Italian. He ſhews in it by what method the King of Spain might obtain the Univerſal Monarchy, and points out the defects of the Spaniſh Government. Herman Conringius (27) ſays, that there are curious things in this Book; and that we are not to wonder, if there are ſome errors in it, ſince the Author wrote it in priſon, while he was ſick, and without the help of any Book, the Bible itſelf

(25) pag. 245.

(26) Cap. 1. Art. 3.

(27) *De Hiſpan. apud* Blount, *Cenſur. Celebr. Author.* pag. 937. edit. Genevæ 1694, in 4to.

his own country. Some words which had eſcaped him with regard to the government of the Spaniards, and ſome hints concerning a revolt being reported to them, he was ſeized [F], and brought to Naples in 1599, as a criminal againſt the State (g), and put ſeven times to the rack, and ſuffered the moſt exquiſite torments imaginable. He was detained in priſon ſeven and twenty years (b). At firſt he was not permitted to ſee any perſon, or to read or write; but afterwards he had the liberty of ſeeing his friends and ſtudying. He wrote during his confinement ſeveral works (i); and Tobias Adam of Saxony upon his return from Jeruſalem having the curioſity to viſit him, procured ſome of his writings, which he afterwards publiſhed in Germany. The diſgrace of the Duke of Oſſuna, Viceroy of Naples, who had a great eſteem for him, and frequently conſulted him, was the occaſion of his being afterwards more ſtrictly confined, and perhaps prolonged his impriſonment. It appears likewiſe, that the Inquiſition intereſted itſelf in the affair, ſince he tells us himſelf, that the accuſations urged againſt him turned upon Religion, and his new opinions in Philoſophy were objected to him as a crime. At laſt ſeveral perſons of diſtinction ſollicited the Court of Spain in his favour; and Pope Paul V ſent Caſpar Scioppius in 1608 to Naples to procure his liberty; but the affair of the Duke of Oſſuna, which happened at that time, rendered his good offices ineffectual. Pope Urban VIII, who knew him from his writings, was more ſucceſsful in his ſollicitations for him to King Philip IV of Spain (k), by whoſe orders the Duke of Alva ſet him at liberty May the 15th 1626 (l). He went immediately to Rome, where he continued ſome years in the priſons belonging to the Inquiſition; but he was only a priſoner in name, for he had all the liberty which he could deſire [G]. At laſt he was entirely ſet at liberty in 1629; but the Spaniards had too violent a reſentment againſt him, to ſuffer him to continue at reſt. The friendſhip which the Pope ſhewed him, (who made him one of his domeſticks, ſettled a conſiderable penſion upon him, and conferred a great many favours on him,) excited their jealouſy, and the correſpondence, which he had with ſome of the French Nation, gave them new ſuſpicions of him. He diſcovered that they were concerting ſome deſign againſt his perſon; upon which he diſguiſed himſelf like a Minime, and went out of Rome privately in 1634 in the coach of Monſieur de Noailles, Embaſſador of France. He embarked afterwards for France, and landed at Marſeilles in October the ſame year. Mr. Peireſc being informed of his arrival, ſent a litter to bring him to Aix, where he entertained him for ſome months. The year following Campanella went to Paris, where he was received with great civility by Lewis XIII and Cardinal Richelieu, who procured him a penſion of two thouſand Livres (m). The Cardinal often conſulted him upon the affairs of Italy, and is ſaid to have aſked of him once, whether the Duke

(b) Niceron, pag. 73. Mr. Baillet, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 70. ſays *about twenty five years.*

(g) Idem, Artic. 3. *and* Niceron, pag. 72, 73.

(i) Campanellæ *Syntagma*, Artic. 3.

(k) Niceron, pag. 73, 74.

(l) Campanellæ, *Syntagma*, Artic. 4.

(m) Niceron, pag. 74, 75, 76.

ſelf being taken away from him. XV. *Ecloga in portentoſam Nativitatem Delphini Galliæ.* Paris 1639 in 4to. This Poem upon the Birth of the Dauphin of France contains 249 verſes. John Caſalas in his *Candor Lilii, ſeu Ordo FF. Prædicatorum à calumniis & contumeliis Petri a Valle-clauſa vindicatus*, printed at Paris 1664 in 8vo obſerves (28), that Campanella was cenſured for ſtiling the Dauphin *Portentoſe Puer* in the ſecond verſe, under pretence that the word *Portentoſus* is never taken in a good ſenſe; but that he proved the contrary by inconteſtable authorities. XVI. *De Libris propriis & recta ratione ſtudendi ad Gabrielem Naudæum.* Paris 1642 in 8vo, and in *Hugonis Grotii & aliorum Diſſertationes de ſtudiis inſtituendis*, printed at Amſterdam 1645 in 24to. Our Author wrote likewiſe a great number of works, which were never printed, many of which are loſt, and others preſerved in ſeveral Libraries. We have a long Catalogue of them in the *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Ordinis Prædicatorum.*

(28) pag. 273.

[F] *Some words, which had eſcaped him with regard to the Government of the Spaniards, and ſome hints concerning a Revolt, being reported to them, he was ſeized.*] This is the account of Father Niceron; but *Ern. Sal. Cyprianus* in his *Vita & Philoſophia Tho. Campanellæ* (29) tells us, that it is probable that our Author's arrogant manner of defending his own peculiar opinions gave riſe to thoſe bitter accuſations formed againſt him, the conſequences of which proved ſo fatal to him. He was charged with a deſign to introduce a new Religion, and to aſſume to himſelf a kind of Empire; and it was added, that as he ſaw no probability of ſucceeding in either but by arms, he reſolved to bring the Turks into a town on the Gulf of Tarentum, and make them Maſters of the Kingdom of Naples. This accuſation being laid before the Viceroy, Campanella was put into priſon, where for five and thirty hours they tortured him moſt cruelly, examined him at the ſame time, and then condemned him to perpetual impriſonment. Cyprianus is of opinion, that tho' they could not convict him of the crime charged upon him, he could not be cleared from juſt cauſe of ſuſpicion. He was charged among other things with writing the Book *de tribus Impoſtoribus*, which he ſays was printed thirty years before he was born. There was another thing, of which he could not altogether clear himſelf. He pretended to propheſy of ſeveral changes. If he had ſtop'd here, he might have been treated only as a Viſionary, and ſent to the Hoſpital for a mad-man; but he imitated moſt of the modern Prophets, who, after having foretold ſeveral events, ſometimes fatal to countries, uſe all their efforts to accompliſh their predictions; and to the character of falſe Prophets, which is deſpicable enough in itſelf, they join that of ſeditious and turbulent perſons, which always deſerves puniſhment; and when they cannot bring thoſe changes about themſelves by the force of arms, endeavour to advance them by ſeditious writings, which they induſtriouſly ſpread abroad. Pietro Giannone in the fourth Volume of his *Iſtoria Civile del Regno di Napoli* (30) tells us, that in the beginning of the reign of King Philip III of Spain, Campanella form'd a conſpiracy in Calabria, which was headed by him, who called himſelf the Meſſiah, and was compoſed for the greateſt part of Friars, Prieſts, and Banditti; and that their deſign was to murder all the Spaniards, ſhake off the Spaniſh yoke, and introduce a Republican Form of Government; to which end they had made an alliance with the Turks, whoſe Fleet commanded by Murath Rays was to ſupport them in the enterprize. But Count Lemos the Viceroy having had timely notice of it from ſome of the conſpirators, by the death of Rinaldo and the other Heads, and the perpetual impriſonment of Campanella, diverted the ſtorm, when it was juſt upon the point of breaking out.

(29) Printed at Amſterdam 1705, in 8vo, pagg. 74.

(30) Printed at Naples 1723 in 4 volumes in 4to.

[G] *But he was only a priſoner in name; for he had all the liberty which he could deſire,*] Divers reaſons are given for his being thrown into priſon. Some ſay, that in order to reſcue himſelf from the long and ſevere confinement, which he had ſuffer'd under the Spaniards, he had appealed from the Inquiſition in Spain, before which he had been accuſed, to that

Duke of Orleans ſhould ever come to the Crown? upon which Campanella anſwered, that he ſhould never be raiſed to the Throne, *Imperium non guſtabit in æternum* *. He paſſed the remainder of his life in the Monaſtery of the Dominicans in the ſtreet of Saint Honore, and died May the 21ſt 1639, in the ſeventy firſt year of his age (*n*). There is variety of judgments concerning our Author [*H*]; but one point, as Father Niceron obſerves (*o*), cannot poſſibly be denied, that he had ſeveral very peculiar and bold opinions, and that he abandoned himſelf too much to his imagination. Ern. Sal. Cyprianus in his *Vita & Philoſophia Thomæ Campanella* (*p*) tells us, that he was a great follower of St. Thomas Aquinas, but very ignorant of the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew Tongues, and contented himſelf with reading the School-Divines; that being curious to know things to come, he was frequently tormented by the Devil; that ſeveral of his predictions were accompliſhed; and that he made uſe of a young man to exerciſe his magic art, and occaſioned his ruin; upon which ſubjects Cyprianus relates (*q*) a long paſſage out of Campanella's works, and aſſerts, that he had much commerce with ſpirits.

* Bernard, *ubi ſupra.*

(*n*) Niceron, *ubi ſupra.*

(*o*) pag. 76.

(*p*) Printed at Amſterdam 1705, in 8vo, pagg. 74.

(*q*) pag. 44, & ſeqq.

of Rome, where he expected to be treated with more lenity. Others report, that the Pope, in order to have a pretence to remove him from Naples, had acquainted the King, that ſince Campanella was not convicted of any crime againſt the State, but was at the ſame time accuſed of having vented ſeveral errors in his writings, it was proper that he ſhould come to Rome to give an account of his Faith before the Inquiſition. In that caſe it was neceſſary for him to continue for ſome time under a kind of confinement, in order to give a colour to this pretext (31).

(31) Niceron, pag. 74, 75.

[*H*] *There is a variety of judgments concerning our Author.*] Leo Allatius in his *Apes Urbanæ* (32) tells us, that he began to write at the twentieth year of his age, and did not follow the opinions of others, but applied himſelf wholly to invent new things in almoſt all the ſciences. *Scripſit ab anno ætatis vigeſimo, non quæ ab aliis ſcripta erant, ſed in hoc incumbens, ut nova in omnibus ferè ſcientiis excogitaret.* Janus Nicius Erythræus in his *Pinacotheca* (33) having obſerved, that he wrote a prodigious large work *upon the Reformation of the Sciences*, divided into two Books, each of which is divided into ſeveral parts, informs us that it appears from thence, that the principal ſign of this man of a moſt acute genius was to abandon the ancient methods of learning the ſciences, and to open a new and direct one for that purpoſe. *Scripſit ingens Opus de Reformatione Scientiarum decem in Codices diviſum, quorum ſinguli plures in partes diſtribuuntur; unde nihil acutiſſimo ingenio homini tam fuiſſe propoſitum apparet, quam relictis veteribus viis, ad omnium ſcientiarum notitiam, novum atque directum iter aperire.* Gabriel Naudæus in his *Bibliographia Politica* ſtiles him a Man of a very warm and prodigious genius; *ardentis penitus & portentoſi vir ingenii.* Herman Conringius (34) ſays, that he was a crafty man, without any Religion or Faith, and a zealous adverſary to the doctrines of Machiavel; tho' at the ſame time he taught them in a diſguiſed manner. *Campanella iſte homo fuit callidus, ſine ulla religione & fide, Machiavelli dogmatum acerrimus pariter reprehenſor, & fucatus Doctor.* And in another place he ſtiles him a Man of an amazing and portentous genius; *vir ſtupendi & portentoſi ingenii.* Bullart in his *Academie des Sciences* tells us, that he diſtinguiſhed himſelf ſo by his great virtue and learning, that he was deſervedly eſteemed the Prince of the Philoſophers of his age. Cyprianus in his Life abovementioned is of opinion, that at the bottom he had no Religion, but made the pretence of it ſubſervient to his other purpoſes. He obſerves, that Campanella was for extirpating with fire and ſword all thoſe, whom he calls Heretics; and aſſerted that the Emperor Charles V did well to keep his promiſe to Luther, when he went to the Diet of Worms, but that he ought to have cut him off at his return, as well as the Princes, who protected him. He has very exactly diſcovered all the artifices made uſe of by the Pope to ſupport his Authority, which he owns to be a mere human invention; and yet exhorts all Princes to maintain it with all their power, ſince this is the ſureſt method of reducing all the reſt of mankind under ſervitude to them. Never, ſays Cyprianus, did the Devil invent more pernicious Arts, than thoſe of Campanella, to deprive mankind of the liberty purchaſed for them by Jeſus Chriſt. Our Philoſopher ſpeaks very odiouſly of Moſes, and ranks among the Atheiſts Calvin, Luther, and all thoſe, who have ſeparated from the Church of Rome. Cyprianus afterwards treats of his Divinity, his Magic, that is, of his ſentiments of the art of foretelling things to come, and of his Philoſophy. In his works he ſeems very fond of the opinion of the Millenaries. *To the ſhame of the Impious*, ſays he in the ſixth chapter of his *Atheiſmus Triumphatus, I expect upon the earth a prelude of the Celeſtial Paradiſe, a golden age full of felicity, from whence ſhall be excluded unbelievers, who preſume to deſpiſe Godlineſs, with a ſcourge made of the cords of the creatures, as St. Catherine of Sienna ſpeaks.* With regard to Campanella's Philoſophy, he was a Sceptic, and truſted very much to ſenſe in matters of Natural Philoſophy. He defined place to be *a firſt ſubſtance, incorporeal, immoveable, and fit to receive all kinds of bodies.* He conſider'd cold and heat as the two grand Agents, which formed bodies out of matter, heat producing the heavens, and cold the earth. He believed that the world and elements had ſenſe, becauſe that which is compoſed of them has ſenſe, and nothing can be in the effect, which is not in the cauſe. He affirmed that the beaſts ſpoke to each other, ſince without ſuch a communication their Societies could not ſubſiſt. Cyprianus does not think this opinion abſurd, becauſe thoſe creatures appear to underſtand one another, as the chickens do the hen, when ſhe calls them. Mr. Bernard (35) obſerves upon this occaſion, that *to ſpeak* and *ſpeech* are equivocal words, and according to the different ſenſe, which is put upon them, the language of beaſts may be granted or denied. If they ſpeak, their language differs from that of men in this reſpect, that the words of beaſts are natural ſigns of their ſentiments; whereas the words of men are only arbitrary ſigns of their thoughts.

T.

(32) *Ap.* Blount, *Cenſur. Celebrior. Author.* pag. 936.

(33) pag. 43.

(34) *Ap.* Blount, pag. 937.

(35) *Republique des Lettres*, for the year 1705.

CAMPANUS (JOHN ANTHONY) one of the moſt famous Prelates of Italy in the fifteenth Century, was the ſon of a countrywoman, who falling in labour whilſt ſhe was at work in the fields, was delivered of him under a laurel (*a*) near Capua (*b*). He was deſtined to be a ſhepherd [*A*]; but as he diſcovered a great genius, they placed him as a ſervant to the Curate of a Village, who taught him a little of Latin (*c*). Others ſay, that he was only the Sexton's ſervant (*d*). He was afterwards Tutor in a conſiderable family

(*a*) *Antonium Campanum ruſtica mulier in agro feſſa opere ſub lauro peperit.* Paulus Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 22. pag. 52, 53.

(*b*) Nicolo Toppi, *Bibliot. Napolit.* pag. 24.

(*c*) Auguſtin. Oldoinus *in Athen. Auguſt.* pag. 24.

(*d*) *Ædituo Sacerdotis in famulatum & diſciplinam tradidit (mater)* Jovius, *Elogior.* cap. 22.

[*A*] *He was deſtined to be a ſhepherd.*] Some ſay, his father put him to that low employment, *agro paſcendiſque ovibus ab initio a patre relegatus fuit* (1). Others pretend, that he loſt his father and mother, when he was yet but a child, and that his relations deſigned to make him a ſhepherd. *Parentibus jam inde a puero orbatus eſt, orbatumque affines, in quorum fide poteſtateque erat, tenuioris fortunæ ſordidis miniſteriis illum exercuerunt, ita ut etiam paſcendo pecori deſtinaretur* (2).

(1) Volater. lib. 21. pag. 776.

(2) Auguſt. Oldoin. *in Athenæo Auguſto*, pag. 24.

family at Naples (*e*), and by his conſtant application made a very great progreſs in his ſtudies. Beſides his other teachers he ſtudied under the celebrated Laurence Valla (*f*). Having ſtaid five years at Naples (*g*), he went to Perugia, where he ſtudied the Law (*h*), and read publick Lectures upon polite Literature, with ſo much reputation, that he was made a Citizen of that City by a decree of the Senate. Some ſay that he never knew the Greek Tongue (*i*), but others aſſert, that he made himſelf perfectly maſter of that Language under Demetrius Chalcondylus at Padua (*k*). Being returned to Perugia he wrote the Hiſtory of the brave Andrew Braccio: that work was very much eſteemed on account of the ſtyle, but it was found to be too much panegyrical [*B*]. Campanus gained ſo great a reputation, that Pope Calixtus III invited him to Rome to be his Secretary; he was no ſooner arrived at Rome, but the death of the Pope made all his hopes vaniſh away. He gained the favour of Pius II, and was made Steward to the Cardinal of Saxoferrate; ſome time after Pius II gave him the Biſhoprick of Crotona, and afterwards that of Teramo [*C*]. Paul II made him Arch-prieſt of St. Euſtachius, which is a very good living. He attended Francis Piccolomini, the Cardinal Legate, into Germany, and made ſeveral ſpeeches in the Diets of the Empire. On his return into Italy, the ſame Pope gave him the government of Tuderti. Under Sixtus IV he enjoyed that of Fulgino, and of Cita di Caſtello; but he loſt that employment and the Pope's favour, becauſe it was thought that he had been acceſſary to the revolt which was raiſed in his government. Sixtus was ſo exaſperated againſt him, that he baniſhed him out of all the territories of the Church, and rejected entirely the interceſſion of thoſe who endeavoured to excuſe him. Campanus took this misfortune ſo much to heart, that he paſt all the remaining part of his life in grief, ſometimes at the Court of Naples, ſometimes at Sienna. In vain did he invoke the aſſiſtance of the Muſes, and of the *belles Lettres*, I mean, that he endeavoured to diſpel his ſadneſs by compoſing ſome works: it was all to no purpoſe; for no ſooner did he diſpoſe himſelf to write, but he felt his grief coming again upon him; this diſpirited him entirely, and as he was alſo ſubject to epileptick fits, he ſunk perfectly under his misfortunes, and died at Sienna July the 15th 1477, in the fiftieth year of his age (*l*), and was buried in the Cathedral Church (*m*). He had very much deſired to ſettle in his own country [*D*], as it appears by his letters. He left ſeveral works [*E*], which have been publiſhed by Michael Fernus (*n*), with his Hiſtory

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

(*f*) Oldoinus, Athen. *Auguſt.* pag. 24.

(*g*) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 22.

(*h*) Oldoinus, *Athen. Auguſt.* pag. 24.

(*i*) *Græcorum omnium expers* Volater. lib. 21. pag. 776.

(*k*) *Græcam eruditionem ubertim potavit.* Oldoin. Athen. *Auguſt.* pag. 24.

(*l*) And not *prope quadragenarius* (near forty years old) as Voſſius *De Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 583 aſſerts, being led into that error by Volaterranus, lib. 21.

(*m*) Taken from Aug. Oldoinus, *Athen. Auguſt.* pag. 24, &c.

(*n*) And not *Fermes*, as it is in Moreri.

[*B*] *He wrote the Hiſtory of Andrew Braccio; that work was very much eſteemed on account of the ſtile, but it was found to be too much panegyrical.*] Here follow the words of Paulus Jovius. *Inter multa orationum, & multiplicis ſtyli Opera quæ extant, avidiſſimè Bracii inclyti Ducis Vita perlegitur, digna poſteritate, niſi rerum geſtarum fidem adulationè poëticâ corrupiſſet* (3). i. e. "Amongſt the various kinds of works he left "behind him, his Hiſtory of the noble Duke Braccio "is read with the utmoſt pleaſure, and would deſerve "to be tranſmitted to poſterity, had he not corrupted "the truth of hiſtory by a poetical flattery." Andrew Braccio was a very great Captain; he was born at Montone in the Perugiano (4). The inhabitants of Perugia choſe him for their Prince, on account of his courage, and the ſervices he had done them (5): he died in the year 1424 (6). His life written in Latin by our Campanus, was tranſlated into Italian by Pompeo Pallini, that tranſlation was printed at Venice in 4to. in the year 1572 (7).

(3) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 22. pag. 53. *See alſo* Oldoin. *Athen. Auguſt.* pag. 24.

(4) Leand. Albert. *Deſcript. Ital.* pag. 136.

(5) Idem, ibid. pag. 100.

(6) Idem, ibid. pag. 136.

(7) *See* Toppi, *Bibl. Napol.* pag. 124.

[*C*] *The Pope gave him . . . the Biſhoprick of Teramo.*] They who ſay, he was Biſhop of *Arezzo*, *Aretinus Epiſcopus*, are miſtaken. Geſner has committed that blunder (8), as well as Peter Opmeer (9) and Voſſius (10), as Leonardo Nicodemo obſerves, who adds that their blunder is probably owing to the word *Aprutinus* (11). Campanus is ſtiled *Epiſcopus Aprutinus* in the title page of his life of Andrew Bracio, printed at Bazil in 1545; and he ſtiled himſelf *Aprutinus* becauſe his Biſhoprick was ſituated in Abruzzo. Voſſius obſerves, that according to Paulus Jovius, he was *Interamnatium Epiſcopus*, and according to Gyraldus *Prætutinorum, ſive Prætutianorum Epiſcopus* (12). He reconciles theſe differences very well by obſerving, *nempe ſedes Epiſcopalis fuit Interamnii Prætutianorum oppidi, quod vulgo à circumfluâ Nare fluvio Terami, vel Teramo vocatur.* i. e. "The "Epiſcopal Sea was at Interamnium, a city of Abruzzo, "which is called Teramo, or Terano from the river "Nare that flows about it." This ſhould have prevented Voſſius from calling him *Epiſcopus Aretinus* (Biſhop of Arezzo.) Konig is one of thoſe who give him that title (13).

(8) Geſner, *in Biblioth.* fol. 383, *verſo.*

(9) Pag. 426. *Chronol. apud* Leonard. Nicodemum, *Addiz. alla Biblioth. Napol.* pag. 18.

(10) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 583.

(11) Leonardo Nicodemo, *Addiz. alla Bibl. Napolit.* pag. 18.

(12) Voſſius. *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 583. *He might have added, and according to Volaterano*, Præſul apud Præcutinos.

(13) Konig, *Bibliotb.* pag. 158.

[*D*] *He had very much deſired to ſettle in his own country.*] This appears from a paſſage in his letters, which will alſo acquaint us with ſome circumſtances of his life. *Dicere de tuis*, ſays he to the Alphonſus of Arragon Duke of Calabria and ſon of Ferdinand King of Naples, *divinis & præſtantiſſimis laudibus non eſt Epiſtolæ, in qua nihil æque ac brevitas & caſtigatio laudatur. Hoc tantum de me addiderim, natum eſſe hac ætate, in qua tu es, & natum tibi, patri ac Regno tuo, & ad illum & ad te pertinere, haberi rationem de veſtris. Ego ſextumdecimum annum Romana in Cur. dego. Sub Pio Pontifice vixi non ſine aliqua gratia & opinione. Qua de re habuit me odio Paulus, ut habuit cæteros, qui Pii memoria afficerentur. Sixtum vero, quo ſum uſus in Philoſophia præceptore, aliquanto habui propenſiorem. Sed fortuna mea omnis à Regno eſt: quam mihi tu & pater tuus dabitis ſpem, ad hanc erigar, huic inſiſtam. Quare te oro & obteſtor, digniſſime & ſanguine altiſſime Princeps, errantem me tot annos redde jam Patriæ, redde meis, & tandem Campanum Campaniæ redde* (14). i. e. "It is not proper to ex- "patiate upon your great and divine virtues in a letter, "in which nothing but brevity and accuracy is re- "quired. This only I ſhall add concerning my ſelf; "I was born in that age, in which you live; and I "was born for you, for your father, and for your "Kingdom; to you and to him I belong, and am "reckoned to be one of your ſubjects. It is now "ſixteen years ſince I lived at the Court of Rome. "Under Pope Pius I lived with ſome favour, and "ſome reputation; for which reaſon Pope Paul hated "me, as he hated all them, to whom the memory "of Pius was dear. Sixtus, who had been my Præ- "ceptor in Philoſophy, was a little more kind to me. "But all my expectations depend from the Kingdom "(of Naples), and I muſt depend upon thoſe favours, "which you and your father will give me room to "hope for. Therefore I moſt earneſtly beg, moſt "worthy and noble Prince, that ſince I have been "wandering for ſo many years, you would now re- "ſtore me to my country, and to my friends, you "would reſtore Campanus to Campania."

(14) Campanus, *Epiſt.* lib. 8. *apud* Nicodem. *Addiz. alla Biblioth. Napol.* pag. 17.

[*E*] *He left ſeveral works.*] Leonardo Nicodemo (15) gives a compleat catalogue of all the pieces contained in the collection of our Campanus's works: you will find there ſeveral moral treatiſes, as *de Ingratitudine fugienda, de dignitate matrimonii*, &c. Several orations, as for inſtance, that which he delivered at Perugia in 1455, when he began to teach polite literature there, the funeral oration of the Duke of Urbino,

(15) Leon. Nicodem. *Addiz. alla Biblioth. Napolit.* pag. 16, 17.

History (o) at large, and full of great encomiums. We must not omit that he had been Corrector of a Printing-house [F], andthat he was very mean in person (p). He ought not to be distinguished from Anthony Campanus [G]. It must be observed, that there have been other Authors named *Campanus*; the Biographers, who mention them, often omit FRANCIS CAMPANUS, an Italian, who understood polite Literature very well (q). I have seen his *Quæstio Virgiliana*, printed by Henry Stephens in the year 1567 (r), with Parrhasius's book *de rebus per Epistolam quæsitis*; the Author dedicated it to Hercules de Gonzaga, Bishop of Mantua in 1536; he was then at Bologna.

I must make one addition to the passage, in which I have observed that he made love-verses [H].

(o) Written by the same *Fernus*.

(p) *Quis in præpinguis simiæ rictu tantam exculti atque habilis ingenii indolem?* Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 22. i. e. "Who would "have expected "so great a wit "and politeness "from that fat "monkey's "face?"

(q) He stiles himself *Collensis*, that is, if I am not mistaken, born at *Collis*, near *Lucca*.

(r) It had been printed at Milan in 1540.

Urbino, those of Cardinal Saxoferrate, of Pope Pius II, &c. nine Books of Letters, some of which have been reprinted in Germany under the direction of Daumius with those of Textor (16); the life of Pope Pius II, eight Books of Elogies and Epigrams, and some Sermons: that which he preached on an Ash-Wednesday seemed very fine to Panigarola, as appears from his own words, which follow. *Il Campano nell' Orazione Cinerizia amplifica in tanti modi questa propozitione, che bisogna morire, chè è cosa de maraviglia il considerarlo: e Monsignor Cornelio non cede punto nell' imitazione* (17). This Monsignor Cornelio is the Bishop of Bitonto a famous Preacher, who was very active in the Council of Trent: the name of his family was Musso; he has transcribed our Campanus almost word for word with regard to the *bisogna morire, we must die* (18). Take notice of the following words of Monsieur Menage. *Campanus wrote a great many love-verses; he says it himself.* Scripsi versus, quorum pars est amatoria; pars amore non vacat ad tria millia. *It is in the 46th Letter of the third Book of his Letters. He was a very eminent man with regard to learning .... and also very virtuous* (19). See the Remark [H].

(16) *See* Reinesius's *Letters to Daumius*, pag. 114, 115.

(17) Panigarola, *vel* Prædicatore, pag. 404. edit. 1609, *apud* Nicodem. *Addit. alla Biblioth. Napolit.* pag. 16.

(18) Nicod. ibid.

(19) Menage, *Anti-Baillet*, tom. 2. pag. 337.

[F] *He had been Corrector of a Printing-house.*] Read the following passage from Gabriel Naudé (20). "Rome was one of the first cities, where printing "was used, by the means of one Uldaricus Gallus, "who gave John Anthony Campanus, (who had made "himself Corrector of his Printing-house) an opportuni- "ty of composing in his praise the following Epigrams "quoted by Faernus, and printed at the end of Tully's "Philippics published by the same Uldaricus without "date, but probably before the year 1470.

"*Anser Tarpei custos Jovis, unde quod alis*
"*Obstreperes, Gallus cecidit, alter adest*
"*Uldaricus Gallus, ne quem poscantur in ipsum*
"*Edocuit pennis nil opus esse tuis.*
"*Imprimit ille die, quantum vix scribitur anno,*
"*Ingenio haud noceas, omnia vincit homo.*

(20) Naude, *Addit. à l'Hist. de Louis XI*, pag. 297, 298.

Mr. Chevillier quotes some of these words, and those in which Monsieur Mentel observes, *that two Bishops were at the same time Correctors of Printing-houses at Rome, John Andrew Bishop of Aleria, and Anthony Campanus, Bishop of Teramo* (21). You must correct two errors in what he quotes from Mr. Mentel (22). *In my opinion*, continues he, *they should rather be called Authors than Correctors, as will appear from the following account.* He relates afterwards, that *under Pope Paul II, about the year* 1466, *two Germans, Conrad Sweynheim, and Arnold Pannarts, came to Rome, where they established the first Printing-house.* He relates, *what Books they printed till March* 1472, *and how many copies they work'd off of each Author.* He says that *it was the Bishop of Aleria, the Pope's Library-keeper, who prepared the Manuscripts of most of those Authors, wrote the Dedications or Prefaces prefixed to some Editions, and corrected the proof-sheets.* He adds, that *another Printer, named* Udalricus (23), *came much about the same time to Rome, where he established a second Printing-house* (34), *in which the Bishop of Terano did all that the Bishop of Aleria did in the first. Udalricus printed with so much diligence, that Campanus, who had undertook to keep the presses a going, by furnishing the necessary copies, and correcting the sheets, could not take the least rest:* Cum inquiescere illum assiduis emendationibus non permitteret, *says Michael Fernus in the life of Campanus.* Observe this conclusion; "It "appears evidently from the account we have given, "that the two Bishops were the Authors of the first "Editions, which were printed at Rome by these Ger- "mans, and that they corrected only their own works "(25)." For my part, I do not think that any reader can infer that, from the foregoing account, for it proves evidently, that the two Bishops performed all the functions of Correctors of Proofs.

(21) Chevillier, *Origine de l'Imprimerie de Paris*, pag. 198, 199.

(22) Mr. Mentel, pag. 11. *de verâ Typographiæ Origine*, says ἱπανοδρώτης, and *Uldarici*, and not as it is in Mr. Chevillier, ἱπτονοδρώτης and *Udalrici*.

(23) He should have said *Uldaricus*.

(24) Chevillier, *Origine de l'Imprimerie de Paris*, pag. 200.

(25) Idem, ibid. pag. 201, 202.

[G] *He ought not to be distinguished from Anthony Campanus.*] Toppi has committed this blunder twice in his *Bibliotheca Napolitana*, as Leonardo Nicodemo reproaches him. The abbreviators of Gesner speak of Anthony Campanus, and of John Anthony Campanus as of two writers. Konig is fallen into the same mistake (26).

(26) Konig, *Bibl. vet. & nov.* pag. 158.

[H] *An addition to the passage, in which I have observed, that he made love verses* (27).] He has been very severely censured, for having written a very smutty Epigram, so that they join him with Giovanni della Casa. *Quæ tamen non deterruerunt in Italia (ô tempora, ô mores) Episcopum quendam Nucerinum.* Johan. de la Casa, *quin Sodomiæ laudes nefario libro fuerit complexus, uti Conrad. Rittershusius conqueritur*, in Novell. lection. Part. 12. Cap. 9. n. 7. *Parem quoque Castimoniam & Episcopali scilicet dignitati convenientem gravitatem sapit Episcopi Imbraninensis ad Gravolonum mostupratorem* (28) *Epigramma, quod longè fœdius & putidius puto, quam ut Commentariis his sit inserendum. Ideoque in id merito insurgit Georg. Erhardus* in Symbolis ad Petronium, p. 96 (29). i. e. "Yet these things "did not deter, (oh wicked times!) John della Casa "from writing an encomium upon Sodomy, in an "abominable Book, as Conrad Rittershusius complains. "The Epigram of the Bishop of Terame to Gravo- "lanus savours of the same modesty, and becomes "really the gravity of a Bishop; It is too obscene "and abominable to be here inserted, and George "Erhard was very much in the right to exclaim "against it." It would be difficult to guess, who that Bishop *Imbraninensis* is, if we did not know, that John Anthony Campanus, Bishop of Teramo, (in Latin no doubt according to some *Interamninensis*) was the Author of that Epigram. George Erhard, quoted by Salmuth, as we have just now seen, expresses it thus. *Joannes Antonius Campanus Epigrammate ad Gravalonum Mastupratorem,*

Non damnosa mihi gratis manus ipsa placebit,
Inque meis digitis hermaphroditus eris.

O pudicum virum! At lusit, inquis, in nequam illum fututorem. At non decebat, inquis, illum, cujus est officii severitatem in castigando adhibere, non risum jocumque facere (30). Mr. Saldenus quotes this passage of Salmuth, without correcting the errors of it; nay, he adds some others to them. *Parem quoque castimoniam Episcopali gravitati convenientem Episcopo* Imbanienfi *adscribit Salmuthus*, ob Epigramma *(inquit)* ad Gravolonum mastupratorem missum, longè fœdius & putidius, quam ut Commentariis suis insereret (31).

(27) At the end of the Remark [E].

(28) It should be *mastupratorem*.

(29) Henr. Salmuth, *Comment. in Panciroll.* Part. 1. Tit. 47. pag. m. 22. See in *Anti-Baillet*, tom. 2. pag. 123. the errors in this passage with regard to the character of John della Casa.

(30) Geor. Erhard. *Symbol. in Perron.* pag. 791. edit. Lugdun. 1615. in 12mo.

(31) Salden. *in Otr. Theolog.* pag. 160.

☞CANGE (CHARLES DU FRESNE Sieur du), one of the most learned writers in the seventeenth Century, was born at Amiens December the 18th 1610, and descended of an antient and noble family there (*a*). His Father Lewis du Fresne was *Prevôt Roïal* of Beauquesne, and his mother's name was Helena de Reli (*b*). Our Author

(*a*) Perrault, *Hommes Illustres, qui ont paru en France pendant le XVII Siecle*, tom. 1. pag. 136. edit. de Paris 1701, in 12mo.

(*b*) Idem, ibid. *and* Du Pin, *Nouvelle Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclesiast.* tom. 18. pag. 141. ed. Amsterd. 1711.

Author was the youngeſt of five ſons [*A*], and ſtudied at the Jeſuit's College at Amiens, where his application and the vivacity of his genius ſoon diſtinguiſhed him from the reſt of his companions. He afterwards went to Orleans, where he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the Law, and was admitted an Advocate in the Parliament of Paris Auguſt the 11th 1631. He frequented the Bar for ſome time, but without any deſign to confine himſelf to that profeſſion (*c*). Upon his return to Amiens his natural inclination led him to the reading of all kinds of books, thoſe in polite Literature, Philoſophy, Law, Phyſick, and Divinity, but eſpecially thoſe which treat of ſacred and profane, antient and modern, Greek and Roman, general and particular Hiſtory. However it was not a vain deſire of knowledge, nor any view of making his fortune, that engaged him in this courſe of ſtudy; but from the obligation which he thought himſelf under of procuring himſelf ſome agreeable and honeſt employment; ſo that he ſometimes ſaid to his friends, that he ſtudied merely for his own pleaſure, *Mihi cano & Muſis*; that was his ordinary expreſſion (*d*). While his father lived, he never thought of ſeeking out for any other companion (*e*), but after his deceaſe, he married July the 19th 1638 Catherine du Bos, daughter of Philip du Bos, Treaſurer of France in the *Generalité* of Amiens, with whom he lived above fifty years in the utmoſt harmony. She ſurvived him, and died July the 19th 1694 (*f*). In 1645 he purchaſed the place of Treaſurer of France at Amiens, and entered upon it June the 10th of the ſame year (*g*). Though he was very aſſiduous in the diſcharge of the functions of his office, and in the management of the affairs of his family, yet he ſtill continued his application to his ſtudies, and devoted all his leiſure to them, the fruits of which are the excellent works, with which he has obliged the world [*B*]. The peſtilence, which in the year 1668 depopulated the City of Amiens and

(*c*) Du Pin, *ubi ſupra*.

(*d*) Idem, ibid. pag. 141, 142.
(*e*) Perrault, pag. 137.

(*f*) Du Pin, pag. 142. *and* Perrault, pag. 137.

(*g*) Du Pin *and* Perrault, *ubi ſupra*.

[*A*] *He was the youngeſt of five brothers.*] This we are informed of by Monſr. Du Pin (1); who tells us, that the eldeſt, whoſe name was Hadrian, ſucceded his father in his employment; the ſecond, named *John*, was an Advocate in the Parliament of Paris, and began a *Journal du Palais*, and wrote a Commentary upon the cuſtoms of Amiens; Michael and Francis entered themſelves into the Order of the Jeſuits. But Monſr. Perrault in his *Hommes Illuſtres, qui ont paru en France pendant le xvii Siecle* (2) obſerves, that Monſr. du Cange's father was twice married; and that by his firſt wife he had three ſons, who had all of them the character of men of learning; and that by his ſecond wife he had likewiſe three ſons, the ſecond of whom was our Author, the eldeſt and youngeſt being Jeſuits.

(1) *Nouvelle Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſiaſt.* tom. 18. pag. 141. edit. Amſterd. 1711, in 4to.

(2) Tom. 1. pag. 136. edit. de Paris 1701.

[*B*] *The excellent works, with which he has obliged the world.*] We ſhall give a Catalogue of them. I. *Hiſtoire de l'Empire de Conſtantinople ſous les Empereurs François, &c.* i. e. "The Hiſtory of the Empire of "Conſtantinople under the French Emperors, divided "into two parts; the former of which contains the "Hiſtory of the taking of Conſtantinople by the "French and Venetians in 1204, written by Geoffrey de Villehardouin in his old ſtyle, with a new "verſion oppoſite to it, reviſed and corrected by the "manuſcript in the King's Library, and illuſtrated "with Hiſtorical obſervations, and a Gloſſary, with "a Continuation of this Hiſtory from the year 1220 "to 1240, extracted from the Hiſtory of France written in verſe by Philip Mouſkes, Canon and afterwards Biſhop of Tournay. The ſecond part contains a general Hiſtory of the moſt remarkable "tranſactions of the French and Latins in the Empire "of Conſtantinople, from the time that they made "themſelves maſters of it, confirm'd by the writers "of thoſe times, and ſeveral chronicles and papers "and other pieces never before printed. By Charles "du Freſne du Cange." Paris, printed at the King's Printing-Houſe 1657 in fol. This work is dedicated to the King. II. *Traité Hiſtorique du Chef de S. Jean Baptiſte.* i. e. "An hiſtorical Treatiſe concerning "the Head of St. John the Baptiſt." Paris 1666 in 4to. He publiſhed this work in favour of the City, where he was born. He aſſerts in it, that the Head of St. John the Baptiſt having been firſt found in the City of Jeruſalem, and then carried to Conſtantinople, was afterwards diſcovered again in the city of Emeſa, from whence it was tranſported to Comana, and then again to Conſtantinople; and that it was conveyed to Amiens after Conſtantinople was taken by the French. He has inſerted in this Book ſome Greek Treatiſes, which mention the different times, when the head of St. John was diſcovered, and which had never been printed before. As ſeveral other churches pretend to have this head, Monſr. du Cange affirms that thoſe heads belong to ſome other Saints, who bore the name of *John*. He uſed to ſay with regard to this Book, that he had proved, that if the head of St. John the Baptiſt was any where, it was at Amiens (3). III. *Hiſtoire de Saint Louis Roi de France, écrite par le Sire de Joinville, & enrichie de nouvelles Obſervations & Diſſertations Hiſtoriques, & de pluſieurs autres pieces concernant ce Regne tirées des manuſcripts.* i. e. "The Hiſtory of "St. Lewis, King of France, written by the Sieur "de Joinville, and illuſtrated with new Remarks and "hiſtorical Diſſertations, and many other pieces re"lating to that reign, taken from manuſcripts." Paris 1668 in fol. Dedicated to the King. Monſr. du Cange in theſe *Diſſertations*, which are very curious, has ſhewn a prodigious extent of reading; but it appears from hence, that he had not the talent of writing French with any great elegance and propriety (4). IV. *Joannis Cinnami Hiſtoriarum de rebus geſtis à Joanne & Manuele Comnenis Libri VI. Græcè & Latinè cum Notis Hiſtoricis & Philologicis Caroli du Freſne D. du Cange, ut & in Nicephori Bryennii & Annæ Comnenæ Hiſtoriam. Accedit Pauli Silentiarii Deſcriptio S. Sophiæ Græcè & Latinè, curâ D. du Cange, cum ejus uberiore Commentario.* i. e. "Joannes Cinnamus's ſix "Books of the Hiſtory of the Affairs of John and "Manuel Comnenus, in Greek and Latin, with hiſtorical and philological Notes by Charles du Freſne "Sieur du Cange, with his Notes upon the Hiſtories "of Nicephorus Bryennius and Anna Comnena. To "which is added Paulus Silentiarius's Deſcription of "the Church of St. Sophia, publiſhed by the Sieur du "Cange, with his large Commentary upon it." Paris 1670 in fol. V. *Memoirs ſur le Projet d'un nouveau Recueil des Hiſtoriens de France, avec le Plan general de ce Recueil.* i. e. "A Memoir upon the Plan "of a new Collection of the Hiſtorians of France, "with the general Plan of that Collection." This piece was inſerted in Father le Long's *Bibliotheque Hiſtorique de la France*. Some time after our Author had ſettled at Paris, a propoſal was made to Mr. Colbert of collecting the Writers, who at different times had been engaged in the Hiſtory of France, and forming a compleat body of them. That Miniſter was pleaſed with the deſign, and thought Monſieur du Cange more capable than any man of executing it. For this purpoſe he put into his hands a great number of memoirs and pieces in manuſcript. Monſr. du Cange immediately applied himſelf to the work and drew up this Plan, which not being approved of by Mr. Colbert, he was deſired to draw up another. But our Author being perſuaded, that if he had followed the Method preſcribed to him, he ſhould have ſpoiled the whole work, very frankly anſwered, that ſince his attempt was not fortunate enough to pleaſe thoſe in power, he would adviſe them to ſeek out ſome perſons of ſuperior abilities to himſelf; and immediately returned all the papers, which were in his hands. This is the

(3) Du Pin, pag. 142.

(4) Niceron, *Mémoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire des Hommes Illuſtres*, tom. 8. pag. 74, 75. edit. de Paris 1729.

and the parts adjacent, obliged him to remove to Paris. This proved of great advantage to him, for in that city he had the opportunity, which he could no where elſe enjoy, of furniſhing himſelf with a variety of Books as well manuſcript as printed, without which it is impoſſible to bring any conſiderable work to perfection (*b*). In June 1688 he was ſeized with a retention of urine, which confined him to his bed for fifteen days. Till then he had enjoyed a perfect ſtate of health, and for fifty years had never been troubled with the leaſt indiſpoſition. About the middle of September he relapſed, and prepared himſelf for death with the greateſt reſignation. He died October 23d following in the 78th year of his age (*i*). Of ten children, whom he had by his wife, there were but three, who ſurvived him, two ſons, the eldeſt of whom was Treaſurer of France at Poitiers, and two daughters (*k*). The generoſity, with which the King rewarded his merit and valuable labours, was extended after his death to his family, to whom that Prince gave two thouſand livres, in conſideration of the pains, which Monſr. du Cange had taken in the publication of the *Chronicon Alexandrinum* (*l*). He was a Gentleman of great humanity and affability, of a lively and agreeable turn of converſation; he ſpoke always with prodigious modeſty of himſelf; never affected any ſuperiority over others, but at the time that he gave proofs of uncommon abilities, by ſolving their difficulties, avoided all dogmatical airs, and propoſed his ſentiments rather as mere conjectures, than as deciſive judgments. He frankly acknowledged, that he was ignorant of many things, and that he was frequently miſtaken. He uſed to ſay, that there was nothing but eyes and fingers neceſſary to compoſe ſuch works as his (*m*). And notwithſtanding the ſucceſs of them, he was ſo far from being elated with it, that he declared, that his performances were of no great importance, but that he had applied himſelf to the ſearch after ſuch barbarous words, as every one avoided and condemned (*n*). He was prodigiouſly aſſiduous in the application to his ſtudies, and wrote in a very noble manner, and with great purity of ſtyle (*o*).

(*b*) Perrault, pag. 137, 138.

(*i*) Du Pin, pag. 144. *and* Perrault, pag. 139.
(*k*) Perrault, pag. 139.

(*l*) Niceron, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire des Hommes Illuſtres*, tom. 8. pag. 72. edit. de Paris 1729.

(*m*) Du Pin, pag. 144.

(*n*) *Melanges d'Hiſtoire & de Litterature, Par M. De Vigneul-Marville*, vol. 1. pag. 167. edit. de Paris 1725.

(*o*) Du Pin, *ubi ſupra*.

account of Father Niceron (5). And Mr. Du Pin informs us (6), that the ſcheme propoſed to him was only to make a Continuation of the Hiſtorians publiſhed by Du Cheſne, but that he refuſed that taſk, being of opinion that ſuch a compilation would not do any honour to his Country. V. *Gloſſarium ad Scriptores mediæ & infimæ Latinitatis, in quo Latina vocabula novatæ ſignificationis explicantur, complures ævi medii ritus & mores, legum, conſuetudinum municipalium, & Juriſprudentiæ recentioris formulæ & obſoletæ voces, utriuſque Ordinis Eccleſiaſtici & Laici dignitates & officia, &c. enucleantur & illuſtrantur.* Paris 1678 fol. 3 Vol. Francfort upon the Maine 1681. fol. 3 Vol. *Editio inſigniter aucta Francofurti*, fol. 1710. 3 Vol. This Gloſſary, which was two years in the preſs, was received with prodigious applauſe by all men of learning. It is accompanied with an excellent Preface and ſeveral curious Diſſertations, and contains an explication of an infinite number of words, which are neceſſary to be underſtood by thoſe, who read the Writers of the lower Age (7). A new edition of it has been long promiſed with great Additions (8). VII. *Lettre du Sieur N. Conſeiller du Roi à ſon ami M. Antoine Wion d'Herouval au ſujet des Libelles, qui de tems en tems ſe publient en Flandres contre les RR. PP. Henſchenius & Papebroch Jeſuites.* i. e. "A Letter of the Sieur "N. Counſellor to the King to his friend Mr. Anthony Wion d'Herouval upon the ſubject of the Libels, which from time to time are publiſhed in "Flanders againſt the Reverend Fathers the Jeſuits "Henſchenius and Papebroch." 1682. VIII. *Hiſtoria Byzantina duplici Commentario illuſtrata, quorum prior familias ac ſtemmata Imperatorum Conſtantinopolitanorum, cum eorundem Auguſtorum Numiſmatibus & aliquot Iconibus, præterea familias Dalmaticas & Turcicas complectitur: Alter deſcriptionem Urbis Conſtantinopolitanæ, qualis extitit ſub Imperatoribus Chriſtianis.* Paris 1680 in fol. This work contains two parts, one of which comprehends the Genealogy of the Emperors of Conſtantinople, and the other an exact deſcription of the State of that City under thoſe Emperors. IX. *Joannis Zonaræ Annales ab exordio mundi ad mortem Alexii Comneni Græcè & Latinè, interprete Hieronymo Wolphio, ex recenſione Caroli du Cange cum ejus Notis.* i. e. "John Zonaras's Annals from the Creation of "the World to the Death of Alexius Comnenus in "Greek and Latin, tranſlated by Jerom Wolfius, and "reviſed by Charles du Cange, with the Notes of the "latter." Paris 1686 fol. 2 Vol. X. *Gloſſarium ad Scriptores mediæ & infimæ Græcitatis. Accedit Appendix ad Gloſſarium mediæ & infimæ Latinitatis, unà cum brevi Etymologico Linguæ Galliæ ex utroque Gloſſario.* Paris 1688 fol. 2 Vol. In this Gloſſary he explains the barbarous terms, which are to be found in the Greek Books printed and not printed of the Civilians, Divines, Phyſicians, Chemiſts, and Writers upon Tactics and Politics. To this he has ſubjoined an *Appendix* to his Latin Gloſſary, with a ſhort Etymologicon of the French Tongue extracted from both Gloſſaries. XI. *Chronicon Paſchale à mundo condito ad Heraclii Imperatoris annum vigeſimum. Opus hactenus Faſtorum Siculorum nomine laudatum; deinde Chronicæ temporum Epitomes, ac denique Chronici Alexandrini Commate vulgatum. Nunc tandem auctius & emendatius prodiit cum novâ Latinâ Verſione, & Notis chronicis & hiſtoricis.* i. e. "The *Chronicon Paſchale* from the Creation of "the World to the twentieth year of the Emperor "Heraclius; a work formerly quoted under the title "of the *Faſti Siculi*, afterwards under that of the *ſhort* "*Chronicle*, and at laſt publiſhed with the title of the "*Chronicle of Alexandria*. But now publiſhed with "Additions and Corrections, and a new Latin Verſion, "and Notes chronological and hiſtorical." Paris 1689 in fol. Monſr. du Cange was engaged in the edition of this book at his death; but Monſr. Baluze compleated and publiſhed it, and prefixed to it an Elogium of our Author. XII. He wrote ſome Notes upon the Byzantine Hiſtory of Nicephorus Gregoras, which are publiſhed in the edition of Mr. Boivin in 1702 in fol. XIII. Father le Long in his *Bibliotheque Hiſtorique de la France* quotes two works, which Monſr. du Cange left in manuſcript; 1. *Hiſtoire de l'Etat & de la Ville d'Amiens & de ſes Comtes, avec un Recueil de pluſieurs Titres concernant l'Hiſtoire de cette Ville, qui n'ont pas encore été publiez.* i. e. "An Hiſtory of the State and City of Amiens, &c." Fol. 1 Vol. This Hiſtory was entirely finiſhed (9). 2. *Hiſtoire des Principautez & des Royaumes de Jeruſalem, de Chypre, & d'Armenie, & des Familles, qui les ont poſſedez.* Fol.

(5) Ibid. pag. 75, 76.
(6) Pag. 142.
(7) Du Pin, pag. 142.
(8) Niceron, pag. 77.
(9) *See* Niceron, tom. 8. pag. 79. and tom. 10. Part 1. pag. 178.

H.

CANICEUS (JAMES) wrote ſome Love-Letters. I mention this only upon the credit of Agrippa (*a*), and to excite the curioſity of the learned in order to engage them to find out who this Author was, whoſe name I never met in any Bibliographer; no more than that of James Calandrus, an Author of the ſame ſtamp, according to the ſame Agrippa (*b*).

(*a*) Agrippa, *de Vanitate Scient.* cap. 64. pag. m. 128, 129.
(*b*) Idem, ibid. pag. 129.

CANINIUS

CANINIUS (ANGELO) was one of the moſt learned Grammarians in the ſixteenth Century. He was born in a ſmall city of Tuſcany, which is called *Anglara* in Latin [*A*], and in Italian *Anghiari*; hence is derived the ſurname of *Anglarienſis*, which he added his name in the title of his works. Thuanus places his death under the year 1557 (*a*) [*B*], and aſſerts that he underſtood the Tongue and the Oriental Languages very well, and taught them at Venice, Padua, Boulogne, Rome, and in Spain; and that he was afterwards Tutor to Andrew Dudithius [*C*], and alſo read Lectures at Paris, and laſtly, that being entered into the ſervice of William Duprat Biſhop of Clermont (*b*) [*D*], he died in Auvergne [*E*]. Some ſay, *he was a Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Paris, and lived in the College of Cambray at Paris, and that this Treatiſe of Helleniſm may truly be ſtiled one of the moſt learned Works, that ever were publiſhed upon the firſt Principles of the Greek Tongue* (*c*). The praiſes, which Scaliger beſtows upon him, ſeem at firſt view to imply a great deal, but after all they ſignify but little. He owns that *for a young man he was very learned* [*F*], and that *he wrote a good Book concerning Helleniſm.* But that *he borrowed*

(a) Thuan. *Hiſt.* lib. 19. pag. 346.

(b) Caninius mentions the generoſity of that Biſhop, *Præfat. Introduct. in linguam Syriacam & Punicam*, as Magius tells us, *Epiſt. Dedicat. Tractat. de Equuleo.*

(c) Lancelot, *Pref. de la Nouvelle Methode Gréque.*

[*A*] *He was born in a ſmall city of Tuſcany, which is called* Anglara *in Latin.*] Thuanus did not know, that this is a city of Tuſcany, and miſtook it for a city in the Milaneſe, called in Latin *Angleria*, or *Anglaria*; for having ſaid, that Magius was born at *Anglara*, a city in the Dutchy of Milan, he adds, that this city was alſo the native place of Angelo Caninius (1). Others (2), by a miſtake of the ſame nature, have ſaid that Caninius, Magius, and Peter Martyr Counſellor to Ferdinand and Iſabella, were born at *Anglaria*, a city of the *Inſubres*, that is, of the Milaneſe, which is true of Peter Martyr only. We have proved in another place that Magius was of *Anglara* in Tuſcany: now, he ſays, that Caninius was his countryman (3), whence it follows that Caninius was not of the Milaneſe, as Don Lancelot aſſerts in his Preface to the *Methode Greque*. Nicholas Antonio, who gives him the ſurname of *Anglerienſis*, explains it thus, *Oppidum Mediolanenſis Ducatus* Anghiera *eſt, ad oram Lacus Verbani ſive majoris* (4). i. e. "Anghiera is "a ſmall city in the Dutchy of Milan, ſituated upon "the bank of the Lake *Majour*."

(1) *Anglara in Inſubribus ditionis Mediolanenſis oppido, quod & nobis Angelum Caninium olim dedit natus.* Thuan. lib. 49. *ad ann.* 1571, pag. 1018.

(2) Quenſtedt, *de Patriis illuſtrib.* pag. 296.

(3) Magius, *Epiſt. Dedicat. Tractat. de Equuleo.*

(4) N. Anton. *Bibl. Hiſp.* tom. 2. pag. 357.

[*B*] *Thuanus places his death under the year* 1557.] He had put it under the year 1554 in the former Editions. See the laſt page of the firſt volume of the Paris Edition in 1604 8vo. Whence you will know, why Monſieur Baillet, who made uſe of that Edition in 8vo, ſpeaking of Caninius, ſays, he died in 1557, or rather in 1554 (5). The Reader will meet in the Remark [*F*] with a quotation, which ſhews that Thuanus knew but very little of this learned Grammarian.

(5) *Jugemens des Savans*, tom. 4. num. 701. pag. 182. He ſays he was born at Angleria.

[*C*] *He aſſerts, that he was Tutor to Andrew Dudithius.*] Du Ryer has given an erroneous tranſlation of the following words of Thuanus. *Demum Andreæ Dudithii Pannonii . . . . adoleſcentiæ admotus, Lutetiæ Pariſiorum docuit.* He tranſlates them thus, *Afterwards, having been choſen to teach Andrew Dudith in Hungary, ... he read lectures at Paris* (6). This tranſlation ſuppoſes that Caninius took a journey into Hungary, and makes Thuanus contradict himſelf; for he ſays in another place, that Dudithius ſtudied at Paris under Caninius, after his voyage to England, and before he returned into Hungary. *Demum ex Anglia Lutetiam venit, & illic ſub optimo Doctore Angelo Caninio Anglarenſi, non ſolum Græcæ linguæ & Hebraicæ, ſed etiam Orientalium peritiſſimo, denuo intermiſſis per illas peregrinationes ſtudiis operam dedit* (7). Here follows a tranſlation of this paſſage as it is in Mr. Teiſſier. *From England he came to Paris, where he began his ſtudies again, which his travels made him interrupt, under* Angelo Canimo, *that excellent man, who was ſo well verſed in the Greek, Hebrew and Oriental languages* (8). This error of the preſs, *Canimo* inſtead of *Caninio*, may one time or other increaſe the Catalogue of the learned, and give us one *Angelus Canimus* different from Angelus Caninius, but equally ſkilled in the knowledge of languages. I don't doubt but when Dudithius ſtudied at Paris, Caninius was a Profeſſor there; therefore theſe words of Thuanus, *Andreæ Dudithii Pannonii Adoleſcentiæ admotus, Lutetiæ Pariſiorum docuit*, which are very exact with regard to the grammatical ſenſe, do not ſeem to be ſo with regard to Hiſtory, for it is not at all probable, that Caninius was Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Paris, and at the ſame time tutor to a young Hungarian Traveller. And yet we muſt ſuppoſe him to have been a Tutor, if we follow the full ſenſe of Thuanus's words, *Andreæ Dudithii Adoleſcentiæ admotus.* But I do not think, he inſtructed Dudithius otherwiſe, than by his publick and private lectures, which is very different from what we call a Tutor, and from what is ſignified by theſe Latin words, *alicujus adoleſcentiæ admoveri.* The tranſlation of Thuanus's paſſage is ſomething better in Moreri, than it is in Mr. Teiſſier, ſince the former does not ſend Caninius into Hungary, but only ſent him to Dudithius of Hungary. Yet there is ſtill a great error there; for, to ſay with Thuanus in Moreri, that *Caninius, after he had been with Andrew Dudith of Hungary, read lectures at Paris*, is to ſuppoſe, that Caninius was Tutor to the young Hungarian, before he taught at Paris; whereas it ſhould be ſaid, that the young Hungarian coming to Paris, and meeting there with a very eminent Profeſſor, named Caninius, he ſtudied under him.

(6) *Apud* Teiſſier, *Eloges tires de Mr. De Thou*, tom. 1. pag. 131.

(7) Thuanus, *Hiſt.* lib. 96. *ad annum* 1589.

(8) *Apud* Teiſſier, tom. 2. pag. 103.

[*D*] *He entred into the ſervice of William Duprat, Biſhop of Clermont.*] As Thuanus does not enter into particulars, it will be proper to relate what Caninius himſelf tells us in a Dedication to William Duprat, in the year 1553 (9). We learn from thence that Caninius was at Paris that ſame year 1553; that when he returned from Spain into France with a Minim called Simon Guichard, they both ſtopt in the Dioceſe of Clermont; and that he received a great many favours from the Biſhop, to whom he dedicates his Book; that going to Paris, he fell ſick on the road, and ſpent almoſt all the money he had; that at laſt he arrived at Paris without knowing any perſon there; but that the recommendatory letters of that Prelate had procured him a lodging, and the other neceſſaries of life. We know by this account, that he was under the generous protection of that Biſhop, before he read lectures at Paris, and we may conjecture about what time he began his lectures. Let us obſerve that the Dedication of his Helleniſm, is dated from the College of Cambray at Paris Auguſt the 29th, 1555. I am far from ſaying that Thuanus was miſtaken. Caninius may poſſibly have left off his teaching, and retired into the family of the Biſhop of Clermont, and that may have been the laſt ſcene of his life.

(9) Prefixed to his *Inſtitutiones linguæ Syriacæ.*

[*E*] *He died in Auvergne.*] Some ſay, it was at Seville in Spain. And this is what Nicholas Antonio ſuppoſes, in the place where he mentions him (10); for he has made a long catalogue of foreign Authors, who lived a long time in Spain, or who died there. He quotes Francis Forerius a Dominican Friar, who in his Preface upon his Commentaries upon Iſaiah acknowledges, that he has been Caninius's diſciple. Nicholas Antonio knew but very few particulars concerning Caninius; the only work he aſcribed to him, is *Diſquiſitiones in Locos aliquot Novi Teſtamenti obſcuriores, ex Hebraicæ & Æthiopicæ linguarum Originibus*, which have been printed at Antwerp, ſays he, with the *Quinquagenæ* of Antonius Nibriſſenſis.

(10) *Biblioth. Hiſpan.* tom. 2. pag. 357.

[*F*] *Scaliger owns that for a young man he was very learned.*] This expreſſion may ſeem ſurprizing, if it be conſidered, that Scaliger made uſe of it long after Caninius's death, and that Thuanus does not repreſent him as a man who died very young; for he makes him wander a long time over Italy and Spain, teaching in ſeveral places the Oriental Languages (11), before he ſettled at Paris. But appears from another paſſage of the *Scaligerana*, that Scaliger thought Caninius lived but thirty ſix years (12). I do not lay much ſtreſs upon that paſſage; for Scaliger had ſaid juſt before, that Caninius died at the age of thirty two, which

(11) *Iis perdecendis diu in Italia, Venetiis, Patavii, Bononiæ, Romæ, atque in Hiſpania vagus.* Thuan. lib. 19. pag. 346.

(12) *Prima Scaligerana*, pag. 47.

rowed the beſt obſervations in it from Vergara, and from all the other Writers upon that ſubject, and alſo added to them ſomething of his own (*d*). Faber of Saumur, who prefers Caninius before all the other Grammarians, that are or ever were in being, openly explodes that accuſation, and obſerves, that that work may be called the Treaſure of Helleniſm, and that it was printed at Paris in the year 1555, in 4to (*e*). Other learned men have beſtowed the ſame encomium upon Caninius's Greek Grammar [*G*]. His other works are not very numerous [*H*]. It is very probable, that Jerom Caninius of Anghiari, the Author of an Italian Tranſlation of Tacitus, publiſhed with the Aphoriſm of Alamos (*f*) and printed at Venice in 1620, was of the ſame family with our Caninius.

(*d*) *Scaligerana*, pag. m. 42.

(*e*) *Notis in Prima Scaligerana.*

(*f*) Nicol. Antonius, *Biblioth. Hiſpan.* tom. 1. pag. 140.

(13) According to Valerius Andreas, *Bibl. Belg.* pag. 683, he lived 42 years, but 49 according to Bullart in his *Acad. des Scienc.*

(14) *Epitr. Franç. à Scaliger.* pag. 329.

(15) It ſhould rather have been from *Angleria* upon the Lake Majour.

(16) Quenſtedt, *de Patriis illuſtr.* pag. 296. See Baillet, *Jugemens des Savans*, tom. 4. pag. 112.

which is not true (13). I have not yet been able to find out how many years Caninius lived. It is not an eaſy thing to give an account of his life; Thuanus, who found it very difficult, applied himſelf to Scaliger. "In the courſe of my Hiſtory, ſays he (14), I "do willingly ſay ſomething of the perſons eminent in "the Republic of Letters, under the year of their "death; amongſt them I very much deſired not to "omit *Angelus Caninius*, for he deſerves, I think, that "his name ſhould be tranſmitted to poſterity; but I am "at a loſs where to find ſome account of him. Firſt, "I do not certainly know, where he was born: he "ſtiled himſelf Anglarenſis, I do not know whether "it is from a village upon the lake Como (15), or "from another place. He was ſtill alive in 1553, "and lived in France. He travelled all his life time, "now in Spain, then here. If you know any thing "of him, and in what year he died, I deſire you "would write it to me."

[*G*] *The learned have beſtowed encomiums upon Caninius's Greek Grammar.*] Here follow the words of a German Author. *In Grammatica Græca, quicquid vetuſtiſſimi Scriptores de Græcæ Linguæ ratione præcipiunt, atque adeò omnia, quæ ad dialectos intelligendas, & Poetas penitus cognoſcendos pertinent, facili methodo exponuntur* (16). i. e. "He has explained in his "Greek Grammar, in an eaſy manner all the rules, "which the moſt ancient Authors give for underſtanding the Greek tongue, and conſequently, for having a true notion of the dialects, and for underſtanding the Poets."

[*H*] *His other works are not very numerous.*] He tranſlated into Latin Simplicius's Commentary upon Epictetus's Manual; that tranſlation was printed at Venice in 1546, folio. He alſo wrote *Inſtitutiones linguæ Syriacæ, Aſſyriacæ, atque Thalmudicæ, una cum Æthiopicæ atque Arabicæ collatione, quibus addita eſt ad Calcem Novi Teſtamenti multorum locorum Hiſtorica enarratio, Pariſii, apud Carolum Stephanum*, 1554, 4to. *De locis Scripturæ Hebraicis Commentarius.*

Mr. Crenius has procured of late a new Edition of two Works of Caninius. Read what follows. *Angeli Caninii Anglarenſis* ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ, *copioſiſſimi Græcarum Latinarumque vocum Indicis acceſſione per* CAROLUM HAUBOESIUM *locupletatus. . . . Accedunt plurimorum verborum Originum explicatio, Regulæ quædam breves de Ratione Syntaxeos, & loci aliquot Novi Teſtamenti cum Hebræorum originibus conlati atque explicati.* THOMAS CRENIUS *recenſuit, emendavit, & Notis ac Præfatione, in qua de claris agitur* ANGELIS, *auxit. Lugduni Batavorum, apud Fredericum Haaring*, CIↃ IↃCC, 8*vo*.

CAPET (HUGH) King of France, the firſt of the third race. A great many particulars might be ſaid on this ſubject; but I ſhall content my ſelf with obſerving, that Dante the Poet publiſhed a very ridiculous falſity, in ſaying that Hugh Capet's father was a Butcher [*A*]. It is ſaid that Francis I flew into a terrible paſſion, upon

[*A*] *Dante the Poet publiſhed a very ridiculous falſity, in ſaying that Hugh Capet's father was a Butcher.*] Should I ſet about refuting this Poet, it would be mere loſs of time, and only abuſe the reader's patience. It will be ſufficient to give the moſt uſual conjecture of Authors who have mentioned this particular, viz. that the only motive of Dante's publiſhing this impoſture, was, to revenge himſelf on Prince Charles of Valois, (ſprung from this Prince) for the treatment he had met with from him. Pope Boniface VIII, at the requeſt of one of the Parties which divided the Republic of Florence at that time, got Charles de Valois, brother to Philip the Fair, King of France, to go and compoſe the diſturbances of that City. The faction in which Dante was engaged at that time, was the weakeſt. Accordingly he was driven from Florence with many more, and all his goods and chattels were confiſcated. He took the ſtrongeſt vengeance in his power, by exclaiming in his writings againſt the Kings of France, who had favoured the oppoſite faction; and, among other things, he ſatyrized them for their extraction. He feigns that Hugh Capet owns that his father was a Butcher, *figliuol fui d'un Beccaio di Parigi* (1); and confeſſes himſelf to be the root of a Plant which has done great miſchief to Chriſtendom.

(1) Dante in his *Purgatory*, Canto 20. pag. m. 282.

I fui radice de la mala pianta,
Che la terra Chriſtiana tutta aduggia
Si che buon frutto rado ſe ne ſchianta.
That is,
"I was the root of that malignant Plant,
"Which ſpreads, o'er Chriſtendom, a deadly ſhade,
"So that it ſeldom throws out wholeſome fruit (2)."

(2) Ibid.

A Canon of Paris, Balthazar Grangier by name, dedicating to Henry IV his Tranſlation, in French Verſe, of Dante's Hell, Paradiſe and Purgatory, tells this Prince that he muſt not take the word *Butcher* in a literal ſenſe; *for Dante, who during his exile reſided a long time in this city of Paris, was not ignorant of our forms of ſpeaking. When a Prince cauſes juſtice to be executed with ſome rigour againſt a great number of malefactors, we ſay he made a great butchery or ſlaughter; and thus our ſaid Poet calls Hugh the great Count of Paris (father of the abovementioned Hugh Capet, great Juſticiary of the Gentlemen and other malefactors and rebels,) Butcher of Paris, as I ſhew more amply in my Annotations; and as ſome of our Annaliſts juſtly remark on this paſſage.* This explication is very near as ridiculous as the falſity advanced by Dante. He certainly took the word *Butcher* in a literal ſenſe. I don't know whether he invented or borrowed this ſtupid fiction from ſome Libelliſt; but 'tis written that many have publiſh'd it: ſo true it is, that no lie, how abſurd ſoever it be, but is tranſcribed out of one book into another, and deſcends to poſterity. *Lie boldly: publiſh the moſt chimerical ſtuff in nature*, may we ſay to the moſt contemptible Gazetteer in Europe, *for people enough will be found to copy your traſh; and ſuppoſing you ſhould happen to be contemned at one time, yet certain conjunctures will ariſe, in which it will be the intereſt of ſome people to raiſe you from your oblivion* (3). We find in the Annals of Papyrius Maſſo, a paſſage which informs us that ſeveral Authors have related this particular mentioned by Dante. *Itali quidam Hugonem humili genere natum ſcripſere ſeu ignorantia, ſeu odio. Dantes poeta illum Pariſienſis Beccai filium fuiſſe canit, quæ vox lanium ſonat. Is Florentia à Carolo Valeſio pulſus Philippum Pulchrum & Francos oderat, ut rectè in mentem venerit Volaterrano, Dantis opinionem refellere, etſi Ricordanus & Villaneus in Hetruſcis Annalibus id quoque à pluribus literis mandatum affirmant* (4). i. e. "Some "Italian Authors, out of ignorance or hatred, declare "that Hugh was born of obſcure parentage. Dante "the Poet ſays, in his writings, that he was a Butcher's "ſon of Paris. This Poet being baniſhed Florence "by Charles de Valois, hated Philip the Fair and the "French, as Volaterranus juſtly obſerves, where he "refutes Dante's aſſertion; altho' Ricordanus and "Villani affirm, in their Annals of Tuſcany, that "many Writers have related the ſame particular." Read the following remark.

(3) See citation (68) of the Article CALVIN.

(4) Papyr. Maſſo, *Annal.* lib. 3.

upon hearing that Dante had related ſuch a circumſtance [*B*].

[*B*] *'Tis ſaid that Francis I flew into a terrible paſſion, upon hearing that Dante had related ſuch a circumſtance.*] "The paſſage of Dante being read and "explained by Lewis Alemanni an Italian before "Franci I, the King was exaſperated at the impo-"ſture, and thereupon commanded it to be taken "from him, and was upon the point to prohibit the "reading of it in his Kingdom." Paſquier, after ſaying theſe words, advances a conjecture which is as idle as what I have now related. *To excuſe this Author*, ſays he (5), *I would ſuppoſe that he, by the word* Butcher, *meant that Capet was ſon to a great and valiant Warrior. . . According to this way of ſpeaking I have read that Oliver de Cliſſon was generally called the Butcher by our Countrymen, becauſe he did not ſpare any of the Engliſh who fell into his hands, but cut every one of them to pieces.* He adds, that the Proteſtants uſed to give the name of Butcher to Francis of Lorrain, Duke of Guiſe. Had Paſquier examined what preceded and followed the verſe of Dante, he would not have thought this Poet meant to ſay, that *Capet was ſon to an illuſtrious and brave Warrior*; for a perſon who ſpeaks thus of another, does not do it out of contempt; and it is manifeſt that Dante intended to defame Hugh Capet. On ſome occaſions an Hiſtorian ought to content himſelf with barely relating matters. Had Paſquier only obſerved, that Francis I was exaſperated againſt Dante, and that the ſilly aſſertion of this Poet, though written merely *by the by*, and *without thought*, it yet ſerved as a foundation to many Authors; in that caſe Paſquier would have merited applauſe. He cites *Francis de Villon, who delighted more in taverns and ſuch like places than in good Books* (6), *who ſays ſomewhere in his writings,*

Si feuſſe des Hoirs de Capet
Qui fut extrait de Boucherie.

That is,

"Were I the heir of Capet, ———
"Who from a paltry Butcher trac'd his lineage.

He adds, that *Agrippa, . . . inſtructing meraly on this fundamental error, declaims impudently againſt the genealogy of our Capet* (7). But how irrational ſoever Paſquier's conjecture may be, it nevertheleſs has been approved by Bullart. *Stephen Paſquier*, ſays he (8), *explaining this great Poet's thought in a more juſt and rational manner, is of opinion, that he employs this word by way of metaphor; and, by the word Butcher, means that Capet was ſon to a valiant Warrior.* Mr. Bullart had declared juſt before, that *this paſſage of Dante gave Francis I ſo much offence, that he commanded the Book to be taken away from him, and was going to prohibit it in his Kingdom.* I know a man, who aſſerts, that this is miſunderſtanding Paſquier's words; "for, *ſaid* "*he*, the words of this Author ſignify, that Fran-"cis I commanded to have the paſſage which "relates to Hugh Capet expunged from Dante's "Poem. It would be very ſtrange ſhould Fran-"cis I have given orders for taking away a "Book which diſpleaſed him. Why did he not "throw it upon the ground? He would have been as "indolent as a Sybarite (9), had he commanded ano-"ther to deliver him from this burthen, his indolence "might then have been ſo extreme, as to command "one of his people to drive from his face a fly which "had ſtung him; and to have the victuals put into "his mouth, to eaſe him of the trouble of lifting up "his hand to it." But with ſubmiſſion to this reaſoning Gentleman, Francis I, notwithſtanding his bluntneſs and martial vigour, he yet might command a Book to be taken from him, which gave offence. He himſelf did not hold the Book, but in all probability an Italian Maſter of Languages who was reading to him. The truth of the matter is, a very ingenious Italian Refugee (10) was reading this Poet to Francis I, which clears up the difficulty at once.

(5) Paſquier, *Recherches*, lib. 6. cap. 1.

(6) Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 1.

(7) In his book *on the Vanity of the Sciences*, in the chapter of *Nobility*.

(8) *Academy of Sciences*, tom. 2. pag. 307.

(9) See in *Athenæus*, book 12. pag. 530. a ſtrange example of the indolence of a Sybarite.

(10) Aloiſio Alamanni. I mention him in the article MACHIAVEL, remark [*C*].

CAPYCIUS (SCIPIO) in Italian *Capece*, ſprung from an antient family of Naples (*a*), gained great reputation in the ſixteenth Century by the works he wrote [*A*]. He was very much eſteemed by Iſabella Villamarini Princeſs of Salerno; and he beſtowed great encomiums on her [*B*]. His chief Poem is that wherein he has argued philoſophically on the principles of Nature. It was printed at Venice in 1546 by Paulus Manutius, with

(*a*) Lorenzo Craſſo, *Elog.* tom. 2. pag. 176.

[*A*] *He gained great reputation . . . by the works he compoſed.*] Moſt of theſe are Poems. He wrote one in proſe *Magiſtratuum Regni Neapolitani cum Romanorum Magiſtratibus comparatio.* Of the four Elegies he publiſhed, the firſt was inſcribed to Andrew Perrinot, Cardinal and Viceroy of Naples; the ſecond to Cardinal Jerom Seripand; the third to John Baptiſt Gaſtaldi Marquis of Caſſano; the fourth treats of the Miſeries of the Author, and thoſe of the Age he lived in (1). Some of his Epigrams are of his own invention, and others are imitations from the *Anthologia*. His Poem on the Life of Chriſt has never appeared in print, which was owing to the negligence of a friend, who poſſeſſed the manuſcript after the Author's death, and did not take care to publiſh it (2). See in the following remark the account which is given of the two beſt Poems of Capycius.

(1) *Nella quarta finalmente deplora le miſerie ſue, e del ſecolo*, Lor. Craſſo, *Elog.* tom. 2. pag. 178.

(2) Extracted from Lorenzo Craſſo, ibid.

[*B*] *He was very much eſteemed by Iſabella Villamarini . . . . and he beſtowed great encomiums on her.*] I appeal for this to the teſtimony of Paulus Manutius, who relates that this Lady, having preferred the ſtudy of Literature to all other employments, was the moſt learned, and at the ſame time the nobleſt and moſt beautiful woman then living; and hence it was that ſeveral Poets, particularly Capycius, had made her the chief object of their Elogiums. This conſideration alſo induces Paulus Manutius to think, that in inſcribing the Poems of Capycius to that Princeſs, ſhe will look upon them as a very agreeable preſent; and honour him with her eſteem. Paulus Manutius is ſo eloquent, that his beautiful Latin deſerves a place here. *Effeciſti ſtudio tu quidem, ſed ingenio magis, ut cum eſſes omnium nobiliſſima, omniumque pulcherrima (quorum alterum majorum tuorum, maximèque viri tui, Principis omni laude cumulati, magnis rebus teſtata virtus, alterum benigniſſima tibi natura dedit) eadem & ſis & habearis omnium doctiſſima. Hinc illa ad te colendam ſingularis omnium propenſio, hinc multorum Poetarum, quibus graviſſima regum bella magni operis argumentum ſuppeditare poterant, ad te canendam traducta ingenia. Hinc Capicius ille tuus, tuarum laudum laudatiſſimus præco, qui te admiratur unam, qui obſervat, qui cùm de te multa & vera prædicavit, ita concludit, unam habere, quæ optabilia ſint, omnia. . . Hoc opus, & quia ſcriptum eſt à tui ſtudioſiſſimo, & quia verſibus te dignis, id eſt luculentiſſimis, non herclè dubito, quin à me miſſum avidè accipias, ſic inquam, ut de iſto me munere ames plurimum* (3). i. e. "So happy are the effects of your "ſtudies, or rather of your genius, that you who are "the moſt noble, and moſt beautiful, (the former "of which you owe to the great virtue and glorious "acts of your anceſtors, and particularly of the "Prince your Conſort, on whom the higheſt applauſes "have been beſtowed; and for the latter you are in-"debted to the indulgence of nature) are at the "ſame time the moſt learned Lady in the world. "Hence proceeds the ſtrong inclination which all men "have to honour you; hence it is that many Poets, "neglecting to ſing the mighty wars of Kings, leave "thoſe exalted Themes to celebrate your praiſes: "Hence your Capicius, the moſt applauded herald of "your praiſes, who admires and reveres you only; "who after ſaying the moſt juſt and fineſt things of "you, concludes thus, that in you alone every excellen-"cy is united. . . This work, being written by one who "had the higheſt veneration for you, and his very ele-"gant Verſes being worthy ſo great a Patroneſs, I don't "doubt but that you'll very readily accept the offer, "and honour me with your eſteem upon that account." This we find prefixed to a Poem *de Principiis Rerum*, printed at Venice anno 1546, with another Poem entitled *de Vate maximo libri tres* (4), and which had been

(3) Paul. Manutius, *Epiſt. Dedicat. Poematis Capycii de rerum principiis ad Iſabellam Villamarinam Salernitani Principis conjugem.* This Dedication of Manutius has been printed ſeparately with his other Prefaces, at Paris 1579, and elſewhere.

(4) *See* Nicodemo, *Addizz. alla Biblioth. Napol.* pag. 226.

with another Poem of the ſame Author on St. John Baptiſt (*b*). Gyraldus has been cenſured for ſpeaking of Capycius as an indifferent Poet [*C*].

been already printed, for Geſner mentions it in a work publiſh'd by him in 1545. *Scipionis Capycii viri doctiſſimi de Vate maximo libri tres erudito carmine conſcripti, quod cum veterum etiam majeſtate conferri queat, ut habet inſcriptio. Joannis Oporinus excudit nuper* (5) *Baſileæ cum aliis quibuſdam Chriſtianis Poematiis* (6). i. e. "The very learned Scipio Capycius's piece *de* "*Vate maximo*, in three books, written in learned "Verſe, which may vie in majeſty with the ancient "Poets, as the title declares. It was lately printed, "together with ſome other Chriſtian Poems, at Baſil "by Jo. Oporinus." Nicodemus muſt therefore be miſtaken, when he ſays that, with regard to theſe two Poems, that this edition of Manutius is the firſt (17); he ſhould have affirmed this only of the work entitled *de Rerum Principiis*. He confutes Father Oldoini, for ſaying that Cardinal Pompey Colonna (8) has greatly applauded Iſabella Filomarini, wife to the Prince of Salerno. The foundation of this criticiſm is, that the Lady of this Prince was called Iſabella Villamarini. She is ſo called by Manutius, as alſo by Niphus, and that on an occaſion which deſerves to be known. He ſays that this Lady was ſo paſſionately fond of the Prince her huſband, that ſhe was reſolved to accompany him into the field; but the Prince would not comply with her requeſt, becauſe of the great dangers and hazards of it. Being thus ſeparated from the huſband whom ſhe idolized, ſhe paſt all her days in the deepeſt affliction, but her nights were pleaſant. This Lady ſaw the Prince for ever in her dreams; ſhe talk'd with, and was careſſed by him; and this made her wiſh for one long night, and that the Sun might never riſe again. But this will appear much more beautiful in the original Latin. *Id quod in Iſabella Villamarina Salerni principe, quæ flos redolentiſſimus noſtri ævi eſt puellarum, corporiſque & animi formæ ſingulare exemplum, eſt videre. Hæc cùm Ferrandum Sanſſeverinum conjugem flagrantiſſimè deperiret, unaque in militiam proficiſci arderet, quia ab eo ob pericula & labores fuit denegatum, nullam teſtatur Heroinæ religioſiſſimæ, aut raram eſſe noctem, quia cum dulciſſimo vino in ſomnis non conjunctiſſime vivat, fabuletur ac delicietur, ut omnibus votis exoptaret perpetuas eſſe noctes; (cum illum totos dies ſuſpiret) & in Epimenidem transformari; quæ de Alceſte & Laodamia fabulata eſt vetuſtas* (9). The Book whence theſe particulars are extracted, was finiſhed the third of November 1529. This doubtleſs is the Lady who was ſo much applauded by Cardinal Pompey Colonna; and thus Father Oldoini is miſtaken only in ſuppoſing that Filomarini and Villamarina are the ſame. Jerom Ruſcelli, who has beſtowed very great applauſes on this Princeſs of Salerno, calls her *Iſabella Vigliomarina*. Here follows a fragment of the Elogium. "She poſſeſſes, *ſays he*, ſo many more "than human beauties both in her body and mind, "that nature exhauſting all her ſtrength (10) might "perhaps be able to form a woman equal to that Prin-"ceſs, either wholly or in part; but could never "form a woman to ſurpaſs her in ever ſo little a de-"gree." Sanſovino alſo calls her Iſabella *Vigliamarina* (11).

To revive this ſubject, Capycius makes the air to be the principle of all things, and he refutes the Atomiſts and thoſe who admit four elements; and ſuch as ſay, with Thales, that all bodies owe their exiſtence to water, or, with Heraclitus, that they proceed from fire (12).

[*C*] *Gyraldus has been cenſured, for ſpeaking of Capycius as an indifferent Poet.*] He deſerves, ſays he, ſome place among the Poets (13). Nicodemo looks upon this praiſe as too faint (14), and he oppoſes to ſo jejune an encomium, what Petrus Bembus and Manutius have written to the advantage of Capycius, tho' he at the ſame time thinks, that they applaud him too much (15). He cites Gaddi, who thinks the judgment of Gyraldus too ſevere (16). See Mr. Baillet, in Tom. III of his *Judgment on the Poets*, numero 1277; and the two Epiſtles (17), which are prefixed to Donatus's Virgil, publiſh'd anno 1535.

(5) i. e. anno 1542.
(6) Geſner *in Biblioth.* folio 592.
(7) Nicodemo, *Addiz. alla Biblioth. Napolet.* pag. 226.
(8) See the article of this Cardinal, about the end of the Text.
(9) Auguſt. Niphus, *de Amore*, cap. 102. pag. 426. edit. Pariſ. 1645.
(10) *Per fare un eſtremo delle ſue forze.* Ruſcelli, Lettura ſopra un ſonetto del Marcheſe della Terza, folio 40.
(11) In his Work on the families of Italy, folio 200 *verſo*.
(12) Lorenzo Craſſo, *Elogii*, tom. 2. pag. 177.
(13) *In aliquo Poetarum numero cenſendus eſt.* Gyraldus, Dial. II. *de Poetis ſui temporis, apud* Leon. Nicodemi, *Addiz. alla Biblioth. Napolet.* pag. 225.
(14) Nicodemus, ibid.
(15) Ibid. pag. 226.
(16) Gaddi, *de Scriptor. non Eccleſ.* tom. 1. pag. 14.
(17) *See* Nicodemo, *Addiz. alla Biblioth. Napol.* pag. 127, 128.

CAPILUPUS (CAMILLUS) a native of Mantua, lived in the ſixteenth Century. He wrote a book intitled, *The Stratagem* (*a*), in which he relates not only what was perpetrated at Paris during the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's day, but alſo the artful preparations which preceded that horrid maſſacre; and which, by a long ſeries of intrigues, drew the Huguenots at laſt into the ſnare. This work, publiſhed at Rome anno 1572 (*b*), was tranſlated into French ſoon after. It is blended with a great number of falſities (*c*). The Court of France muſt neceſſarily have been diſpleaſed at ſuch a relation, ſince it endeavoured to perſuade the world that it was not premeditated (*d*). Camillus Capilupus is ranked among the Latin Poets. He had two brothers, one of whom named Hippolytus was Biſhop of Fano (*e*); and the other, who was called LELIUS, made himſelf famous by ſome Cento's of Virgil. Thuanus, cited by Moreri, informs us of this particular. I alſo will take ſome notice of him in the remark [*A*]. It is to be obſerved, that Moreri has cited very improperly the 22d book of Thuanus, and Miræus, with reſpect to Camillus Capilupus.

(*a*) Thuan. lib. 52. pag. 1089.
(*b*) Idem, ibid.
(*c*) Idem, ibid.
(*d*) *Sanè ingeniоſi ſunt Itali & Hiſpani, qui hæc tradunt, dum nobis profundam ſuam calliditatem & præpoſteram prudentiam in hoc facto affingere conantur; quod tamen noſtri aulici tanquam ex occaſione natum, neque ante præmeditatum tam artificioſè excuſarunt.* Thuan. lib. 52. pag. 1089.
(*e*) Teiſſier, *Addit. aux Eloges*, tom. 1. pag. 179.

[*A*] *I will take notice of* Lelius Capilupus *in the Remark.*] The manner in which he applied the expreſſions of Virgil, to repreſent things which the Poet never dreamt of, cannot be enough admired. Thuanus (1), Poſſevinus (2), Ghilini (3), and ſeveral others, have very happily repreſented his ſkill in this particular. He died at Mantua (4) the third of January 1560, aged 62 and 15 days (5). The Cento he made againſt the Monks is inimitable. It is annexed to Naogeorgus's *Regnum Papiſticum*. It was not inſerted in the Edition that was made in Rome, of his Cento's anno 1590. They had been prohibited, but at that time were allowed to be printed, after making all the Caſtrations they thought proper (6). JULIUS CAPILUPUS his nephew, added ſeveral Cento's of his own compoſing. He had a peculiar talent for this ſpecies of writing, and ſurpaſſed even his uncle therein, if we may credit Poſſevinus (7), who adds, that Julius Roſcius Hortinus having explained the rules of Auſonius by examples, inſerted them in this Edition. Miræus (8), and Moreri after him, pretend that this Roſcius procured it; but Poſſevinus would induce us to think otherwiſe. I know not whether the Cento of Lelius Capilupus againſt women be among them. It is a very ingenious, but too ſatyrical piece, and is found in the collection entitled *Baudii Amores*, printed at Leyden in 1638. I am to obſerve, that Camillus, Hippolytus, Lelius, and Julius Capilupus were not brothers, as ſome writers have aſſured (9). Their Italian Poems are inſerted in the *Deliciæ Poetarum Italorum*. Teiſſier informs us, that *Hippolyto Capiluppi excelled in ſatyrical Poetry* (10); but others affirm that he, as well as Julius and Camillus, excelled in the Elegiac: *alio atque alio carminum genere famam ſuam propagarunt, floridiores tamen elegiaco* (11). Theſe are Borrichius's words, who may be charged with a conſiderable omiſſion; for he did not know that Julius Capilupus had diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his Cento's, Borrichius mentioning only thoſe of Lelio.

(1) Thuan. lib. 16. *ſub fin.* pag. m. 583.
(2) Poſſevin. *Bibl. Select.* lib. 17. cap. 24. pag. 437.
(3) Ghilini, *Teatr.* tom. 1. pag. 145.
(4) The place of his birth.
(5) Ghilini's *Teatro*, tom. 1. pag. 145.
(6) Poſſevin. *Bibl. Select.* lib. 17. cap. cap. 24. pag. 437.
(7) Idem, ibid.
(8) Aubert. Miræus, *de Scriptor. Sæc.* 16. pag. 99.
(9) Baillet, *Jugem. ſur les Poetes*, tom. 2. num. 1300. pag. 277.
(10) Teiſſier, *Addit. aux Eloges* tom. 1. pag. 179.
(11) Borrichius, *Diſſert. de Poetis*, pag. 96.

CAPISTRAN (JOHN) a Franciſcan Friar (a) lived in the fifteenth Century. He was born in the village of Capiſtran in Italy, anno 1385 (b). He acquired prodigious reputation by his zeal, his eloquence, and the regularity of his manners. He was ſent into Bohemia, in order to labour at the converſion of the Huſſites [A]; and he preached a Cruſade againſt the Turks in Germany, in Hungary [B], and in Poland (c). His eloquence ſeconded ſo happily the valour of Hunniades, that he contributed greatly to the victories which the Chriſtians gained over Mahomet, and particularly to the famous battle of Belgrade in 1456. Theſe two men divided ſo evidently the glory of the victories which were gained, that it was thought there was a kind of jealouſy between them; for in the relations which Capiſtran made of the victory of Belgrade, no notice was taken of John Hunniades; and the relations of the latter did not make the leaſt mention of Capiſtran. The conjecture or reflection of Æneas Silvius on this head is extremely judicious [C]. Capiſtran died a little after the victory laſt mentioned (d), and was buried at Willak in Hungary. We are told, that many miracles were wrought at his tomb, and that his prayers put a ſtop to the miracles of a lay-brother (e). He was canonized in October 1690 by Pope Alexander VIII. He had before been beatified by Gregory XV. He wrote ſome books [D]. Some very ſurprizing effects are related of his eloquence [E]. His corps about an hundred years after being buried, had been removed

(a) Not a Dominican, as is aſſerted by Leunclavius, *Pandect.* cap. 133. cited by Guillet, *Hiſt. of Mahomet II.* tom. 2. pag. 431.

(b) Labbe, *de Scriptor. Eccleſ.* tom. 1. pag. 518.

(c) Guillet, *Hiſt. de Mahomet.* tom. 1. pag. 288.

(d) The 3d of October 1456. He was 71 years of age. Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſ.* tom. 1. pag. 519.

(e) See the remark [E] *ad finem.*

[A] *He was ſent into Bohemia, to labour at the converſion of the Huſſites.*] It is ſaid that his *labours were very ſucceſsful*; and that he at laſt required them, *as a proof of the ſincerity of their converſion, and by way of penance for their errors, to take up arms and march againſt Mahomet. It is on this occaſion that Chalcondylas* (*) *has ſpoken of Capiſtran and the Bohemians from incorrect memoirs; he ſaying that thoſe people worſhipped the God Apollo, and that Capiſtran won them from that Idolatry* (1).

(*) Chalcond. lib. 8.

(1) Guillet, *Hiſtoire de Mahom. II.* tom. 1. pag. 314.

[B] *He preached a Cruſade againſt the Turks . . . in Hungary.*] The French Author whom I cite in the preceding remark obſerves, that *as Capiſtran was a Picentine born, he had been admired in his own country for the beauty of his Italian; but that this tongue was of no ſervice to him in Hungary, he not being underſtood there: ſo that he had little ſucceſs in preaching the Cruſade there; he not having brought more than five hundred men, under the ſtandard of the Crucifix* (2). Methinks this made him equally unfit to preach in Germany and Poland, and to convert the Huſſites. Read the laſt Remark.

(2) Guillet, ibid.

[C] *The conjecture of Æneas Silvius . . . . is extremely judicious.*] He is firmly perſuaded, that it was a ſecret thirſt of fame, which prompted both to be ſilent on this occaſion; and he obſerves farther that mankind can with much greater eaſe renounce riches and pleaſures, than the praiſe and honour of their fellow-creatures. Each aſcribed the glory to God, and acknowledged that to him they owed the victory; but at the ſame time each appropriated to himſelf the honour of having been the inſtrument of heaven. Ambition and vanity will not prevent men from acknowledging a thing is entirely owing to God; they are not afraid of ſuch a rival; and they refuſe to creatures like themſelves any ſhare in their reputation; and with theſe they decline all competition. Here follow the words of Æneas Silvius, who was afterwards Pope Pius II. *Auctores victoriæ tres Joannes habiti, legatus Cardinalis, cujus auſpicio res geſta eſt, Huniadis & Capiſtranus, qui prælio interfuere. Verùm neque Capiſtranus Huniadis, neque idem Capiſtrani Huniades mentionem fecere in eis Literis, quas ambo, obtenta victoria, ſive ad Romanum Pontificem, ſive ad amicos ſcripſere; per ſuum quiſquam miniſterium Deum dediſſe Chriſtianis victoriam affirmavit. Avariſſima honoris humana mens, facilius Regnum & opes, quàm gloriam partitur. Potuit Capiſtranus Patrimonium contemnere, voluptates calcare, libidinem ſubigere, gloriam verò ſpernere non potuit,* &c. (3). He ſpeaks to much the ſame effect in another Book. *Huniades & Capiſtranus huic bello interfuere, uterque rem geſtam ſcripſit, neque alterius mentionem fecit; alteruter ſolidam ſibi rei geſtæ laudem uſurpavit. Ingens dulcedo gloriæ, facilius contemnenda dicitur, quam contemnitur. Spreverat Capiſtranus ſæculi pompas, fugerat delicias, calcaverat avaritiam, libidinem ſubegerat, contemnere gloriam non potuit. Qui ſummo Pontifici bellum, atque exitum Belli deſcribens, nulla Huniadis, nulla Cardinalis facta mentione, totum ſuum eſſe dixit, quod geſtum erat, quamvis Deum in primis victoriæ confeſſus fuerit auctorem. Nemo eſt tum Sanctus, qui dulcedine gloriæ non capiatur. Facilius Regna Viri excellentes, quam gloriam contemnunt,* &c. (4). The endeavours which Guillet employed, in order to excuſe theſe two great men, are very praiſe-worthy; but ſtill, this muſt not induce us to believe, that he has juſtified them well. Some, ſays he (5), *have aſcribed this ſilence to a ſecret jealouſy that each of them harboured; whence it was ſaid of Capiſtran, that of all the vanities of the world, there was but one (the thirſt of praiſe) which he had not yet trampled under foot. But to excuſe theſe two great men, we may ſay, that each of them would aſcribe this triumph to God only; and that neither would furniſh the other with a ſubject for vanity, in oppoſition to the modeſty and humility enjoined by Chriſtianity.* This is aſcribing to them a ſtrange kind of charity. Each acknowledged himſelf to be the inſtrument of heaven (6). He therefore did not fear aſcribing to himſelf a *ſubject for vanity*; or elſe he choſe to run the hazard of committing a crime, rather than expoſe his companion to it; or laſtly, he was diffident of his friend's modeſty, but not of his own; and even this would be an act of vanity. They who endeavour to apologize for the mutual ſilence of theſe two great men, by ſaying, that one was not the other's Hiſtoriographer; and that each contented himſelf with relating ſuch things as he himſelf had executed (7), employ a very weak reaſon. If Marſhal de Brezé and de Chatillon had ſent to Lewis XIII a relation of the battle of Avein, in which one of them ſhould have made no mention of the other, might not a perſon pronounce very ſafely, that jealouſy was the motive of this ſilence?

(3) Æneas Silvius, *Hiſtor. Europæ*, cap. 8. pag. 403. edit. Baſil. 1571.

(4) Idem, *Hiſt. Bohemiæ*, pag. 138.

(5) Guillet, *Hiſtoire de Mahomet*, tom. 1. pag. 330, 331.

(6) *Per ſuum quiſquam miniſterium Deum dediſſe Chriſtianis victoriam affirmavit.* Æneas Silvius, *Hiſtor. Europæ*, pag. 403.

(7) *Uterque videtur ea infami nota liberandus quia neuter agebat alterius Hiſtoricum, ſed quilibet de iis quæ per ſeipſum tractaverat, atque perfecerat, commonebat Pontificem.* Th. Raynaudus. *Hoploth.* Sect. 2. Serie 3. cap. 11. pag. m. 368.

[D] *He wrote ſome Books.*] *Speculum Clericorum. De Poteſtate Papæ & Conſilii. De pœnis Inferni & Purgatorii.* Another piece againſt the Huſſites, and particularly againſt John de Roqueſane their Biſhop (8) &c.

(8) Bellarm. *de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.*

[E] *Some very ſurprizing effects are related of his eloquence.*] He went to Nuremberg in 1452, and was there received in great pomp by all the Clergy. He cauſed a pulpit to be ſet up in the middle of the great ſquare, and there preached for ſome days, in ſo forcible a manner againſt vice, that he obliged the inhabitants to make a pile of their cards and dice, and afterwards ſet fire to them (9), which being done, he exhorted them to take up arms againſt the Turks. The year after he went to Breſlaw in Sileſia, and there inveighed ſtrongly againſt cards and dice; and commanding a pile to be made of them all, he ſet fire to it. But the power of his eloquence was not confined merely to the doing this execution on inanimate things, he exerting his power in a moſt dreadful manner over the Jews; and cauſed a great number of them to be burnt in all parts of Sileſia, upon pretence of their behaving irreverently towards the conſecrated bread. He uſed to preach two hours in Latin, after which another uſed to repeat Capiſtran's Sermons in the language of the country (10).

(9) Compare this with chap. 19. ver. 19. of the Acts of the Apoſtles.

The following Latin paſſage enumerates ſeveral particulars. *Johannes Capiſtranus in Germaniam deſcendit, prædicans magno zelo verbum Dei, in Auſtria, Bavaria, Suevia, Thuringia, & Saxonia. Nam in civitate Magdeburgenſi, in novo foro, maxima ad illam confluente multitudine, cùm eſſet Germanicæ linguæ non ignarus,*

(10) *Ex Theatro Pauli Freheri*, pag. 89.

removed to another Monaſtery, when the Turks took Sirmiſch; but it was torn to pieces, and thrown into a well, when the Proteſtants plundered that Monaſtery (*f*).

(*f*) Ilthuanffi, *Hiſt. Hungar.* lib. 10. *apud* Spondan. *ad ann.* 1456. num. 6.

rus, Latino ſermone prædicabat Latinis in tertiam horam, populo ſolis geſtibus ejus, quos antè non viderat, ſatis vehementer permoto. Aderat ex Germanis ſui Ordinis Fratribus vir æquè doctus, qui poſt illum non minore tempore dicens interpretabatur populo, quæ ille dixiſſet. Moti ſunt omnes, & uſque adeò permoti, ut fœminæ abuſum in ornatu, viri ludos, quibus tempora perdunt, ſcacorum alearumque in unum contulerint, & in eodem loco igne ſubdito concremârint. Fertur idem aliquot ſanitatis ſigna feciſſe, ut vulgo eſt creditum. Sed eſt in ea re ſæpè loquacior fama. Hoc conſtat, virum fuiſſe incredibilis in vita & moribus auſteritatis & ſanctitatis. Sed eſt ſpiritus ille torrens, quo tum commotus populus, illa quæ diximus, fecit, ut non diù perſeveret. Facilè redit res in abuſum, ut eſt hodiè cernere per omnes terras & urbes (11). i. e. "John Capiſtran went into "Germany, preaching very zealouſly the word of "God in Auſtria, Bavaria, Schawaben, Thuringia "and Saxony. For being in the new market of the "city of Magdeburg, and a multitude flocking "about him, altho' he was not ignorant of the Ger-"man language, he yet preached upwards of two "hours in Latin to thoſe who underſtood the tongue; "the people being ſtrongly affected, merely by the "force of his action, they having never ſeen ſuch "geſtures before. There was preſent on this occaſion a "German, of the ſame Religious Order with Capiſtran, "a man as learned as himſelf, who interpreted in the "ſame time as Capiſtran had employed, his Latin to "the multitude. All the auditors were moved to ſo "prodigious a degree, that the women taking off "their ſuperfluous ornaments, and the men bringing "gaming tables and dice, at which they uſed to miſ-"pend their time; they made a pile of the whole, "and burnt them in that place. It is vulgarly re-"ported, that Capiſtran performed ſome miraculous "cures, but fame often exceeds the bounds of truth "on theſe occaſions. This is certain, that he was a "man of incredible auſterity and holineſs in his life "and manners. But this ſpirit, which then moved "the people to all theſe things, was like a flood, "and ſo not laſting. Matters of this nature eaſily re-"turn to their former abuſes, as is ſeen in every part "of the earth." The reader will obſerve 1ſt, that, according to the Author whence theſe particulars are extracted, Capiſtran's eloquence produced this great reformation, not in Nuremberg, but in Magdeburg. 2dly, That this reformation was but of ſhort continuance. 3dly, That with regard to Capiſtran's miracles, we muſt not give too much credit to common fame. 4thly, That with reſpect to the auſterity of his life, there is no room to doubt of it, it being an undoubted fact. Capiſtran could not be afraid of thoſe ſatyrical flings which are thrown out againſt jolly Preachers, who aſſiduouſly exhort their flock to faſt and mortify the fleſh; for he was a little, lank creature, made up of nothing but ſkin and bones. This is the deſcription which Hertmannus Scheydel, who had ſeen Capiſtran, gives of him (12). *Capiſtranum puſillum corpore Nurmbergæ vidi, ætate ſenectâ annos quinque & ſexaginta natum, ſiccum, aridum, exhauſtum, ſola cute, nerviſque & oſſibus compactum, lætum tamen & in laborem fortem; ſine intermiſſione ſingulis diebus prædicantem, altas ac profundas materias abſolventem.* i. e. "I ſaw Capiſtran at Nuremberg. He was then three-"ſcore and five, ſhort, extremely lean, emaciated, "and a compoſition of mere ſkin and bones, but at "the ſame time chearful and very laborious: he ne-"ver failing to preach every day, and to explain the "moſt profound matters."

(11) Alb. Krantzius, *Saxon.* lib. 11. cap. 35. pag. m. 841.

(12) *In ſexta mundi ætate, apud* Sadulium Comment. *in Vitam S. Franciſci*, pag. 260.

I muſt not omit, that his Prayers wrought as great an effect as his Sermons. It was theſe ſuſpended the Miracles which were wrought at the grave of one Thomas of Florence (13), who had been a lay-brother in a Franciſcan Monaſtery. There were ſome apprehenſions, that whilſt endeavours were uſed to get St. Bernardin canonized, the Miracles of the Lay-brother might retard the affair; for which reaſon Capiſtran addreſſed a very fervent Prayer to him, in order that they might be ſuſpended. He was heard. Thomas of Florence, that he might not put a ſtop to the affair, nor give occaſion to any obſtacles or delays, ſuſpended his miraculous virtue; and did not reſume it, till after St. Bernardin had been canonized. Spondanus relates the incident thus. *Memoria dignum eſt*, ſays he (14), *quod Chronicon refert Minorum* (*); *cùm eo tempore quo de canonizatione Bernardini ageretur, Reate defunctus quidam Thomas Florentinus ejuſdem ordinis Laïcus, miraculis etiam fulgeret, ne inde aliquâ ratione Bernardini negotium retarderetur, Joannem de Capiſtrano inſignem alium ejuſdem Ordinis Patrem antè Thomæ ſepulchrum proſtratum, orâſſe ut tamdiù à miraculis edendis abſtineret, quoad Bernardini canonizatio perfecta eſſet; Thomamque ceſſâſſe, atque eâ factâ rurſum continuâſſe.* This is not the only proof that may be given, of the regard which the Saints have one for the other. St. Germain ſhewed St. Martin a complaiſance, that has all the air of human politeneſs. "The relicks of St. "Martin having been carried thorough all parts of "France, arrived at Auxerre, and being depoſited in "St. Germain's Church, wrought a great many Mi-"racles. The Monks of Auxerre, being perſuaded "that St. Germain was as great a Saint as St. Martin, "inſiſted upon half the offerings (which were very "conſiderable) made on that occaſion. But the Prieſts "of St. Martin declared, that as their Saint alone, "wrought all the Miracles, all the offerings ought to "be his. To juſtify that what they aſſerted was no-"thing but the truth, they deſired that a ſick per-"ſon might be laid between the two ſhrines of St. "Germain and St. Martin, and that it would then "appear which of them wrought the Miracle. Ac-"cordingly a leper was brought, who was ſoon healed "on that ſide which lay towards the ſhrine of St. "Martin, but not on that turned towards St. Ger-"main; and after this, the diſeaſed part being turned "towards St. Martin's ſhrine, it alſo healed. *It is "not*, ſays Cardinal Baronius, *that St. Germanius was not "as great a Saint as St. Martin, and wrought a great "number of Miracles: but becauſe St. Martin had fa-"voured him with a viſit, he ſuſpended the power "with which God was pleaſed to endow him, in or-"der to give the better reception to his gueſt* (15)."

(13) It may be obſerved on this occaſion, that ſome Saints have ceaſed their miracles, becauſe they were forbid to perform any. See Mr. Baſnage, *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe*, tom. 2. pag. 1283.

(14) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1444, num. 22. pag. m. 911.

(*) *Chron. Min.* lib. 2. Part 3. cap. 28.

(15) Bourſault, *Lettres Nouvelles*, pag. 397, 398. edit. de Hollande, 1698.

CAPISUCCHI. A Roman family, which has given birth to ſeveral illuſtrious perſons in theſe laſt ages, as will be ſeen in the following articles; and as appears more at large from the Hiſtory which Vincenzo Armanni publiſhed of that family, and from the genealogy written by Ughelli. See alſo Father Tarquin Gallucci, in his firſt book *De Bello Belgico*.

CAPISUCCHI (BLASIUS) Marquis of Monterio, General of the Pope's forces at Avignon, about the end of the ſixteenth Century, was famous for his courage and his ſkill in the military arts. He performed a very remarkable action at the ſiege of Poitiers in 1569 (*A*). Pope Pius V has expreſly named this action in a Bull (*a*); others relate it with too many rhetorical flouriſhes [*B*]. This Roman Gentleman was at that

(*a*) Strada, *de Bello Belg.* Dec. II. lib. 5.

[*A*] *He performed a very remarkable action at the ſiege of Poitiers in* 1569.] The Proteſtants were beſieging Poitiers, and had already thrown a bridge over the river, in order to make an aſſault. Capiſucchi, with two other good ſwimmers, plunged into the river; and getting under the bridge cut in various places that which faſtened the pieces of it together (1), this ſoon made the whole bridge ſink into the water, which was of great ſervice to the beſieged.

(1) Davila, lib. 5.

[*B*] *Some relate it with too many rhetorical flouriſhes.*] According

that time in the company of Fuzilleers under Paul Sforza, brother to the Marquis of Santa-Fiore (*b*); and afterwards ſerved in the Low-Countries under the Duke of Parma (*c*), who ſent him to ſuccour Colen in 1584, during the war which was carried on againſt Gebhard Truchſes, a Proteſtant Elector, and married. Capiſucchi ſignalized himſelf in that Country [*C*]. He was afterwards made Lieutenant-General of the Duke of Florence's forces, and commanded thoſe of the Pope at Avignon and in the Comté Venaiſſin (*d*). In the Archives of the Vatican is preſerved a volume of his Letters, written to Cardinal Aldobrandini, nephew of Clement VIII. He had a brother called Camillo (*D*).

(*b*) Davila, lib. 5.

(*c*) Strada, *de Bell. Belg.* Dec. II. lib. 5. *ad ann.* 1584.

(*d*) Proſp. Mandoſius, *Bibliotb. Romana*, pag. 226.

According to Famianus Strada, this action was much more glorious, than Davila will allow it to be. The latter relates, that whilſt the ſwimmers were getting in the night-time under the bridge, in order to looſen it in ſeveral places, the beſieged alarmed the enemy ſeveral times, and made a ſally under the command of Fervaques, with a great diſcharge of the artillery; by which means they employed the beſiegers ſo much, that they did not perceive the breaking down of their bridge. Thoſe who furniſh'd Father Strada with the particulars of this action, did not find any thing wonderful in it; they thought it better to expoſe Blaſius Capiſucchi to a furious diſcharge of the ſmall arms; and to raiſe him above that Horace, who was one of the three Worthies of ancient Rome, in the war againſt Porſenna. Here follow the words of that eloquent Hiſtorian. *Ob iteratas Colonienſium ac Septemviri literas, addiderat Blaſium Capiſuccum, quem paulo ante ſclopetariorum equitum, mox & lancearium turmæ præfecerat; commendatum a fama præclari facinoris, quo in Pictavienſi obſidione, quum Hugonoti ad invadendam urbem flumini pontem injeciſſent, ipſe aquis immerſus crebra inter hoſtium miſſilia grandi cultro pontem intercidit, atque aditum ſubeuntibus interrupit. Veteris illius Romani patria non indignus, niſi quod ille poſt ſectum aliorum opera pontem tum fluminis periculum ſubiit urbis ſuæ ab hoſtibus jam ſecurus; hic à diſcrimine in aquis exorſus ſuis pontem manibus perfregit, hoſtibus à patria ſubmotis aliena, meritus ut facti memoriam Romanus Pontifex ſanctioribus literis inſeruerit* (2). i. e. "Upon "the repeated Letters of the inhabitants of Colen and "of the Elector, he joined Blaſius Capiſucchi, on "whom he had a little before beſtowed the command "of a troop of horſe-muſketeers, and afterwards that "of a company of pikemen; an officer who was fa"mous for the glorious action he atchieved at the "ſiege of Poitiers, when the Huguenots having "thrown a bridge over the river in order to aſſault "the town, Capiſucchi plunging into the waves a"midſt the uninterrupted vollies which were diſcharg"ed by the enemy, cut down the bridge and ſtopt "the paſſage of thoſe who were going over it. An "exploit certainly not unworthy his illuſtrious coun"tryman Horatius Cocles; but with this difference, "that Cocles did not plunge into the river, till others "had cut down the bridge, and his own city (Rome) "was ſecured from the attempts of the enemy; "whereas Capiſucchi plunging into the ſtream at the "beginning of the danger, drove the enemy from a "place belonging to a foreign Nation: an exploit "which has been thought worthy of being recorded in "the Pontifical Bulls." He cites in the margin a Bull of Pope Pius V dated the 10th of May 1567. He does not mark the year exactly, ſince the ſiege did not happen till two years after; but that is the leaſt error. He declares, that the bridge was broken down tho' the beſiegers let fly their ſmall-ſhot, and were already got upon it, in order to enter the city. This has more the air of an Orator than of an Hiſtorian, ſince Davila relates the contrary.

(2) Strada, *de Bello Belg.* Dec. II. lib. 5. pag. m. 305.

[*C*] *The Duke of Parma ſent him to ſuccour Colen.. he ſignalized himſelf in that Country.*] *Blaſio Capiſucco mandavit ut cum ſua lancearium turma... per Agrippinenſem Provinciam ac præcipuè per Bonnenſem agrum infeſtis ſignis excurreret,... quod ille prævia ſui fama quæ multa per eos Rheni tractus, ſtrenuè ac feliciter peregit, &c* (3). i. e. "He commanded Blaſius Capi"ſucchi to march his company of pikemen into the "territory of Colen, and that of Bon, and to com"mit hoſtilities, eſpecially in the latter.... This he "performed with prodigious bravery and ſucceſs, by "the great fame he had before acquired in the Coun"tries lying about the Rhine."

(3) Strada, *de Bello Belg.* Dec. II. lib. 5. pag. m. 301.

[*D*] *He had a brother called Camillo.*] This CAMILLO CAPISUCCHI, Marquis of Puy-Catin, was a famous Warrior in the ſixteenth Century. He gave ſeveral proofs of his valour at the famous battle of Lepanto, which occaſioned Don John of Auſtria, two years after, to give him the command of four hundred Gentlemen on board his ſhip, at the expedition of Tunis (4). He often ſignalized himſelf in the wars of the Low-Countries, where the Duke of Parma gave him a regiment of foot in 1584 (5). After ſeveral Campaigns in ſo inſtructive a ſchool, he was raiſed to the command of the Pope's forces, which he did with great reputation in Hungary; where he died in the beginning of November 1597, of a ſickneſs he had got by endeavouring ſtrenuouſly to prevent the breaking down of a bridge ſituated on the Danube. He was then in his ſixtieth year. He underſtood perfectly the Mathematicks and Fortifications; and wrote a work *de Officio Præfecti Caſtrorum*; which his heirs have ſtill in manuſcript. In the Archives of the Vatican ſeveral of his Letters are kept, written by him to Cardinal Aldobrandini nephew of Pope Clement VIII. His monument and epitaph are at Vienna in the Church of Sainte Croix (6). The exploits he performed in France under the Duke of Parma, are written very much at large by William Dondini the Jeſuit; in the Hiſtory of the Expeditions which that Duke was ordered to undertake, in favour of the League.

(4) Idem, *ad ann.* 1584.

(5) Idem Strada, *paſſim.*

(6) See the *Bibliotb. Romana* of Proſper Mandoſio.

CAPISUCCHI (JOHN ANTHONY) Cardinal of St. Pancratius, and afterwards of Santa Croce or the Holy Croſs of Jeruſalem, and laſtly of St. Clement, roſe by degrees to the Purple or Cardinalate. He was a Canon of the Vatican, and afterwards Auditor of the Rota under Pope Paul III. He was created Cardinal and Biſhop of Lando, by Paul IV; who alſo gave him an employment in the Inquiſition. He was Prefect of the ſignature of Grants under Pius V, and Governor of Gualdo, and the Pope's Legate. He died January the 29th, 1569, in his 54th year. He publiſhed Conſtitutions for his Dioceſe, and a Synod (*a*).

(*a*) *Ex Bib. Rom.* Proſperi Mandoſii.

CAPISUCCHI (PAUL) became famous in the ſixteenth Century for ſeveral employments he enjoyed, and negotiations performed by him. He was a Canon of the Vatican, Referendary of both ſignatures, Auditor of the Rota, Biſhop of Neocaſtro, Vicar-General of Clement VII and of Paul III, Prefect of the Signature of Grants, and Vice-Legate of Umbria. He pacified the diviſions which had broke out in Perugia, and again reduc'd this City to the allegiance it owed the Pope. He was as fortunate at Avignon under Paul III, ſince by his wiſdom and authority he cruſhed the ſeveral Factions which divided that State, and diſpoſed all the inhabitants of it to peace and fidelity. It was he whom Clement VII appointed to examine and report the important and critical affair of Henry VIIIth's divorce. He was at that time Dean of the Rota (*a*); and we find by the

(*a*) Palavic. *Iſtor. del Concil.* lib. 2. cap. 17.

the volume of his Deciſions, that he did not favour the King of England's deſign; ſince he declares in two of his Deciſions, that Henry had incurred the Pope's cenſures, for divorcing Katherine of Arragon, and marrying another woman, in ſpite of the prohibitions of the Holy See; and that Queen Katherine ought to be reſtored to her former dignity. He publiſhed ſeveral very uſeful Conſtitutions concerning the Troubles of Perugia and Avignon, in the Government of which he was Vice-Legate, and the Clerks of his Dioceſe. He died at Rome anno 1539 at ſixty years of age, and was buried in the vault belonging to his family by John Anthony Capiſucchi his nephew, Cardinal of St. Prancratius mentioned above (*b*).

(*b*) *Ex Biblioth. Romana Proſperi Mandoſii.*

CAPISUCCHI (RAYMUND) raiſed to the Purple by Pope Innocent XI, the firſt of September 1681, was ſon to Paul Capiſucchi, Marquis of Puy Catin. At fourteen years old he entered among the Dominicans, and afterwards taught Philoſophy publickly in Rome. Innocent X appointed him Secretary to the Congregation of the Index, and ſoon after to that of the Examination of Biſhops; and in 1654 created him Maſter of the Sacred Palace (*a*). Raymund Capiſucchi wrote ſeveral works [*A*].

(*a*) Extracted from Proſper. Mandoſii, *Bibl. Rom. Centur. V.* pag. 299, 300.

Alexander the VIIth removed him from the employment of Maſter of the Holy Palace, as I have obſerved elſewhere (*b*); and it was thought that his diſgrace would be attended with more dangerous conſequences. However this ſtorm blew over; the Pope acknowledged his innocence (*c*), and offered him a Biſhoprick; but finding that Capiſucchi choſe to live a conventual life, rather than be made a Biſhop, he raiſed him to the ſecond employment, both as to honour and authority among the Dominicans.

(*b*) In Note [*C*] of the Article (Vincent) BARON.

(*c*) *See* Father Baron, *Apologet.* tom. 2. lib. 5. pag. 343, *& ſeq.*

[*A*] *Raymund Capiſucchi wrote ſeveral Works.*] Here follow the titles of them. *Controverſiæ Theologicæ, Scholaſticæ, Morales, Dogmaticæ, Scripturales, ad mentem Divi Thomæ Aquinatis reſolutæ.* There is a ſecond edition of them reviſed and enlarged by the Author. *Appendices ad Controverſias ſupradictas. Vita beati Joannis Chiſii. Cenſura ſeu Votum ad Librum de Cultu & Veneratione Sanctorum Veteris Teſtamenti. Diſcurſus de gradu virtutum in Sanctis canonizandis requiſito.* The *Bibliotheca Romana* of Proſper Mandoſius, whence what I have here given is extracted, gives a liſt of ſeveral works of this Author which were ready for the preſs. There is one piece *de Contritione & Attritione*; and another *de Opinione probabili.* Some Controverſial Writers have obſerved, that Father Capiſucchi had approved the expoſition of the Biſhop of Condom, tho' it contained opinions different from thoſe of the Approver. See *l'Examen des Methodes propoſées par Meſſieurs de l'Aſſemblée du Clergé de France en l'année* 1682 (1).

(1) Mr. Baſnage who was at that time Miniſter in Roan, and has been ſo at Rotterdam ever ſince the year 1685, is Author of that excellent Work. It was printed at Rotterdam in 1684 for Henry de Graef, tho' the title ſays, *à Cologne, chez Pierre Marteau.* Capiſucchi's Extracts are in pag. 313, 315.

CAPPADOCIA, a country of Aſia, ſituate between Cilicia, Armenia, Colchis, the Euxine Sea, Paphlagonia, Galatia, &c. (*a*), was ſucceſſively divided in ſeveral manners. Ariarathes, who was the firſt King of it [*A*], reunited the Cataones and the Cappadocians. The Perſians divided this Kingdom into two Satrapies. The Macedonians preſerved this diviſion [*B*], and partly by force, and partly by conſent, ſuffered them to be converted into two Kingdoms, of which the one was called Cappadocia ſimply, or Great Cappadocia,

(*a*) Strabo, lib. 12. *init.*

(1) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 368.

[*A*] *Ariarathes . . . was the firſt King of it.*] Strabo, who ſays this (1), does not tell us when this ſame Ariarathes lived, and we find in Diodorus Siculus ſome room to doubt whether the firſt King of Cappadocia was ſo named. We find there that Atoſſa, the ſiſter of Cambyſes the father of Cyrus, was wife to Pharnaces King of Cappadocia, and that ſhe bore him a ſon who was named Gallus (2). This laſt was father of Smerdis, and grandfather of Artames, and great grandfather of Anaphas, who left a ſon of the ſame name, who was father of a very brave Prince named Datames. He, being ſlain in battle by the Perſians, left the Kingdom to his ſon Ariamnes, who poſſeſſed it fifty years, and had two ſons, Ariarathes and Holophernes. They both reigned in Cappadocia, and loved one another tenderly. ARIARATHES, having joined the Perſians in the expedition againſt Egypt, acquired a great deal of glory there, and returned home loaded with honours by King Ochus. He left two ſons, ARIARATHES and Aryſas. The eldeſt ſucceeded his uncle Holophernes, who having no children of his own had adopted him. Here are, therefore, a great many Princes who reigned in Cappadocia before Ariarathes the firſt of that name. Moreri, who places but ſix between Pharnaces and him (3), has not reckoned right; and ſince he ſays their names are not known, it is plain he had not read Diodorus Siculus. I do not know whether Appian had read him, or whether he judged him unworthy of credit; but I know well enough that he declares he cannot tell for certain whether Cappadocia had particular Kings before the time of Alexander, or whether it was a Province of the Perſian Monarchy (4).

(2) Diodorus Siculus, *in Eclogis*, lib. 31. pag. m. 1164.

(3) Moreri, at the Word *Cappadoce.*

(4) Appianus, *in Mithridaticis*, pag. m. 117.

[*B*] *The Perſians divided this Kingdom into two Satrapies. The Macedonians preſerved this diviſion.*] It is Strabo who ſays this (5). But we have juſt now heard Diodorus Siculus, who ſpeaks of Cappadocia as of a country governed by a ſingle King independent of Perſia. I acknowledge he ſays that Anaphas had ſo much courage that he rather choſe to abandon the government of Cappadocia, than to pay a tribute to the Perſians; and I believe, at the bottom, that the Kings of Cappadocia were tributary to thoſe of Perſia; but however he does not ſpeak of that kind of dependance; he ſays nothing which inſinuates that Cappadocia contained any Satrapies of the Perſian Monarchy, and he ſays all that is neceſſary to induce one to be of another opinion. Let us proceed to the other part of this remark. He obſerves that Ariarathes King of Cappadocia had maintained himſelf in the poſſeſſion of his Dominions while Alexander ſubdued Perſia, and employed himſelf in other expeditions which prevented his thinking of him (6). Quintus Curtius notwithſtanding ſays that Conqueror made himſelf Maſter of Cappadocia, and that he left a Governor there, when he departed thence in queſt of Darius (7). But it muſt be ſuppoſed that Governor did not maintain himſelf there long; for we read in the ſame Q. Curtius that after the death of Alexander, Eumenes was charged with the defence of Cappadocia ſo far as Trapezus, and to make war againſt Ariarathes who was the only perſon who refuſed to ſubmit. *Et bellum cum Ariarathe gereret: ſolus hic detrectabat imperium* (8). Appian thinks it probable that Alexander left the Cappadocians under the government of their own Princes, in conſideration of a certain tribute (9). He adds that the Hiſtorian Hieronymus ſays that Conqueror did not ſo much as enter into the Country. Mithridates, in his harangues, boldly aſſerted that Cappadocia was one of thoſe parts of Aſia which neither Alexander nor his ſucceſſors had touched (10). However that be, let us reſume the thread of Diodorus Siculus's narration.

(5) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 368.

(6) Diodor. Sic. lib. 18. pag. 920.

(7) Quint. Curtius, lib. 3. cap. 4.

(8) Idem, lib. 10. cap. 10. *See* Freinſhemius on this paſſage; he ſhews that we ſhould read *Ariarathe*, and not *Arbate.*

(9) Appianus *in Mithridat.* pag. 117.

(10) Juſtinus, lib. 38. cap. 7. pag. m. 560.

After Alexander's death, his ſucceſſors would not ſuffer Cappadocia to be free from the Macedonian yoke. Perdiccas entred it with a great army, and found Ariarathes prepared to defend himſelf, having thirty thouſand foot, and fifteen thouſand horſe. A battle was

Cappadocia, and the other was called Pontus, or Cappadocia Pontica (*b*). Great Cappadocia was divided into ten Provinces, and continued ſo in Strabo's time, and under King Archelaüs, after whom it was reduced into a Province of the Roman Empire (*c*). This country abounded in horſes, aſſes, and mules (*d*), and it is even ſaid that the mules there were not barren (*e*). It was from thence they had thoſe horſes which were ſo peculiarly deſtined for the Emperor's own perſon, that the Conſuls themſelves were forbidden to make uſe of them (*f*). It alſo furniſhed a great number of ſlaves [C], falſe witneſſes, and tranſparent ſtones [D]; but money was very ſcarce there [E]: they made excellent bread there (*g*), and the beſt Bakers in the world were thoſe of this country (*h*). The Romans, when they granted their friendſhip to thoſe who reigned

(*b*) Idem, ibid. pag. 368.

(*c*) Idem, ibid. pag. 367 & 368.

(*d*) Lloyd cites ſeveral Authors for this. *See alſo* Bochart's *Phaleg*, Book 3. chap. 11.

(*e*) *Theophraſtus vulgo parere* (mulas) *in Cappadociâ tradit, ſed eſſe id animal ibi ſui generis.* Plin. lib. 8. cap. 44. pag. m. 216.

(*f*) Bochart. *Phaleg*, lib. 3. cap. 11.

(*g*) Athen. lib. 3. pag. 113.

(*h*) Idem, ibid. pag. 112.

was fought: Perdiccas gained it: Ariarathes was taken priſoner, and crucified with ſeveral others; and the government of Cappadocia was given to Eumenes. Let us take notice here of a fault of Juſtin's. He ſays that Perdiccas's victory over Ariarathes brought no advantage to the conqueror, becauſe the vanquiſhed retired into the city, killed their wives and children, burned their houſes, and threw themſelves into the midſt of the flames (11). He confounds things. What he relates paſſed in Piſidia, at the ſiege of Iſaura, after Cappadocia had been reduced to obedience by the defeat and execution of Ariarathes (12). We ſhall ſee below (13) that the Macedonians kept this country but a very little while.

(11) Ibid. lib. 12. cap. 6.

(12) *See* Diodorus Sicul. lib. 18. cap. 22. pag. 926. and the *Juſtin Variorum* of Grævius, pag. 309.

(13) In the Remark [I].

[C] *This country . . . furniſhed . . . a great number of ſlaves.*] This appears from the following words of Cicero: *Cappadocem modo abreptum de grege venalium diceres*; i. e. "You would take him for a Cappadocian juſt bought in the Slave-market (14);" and by this paſſage of Perſius:

(14) Cicero, *in Orat. poſt reditum in Senatu*, folio 170. A.

Vende animam lucro, mercare, atque excute ſollers
Omne latus mundi, ne ſit præſtantior alter
Cappadocas rigida pingues plauſiſſe cataſta (15).

That is,

"Go, miſer, go, for lucre ſell thy ſoul,
"Truck wares for wares, and trudge from pole
" to pole:
"That men may ſay, when thou art dead and gone,
"See what a vaſt eſtate he left his ſon!
"How large a family of brawny knaves,
"Well-fed, and fat as Cappadocian ſlaves!

Dryden.

(15) Perſius, Sat. 6. *ſub fin.*

Hither may be referred what Horace ſays, that the King of Cappadocia was deſtitute of money tho' very rich in ſlaves:

Mancipiis locuples eget æris Cappadocum rex (16).

(16) Horat. *Epiſt.* 6. lib. 1. ver. 39.

Mr. Dacier obſerves, *that when Lucullus was in Cappadocia, an ox was ſold but for . . . ſix pence, and a man for no more than four and twenty pence* (17). Take notice that the ſlaves of this country, thoſe of Cilicia, and thoſe of Crete, paſſed for ſad raſcals, and occaſioned the proverb *tria cappa peſſima*. See the *Prolufions* of Famianus Strada (18).

(17) Dacier, on this paſſage of Horace, tom. 8. pag. m. 327.

(18) Lib. 3. Plautina II, pag. m. 485.

[D] . . . *And of falſe witneſſes, and tranſparent ſtones.*] It is ſaid the Cappadocians accuſtomed themſelves from their infancy to indure pain, and that they tortured one another to harden themſelves againſt the puniſhments to which their falſe teſtimonies might one day expoſe them, and alſo to raiſe the price of their perjuries in proportion to the degree of conſtancy they had acquired. This is the ſenſe which I give the following words of the Scholiaſt on Perſius: *Vel quia Cappadoces dicerenter habere ſtudium naturale ad falſa teſtimonia proferenda: qui nutriti in tormentis a pueritia equuleum ſibi facere dicuntur, ut in eo ſe invicem torqueant, & cum in pœna perdurarent, ad falſa teſtimonia ſe bene venundarent* (19). Theſe people out-did the Grecian Nation, tho' they were exceedingly addicted to this vice, if we may believe Cicero, who attributes to them the having given occaſion to that way of ſpeaking, *Lend me your teſtimony, and I will return it you.* He expreſſes the ill qualities of the Grecian Witneſſes ſo eloquently, that I cannot forbear preſenting that fine deſcription to be read here. *Hoc dico de toto genere Græcorum; tribuo illis literas, do multarum artium diſciplinam, non adimo ſermonis leporem, ingeniorum acumen, dicendi copiam: denique etiam ſi qua ſibi alia ſumunt, non repugno. Teſtimoniorum religionem, & fidem, nunquam iſta natio coluit: totiuſque hujuſce rei quæ ſit vis, quæ autoritas, quod pondus, ignorant. Unde illud eſt? Da mihi teſtimonium mutuum: num Gallorum? num Hiſpanorum putatur? totum iſtud Græcorum eſt: ut etiam qui Græcè neſciunt, hoc quibus verbis a Græcis dici ſoleat, ſciant. Itaque videte quo vultu, qua confidentia dicant: tum intelligetis qua religione dicant. Nunquam nobis ad rogatum reſpondent, ſemper accuſatori plus quàm ad rogatum: nunquam laborant, quemadmodum probent quod dicunt; ſed quemadmodum ſe explicent dicendo. . . . Græcus teſtis cum ea voluntate proceſſit, ut lædat, non jurisjurandi, ſed lædendi verba meditatur. Vinci, refelli, coargui putat eſſe turpiſſimum; ad id ſe parat, nihil aliud curat. Itaque non optimus quiſque, nec graviſſimus, ſed impudentiſſimus loquaciſſimuſque deligitur.* i. e. "This I ſay of the whole Grecian race: "I allow them to have learning, I grant them to be "ſkilful in ſeveral arts, I deny them neither delicacy "of ſpeech, ſharpneſs of wit, nor copiouſneſs of expreſſion: and, to ſay no more, whatever other valuable "qualifications they may aſſume to themſelves, I will "not diſpute. But the ſacred obligation of an oath, "and ſincerity in giving evidence, has this Nation "never regarded; being utterly ignorant what force, "what authority, what weight there is in this matter. Whence is that ſaying, Lend me your teſtimony? Is it thought to owe its original to the Gauls, "or to the Spaniards? it is wholly from the Grecians; "ſo that even they who underſtand not Greek, know "in what words this is uſually expreſſed by them. "Therefore obſerve with what countenance, with "what aſſurance they ſpeak: ſo ſhall ye perceive with "what regard to truth they ſpeak. They never return us an anſwer to what is aſked, but always anſwer the accuſer more than the queſtion: they never trouble themſelves how to make out what they "ſay, but how to expreſs themſelves in ſpeaking. . . . "A Grecian Witneſs, when he appears with intent to "do miſchief, conſiders not the words of his oath, "but thoſe which may be miſchievous. To be foiled, "to be refuted, to be convinced, he thinks moſt ignominious; this he prepares againſt, and cares for "nothing elſe. So that not the beſt man, or the "graveſt, but the moſt impudent and loquacious is "pitched upon (20)." This brings to my mind certain ſtories which I have heard a hundred times, that there is a Province in France (21) where the Gentlemen write to one another, *I deſire you to lend me your witneſſes for a few days*, and where people are to be met with who when they are aſked, What trade are you of? anſwer, *Sir, I am a witneſs at your ſervice.*

(19) Schol. Perſii *in hæc verba* Sat. 6. ver. 77. *Cappadocas rigida pingues plauſiſſe cataſta.*

(20) Cicero, *Orat. pro L. Flacco, circa init.* fol. m. 150, A.

(21) See *the Treatiſe of Mr. de Brieux on the Original of certain Proverbs.*

As to the tranſparent ſtones which were found in Cappadocia, I ſhall only cite Pliny. *Hiſpania hunc* (ſpecularem lapidem) *olim citerior tantum dabat, nec tota, ſed intra centum millia paſſuum circa Segobricam urbem: jam & Cypros & Cappadocia, & Sicilia, & nuper inventum Africa: poſtferendos omnes tamen Hiſpaniæ & Cappadociæ, molliſſimis, & ampliſſimæ magnitudinis, ſed obſcuris.* i. e. "This ſtone" *(he ſpeaks of the Lapis ſpecularis or Talc)* "formerly the hither "Spain alone furniſhed, and not the whole country "neither, but only that which lies within an hundred "miles round the city Segobrica: at preſent it is alſo "had from Cyprus, Cappadocia, and Sicily, and "from Africa where it has been lately found out: "yet they are all inferior to thoſe of Spain and Cappadocia, which are very ſoft, and exceeding large, "but obſcure (22)." He adds that in the reign of Nero there was diſcovered in Cappadocia a ſort of ſtone hard as marble, white and tranſparent (23), which they called Phengites. Nero made great uſe of it in his buildings (24); and Domitian, fearing conſpiracies, and deſirous of ſeeing what was done behind him, cauſed the galleries where he uſed to walk to be ſet round with it (25).

(22) Plin. lib. 36. cap. 12. pag. 331.

(23) *Tranſlucent etiam quæ partes fulvæ incidurant venæ.* Plin. lib. 36. cap. 22. pag. 332.

(24) Idem, ibid.

(25) Sueton. *in Domit.* cap. 14.

[E] *Money was very ſcarce there.*] The verſe of Horace

reigned in Cappadocia, comprehended the inhabitants therein [*F*], I mean they received the King and the People jointly into their alliance. They did not act in the same manner with regard to the Kings of other Nations; for they declared them their friends, without making any mention of the People (*i*). This might induce one to believe that the inhabitants of Cappadocia lived under a mixed Government, partly Aristocratical, and partly Monarchical; but I have some difficulty to be persuaded of it. What is very certain is that they could not live without a King [*G*]. There were a great many Magi in their country, and a great many places of devotion [*H*]. It must not be concluded from hence that this is peculiar to rude, ignorant, and brutish Nations; for, in matter of superstition, they equalled neither the Greeks nor the Romans, and there are some Nations in the world, which are barbarous and stupid to such a degree, as to have no Religion at all. We shall see in the Remarks part of the History of the Princes who have reigned in Cappadocia [*I*]. They usually resided at Mazaca (*k*), a city situated under the mountain

(*i*) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 372.

(*k*) Idem, ibid. pag. 371.

Horace which has been quoted above (26), is a proof of this. Mr. Dacier fortifies it from the cheapness of oxen and men, and by saying that the Cappadocians *paid their tribute to the great King in horses and mules* (27). He forgets not Cicero, who *speaking of Cappadocia, and its King Ariobarzanes, says, Mehercule ego ita judico, nihil illo regno spoliatius, nihil rege egentius.* i. e. "I am really persuaded there is nothing "more destitute of money than that Kingdom, nothing "poorer than its King (28)." Cicero was then Governour of Cilicia. He observed that Ariobarzanes was too much loaded with debts to be able to pay Brutus and Pompey both at once. He paid every month to the agents of the latter thirty three Attic talents, and this was not sufficient to discharge the interest. He was obliged to impose taxes, which he did by the direction of Appius (†); for he had no ordinary revenues; and he exhausted what was brought in by those taxes in such a manner, that he could pay nothing to his other creditors (29). *Alii neque solvit quicquam nec potest solvere: nullum enim erarium, nullum vectigal habet. Appii* (30) *instituto tributa imperat, ea vix in fœnus Pompeii quod satis sit efficiunt* (31). Though he was very poor (32), yet at length he paid near one hundred talents to Brutus in one year, and he promised to pay two hundred to Pompey at the end of six months (33).

(26) Citation (16).

(27) Dacier, *Rem. sur Horace*, tom. 8. pag. 327.

(28) Cicero, *Epist. I.* lib. 6. *ad Atticum*, pag. 569.

(†) See Citation (30).

(29) Idem, ibid.

(30) It was he who had governed Cilicia before Cicero.

(31) Cicero, *Epist.* 1. lib. 6. *ad Atticum*, pag. 569.

(32) *Erat enim rex perpauper.* Idem, ibid. Epist. 3. pag. 612.

(33) Idem, ibid. pag. 613.

[*F*] *The Romans, when they granted their friendship to those who reigned in Cappadocia, comprehended the inhabitants therein.*] The first King of Cappadocia who had the advantage of being declared a friend of the Roman people, had followed the party of Antiochus King of Syria. He asked pardon of the Commonwealth for it after that Monarch's defeat, and offered to expiate his fault by a sum of money. He was condemned to pay two hundred talents; but at the intreaty of Eumenes King of Pergamus his son-in-law, he obtained a considerable abatement; he got off for half that sum, and was admitted into the friendship of the Romans. *Legati . . . . ab Ariarathe rege Cappadocum venerunt ad veniam petendam tuendamque pecunia noxam quod auxiliis Antiochum juvisset. Ei CC talenta argenti sunt imperata . . . .* (34). *Ariarathes rex parte dimidia pecuniæ imperatæ Eumenis beneficio, cui desponderat per eos dies filiam, remissa, in amicitiam est acceptus* (35). After that time, he faithfully followed their party with his son-in-law. See the margin, you will there find his dispositions in the war which they made on the last King of Macedon (36).

(34) T. Livius, lib. 38. pag. m. 732.

(35) Idem, ibid. pag. 733.

(36) *Ariarathes Cappadocum rex, præterquam quod Romanis suo nomine auxilia pollicitus erat, ex quo est junctus Eumeni affinitate in omnia belli pacisque se consociaverat consilia.* T. Livius, lib. 42. pag. 820.

[*G*] . . . *They could not live without a King.*] The Royal Family being extinct, they refused the permission, which the Roman People would have given them, to be free, and sent Embassadors to Rome, to declare that liberty was insupportable to them, and to ask a King. Προσδευσάμενοι τὴν μὲν ἐλευθερίαν παρητοῦντο, οὐ γὰρ δύνασθαι φέρειν αὐτὴν ἔφασαν. βασιλέα δ' αἰτοῦσιν αὐτοῖς ἀποδοθῆναι. *Missis legatis libertatem repudiaverunt ut quam sibi dicerent esse intolerabilem, regem sibi dari postulaverunt* (37). The Romans were surprized at such a taste, and gave them leave to confer the Kingdom on whom they should think good. They chose Ariobarzanes, whose posterity failed in the third generation: after which Archelaüs, who was not at all related to that family, was created their King by Mark Antony (38). It is of them that one might say, *O homines ad servitutem natos!* i. e. *O men born to slavery!* After all, it is plain that a Monarchy was fitter for them than a Commonwealth: a certain turn of mind is necessary not to abuse liberty, and all people have not that turn. Observe that Justin assures us it was the Roman Senate who chose Ariobarzanes. *Cappadoces munus libertatis abnuentes, negant vivere gentem sine Rege posse, atque ita Rex illis a Senatu Ariobarzanes constituitur* (39). Mithridates maintained that the Romans granted the Cappadocians their liberty, only to affront him; he added, that they opposed the desires of the people who asked Gordius for their King, for no other reason than because Gordius was his friend. *Libertatem etiam in contumeliam sui à Senatu ultro delatam Cappadociæ quam reliquis gentibus abstulerunt: deinde populos Cappadocum pro libertate oblatâ Gordium Regem orantes ideo tantum quoniam amicus suus esset, non obtinuisse* (40). He is in this point less unworthy of credit than Strabo; for what likelihood is there that the Romans left the election of a King to the discretion of the Cappadocians at such a conjuncture?

(37) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 372.

(38) Extracted from Strabo, ibid.

(39) Justinus, lib. 38. cap. 2.

(40) Idem, ibid. cap. 5. pag. 557.

[*H*] *There were a great many Magi, and a great many places of devotion.*] A Parenthesis of Strabo furnishes us with a proof of it. Ἐν ᾗ τῇ Καππαδοκίᾳ (πολὺ γάρ ἐστι τὸ τῶν μάγων φῦλον, οἱ καὶ Πύραιθοι καλοῦνται. πολλὰ δὲ καὶ τῶν Περσικῶν Θεῶν ἱερά) οὐδὲ μαχαίρᾳ θύουσι, ἀλλὰ κορμῷ τινὶ ὡς ἂν ὑπέρῳ τύπτοντες. *In Cappadocia (etenim maxima est ibi magorum multitudo qui Pyræthi vocantur, & multa Persicorum Deorum templa) non cultro sed stipite quodam mactant tanquam malleo verberantes.* i. e. "In Cappadocia (for there are "great numbers of Magi, who are called Pyræthi, "and many temples of the Persian Gods) they do not "kill their sacrifices with a knife, but knock them "down with a club, as with a mallet (41)." I have elsewhere (42) spoken of the devotion of the Cappadocians for the Bellona of Comana, and for the Diana of Castabala (43). Let us say here that they had a Priesthood of Jupiter in a place called Dacia, which was very famous (44). The Temple of Apollo at Cataone was had in veneration throughout all Cappadocia: the image which was seen in that place was an original from whence many copies were taken for the other cities (45). The Jupiter of the Venasians scarce yielded to the Bellona of Comana: his Temple was situated in a fertile place, which brought the Chief Priest a yearly revenue of fifteen talents. This office was for life. There were full three thousand persons destined for the service of that God, and maintained in his Temple (46). Plutarch observes that the Romans had learned of the Cappadocians the worship of a Goddess which was the Moon, or Minerva, or Bellona (47). Add to all this what Maximus Tyrius says, that a Mountain was the God, the oath, and the statue of the Cappadocians: Ὄρος Καππαδόκαις καὶ θεὸς καὶ ὅρκος καὶ ἄγαλμα: *Mons Cappadocibus & Deus & jusjurandum est & statua* (48). If he meant to say they had no other God than a mountain, he was very much mistaken.

(41) Strabo, lib. 15. pag. 504.

(42) In the Article COMANA.

(43) See the Remark [*A*] of the Article COMANA, at the end.

(44) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 369.

(45) Idem, ibid. pag. 370.

(46) Idem, ibid.

(47) Plut. *in Sylla*, pag. 457. B.

(48) Maxim. Tyrius, *Orat.* 38. pag. m. 385.

You will find in a work of Buonarotti that *Mount Argæus* was the *Symbol* of the city of Cæsarea in Cappadocia *in all her medals* (49), and that the height of that Mountain *rendered it almost inaccessible; which induced the people of the neighbourhood, and particularly those of Cæsarea, to adore it as a kind of Deity.* See also the 892d page of Baron Spanheim's Dissertation *de præstantia & usu Numismatum.*

(49) *Hist. des Ouvrages des Savans*, Sept. 1700, pag. 393. in the Extract of the *Osservationi istoriche sopra alcuni Medaglioni antichi.*

[*I*] *Here is part of the History of the Princes who reigned in Cappadocia.*] Let us finish what we began in the preceding Remarks.

I. We have conducted the Reader to the time of Perdiccas, who, after the death of Alexander, again reduced Cappadocia under the Macedonian yoak. We have seen that he made ARIARATHES expire on a cross.

mountain Argæus, and which followed the Laws of Charondas explained by a Singer, who was choſen for that function (*l*). This city was built on the river Melas, which diſcharges itſelf into the Euphrates. A King of Cappadocia having ſtopped up the mouth of this river drowned all the adjacent country, after which he made ſeveral Iſlands there in imitation of the Cyclades. He there ſpent one part of his life in a childiſh manner (*m*); but theſe amuſements occaſioned him diſgrace and detriment. The river broke down the dams made at its mouth; the waters returned into their channel, and the Euphrates having received them overflowed, and made incredible devaſtation in Cappadocia. The Galatians, who inhabited Phrygia, ſuffered a great many loſſes by this inundation,

(*l*) Αἰρέμενοι καὶ νομωδὸν ὃς ἐστιν αὐτοῖς ἐξηγητὴς τῶν νόμων καθάπερ οἱ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις νομικοί. *Legum decantatorem deligunt, qui ipſis eſt legum interpres ut Romanorum ſunt juriſconſulti.* Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 371.

(*m*) Διατρίβει ἐν αὐτοῖς παιδικῶς μειρακιώδως. *Puerilem ibi in morem vitæ partem exegit.* Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 371.

croſs. That unfortunate Prince left a ſon named, like him, ARIARATHES, who eſcaped into Armenia, and recovered the Kingdom ſome time after; for ſo ſoon as he knew of the death of Perdiccas, and that of Eumenes, and of the employment which other wars gave to Antigonus and Seleucus, he entered Cappadocia with the troops which Ardoates King of Armenia furniſhed him with; he defeated Amyntas the General of the Macedonians, killed him, and drove them out of the country. He left the Kingdom to ARIARATHES his eldeſt ſon, who made an alliance with the King of Syria Antiochus Theos; for he married Ariarathes his eldeſt ſon to Stratonice the daughter of that Antiochus. He had ſo great an affection for his ſon, that he admitted him a partner in his throne. ARIARATHES having reigned alone after his father's death, left his Dominions when he died to his ſon ARIARATHES, who was yet very young. This laſt married Antiochis the daughter of Antiochus the Great (50), a ſubtle woman, who finding herſelf barren, had recourſe to a ſuppoſititious birth. She made her huſband believe ſhe had had two boys, which were named one Ariarathes, and the other Holophernes. Her ſterility was removed ſome time after: ſhe had two daughters, and afterwards a ſon, who was named Mithridates. She confeſſed the fraud to her huſband, and procured the eldeſt of thoſe ſuppoſed ſons to be maintained at Rome with few attendants, and the other of them to be ſent into Ionia. The legitimate ſon took the name of ARIARATHES, and was educated after the Grecian manner. His father, who was ſingularly beloved by him, deſirous of giving him ſenſible proofs of his reciprocal affection, would ſurrender his whole Kingdom to him; but the ſon oppoſed it, and repreſented to him that the ordinary courſe required he ſhould not reign during the life of thoſe who had given him birth. He reigned after his father's death, and was a very honeſt and worthy man: he addicted himſelf much to the ſtudy of Philoſophy, which made Cappadocia, unknown before that time to the Greeks, become the agreeable reſidence of ſeveral learned men (51). This is what we find in the fragments of Diodorus Siculus.

(50) Appian, *in Syriacis*, pag. m. 59. *obſerves that Antiochus gave his daughter Antiochis in marriage to Ariarathes King of Cappadocia, when he prepared himſelf for the war againſt the Romans. This therefore was about the year of Rome* 560.

(51) Extracted from Diodorus Siculus, *in Eclogis*, lib. 31. pag. m. 1164, 1165.

II. There are other fragments of the ſame Hiſtorian, which inform us, that Orofernes expelled his brother ARIARATHES from the Kingdom of Cappadocia, and after that act of violence reigned in a tyrannical manner. He put ſeveral perſons to death, he committed a hundred extorſions, he confiſcated the eſtates of the greateſt Lords, and even pillaged a Temple of Jupiter, which from time immemorial had been out of the reach of ſuch attempts, and was ſituate at the foot of the mountain Ariadne (52). We learn from Polybius, that Attalus King of Pergamus re-eſtabliſhed Ariarathes on the throne of Cappadocia (53), and encouraged him to demand back from the inhabitants of Priene the four hundred talents which Orofernes had intruſted with them, and to lay waſte their lands, becauſe they would not part with that ſum (54). In effect, they actually kept it, and returned it to Orofernes; but this fidelity expoſed them to ineſtimable damage (55). Obſerve that Attalus, who reſtored Ariarathes, was brother to Eumenes, and that it was the firſt action of his reign (56). This gives us ſome lights in point of Chronology; for we know the aforeſaid Eumenes died in the year of Rome 596, and that Attalus reigned after him. It would not be reaſonable therefore to ſuppoſe that the two brothers Ariarathes and Orofernes were the ſons of Ariarathes the Philoſopher, whoſe mother was daughter to Antiochus the Great who died in the year 567 of the foundation of Rome (57); for, ſince that daughter of Antiochus did not eſpouſe the King of Cappadocia till about the year 560 (58), it is not poſſible that about the year 597 her ſon's ſons ſhould be men grown as they are repreſented to us. She had not theſe two daughters till after a barrenneſs which had induced her to ſuppoſe two boys (59). How then could her ſon be the father of an Ariarathes, and of an Orofernes, who before the end of the VIth Century of Rome acted what is read of them in Hiſtory?

(52) Diodor. Sic. *in Excerptis a* Valeſio *publicatis*, pag. 335, 336.

(53) Polybius, *in Excerptis à* Valeſio *editis*, pag. 168.

(54) Idem, ibid. pag. 172.

(55) Idem, ibid.

(56) Idem, pag. 168.

(57) Calviſius, *ad ann. Mundi* 3764, pag. m. 302.

(58) *See* Appian *in Syriacis, circa init.* pag. m. 59.

(59) Diodor. Sicul. *in Eclog.* lib. 31. pag. 1165.

III. We learn from Juſtin, that Demetrius King of Syria undertook to reſtore Orofernes. He had a ſiſter whom Ariarathes had refuſed to marry, and for that reaſon he bore that King of Cappadocia a great deal of ill will. *Demetrius . . . . Ariarathi regi Cappadociæ propter faſtiditas ſororis nuptias infeſtus, fratrem ejus Orofernem per injuriam regno pulſum ſupplicem recepit* (60). He gladly hearkened therefore to the requeſt which Orofernes made him to reinſtate him in the throne, from which his brother had unjuſtly driven him: but when he diſcovered that this Orofernes ſought to dethrone him, he cauſed him to be impriſoned; and if he had not been afraid that by killing him he ſhould free Ariarathes from the apprehenſions of a fraternal war, he would not have been ſatisfied with impriſoning of him, but would have put him to death without remiſſion. Take notice that the beginning of his reign anſwers to the year of Rome 592; it muſt be ſuppoſed therefore that he had reigned four or five years when he granted a retreat to Orofernes, and engaged to reſtore him. He actually did reſtore him, if we believe Appian (61), and expelled Ariarathes; which did not pleaſe the Roman people, who had rather the two brothers ſhould have reigned together. Juſtin does not at all agree with Appian; for he places Ariarathes among the Princes who ſet up a ſuppoſititious ſon of Antiochus, and ſupported him ſo vigorouſly that Demetrius loſt his crown and life by that intrigue (62). But both theſe Hiſtorians are in the right in one ſenſe, for Polybius aſſures us that Demetrius expelled Ariarathes by the reſtoration of Orofernes, and afterwards Orofernes by the reſtoration of Ariarathes (63). However it be, I imagine this Ariarathes to be the ſame with him who loſt his life in the war againſt Ariſtonicus, in ſupport of the Roman cauſe. That war was ended in the year 623 (64). I am alſo of opinion that he ought not to be diſtinguiſhed from Ariarathes the Philoſopher, or if he ought, we muſt ſay, that after the death of that Monarch, the favourer of learned men, the two ſons which Antiochis had ſuppoſed pretended to the Crown, and mutually expelled each other from the throne, and in a word, that they are the ſame Ariarathes and Orofernes of whom Polybius, Juſtin, Appian, &c. make mention. For my part, I ſhould rather think that Orofernes diſputed the throne with the legitimate ſon of Antiochis, than that he diſputed it with the other ſuppoſititious brother. The legitimate ſon, the Prince who loved Philoſophers, and drew ſo many learned men to his court, would not have had the leiſure to deſerve what Diodorus Siculus ſays of him, if he had died before Eumenes, and had before that time left the throne vacant to his two pretended brothers. It was he therefore who had Orofernes for his rival. Pray obſerve in Appian that it was not certain that this Orofernes was brother to the Prince with whom he diſputed the Crown. *Demetrius acceptis mille talentis pulſo Ariarathe Holophernem ejus,* UT FEREBATUR, *fratrem in regnum induxit.* i. e. "Demetrius, having received a thouſand talents, expelled Ariarathes, and ſet Holophernes, who WAS REPORTED to be his brother, on the throne (65)." There is great probability, therefore, that Ariarathes gave out he was a ſuppoſed ſon.

(60) Juſtin. lib. 35. *init.*

(61) Appianus, *in Syriacis*, pag. m. 79.

(62) Juſtin. lib. 35. cap. 1.

(63) Polyb. lib. 3. cap. 1. pag. m. 175.

(64) *See* Sigonius *in Faſtis.*

(65) Appian. *in Syriac.* pag. 79.

The ſons of that Ariarathes who was ſlain in the war of Ariſtonicus, obtained of the Roman People

dation, and inſiſted to be indemnified from them. They demanded three hundred talents of this King of Cappadocia, and referred themſelves to the judgment of the Romans. He was alſo obliged to indemnify the Cilicians, who had ſuffered loſſes when the river Carmalus, which he had alſo ſtopped up, broke down its damns (*n*). The negligence of Strabo is inexcuſable: he is ſatisfied with ſaying that this Prince was named Ariarathes. Would a good Writer be ſuffered at this time of day to tell us gravely that Charles King of

(*n*) Idem, ibid.

Lycaonia and Cilicia, in acknowledgment of their father's ſervices (66). They were ſix brothers, and ſome of them of the age of puberty; for which reaſon their mother, poſſeſſed by an abominable ambition, apprehending ſhe ſhould not long enjoy the Regency, deſtroyed five of them by poiſon. She had treated the youngeſt in the ſame manner, if the vigilance of his relations had not preſerved him from her fury. The people placed him on the throne, after having ſlain Laudice (67): that was the name of this unnatural mother. The new King took the name of ARIARATHES, and married Laudice the ſiſter of Mithridates, and had children by her. He was killed by the order of that ambitious brother-in-law (68); and immediately Nicomedes King of Bithynia ſeized on Cappadocia, and married Laudice. So ſoon as Mithridates knew it, he ſent an army into Cappadocia, drove out the garriſons of Nicomedes, and reſtored the Kingdom to his nephew the ſon of the ſame Ariarathes whom he had cauſed to be aſſaſſinated by one Gordius. He intreated the young King whom he had juſt reinſtated, and who was named ARIARATHES, to recall Gordius. In caſe that were granted him, he hoped to rid himſelf of the ſon by the hand of the ſame aſſaſſin who had murdered the father; and if it were refuſed him, he would be furniſhed with a pretence to make diſturbances. Ariarathes, not enduring that his uncle ſhould intereſt himſelf in the reverſing of the ſentence of baniſhment pronounced againſt Gordius, and plainly ſeeing the deſign of this contrivance, prepared himſelf for war. He raiſed a very ſtrong army by the aſſiſtance of his neighbours. Mithridates met him with equal forces (69). The armies being in view of each other, he demanded a conference with his nephew; for in the uncertainty of the event of a battle, he reſolved on a piece of treachery. He hid a dagger under his cloaths, and when, according to the cuſtom uſed among Kings in ſuch caſes, they ſelt the lower part of his belly, he ſaid to the man whom Ariarathes had truſted to make that ſearch, and who was acquitting himſelf of the office in a very ſtrict manner, Take care you do not touch a weapon of another ſort than that which you are ſearching for: by this jeſt he concealed the preparatives of his treachery, and having taken Ariarathes aſide as if it were to diſcourſe with him in private, he killed him in ſight of the two armies. *Cùm ferrum occultatum inter faſcias gereret ſcrutatori ab Ariarathe regio more miſſo, curioſius imum ventrem pertractanti, ait,* caveret ne aliud telum inveniret, quàm quæreret. *Atque ita riſu protectis inſidiis ſevocatum ab amicis velut ad ſecretum ſermonem, inſpectante utroque exercitu, interficit* (70). He made a preſent of Cappadocia to his ſon, who was but eight years old; he named him ARIARATHES, and gave him Gordius for his Governour.

(66) Juſtin. lib. 37. cap. 1.

(67) Idem, ibid.

(68) Idem, lib. 38. cap. 1.

(69) He had 80 thouſand foot, 10 thouſand horſe, and 600 ſcythed chariots. Juſtin. ibid.

(70) Idem, ibid.

IV. The Cappadocians, not able to bear the oppreſſions of Mithridates's Lieutenants, revolted, and ſent for ARIARATHES the brother of the laſt King, and ſet him on the throne. Mithridates attacked and defeated him, and drove him out of the Kingdom. Affliction threw this young King into a languiſhing diſtemper of which he died ſoon after. Then Nicomedes ſuborned a handſome youth, and obliged him to ſay he was brother to the two laſt Ariarathes, and to demand the Kingdom of the Romans on that foot. He ſent Laudice his wife to Rome, there to declare that ſhe had three boys by her firſt huſband. Mithridates having diſcovered this fraud, oppoſed it with another: he diſpatched Gordius to Rome, to aſſure the Senate that the child which he had created King of Cappadocia had for his father the ſame Ariarathes who loſt his life in the war againſt Ariſtonicus. The Senate plainly ſaw that each of theſe Princes ſought to uſurp a Crown by means of a ſuppoſed child; for which reaſon they ordered Mithridates to renounce Cappadocia, and Nicomedes to quit Paphlagonia, and that thoſe two nations ſhould govern themſelves as they ſhould think beſt. It was then that the Cappadocians anſwered they could not live without a King, as has been ſeen above. The Senate gave them ARIOBARZANES (71).

(71) Extracted from Juſtin. lib. 38. cap. 1, & 2.

V. This new Prince did not enjoy his dignity quietly: Appian relates that Mithraas and Bagoas expelled him out of Cappadocia, and ſet up Ariarathes (72). The Romans cauſed Ariobarzanes to be reinſtated (73). He was expelled a little after by an army which Mithridates ſent into Cappadocia to place his ſon Ariarathes on the throne (74). Sylla having obtained ſome ſignal advantages over Mithridates forced him to reſtore Cappadocia (75). Some time after, at the inſtigation of the ſame Prince (76), that Kingdom was invaded by Tigranes, who drew from thence three hundred thouſand men to whom he gave lands in Armenia. Ariobarzanes, who had eſcaped to Rome before the invaſion (77), was not re-eſtabliſhed till Pompey had ended the Mithridatic war in 690 (78). See how Cicero complains becauſe a Prince their ally enjoyed not his dominions (79). Obſerve that according to Plutarch Cappadocia was twice reſtored to him by Sylla; firſt, when Sylla after his Prætorſhip was ſent into that country to replace Ariobarzanes on the throne (80); and ſecondly, after the victories which he obtained over Mithridates during and after his Conſulſhip (81). This will be diſcuſſed towards the end of the following Remark, and the confuſed accounts of Appian and Juſtin will be rectified. Let us not forget I, that Pompey conſiderably enlarged the dominions of Ariobarzanes, when he replaced him on the throne of Cappadocia (82): II, that the ſon of Ariobarzanes ſucceeded to all that fine inheritance (83).

(72) Appian. *in Mithridat.* pag. 118.

(73) Idem, ibid.

(74) Idem, ibid. pag. 120.

(75) Idem, ibid. pag. 144, 145.

(76) Idem, ibid.

(77) Juſtin. lib. 38. cap. 3.

(78) Appian. *in Mithridat.* pag. 163.

(79) Cicero, *in Orat. pro Lege Manilia.*

(80) Plutarch. *in Sylla,* pag. 453.

(81) Idem, ibid. pag. 466.

(82) Appian. *in Mithridat.* pag. 163.

(83) Idem, ibid.

VI. He did not keep it long: for he had been killed when Cicero in the year 702 went to command in Cilicia. He who reigned then in Cappadocia was grandſon to Ariobarzanes the Iſt of that name, and ſaw himſelf threatned to be killed as his father had been. A conſpiracy was formed againſt him in favour of Ariarathes his brother; but Ariarathes declared to Cicero that he did not give his conſent to the plot. *Dixit* (Ariobarzanes) *ad ſe indicia manifeſtarum inſidiarum eſſe delata, quæ eſſent ante adventum meum occultata, quòd ii qui ea patefacere poſſent, propter metum reticuiſſent: eo autem tempore, ſpe mei præſidii, compluris ea quæ ſcirent audacter ad ſe detuliſſe: in his amantiſſimum ſui, ſumma pietate præditum, fratrem, dicere ea, quæ is me quoque audiente dicebat, ſe ſollicitatum eſſe ut regnare vellet: id vivo fratre ſuo accidere non potuiſſe: ſe tamen ante illud tempus eam rem nunquam in medium propter periculi metum protuliſſe. Quæ cum eſſet locutus, monui regem ut omnem diligentiam ad ſe conſervandam adhiberet; amicoſque patris ejus avique judicio probatos hortatus ſum, regis ſui vitam, docti caſu acerbiſſimo patris ejus, omni curâ cuſtodiâque defenderent.* i. e. " He *(Ariobarzanes)* ſaid, " that he had informations given him of plots which " were manifeſtly carried on, and had been concealed " before my arrival, becauſe thoſe who were able to " diſcover them held their tongues through fear: but " then, in hopes of my protection, a great many had " boldly acquainted him with what they knew: that " among theſe his brother, who was very tender and " affectionate to him, ſaid what he alſo repeated " in my hearing, that he had been ſollicited to ac- " cept the Crown; which could not be done while " his brother was living: yet that he had never diſ- " cloſed this affair before that time, for fear of danger. " Which things when he had ſpoken, I adviſed the " King to take all proper precautions for his own " ſafety; and exhorted thoſe who had been approved " friends to his father and grandfather, and had been " taught by his father's moſt unhappy fate, to de- " fend their King's life with the utmoſt aſſiduity and " vigilance,

of France, or Pope John, repaired a highway? Could a reader be able to discover this Charles, or John, among the Kings, or the Popes of that name? They have ventured in Moreri to determine which Ariarathes this was. Perhaps they were in the wrong, and more than in many other things which have been said without exactness [K], the detail of

" vigilance (84)." Cicero at his departure from Rome, had received orders to favour and protect Ariobarzanes with all possible care. Never had the Senate given such a commission for any King: this was therefore a very glorious testimony of affection to him. Read these words of Cicero (85): *Cùm vestra auctoritas intercessisset, ut ego regem Ariobarzanem Eusebem & Philorhomæum* (86) *tuerer, ejusque regis salutem, incolumitatem, regnumque defenderem, regi regnoque præsidio essem: adjunxissetque, salutem ejus regis populo senatuique magnæ curæ esse, quod nullo unquam de rege decretum esset a nostro ordine: existimavi me judicium vestrum ad regem deferre debere, eique præsidium meum & fidem & diligentiam polliceri: ut, quum salus ipsius incolumitas regni mihi commendata esset a vobis, diceret, siquid vellet.* The order of the Senate was faithfully executed. Cicero made use of the authority of his office, his forces, and his counsels, to the advantage of Ariobarzanes, and thereby, and by shewing himself not to be corrupted, and even inaccessible to that Prince's enemies, he saved his Crown for him, and even his life. *Ariobarzanes operâ meâ vivit, regnat.* Ἐπαρῳδῷ, *consilio & auctoritate, & quod insidiatoribus ejus ἀπρόσιτον me non modo ἀδεκτον præbui, regem, regnumque servavi* (87). He hindred the Priests from disturbing him (88). This was a master-stroke.

VI. Before we proceed any further, let us take notice of two faults of a learned Commentator. He supposes that the Prince here meant was the son of Ariobarzanes the Ist (89), and that he was honoured by the Senate with the title of King, when Cicero was Consul (90). He cites for the last particular these words of Cicero. *Ariobarzanem . . . . Senatus per me regem appellavit, mihique commendavit*; i. e. " The " Senate have by me given Ariobarzanes the title of " King, and recommended him to my care (91)." But this relates to the time when Cicero was sent into Cilicia, and not to his Consulship. Besides, there is no likelihood that Ariobarzanes I was dead at the time of that Consulship. There was no occasion, therefore, as yet to acknowledge another Ariobarzanes for King. As to the first mistake, it proceeds from Manutius's not having perceived, as other Critics have done, that we should read *amicosque patris ejus avique judicio probatos* in the passage quoted above (92). We have no ground to suppose that any son or nephew of that Ariobarzanes whom Cicero protected ever reigned in Cappadocia; and yet this family was not extinct till the third generation (93): it is reasonable, therefore, to take him who was on the throne when Cicero went to govern Cilicia, to be grandson to the first Ariobarzanes.

VII. He brought some troops to Pompey (94) which fought against Cæsar at the battle of Pharsalia. This doubtless was the reason why Cæsar put him under contribution. It is certain that he exacted sums of money of him; for that Prince caused it to be represented that he should become insolvent, if Pharnaces continued to plunder Cappadocia. *Rex Deiotarus ad Domitium Calvinum, cui Cæsar Asiam finitimasque provincias administrandas tradiderat, venit oratum ne Armeniam minorem regnum suum, neve Cappadociam, regnum Ariobarzanis, possideri vastarique pateretur a Pharnace: quo malo nisi liberarentur, imperata se facere, pecuniamque promissam Cæsari non posse persolvere.* i. e. " King Deiotarus came to beg of Domitius Calvinus, " to whom Cæsar had committed the government of " Asia and the bordering Provinces, that he would " not suffer the lesser Armenia, his own Kingdom, or " Cappadocia, the Kingdom of Ariobarzanes, to be " possessed and ravaged by Pharnaces; assuring him " that if they were not freed from that hardship, they " could not perform what was commanded them, or " pay the money they had promised to Cæsar (95)." Cæsar was then in Egypt: he departed thence to reduce Pharnaces to reason. He passed thro' Cappadocia, and made some regulations there which persuade us that Ariobarzanes and his brother Ariarathes lived in no great union. He ordered the latter to obey: he plainly saw that Ariobarzanes was afraid of his heir, and that the heir was not quite proof against the desire of succeeding him too soon: *Fratrem Ariobarzanis Ariaratem, cum bene meritus uterque eorum de Rep. esset, ne aut regni hæreditas Ariaratem sollicitaret, aut hæres regni terreret, Ariobarzani attribuit; qui sub ejus imperio ac ditione esset* (96). It may be inferred from hence, that Ariobarzanes had no children, and that therefore the reading *frater* would be better than that of *filius* in this passage of Cicero: *Ariarathes Ariobarzanis filius Romam venit. Vult, opinor, regnum aliquod emere à Cæsare, nam quomodo nunc est, pedem ubi ponat in suo non habet.* i. e. " Ariarathes, the son of Ari- " obarzanes, is come to Rome. He has a mind, I " suppose, to buy some Kingdom of Cæsar, for as " matters stand with him now, he has no where to " set his foot in his own (97)." This shews us that Ariarathes, after Cæsar's regulations, had no longer any share of authority in Cappadocia. When Cæsar had vanquished Pharnaces, he gave one part of Armenia to our Ariobarzanes (98). This made the murderers of Julius Cæsar believe, some years after, that the King of Cappadocia did not favour them. He did not declare himself openly against their party, but he refused to enter into alliance with them. This conduct gave them just grounds to mistrust him, so that Cassius resolved to keep no measures with him: he attacked him, and having taken him prisoner, put him to death (99). This was in the year of Rome 712. We have seen elsewhere (100) that ARIARATHES was disturbed in the succession of Cappadocia, and that the cause was decided to his prejudice in the year 713; and that having found means to appeal from that sentence, he was quite expelled in the year 718, after which Archelaus reigned in Cappadocia: he was the last who reigned there.

The confusion which is found in comparing the ancient Historians together is infinite. I shall mention some instances of it in the following Remark.

[K] *In Moreri . . . many things have been said . . without exactness.*] I. It is a mistake to suppose, as I have already observed (101), that between Pharnaces the first King of Cappadocia, and Ariarathes the first of the name, there were but six Kings. II. And that we know not their names. III. Archelaüs did not obtain that Crown after an Ariarathes brother to the Ariobarzanes who had been restored by Pompey, but after an Ariarathes grandson of that Ariobarzanes (102). IV. Since in the Article of Cappadocia ten Kings are set down who were named Ariarathes, it is wrong to say elsewhere (103), that Ariarathes the second *had seven successors of his name*. V. In the battle against Perdiccas, the Horse of Ariarathes II were but fifteen thousand (104), and not twenty thousand. VI. Ariarathes the fifth, who *furnished* Antiochus *with troops* against the Romans, was not *brother-in-law*, but son-in-law to that Antiochus. VII. There is no proof that it was he *who caused the entrance of the river Mela into the Euphrates to be stopped*. VIII. It should not have been omitted that the works which were made in that place fell to ruin; for this omission renders the rest of the narration wholly unintelligible. One cannot comprehend those works to have been the cause of the overflowing of the Euphrates; they being infinitely more likely to prevent than to cause it. And if the Euphrates did overflow, tho' the waters of the Melas discharged themselves into it no longer, one does not comprehend how the King of Cappadocia could be obliged to repair the damages of the inundation. IX. The Roman Senate did not order him to pay three hundred talents: they gave judgment as to the demand which the Galatians made of that sum, but it is not known what their determination was. It is more probable that they moderated the pretensions of the complainants, than that they supported them in their whole demand. X. Why is it thought sufficient to cite Polybius and Livy (105), who say nothing of this? It would have been more proper to cite Strabo. XI. Nobody says that the *city of Ariaratha*

(84) Cicero, *Epist.* 2. lib. 15. *ad Famil.* pag. m. 381, 382.

(85) Idem, ibid. pag. 380, 381.

(86) *The Medals give these two titles to this King: they signify Pious, and a Friend to the Romans.* See Græv. *Variorum* on this passage of Cicero.

(87) Cicero, *Epist.* 20. lib. 5. *ad Atticum*, pag. m. 542, 543. *See also* Epist. 2. & 4. lib. 15. *ad Famil.* pag. 383, 389.

(88) Idem, *Epist.* 4. lib. 15. *ad Famil.* pag. 389. I have set down his words in the Remark [D] of the Article COMANA, at the end.

(89) Paulus Manutius *in Cicer. Epist.* 2. lib. 15. *ad Famil.* pag. m. 159.

(90) Idem, ibid.

(91) Cicero, *Epist.* 17. lib. 2. *ad Famil.* pag. 115.

(92) Citation (84).

(93) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 273.

(94) Cæsar, *de Bello Civili*, lib. 3. pag. m. 307.

(95) Hirtius, *de Bello Alexandr.* pag. 390.

(96) Idem, ibid. pag. 409.

(97) Cicero, *Epist.* 2. lib. 13. *ad Attic.* pag. 395.

(98) Dio, lib. 42. pag. 234.

(99) Idem, lib. 47. pag. 395.

(100) In the Text of the Article ARCHELAUS King of Cappadocia.

(101) In the Remark [A], Citation (3).

(102) See the preceding Remark Num. vi. at the end.

(103) At the word *Ariarathes*.

(104) Diodor. Sicul. lib. 18. cap. 16. pag. m. 290.

(105) The 5th Book of Livy is cited: they should have cited the 38th and 42d.

of which may be ſeen in my Remarks, as well as the cenſure of ſome errors of Juſtin and Appian. Cappadocia, generally ſpeaking, was nothing leſs than a country of wit and learning: yet ſome very famous Authors have ſprung from thence. Strabo and Pauſanias are of this number. One would believe above all things that the Cappadocians were

ratha (106) was founded after the inundations of the Euphrates, and the payment of the three hundred talents: why is it aſſerted in Moreri? XII. He who built the city of Ariarathia was ſon-in-law to Antiochus (107): the Continuator of Moreri ought not therefore to have attributed that foundation to the Ariarathes to whom he aſcribes it; for he conſiders him as the brother-in-law of Antiochus: tho', in reality, this pretended brother-in-law of Antiochus was his ſon-in-law, yet it does not thence follow that he built Ariarathia; for his father Ariarathes was ſon-in-law to Antiochus Theos (108). It is he perhaps who was intended to be ſpoken of in Stephanus Byzantinus.

Let us make a digreſſion here, to obſerve that Pinedo has there made a very uſeleſs Commentary: he has cited a paſſage of Strabo, which informs us that Ariarathes the firſt King of Cappadocia joined the Catаones with the Cappadocians (109). What help is this for the underſtanding of the words of Stephanus Byzantinus? and ſince he cited that paſſage, why did he not cite the other where Strabo mentions a more modern Ariarathes? Berkelius, another Commentator on Stephanus, has endeavoured to comment his text in a better manner; but he has not ſucceeded well. He at firſt imagined Ariarathes the ſon-in-law of Antiochus had married the daughter of Antiochus Soter; but afterwards, he obſerved that Demetrius the brother of Antiochus made war on Ariarathes, *propter faſſiditas ſororis nuptias* (110). His opinion therefore is, that the founder of Ariarathia had married the ſiſter of Demetrius, and afterwards ſent her back becauſe he diſliked her. I anſwer that the Latin words have a more general ſenſe, and that it is more natural to take them for a refuſal of marriage, than for a divorce. I add, that a Prince who had married the ſiſter of Demetrius would not have been the ſon-in-law of Antiochus; for Demetrius was ſon to Seleucus Philopator, the ſon of Antiochus the Great. My third remark againſt Berkelius is, that he did not know that Diodorus Siculus makes mention of two Kings of Cappadocia named Ariarathes, and ſons-in-law, the one to Antiochus Theos, and the other to Antiochus the Great. Let us return to Moreri.

The XIIIth fault is to ſay that Mithridates *drove out Nicodemus, who had ſeized Cappadocia.* It ſhould have been Nicomedes King of Bithynia. XIV. Mithridates did not cauſe his nephew to be ſlain by a young man (111): he ſlew him himſelf, as I have related above (112). XV. The XXXVIIIth Book of Juſtin ought to have been quoted, and not the thirtieth. XVI. The ſucceſſor of him who was killed by Mithridates was his brother, and not his ſon. XVII. The reign of Mithridates's ſon ought not to have been omitted; his reign, I ſay, anterior to the election of Ariobarzanes. XVIII. This ſon of Mithridates ſhould have been placed under the word *Ariarathes*, and not under *Ariathes*; for when his father placed him on the throne of Cappadocia, in the room of his nephew whom he had killed, he made him take the uſual name of the Kings of that country, *viz.* that of Ariarathes (113). XIX. The conqueſt of Cappadocia by Ariarathes did not give Mithridates a jealouſy which induced him to poiſon him. Cappodocia had been conquered long before, when that Ariarathes commanded a body of troops for his father in Europe (114); and if he was poiſoned by Mithridates, as is pretended, it was on ſome other jealouſy (115). XX. There is no likelihood that Ariobarzanes *was placed on the throne towards the year* 644 *of the foundation of Rome* (116). I ſhall prove it below. XXI. It was he whom Mithridates drove out of Cappadocia, and whom Sylla reſtored. Why then do they come and tell us this of his ſon? XXII. He was not *immediately attacked by Tigranes* (117). He had been already re-eſtabliſhed more than once, before Tigranes attacked him. XXIII. It is not true that Sylla *defeated the army of Tigranes.* XXIV. Juſtin, whoſe 30th book is all along falſly quoted, no where ſays that Ariarathes the ſon of Mithridates was vanquiſhed by Ariobarzanes; XXV. nor that the latter, by the aſſiſtance of Pompey, conquered Sophene, Gordene, and part of Cilicia; XXIV. nor that *after thoſe victories and conqueſts he ſurrendred the crown to his ſon Ariobarzanes, to paſs the reſt of his life in repoſe.* Not only Juſtin ſays nothing of all theſe things, but I do not believe any one good Author ſpeaks of them. Appian ſays only that Ariobarzanes was gratified with thoſe countries by Pompey (118). Is this to be the conqueror of them? XXVII. It ſhould have been known that at the time it is pretended Ariobarzanes vanquiſhed Ariarathes ſon of Mithridates, that is to ſay, after Tigranes had been vanquiſhed, that ſame Ariarathes was dead (119).

Let us ſee whether it be true that his election was made in the year 644. I aſſure my ſelf that if you conſider well all the things which paſſed from the war of Ariſtonicus to that election, you will find four and twenty years will ſcarce be ſufficient. Ariarathes dying during that war, which laſted two or three years, more or leſs, and ended in 623, all his ſons, except only the youngeſt, were poiſoned by their mother. The ſon who eſcaped was ſet on the throne, and being aſſaſſinated by the intrigues of Mithridates, left two ſons who reigned one after another. The eldeſt vigorouſly oppoſed Mithridates, he aſſembled a very numerous army, he commanded it himſelf, when he was killed by Mithridates, who had demanded a private conference with him. All this ſhews he was not a child. Cappadocia was afterwards under the adminiſtration of Gordius, Governor of the new King, the ſon of Mithridates. This Government was ſo harſh, that the ſubjects revolted: the brother of the late King was recalled, he reigned; but he was defeated by Mithridates, and conſtrained to quit the country. He lived not long after that; and Nicomedes being informed of his death, ſuborned a youth who pretended to be the lawful ſucceſſor. His wife took a journey to Rome to ſupport the fraud. Mithridates diſpatched Gordius to the Romans, to oppoſe that impoſture with another. The Senate ended all theſe diſputes, by granting a full liberty to Cappadocia. Their preſent was rejected: that people would needs have a Prince, and they had Ariobarzanes (120). It is impoſſible, according to this, that his election could be made in the year of Rome 644. I ſhould not have repeated all this detail, if beſides its being neceſſary as a proof of Moreri's XXth fault, I had not ſeen that it would afford us an occaſion of criticiſing Juſtin.

He ſays that Laudice, widow of that Ariarathes who was killed in the war againſt Ariſtonicus about the year of Rome 622, poiſoned five of her ſons, and that the youngeſt would have had the ſame fate, if the relations had not preſerved him from the violence of that unnatural mother. He obſerves that the fear of not enjoying the regency long, becauſe ſome of her ſons were adult, incited her to commit that inhuman action (121). It is difficult to diſcover that he argues juſtly: for if by reaſon of that fear ſhe endeavoured to diſpatch the youngeſt of her ſons, it neceſſarily follows that he wanted not much of being at age; and in that caſe, the eldeſt ſon would have been of full age, which would have excluded Laudice from the regency. If you ſay the eldeſt ſon was not yet of age, but that he wanted not much of it, you will be forced to grant me that the age of the youngeſt did not nearly threaten the Regent's ambition. She might have hoped for an adminiſtration of ſufficient length, not to put him to death ſo ſoon. Juſtin therefore has not reaſoned juſtly on the motives of this cruel woman. An infinite number of like faults might be found in that Author, and in the beſt Writers, if a man would take the pains to collect them. I believe, for my part, that all the ſons of Laudice were adult, and I take this to be the reaſon why ſhe tried to get rid of all of them at once. What makes me judge thus of their age is that the youngeſt left two ſons who reigned in Cappadocia, and who, by the manner in which they are ſpoken of, lived at leaſt twenty years. Now it is certain that Ariobarzanes had already been diſpoſſeſſed in the year of Rome 659; for it was in that year that Sylla reſtored him (122). Some time paſſed between

(106) It ſhould be *Ariarathia.*

(107) Stephanus Byzantinus, *Voce* Ἀριαράθεια.

(108) Diodor. Sicul. *in Eclog.* lib. 31. pag. m. 1164, 1165.

(109) Pinedo *in Steph. Byzant.* pag. 107.

(110) Berkelius *in Steph. Byzant.* pag. 164.

(111) The Author was deceived by theſe words of Juſtin, lib. 38. cap. 2. *Sollicitatoque juvene ad colloquium, &c.*

(112) In the preceding Remark, Num. III. Citation (70.)

(113) Juſtin. lib. 38. cap. 1. pag. 549.

(114) Plutarch. *in Sylla*, pag. 458. C.

(115) Idem, *in Pompeio*, pag. 639. A.

(116) Moreri, at the Word *Ariobarzanes.*

(117) The Continuator of Moreri, at the ſame Word.

(118) Appian. *in Mithridat.* pag. m. 163.

(119) Appian. *in Mithridat.* pag. m. 129, *ſpeaks of Areathias a ſon of Mithridates, as of a man who having ſubdued Macedonia, marched againſt Sylla; but he died of ſickneſs. It is he without doubt whom* Plutarch *names Ariarathes.*

(120) All this Narration is taken from Juſtin, Book 38.

JUSTIN criticiſed.

(121) *Timens ne non diutinam regni adminiſtrationem adultis quibuſdam potiretur.* Juſtinus, lib. 38. cap. 1. pag. 540.

(122) *See* Sigonius, *in Faſtis, ad annum* 659. folio m. 106 *verſo.*

were unfit to become Orators [*L*]; but St. Baſil, and St. Gregory Nazianzen, have been an exception to this rule. It has been obſerved that the horſes of Cappadocia improved as they grew old [*M*].

CAPRIATA

tween the death of the laſt Ariarathes and the election of Ariobarzanes: in that interval the pretenſions of the two ſuppoſed children were produced at Rome; a Decree of the Senate alſo intervened. Let us add that ſome time paſſed between the election of Ariobarzanes and his deprivation, and between his deprivation and his re-eſtabliſhment. Since therefore he was reſtored in the year 659, there is a great deal of likelihood that the laſt Ariarathes aged about twenty did not die before the year 654: judge whether it be probable that his father was but a little child when Laudice would have murdered him about the year 623.

APPIAN and Juſtin criticiſed.

I ſhall in this place examine whether Appian has related the adventures of Ariobarzanes as he ought. His relation is as follows, The Romans ordered Mithridates to ſurrender Cappadocia to Ariobarzanes: he obeyed, but Mithraas and Bagoas expelled Ariobarzanes, and gave the Kingdom to Ariarathes. The Romans ſent an Embaſſy into that country to reſtore Ariobarzanes. Manius Aquilius was the head of that Embaſſy: Lucius Caſſius, who commanded in Aſia, and Mithridates received orders from Rome to aſſiſt the Embaſſadors. Mithridates, being diſguſted with the Romans, gave them no aſſiſtance: but notwithſtanding Caſſius and Aquilius reſtored Ariobarzanes, and adviſed him, as well as Nicomedes King of Bithynia, to make incurſions into the Dominions of Mithridates. Nicomedes, not being able to reſiſt the ſollicitations of the Embaſſadors, committed hoſtilities (123). Mithridates complained of it, and found no redreſs: for which reaſon he had recourſe to arms, he conquered Cappadocia, and gave it to his ſon Ariarathes (124), The Embaſſador he ſent to the Roman Generals ſpoke very haughtily, and received an anſwer yet more haughty (125). The conſequence was that Mithridates beat the Romans, and even took Manius Aquilius the chief of their Embaſſy priſoner, and that Sylla vanquiſhed him, and forced him to accept a diſadvantageous peace (126). The reſtoration of Ariobarzanes was one of the conditions of the treaty (127): it was at firſt executed imperfectly (128), and afterwards very fully (129). The invaſion of Cappadocia by Tigranes happened ſome years after (130). Sylla was no longer living. Lucullus retook Cappadocia (131), Mithridates recovered it (132), and at laſt Pompey re-eſtabliſhed Ariobarzanes (133).

(123) Appianus, *in Mithridat.* pag. 118.

(124) Idem, ibid. pag. 120.

(125) Idem, ibid. pag. 121.

(126) Idem, ibid. pag. 122.

(127) Idem, ibid. pag. 141.

(128) Idem, ibid. pag. 143.

(129) Idem, ibid. pag. 144.

(130) Idem, ibid.

(131) Idem, ibid. pag. 150, 151.

(132) Idem, ibid. pag. 156.

(133) Idem, ibid. pag. 163, 168.

I obſerve I, that Appian is inexcuſable in ſpeaking of the invaſion of Mithraas and Bagoas, without telling us who they were, and what Ariarathes it was whom they placed on the throne of Cappadocia. II. He deſerves blame for having ſaid nothing of the commiſſion given to Sylla to reſtore Ariobarzanes. This was in the year of Rome 659. Sylla commanded then in Cilicia. He ſays it himſelf in Appian, ſpeaking to Mithridates. *In Cappadociam ego reduxi Ariobarzanem ex S. C. cum præeſſem Ciliciæ: idque feci te cedente autoritati populi.* i. e. "I brought Ariobarzanes "back into Cappadocia by order of the Senate when I "was Governor of Cilicia: and this I did you your-"ſelf ſubmitting to the authority of the people (134)." This renders our Hiſtorian the leſs excuſable; for ſince he was no ſtranger to this diſcourſe of Sylla, he was obliged to inform himſelf concerning the re-eſtabliſhment of Ariobarzanes, and to place it where good Chronology required. His omiſſion would have been leſs to be found fault with, if he had not known what Sylla ſaid to Mithridates. Take notice Plutarch obſerves that Sylla, after his Prætorſhip, was ſent into Cappadocia under the ſpecious pretext of reſtoring Ariobarzanes, but in reality to curb Mithridates who formed great deſigns (135). Conſult Sigonius, and he will clear up all this to you (136), but do not truſt him when he aſſures you that Mithridates cauſed Ariarathes King of Cappadocia, and the ſon of the ſame Ariarathes, who was yet a child, to be ſlain by Gordius. Remember that Mithridates killed that ſon with his own hand, when he was a man grown. My IIId Remark on Appian is, that according to all appearance, he is miſtaken with regard to the invaſion of Mithraas and Bagoas: he ſuppoſes that Mithridates had no hand in it, and even that the Romans ordered him to drive out the uſurper, and to reſtore Ariobarzanes; and that Mithridates being diſſatisfied with the Roman People diſobeyed that order. I doubt not but that invaſion was made by the Generals of Mithridates, and in favour of his ſon Ariarathes whom the Cappadocians had expelled. Juſtin ſays they recalled the brother of their laſt King, and that this brother was vanquiſhed by Mithridates (137); that is to ſay, if I am not miſtaken, by Mithraas and Bagoas, who brought back into Cappadocia Ariarathes their maſter's ſon. Let us ſay in the IVth place, that the Embaſſy of Manius Aquilius ſhould be placed under the year of Rome 663, or thereabouts; and that therefore it concerns not, as Appian ſuppoſes, the firſt reſtoration of Ariobarzanes (138).

(134) Idem, ibid. pag. 139.

(135) Plutarch. *in Sylla*, pag. 453.

(136) Sigonius, *in Faſtis, ad ann.* 659.

(137) Juſtin, lib. 38. cap. 2.

Let us add a word againſt Juſtin, who ſuppoſes that Tigranes ſet on by Mithridates was the firſt who expelled Ariobarzanes, and that this was the ſubject of Aquilius's Embaſſy. This is falſe. That Embaſſy was anterior to the great wars of Sylla and Mithridates, which did not begin till the year of Rome 665. Tigranes is never ſeen to appear before the expedition of Lucullus. We muſt ſay therefore that he did not poſſeſs himſelf of Cappadocia, till after Sylla had reſtored Ariobarzanes the ſecond time.

(138) The Epitome of Livy, Book 70, *makes mention of the Reſtoration of this Prince by Sylla, and Book 74, of another Reſtoration.*

I may be reproached for ſtanding too much on trifling niceties: I would have it be known that I do it, not becauſe I think theſe things are important enough in themſelves, but to inſinuate by ſenſible examples that a man ſhould arm himſelf with diſtruſt againſt what he reads, and exerciſe his genius in diſtinguiſhing of facts. This application inlarges and multiplies the ſtrength of the mind. For which reaſon I believe the pains I have taken will not be uſeleſs to the Reader.

There is ſo little Chronology in the greater part of the Greek and Latin Hiſtorians, that ancient Hiſtory wants to be new-caſt. I dare ſay, that if all the helps which they had in abundance were to be had at this day, much better bodies of Hiſtory would be compiled than thoſe which they have left us.

[*L*] *One would believe the Cappadocians were unfit to become Orators.*] It is from hence that Kuhnius has confirmed the opinion of thoſe who ſay that Pauſanias, Author of the Deſcription of Greece, ought not to be diſtinguiſhed from the Sophiſt Pauſanias whoſe Life Philoſtratus has written, and who was one of thoſe pupils whom Herodes Atticus admitted to his greateſt familiarity. To this the Obſervation of Philoſtratus, that the ſaid Sophiſt did not pronounce Greek well, is by no means repugnant: for it was the defect of the Cappadocians, and a defect ſo incorrigible, that a Rhetorician of that country was ſaid to be more rare than a white raven, or a flying tortoiſe. *Cui non repugnat*, they are the words of Kuhnius in the Preface to the new edition of Pauſanias (139), *quod Philoſtratus tradit, quòd Græcam linguam duriùs pronunciârit quàm delicata ejus rotunditas patiebatur. Hoc enim toti Cappadocum nationi commune vitium, oriſque fuit ἰλάττωμα nullâ exercitatione emendandum, ſuti clare indicat notum Epigramma:*

(139) That of Leipſic in 1696.

Θᾶττον ἴην λευκὺς κόρακας πλησάς τε χιλώνας
Εὑρεῖν, ἢ δέκιμον ῥήτορα Καππαδόκην.
Rarius alata teſtudine, rarius albo
Invenias corvo Rhetora Cappadocem.

[*M*] *The horſes of Cappadocia improved as they grew old.*] "Oppian has obſerved that they are very weak "when young, and that the older they be the ſwifter "they go.

Χραισμότεροι ϗ πίλεσιν ὅσῳ μάλα γηράσκουσι (140).

(140) *Suite du Menagiana*, pag. 53, of the Dutch edition.

I ſhall add to theſe words of the Menagiana a paſſage of Brantome. *The Cardinal de Guiſe* has been *the only perſon to whom the late King Francis's Proverb might be applied, who uſed to ſay that the Princes of Lorrain were like the courſers of the Kingdom of Naples, which were long and backward in growing, but were excellent when they began to wax old* (141).

(141) Brantome, *dans l'Eloge de Mr. de Guiſe*, tom. 3. *des Mémoir.* pag. m. 139.

CAPRIATA (PETER JOHN) a Civilian and Hiſtorian, was of Genoa, and lived in the ſeventeenth Century. If Amantius may be credited, he poſſeſſed all the qualities that form the great Lawyer [*A*]; but we muſt obſerve, that this teſtimony is in a Poem prefixed to one of Capriata's books. In this Poem, all the applauſes which an accompliſhed Hiſtorian could deſerve, are beſtowed upon him. We are not to take in a literal ſenſe, the expreſſions which are uſed in an elogium of this kind; but it is certain that the hiſtorical pieces of this writer are very valuable [*B*]. He relates the ſeveral tranſactions in a very clear and preciſe manner; he accounts for their ſeveral motives, their inſtruments and conſequences; and he is not guilty, either of the low artifices of a flatterer, or of the malice of an ill-natured cenſor. He boaſts his having obſerved a medium, without being the leaſt partial, either in favour of France or Spain; and declares, that thoſe who do not perceive this impartiality, muſt blame themſelves for it [*C*]. The Venetians complained of their being treated injuriouſly in his Hiſtory; on which occaſion

[*A*] *If Amantius may be credited, he poſſeſſed all the qualities that form the great Lawyer.*] Here follows the beginning of a Poem, prefixed to Capriata's Book:

Qui conſulta patrum, & nodoſi dogmata juris,
Atque vagos Legum anfractus, dubioſque receſſus
Ingenio ſolitus celeri ſcrutarier, & quem
Juriſconſultum inſignem Menochius olim
Teſtatur, ſcriptis commendans laudibus, . . . (1).

(1) Paulus Amantius, *in Carmine ad auctorem Hiſtoriæ & ad Librum.*

Imitated,

" Thy piercing genius ever trac'd with eaſe,
" The knotty points of Law, however ancient;
" And all the random windings of the Bar:
" Menochius gave the praiſe thy merit claim'd,
" And told the world that thou would'ſt be illuſtrious.

A little after follow theſe lines:

Tu, ſeu jura doces, juris penetralia quærvis,
Seu patronus agis cauſas, dubiumque clientem
Sublevat arguto quem promis pectore, ſenſus,
Unde audet dubiæ melius conſidere cauſæ;
Seu juris reſponſa refers conſulta petenti,
Seu lites dirimis certantes arbiter inter;
Tam ritè & rectè peragi tibi cuncta videntur,
Tam facile, atque brevi interjecto tempore, quantum
Per tardas perfecta moras vix quiſque dediſſet.

The ſenſe is,

" Whether you read Law-Lectures to your Pupils,
" Or plead a cauſe in preſence of the Court,
" So well you trace the hidden ſprings of Law,
" So happily expreſs your cloudleſs ſenſe,
" That all who liſten, ſay — you'll be victorious.
" Whether you give advice; or when you're umpire,
" Juſtice and truth confirm your ev'ry dictate.
" No Lawyer, tho' he ſtudied months on months,
" On ſome perplexing controverted point,
" Could argue better than you do at once."

Here we ſee a man, who was equally ſucceſsful, either in explaining the moſt knotty points of the Civil-Law, in pleading cauſes, in giving opinion, or ending law-ſuits by the way of arbitration. Is it poſſible to give a more glorious character of a Civilian?

[*B*] *The hiſtorical labours of this Writer are very valuable.*] Theſe relate to the tranſactions of his own time, and eſpecially in Italy. He publiſhed the two firſt Books in 1626, by way of ſpecimen. *I due primi libri dell' Hiſtoria, ſopra i movimenti d'arme ſucceſſi in Italia dall' anno* 1613, *fino al* 1618 (2). i. e. " The " firſt two Books of the wars in Italy, from the year " 1613 to 1618." He had them reprinted at Genoa in 4to, anno 1638, with the ten ſucceeding Books. Theſe twelve Books extend from 1613 to 1634; and were reprinted at Geneva in 1644 in 8vo. The Author publiſhed a ſecond part at Genoa in 1648, which was reprinted at Geneva, in 1650, 8vo. It is intitled *dell' Hiſtoria de Pietro Giovanni Capriata, parte ſeconda in ſei Libri diſtinta. Nel primiero dè quali ſi contingono alcuni movimenti d'armi fuor d' Italia ſucceduti. E né cinque ſuſſequenti la continuatione di quei d'Italia dall' anno* M.DC.XXXIV. *fins al.* M.DC.XLIV. i. e. " The Hiſtory of Peter John Capriata, part II, di- " vided into ſix books. The firſt of theſe contains " the relation of ſome wars out of Italy; and the five " following, the continuation of thoſe of Italy, from " anno 1634 to 1644." An Engliſh Tranſlation of all this was printed at London in 1663.

(2) In Thuanus's *Catalogue*, pag. 305. of Part 1. it is put the Milan edition of 1627, in 8vo.

[*C*] *He declares that thoſe who do not perceive his impartiality between France and Spain, muſt blame themſelves for it.*] This is a judicious obſervation, and may be a warning to a great number of readers, who accuſe an Hiſtorian of partiality, for no other reaſon but becauſe they themſelves are very much prejudiced. They are perſuaded, that in caſe he ſpeaks well of thoſe, whom they hate merely from a national prejudice, and from party intereſt, he then is guilty of flattery; and that, if he ſpeaks ill of thoſe whom they love from a like principle, he then is ſwayed too much by a ſpirit of malice. But ſuch readers don't examine themſelves, nor ſee that their own partiality makes them look upon this Hiſtorian as partial. This it is that Capriata repreſents to certain readers, who complained that he had not held the two ſcales even between two crowns; but had applauded too much the actions of ſome Princes, and related as diſadvantageouſly in proportion the actions of ſome others. When the readers, ſays he, are more prejudiced than the writer, they think thoſe praiſes too faint which he beſtows on their favourite party; and thoſe as too ſtrong which they give to the party they abhor. They accuſe him of not cenſuring ſufficiently the latter, and of blaming the former too much; and they form the very ſame judgment, even when the Hiſtory has obſerved the moſt exact impartiality. Their heavy complaints are the effect of their prejudices, and not (as they pretend) of thoſe of the Hiſtorian. But I will quote Capriata's words, as they expreſs the thought much better. *Ma perche frà molti affettionati vedatori ſi ſentono qualche più preſto doglienze, che dettrattioni, parendo ad alcuni, che io ſia più dell' una, che dell' altra Corona partiale, e che de Principi nella parte primiera intereſſati; altri venghino innalzati, altri depreſſi più di quel, che la via mezzana, che han gl' iſtoriografi a tenere. Dirò per tanto in riſpoſta, più che in deſeſa di ſimili dogliènze, premieramente, che tanto rieſche difficile tener la via di mezzo allo ſcrittore, quanto al lettore, & che però tanto può l'uno, quanto l'altro trapaſſare la mediocrità, quello nello ſcrivere, & queſto nel giudicare. Imperciocche il lettore tocco per avventura da maggior paſſione, che l'Autore, e però più all' una che all' altra parte inclinante reputerà ſempre corte le lodi, e abbondanti gl' abbaſſamenti della parte, nella quale inclina, & por lo contrario maggiori le lodi, & minori gl' abbaſſamenti delle contrarie, per quanto lo ſcrittore ſi ſia ugualmente con tutti diportato; onde la dogli- enza procederà per avventura piu dalla paſſione di chi legge, che da quella di che ſcrive, conforme al Proverbio Latino,*

Arquatis omnia lurida videri (3).

That is,

" All things ſeem yellow to the jaundic'd eye."

(3) Capriata, in the Preface to Part 2. of his Hiſtory.

I have obſerved in another place (4), that it is ſometimes more difficult to be an honeſt man, than to appear ſuch; and I ſay on this occaſion, that it is ſometimes more difficult to appear a faithful Hiſtorian, than to be ſo in reality. I don't pretend to ſay, that it is an eaſy matter to write a Hiſtory which may repreſent, with equal impartiality, the errors and wiſdom, the right and the wrong, the loſſes and advantages of both parties. A man muſt be entirely diveſted of paſſions, he muſt be the wiſe man imagined by the Stoicks, ſuch a one as will never be found, and who exiſts only in the fancy; an Hiſtorian, I ſay, muſt attain to this inſenſibility,

(4) In the Remark [*H*] of the article AMPHIARAUS.

occaſion he employed a reaſon to juſtify himſelf, that deſerves to be related [*D*]. He dedicated his work, not to Princes, but to private men, for he was afraid that had he inſcribed

inſenſibility, in caſe he will pretend to obſerve, on all occaſions, this juſt medium in writing a Hiſtory. 'Tis not ſufficient that he is the native of a Country which did not join either with France or Spain, during the war in which thoſe two Nations were engaged. Notwithſtanding this neutrality, the writer might favour indirectly, or by his wiſhes one of the parties much more than the other (5). This preference might be inſpired, either by the true intereſt of his Country, or by national caprice. Now it is not poſſible to expreſs, how greatly this prejudices an Hiſtorian againſt the party he hates; how many ſecret paſſions he imbibes which corrupt his judgment; and the habit he contracts of relating with greater joy, the advantages of that party to which he is moſt inclined. I add, that an Hiſtorian may conceive (from his natural diſpoſition) more affection for one foreign Nation than for another; and the ſtate and condition of his fortune may be ſuch, as to make him hope or fear more from one Prince than from another. Theſe all are obſtacles to the perfect impartiality of an Hiſtorian, and the medium he ought to obſerve. Several others might be mentioned; and were we to ſpecify the ſeveral things which biaſs an Author, who ſets about writing the Hiſtory of his own Country, the Catalogue would be very long. We therefore muſt be obliged to confeſs, that to write a Hiſtory with ſtrict impartiality is an extreme difficult taſk.

(5) See in the *Lettres Hiſtoriques* for October 1702, pag. 374, & *ſeq.* the fury with which the inhabitants of Rome diſcover their partiality, either for the Emperor, or for France. See alſo the *Nouvelles des Cours de l'Europe*, for October 1704, pag. 380, & *ſeq.* and the *Lettres Hiſtoriques* for the ſame month, pag. 358.

But though an Author could arrive ſo far, as to ſurmount all the obſtacles; the ſnares and ſurprizes of his Paſſions; the prejudices of childhood, the force of preposſeſſion, the bent his mind took before he began to write a Hiſtory; in a word, tho' he ſhould write impartially the good and bad actions of each party, without leaning to either ſide, would he meet with readers of ſo equitable a temper, as to do him the juſtice he deſerves? Will they have taken as much pains as he had done to diveſt himſelf of prejudices of every kind? Will they not be diſpleaſed at reading the ſeveral particulars he relates to the diſadvantage of the party they favour, and to the advantage of that which is odious to them? Will they believe that he has given a genuine account of the ſeveral events? Will they not look upon every circumſtance which claſhes with their prejudices as falſe? Conſequently, it would be much more difficult for ſuch a writer to appear impartial and unprejudiced than to be really ſo.

The difficulties I mention are eſpecially to be feared, in the writing the Hiſtory of one's own times; for readers are tractable in proportion to the remoteneſs of the events; but they are quite unreaſonable with reſpect to modern tranſactions. They give the name of penſioners to the enemy, to ſuch Gazeteers as make the loſſes they ſuſtained leſs than others had declared them to be, and do not weaken their advantages. A numberleſs multitude of people are ſo unjuſt, as to conſider, as favourers of the enemy, thoſe who dare contradict the advantageous news which had been brought. Thus, in a proportionable degree, an Hiſtorian makes himſelf be ſuſpected, at a time that he is truly impartial. Saluſt might have included this among the difficulties of hiſtory-writing; thoſe difficulties I mean, which, according to him, proceed from the ſtate and diſpoſition of the reader's mind. *Ac mihi quidem, tametſi haudquaquam par gloria ſequatur ſcriptorem, & auctorem rerum; tamen imprimis arduum videtur res geſtas ſcribere: primum, quod facta dictis exæquanda ſunt: dein quia plerique, quæ delicta reprehenderes, malevolentia & invidia dicta putant; ubi de magna virtute, atque gloria bonorum memores; quæ ſibi quiſque facilia factu putet, æquo animo accipit; ſupra, veluti ficta pro falſis ducit* (6). i. e. "Tho' there be not an "equal glory in writing as in atchieving of great actions, yet the compoſing of Hiſtory appears to me "a very difficult taſk; firſt, becauſe events muſt be "equalled by the words which deſcribe them; again, "becauſe moſt readers will look upon the blame which "the Hiſtorian caſts on certain things, as proceeding "from envy and malice. And, where the Hiſtorian "relates ſuch a brave and glorious exploit, as the reader thinks he himſelf could have performed, that "he aſſents to readily; but every thing above this, "he conſiders as the mere reſult of the writer's inven- "tion, and conſequently rejects it as falſe."

(6) Salluſtius, *in Præfat. Belli Catilinarii.*

To return to Capriata, I obſerve that he exhibits (7), as an example of his impartiality, the particulars he wrote concerning the two wars of Montferrat. The Duke of Mantua being attack'd in the firſt of theſe wars by the Duke of Savoy, was ſupported by the King of Spain; but in the ſecond, he was attacked by the latter Prince, and ſupported by the King of France. Now our Author, who had applauded the King of Spain with reſpect to the firſt war, cenſures him for the ſecond; and was ſo laviſh of his applauſes on the conduct of Lewis XIII, that his words were tranſcribed by a French Author. *Che un Cavaglier Franceſe dell' ordine dello ſpirito, nel ſuo Politico Chriſtianiſſimo, dato alle ſtampe, ſi compiacciuto per pompa di quella Reggia attione di regiſtrarlo parola per parola, ſenza piro nominar l'Autore* (8). i. e. "A French Knight "of the Order of the Holy Ghoſt, in a printed work "of his entitled, *The moſt Chriſtian Politician*, was ſo "pleaſed with the ſplendour of this royal action, that "he copied it word for word, but without naming "the Author." I alſo prove his impartiality and independence, by a Latin Epigram he gives us; and which had been publiſhed by an Author (9), who was not perſonally known to him. Here follows part of it:

(7) In the Preface to Part 2.

(8) Capriata, ibid. The Author of *The moſt Chriſtian Politician*, is not a plagiary, he declaring, pag. 202. of the edit. of 1645, in 12°, that what he had there related, *was borrowed from an Italian Writer.*

(9) Paganinus Gaudentius, in the Treatiſe intitled, *Obſtetrix Librorum.*

Detegis arcanos Regum ſenſuſque Doloſque,
Nec Belli cauſas præteriiſſe finis,
Venalem renuis laudando obtrudere palpum
De nullo erectus dicere vera times;
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
Gallus & Hiſpanus nullo diſcrimine habentur?
Nec tibi tractatur molliter Emanuel.

That is,

"Still you diſcloſe the ſecret arts of Kings,
"Their frauds; and cauſes of their wars relate.
"Flattery would never prompt you to be venal;
"But nobly bold, you dare to ſpeak the truth.
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
"Impartially you treat or French or Spaniard,
"Nor can Emanuel move your equal mind."

But it would have been to no purpoſe for Emanuel to have rendred himſelf worthy of ſuch an Elogium with regard to a prejudiced reader; for ſuch a one would never perceive his impartiality; and if we may aſſert, that a perſon who ſets about writing an Hiſtory ought to be diveſted of all prejudice; we may alſo aſſert, that a reader ought to be ſo, in order to form a proper judgment of the compoſition of an Hiſtorian. Of all kinds of writing, Hiſtory is that to which we may moſt juſtly apply the following ſentence; *Pro Captu Lectoris habent ſua fata libelli.* i. e. "The fate of a "Book depends on the reader's capacity or under- "ſtanding."

[*D*] *The Venetians complained of being ill treated in his Hiſtory; on which occaſion he employed a reaſon to juſtify himſelf, that deſerves to be related.*] Andrew Balbo, a noble Venetian, was at Genoa when the firſt part of Capriata's Hiſtory was publiſhed. That Gentleman made his complaints, in the moſt polite terms, to the Author, who, among other particulars, made the following anſwer. No juſt complaints can be made of my being wanting in reſpect to the Republic of Venice, with regard to the wiſdom of its government (10); if I have written the ſucceſſes of the ſeveral wars, in ſuch a manner as has given offence, it was not my fault; for I was obliged to relate them according to truth; and we cannot expect that the deſcription of ſuch things as gave us pain when they happened, can give us any pleaſure in the reading. *Quanto poi a ſucceſſi delle Guerre tanto di mare, quanto di terra, non havendole recato guſto quando ſuccedettono, e impoſſible che glie el recchino quando ſi deſcrivono, onde non v' hà colpa lo Scrittore, ſe conforme al vero i rappreſenta.* It would doubtleſs be an irregularity, ſhould the events themſelves be diſagreeable, and the hiſtory of them give us new pleaſure. None but lying writers can produce this ſtrange confuſion of the nature of things.

(10) Capriata, Preface to Part 2. of his Hiſtory.

inſcribed it to a ſovereign power, the publick would have been apt to ſurmiſe, that he had not obſerved faithfully the Laws preſcribed to Hiſtorians [*E*].

They are like certain Cooks, who make ſo excellent a ſauce to the moſt inſipid meats, and ſuch as are the hardeſt to digeſt, and they are eat with pleaſure. An unfaithful Hiſtorian either ſuppreſſes ill ſucceſſes, or covers them with ſo large a detail of petty, advantageous circumſtances, that they become imperceptible to the reader. He cannot diſcover the wound, under the multitude of glaring plaiſters which they apply to it.

Capriata repreſented alſo, that he was not either a ſubject of the Commonwealth of Venice, or its penſioner; and nevertheleſs, that he had been more tender of it than ſome Venetian Writers, whom it had puniſhed, both in their perſons and their works, at the ſame time that it permitted the ſale of his Hiſtory. *E ſe V. S. anderà paragonando i noſtri ſcritti con quei d'alcuni Veneti Scrittori troverà, che, come con maggior verità, coſi con riſpetto maggiore ho i ſucceſſi poco felici del armi Venetiani repreſentato, havendo nelle coſe dubbie ſempre nella più benignà interpretatione inclinato. In maniera, che le noſtre opere ſono publicamente, nella ſteſſa Citta di Venetia, vendute, lette, & con applauſi non minori che altrove, ricevate, dove quelle de' loro Scrittori rimanondo affato ſterminato, non compaiono in luce; e gl' Autori ne ſtati ſono puniti, & puniti ancora i Capitani, che mal ſi diſportarono ne ſiniſtri incontri dell' arme, & delle publiche fattioni* (11). All theſe particulars were fitter to juſtify the Author, rather than to remove the uneaſineſs with which the impartiality and ſincerity of his pen filled the Venetians. People don't care to have truth ſpoke of them publickly (12).

(11) Ibid.

(12) *Obſequium amicos, veritas odium parit.* Terent. *And.* Act. 1. Sc. 1. i. e. "Flattery "procures "friends, and "truth raiſes "enemies.

[*E*] *He was afraid, in caſe he had inſcribed his work to a ſovereign power, the public would have been apt to ſurmiſe, that he had not faithfully obſerved the laws preſcribed to Hiſtorians.*] He dedicated the firſt part of his Hiſtory to Ottaviano Raggi, auditor of the Chamber to Pope Urban VIII; and the ſecond to Charles Emanuel Durazzo Referendary to both Signatures; and declared the reaſons which prevented his dedicating them to ſome Prince. There is no Prince, ſays he, but is concerned in the Kings I relate; hence it might be imagined, that what I have related to the advantage of the Potentate to whom I ſhould dedicate my work, would be mere flattery; or, that I ſhould affront him, by the relation of ſuch particulars as are not to his advantage. It might alſo be ſuſpected, that a deſire of ingratiating my ſelf with a Monarch, was either a bridle to check, and keep me ſilent; or elſe a ſpur, to make me exceed the bounds of truth. *Eſſendovi tutti* (Principi) *o tanto o quanto intereſſati, non pareſce adulatione quel, che il corſo ordinario delle coſe ſuccedute portaſſe di poco loro guſto, e ſodisfattione: E per che ancora neſſuno haveſſe occaſione di far concetto, che il deſiderio d'acquiſtarmi la gratia di quel Principe, haveſſe ſervito di freno, per farmi tacere, o di ſtimolo per i ſcrivere più abbondantemente, contro quel, che l'obbligo di fidele, e ſincero ſcrittore mi poteſſe perſcrivere* (13). Nothing can be more judicious than theſe reflexions; for as laudable as the ſincerity of an Hiſtorian would be, who ſhould have juſtly cenſured the conduct of a Monarch, and related faithfully the ignominious ſucceſs which had accompanied it; ſo much in proportion would be his imprudence, ſhould he dedicate his work to him. Beſides, it is cuſtomary for an Author to flatter and cajole a ſovereign Prince, when he dedicates his work to him. He aſpires at a penſion, or ſome other reward; hence he knows what to write and what to ſuppreſs. He has had an eye to this in every part of his Hiſtory, where he ſpeaks of that Prince's actions. To dedicate ſuch a work to ſuch a Prince, what is it elſe but plainly ſhewing that the writer, from the very beginning, has given up his liberty, and is looking out for a maſter? at leaſt, will not this be the opinion of the public?

(13) Capriata, Epiſt. Dedic. to Part 1. of his Hiſtory.

CARACCIOLI. Moreri has ſpoken of ſeveral illuſtrious perſons of this family, but omitted the chief Seneſchal of Naples, who perhaps was the firſt conſiderable Nobleman of his branch. He was called John Caraccioli; and though born a Gentleman, he was obliged to turn writer in his youth (*a*), on account of the unhappineſs of his circumſtances. He was ſo fortunate as to pleaſe Joan II Queen of Naples: this opened him the way to preferment; for the lovers of this Queen were not barely eſteemed; they went on to enjoyment, and afterwards were raiſed to the higheſt poſts, according as they pleaſed her, and exerted themſelves on this occaſion. The manner in which it is ſaid this Princeſs made Caraccioli the firſt advances, is ſingular enough [*A*]. He at laſt met with the fate ſo common to ſuch minions; he engaged in too many intrigues, and became odious to a Lady who had a great aſcendant over the Queen. Some declare that he was ſo inſolent as to uſe very injurious expreſſions in ſpeaking to the abovementioned Queen, and that he even gave her a box on the ear, upon her refuſing him the Principality of Salerno (*b*). He gave occaſion to his being ſuſpected of ſeveral ſecret practices againſt

(*a*) Brantome, *Vie des Dames illuſtres*, pag. m. 398.

(*b*) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1432, num. 18. pag. m. 816.

[*A*] *The manner in which Joan II, Queen of Naples, made Caraccioli the firſt advances is ſingular enough.*] Here follows Brantome's relation of it. "The firſt "opportunity the Queen ever had to ſpeak of her "paſſion to him, was this; he was very much afraid "of mice; ſo one day while he was playing at cheſs "in her wardrobe, ſhe herſelf cauſed a mouſe to be "ſet before him; and he, ſcampering about for fear; "firſt ſtumbling againſt one, then againſt another, run "in at the Queen's chamber door, and fell juſt upon "her; by this means the Queen diſcovered her flame "to him, and they ſoon made up matters together. "A little after ſhe created him her chief Seneſchal (1)." Let thoſe who will believe this tale: and however it be, it is not unlikely, that of all love-declarations, the verbal one is the moſt painful to Ladies of ſo exalted a rank.

(1) Brantome, *Dames Illuſtres*, pag. m. 399.

This muſt not be wondered at; perſons can better command their tongues than ſeveral other ſigns which diſcover the paſſion that burns in their boſom (2). For this reaſon, ſhame more eaſily hinders a woman from diſcloſing her flame in words, theſe being arbitrary ſigns invented by man, than from diſcovering in her face, by natural ſigns, the deſires which engroſs her ſoul. And as the men are generally very dexterous in diſcovering thoſe ſigns, and ſoon take advantage of them, women have ſeldom occaſion to mention by word of mouth what they require from men; and they are ſo ſeldom reduced to the neceſſity of making ſuch a declaration, that they do not acquire, by ſeveral trials, a facility of expreſſing themſelves on that ſubject. If a woman perceives that the other ſigns are not perfectly underſtood, ſhe will rather write to her lover, than reveal her paſſion in words. We have an inſtance of this above (3) in the deſcription Ovid has given us of Byblis's paſſion. It is to be obſerved that in an affair of this kind, a Queen has not the advantage which other women enjoy; becauſe ſhe is attended by perſons, who on account of their inferiority, dare not to make her a declaration of love: ſhe therefore muſt make the firſt advances, and firſt diſcover her tender pangs. Other women, generally ſpeaking, will be attacked; and even when they wiſh to be conquered, they ſtand on the defenſive, and glory in it (4); whereas a Queen is obliged to attack, and to be expoſed to the ſhame of acting againſt all the rules of decency. I do not ſpeak of the danger of her not being underſtood; ſhe herſelf is poſſeſſed of methods to free herſelf from that peril, ſhe never failing to diſcover the ſtate of her ſoul one time or other. Our

(2) *Vulnus alit venis, & cæco carpitur igne.* Virgil *Æneid.* lib. 4. ver. 2.

(3) In note [*B*] of the Article BYBLIS.

(4) *Pugnabit primo fortaſſis, & improbe, dicet; Pugnando vinci ſed tamen illa volet.* Ovid. *de Arte amandi*, lib. 1. ver. 667.

againſt the State; for it was he who adviſed Alphonſo King of Arragon to return to Naples (c), which he had left for no other reaſon but becauſe he could not carry off forcibly from thence Queen Joan, who had adopted him her ſon. The reader may judge how ſtrongly this Queen muſt hate for ever after the party of her ungrateful ſon. Nevertheleſs Caraccioli undertook to make this very party triumph in the Kingdom of Naples. His machinations were diſcovered; and, to fruſtrate them, confidence was ſeemingly repoſed in him; and upon this ſpecious pretence he was allured into the Queen's preſence, who, by the advice of her female favourite, cauſed him to be put to death in Auguſt anno 1432 (d) [B]. In the beginning of the rupture between Alphonſo of Arragon, and Joan Queen of Naples; Caraccioli, who was ſent to viſit this Prince who feigned an indiſpoſition, was impriſoned (e), but releaſed ſome time after (f). See Paſquier, chap. 16. *du VI Livre des recherches de la France.*

(c) Mariana, lib. 21. cap. 5.

(d) Idem, ibid.

(f) Idem, ibid.

(e) *Simulat rex valetudinem. Joannes Caracciolus Seneſcallus majori apud reginam gratia & auctoritate quam honeſtum eſſet, ad inviſendum accedens capitur.* Mariana, lib. 20. cap. 13.

Our Jane of Naples tried ſo many methods, that, without being forced to breath the words, *I love you*; or to expreſs herſelf in ſuch plain and courſe terms as were addreſſed to Joſeph the Patriarch (5), ſhe diſcovers her fond wiſhes. A Queen runs very little danger of being refuſed. The advantages which thoſe who acquieſce with her deſires would gain, and the evils to which ſuch perſons would be expoſed, did they not anſwer the firſt advances of a Queen (6) generally compel them to gratify her.

(5) Gen. xxxix. 7.

(6) See note [C] of the article FAUSTA.

[B] *This Queen, by the advice of her favourite, had him put to death.*] Mariana relates it thus: *Princeps concilii autor Cobella Rufa Antonii Sueſſæ Ducis conjux, quæ præcipuum gratiæ & auctoritatis locum apud Reginam nacta erat, eoque implacabili odio in Caracciolum ferebatur* (7). i. e. "The perſon who chiefly adviſed "this, was Cobella Rufa, the Duke of Sueſſa's Lady, "who was moſt in favour, and had the greateſt au- "thority with the Queen, and for that reaſon ſhe bore "an implacable hatred to Caraccioli." Obſerve, that according to ſome Authors, this Queen rather connived at Caraccioli's murther, than commanded it (8). She pardoned the murtherers; confiſcated the eſtate of the deceaſed, and branded his memory. He did not take this Princeſs to be his enemy, for he no ſooner heard the falſe and inſidious meſſage ſent him by the aſſaſſins viz. that he muſt immediately wait upon the Queen, who was ſeized with an apoplectic fit, but he ſtarted up and opened his chamber door, being half naked. Upon this the murtherers ruſhed in, and killed him the 27th of Auguſt, on which day he had ſolemnized, with great pomp, his ſon's nuptials (9).

(7) Marian. lib. 25. cap. 5.

(8) *Non tam jubente quàm non negante regina.* Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1442. num. 18.

(9) Extracted from Spondanus, ibid.

CARACCIOLI (JOHN ANTHONY) ſon to John Caraccioli Prince of Melphi, Marſhal of France, &c. was Biſhop of Troies in the 16th Century, and turned Calviniſt publickly, anno 1561. See Moreri's Dictionary, but take notice that Thuanus's words are there diſguiſed. He is made to ſay what he never ſaid (a); and a remarkable circumſtance ſpecified by him is omitted, viz. that the Proteſtants acknowledged Caraccioli for Biſhop, after he had publickly embraced their Religion [A]. This deſerves to be examined.

(a) This is eſpecially viſible in the later editions, where the Editors have printed in Italic, thoſe words which it is pretended are from Thuanus.

CARBO

[A] *The Proteſtants acknowledged Caraccioli for Biſhop, after he had publickly embraced their Religion.*] Thuanus relates, that a doubt was raiſed in the mind of this Biſhop, on account of his not having been elected by the ſuffrages of the Church, nor by thoſe of the people: that for this reaſon he aſſembled the Elders of the Proteſtant Conſiſtory; in order that they might enquire and conſult in a pious and wiſe manner, whether they would elect and acknowledge him for Biſhop. He declared, that he would have no favour ſhewn him; and that if he were not judged qualified for that office, he would very willingly reſign it. This affair having been debated, he was unanimouſly elected, and re-ordained; took his ſeat as Biſhop, and preached often; till the other Prelates fearing this example would be of ill conſequence, prevailed upon the King to have him deprived of the Epiſcopal dignity. *Ei ſcrupulus injectus eſt de vocatione ſuâ, quod non Eccleſiæ neque populi ſuffragiis electus eſſet; itaque Proteſtantium Eccleſiæ ſeniores evocat, ut pie ac prudenter deſpicerent, an ſe eligere vellent, ac pro Epiſcopo habere; neque quidquam gratiæ darent; nam ſi minus idoneum exiſtimarent, ſe libenter loco ceſſurum. Ita re inter eos deliberatâ, omnium conſenſu electus & denuo ordinatus loco Epiſcopi ſedit, in concionibus publicè ad populum, quibus eorum doctrinam ſequebatur, habendis aſſiduus, donec præſules exemplum veriti apud Regem pervicerunt ut dignitate moveretur* (1). Ought Moreri to have omitted this circumſtance? We ſhall ſoon ſee, that it does not agree with Beza's relation; and that nevertheleſs Thuanus has only copied Peter Martyr, who had been on the ſpot.

(1) Thuanus, lib. 28. pag. m. 569. vol. 1. C. *ad ann.* 1561.

One of the Preſbyterian Miniſters who were baniſhed England anno 1662, publiſhed an apology in which he refutes a work written by Durel (2), in favour of Epiſcopacy. I have read in that apology the anſwer which was made to Durel, who had proved by this example of Caraccioli Biſhop of Troies, that the Proteſtants of France did not condemn Epiſcopacy. It was objected to him, that if they had acknowledged this proſelyte as a real Biſhop, it was becauſe they underſtood, by the word Biſhop, a Miniſter of God's word; and not a perpetual Preſident in the aſſembly of Miniſters or Preſbyters; and ſtill leſs in the ſignification of a Prelate, who regulates all things without the advice of the Preſbyters (3). It moreover added, *Inceſſit animum boni viri ſcrupulus, an poſſit munus paſtoris obire, eo quod non haberet Eccleſiæ & populi confirmationem ſeu electionem, inde (utar ipſiſſimis verbis Petri Martyris in Epiſtola ad Bezam.)* "*Seniores Ec-* "*cleſiæ Reformatæ accerſivit, rogavitque, ut pie ac pru-* "*denter deſpicerent, an eum vellent eligere, & confir-* "*mare, ac pro Epiſcopo habere, quod ſi judicarent faci-* "*endum, ſe daturum operam, ut ſicut cæpit ita pergeret, Eccleſiam ſibi commiſſam docendo & hortando,* "*pro viribus ædificare, & augere, ſin verò exiſtima-* "*rent illum minus idoneum ad tantum munus, libere* "*atque apertè dicerent, ſe autem paratum eſſe loco ce-* "*dere, modo ei liceat in Eccleſiâ Reformatâ vivere, jux-* "*ta Sanctam Evangelii Diſciplinam. Rogavit ut ea* "*de re mature in Eccleſiâ deliberarent; quod cum fac-* "*tum eſſet, ab omnibus unanimiter ut verus Epiſcopus* "*agnitus eſt & receptus Nov.* 16. 1561 (4). i. e. "Carraccioli (that good man) doubting whether he "could take upon him the exerciſe of the paſtoral "functions, as he had not been confirmed or elected "either by the Church or the People, he thereupon "(to uſe the very words of Peter Martyr in his letter "to Beza) aſſembled the Elders of the Reformed "Church, and deſired them to conſider piouſly and "prudently, whether they would elect, confirm and "receive him as Biſhop; which if they ſhould think "proper to do, he would uſe his endeavours to pro- "ceed as he had begun; and by inſtructing and ad- "moniſhing the Church committed to his care, and "would increaſe and edify it to the utmoſt of his "power; but that in caſe they thought him incapable "of exerciſing ſo weighty a charge, they then ſhould "ſpeak their minds freely and openly, in which caſe "he was ready to reſign; he deſiring nothing more, "than to be permitted to live in the Reformed Church, "according to the Holy Rules enjoyned by the Goſpel. "He entreated them to deliberate ſeriouſly in the "Church, on this affair; which being done he was "unanimouſly acknowledged to be a true Biſhop, "and accordingly was received as ſuch the 16th of "November 1561." Thus we find Thuanus and Peter Martyr agree exactly in their relation; we therefore

(2) He was at that time Miniſter of the Savoy in London, which is an Epiſcopal Church.

(3) *Apologia pro Miniſtris in Anglia (vulgo) nonconformiſtis*, pag. 163. edit. 1665.

(4) Idem, ibid.

CARBO (*a*) (LEWIS) Author of ſeveral works of Rhetoric, Philoſophy, and Divinity, lived towards the end of the ſixteenth Century. He was not a Lawyer, as Konig affirms, but a Divine; and was even Profeſſor of Divinity at Perugia. Servilius Treus, a native of Udino, was one of Carbo's good friends, and adviſed ſeveral perſons to purchaſe the Rhetoric which Carbo had publiſhed. This reaſon, among others, determined Carbo to dedicate to him his *Introductio in Logicam* [*A*], printed at Venice, anno 1579, in 8vo. An Author cannot but be very well pleaſed to have his works recommended.

(*a*) He takes *à Coſtacciaro*, for his ſurname.

muſt not think it ſtrange, that Durel ſhould aſſert that Caraccioli was acknowledged as a true Biſhop by the Proteſtants of France; for who could better prove this than Peter Martyr, who, after the conference of Poiſſy, paſſed by Troies, on purpoſe to ſee the Biſhop, who publickly declared himſelf a Proteſtant (5)? Nevertheleſs the Author of the abovementioned apology, charges Durel with being guilty either of a fraud or negligence, and in order to prove this, he compares his words with the following paſſage taken from the Hiſtorian of the Proteſtant Churches of France.

(5) Thuanus, lib. 28. *ad ann.* 1561.

" About the end of September, Meſſire Anthony " Caraccioli, Biſhop of Troies, coming back from " the conference of Poiſſy, where he had reaped no " benefit; and being alſo ſollicited by ſome Princeſſes " and other Ladies of the Court, he appeared before " the Conſiſtory of the Church of Troies, acknow- " ledging his errors in a ſolemn manner, and deſiring " to be admitted to the Miniſterial Functions. Upon " this the opinions were divided, ſome thinking it " would be a great advantage to have him on their " ſide; while others ſuſpecting him, and not without " cauſe, his fickleneſs and lewd life till then being " but too well known; at laſt, they agreed to aſk the " advice of the Miniſters, who were ſtill aſſembled at " Poiſſy, and being a little perplexed with this af- " fair, becauſe of ſeveral circumſtances which were " ſpread concerning it, ſent to deſire the advice of " the Church of Geneva, whoſe judgment is inſerted " in the Latin anſwers of Calvin (6). In the mean " time, the famous Peter Martyr paſſed thro' Troies, " in his return from Poiſſy to his Church at Zurich, " by whoſe (Peter Martyr's) advice, the Biſhop hav- " ing abjured his errors, and ſigned his confeſſion of " faith, and promiſed to reſign his Biſhoprick; he " was admitted into the Miniſtry, but not without " being oppoſed by one of the Miniſters called Peter " le Roy. Nevertheleſs having quitted his Biſhoprick, " on condition of having certain penſions which the " Queen procured him, Caraccioli began to preach, " he having a much greater flow of words, than true " learning. He afterwards behaved very ill, as ſhall " be ſhewn in its place (7)."

(6) I believe it is in the 373d of Calvin's *Epiſt.* pag. 726. edition Hanov. 1597.

(7) Beze, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. des Egliſes Réformées*, tom. 1. lib. 5. pag. 767. *ad ann.* 1561.

If this relation could be reconciled with that of Peter Martyr, we then muſt ſay, that Durel has expreſſed himſelf in the moſt obſcure and deceitful manner. I allow, that if Durel knew what the Author of the Hiſtory of the Proteſtant Churches had ſaid, he ought either to have refuted him, or have reconciled him to the beſt of his power with Peter Martyr: but there is ſome little probability that he knew nothing of it; and that he did not ſuſpect there were relations ſo different from thoſe of that Miniſter, and which were adopted and confirmed by Thuanus. Durel took advantage of the obſervation which this illuſtrious Hiſtorian employed to ſtrengthen his relation, viz. that the Biſhops of France feared the conſequences of the Biſhop of Troies's conduct, and for this reaſon they prevailed with the King to diveſt him of the Epiſcopal dignity. Now the apologiſt for the Preſbyterians eludes this Remark, by ſaying, that the Biſhops feared the conſequences of the conduct of the Biſhop of Troies, becauſe, that if the election of Biſhops could not be lawful without the voice or conſent of the people, all the hierarchy would be deſtroyed; and becauſe Caraccioli frequently condemned in his Sermons, either the idleneſs of the Prelates, or the cares they beſtowed on other matters (8). But this is far from the queſtion: it is evident Thuanus meant, that the fear of the Biſhops was founded on this reaſon, viz. upon Caraccioli's ſtill poſſeſſing his Biſhoprick after he had turned Proteſtant. It is by this means that his example might have been of very dangerous conſequence. Several Prelates would perhaps have forſaken the Romiſh Religion, had they been ſure of preſerving their Biſhopricks, by getting themſelves confirmed by the people among the Calviniſts. There was no room to fear, that any of them would have quitted their Sees, were they only to become Proteſtant Miniſters without any title or character in the Church. We may then aſſert that Durel's antagoniſt miſtook, and ſtruck into mere common places of controverſy, in order that he might have an opportunity chiefly to reproach the Engliſh Biſhops with their neglect of preaching (9).

(8) *Apologia pro Miniſtris in Anglia*, pag. 166.

(9) Ibid. and pag. *ſeq.*

[*A*] *Servilius Treus . . . . adviſed . . . . the Rhetoric. . . . This reaſon among others, determined Carbo to dedicate to him his* Introductio in Logicam.] The uſual common place, by which it is ſaid, that the perſon to whom an Author dedicates his work ſhall be the Protector of it (1), failed not of being firſt mentioned in this Epiſtle Dedicatory. After this followed the common place of gratitude, and therein the Panegyriſt, among other ſervices, expatiated on the applauſes which had been given to the treatiſe of Rhetoric, and the Exhortations that were made for people to purchaſe it. *Deinde ſi iis potiſſime Opera dicanda* . . . as it is expreſſed in folio 2d verſe, of the dedication of the work entitled *Lud. Carbonis Introduct. in Logicam, Venetiis*, 1597, *in* 8*vo.* to *hortatum* incluſive.

(1) See on this ſubject the note [*C*] of the Article ANTESIGNAN.

Obſerve that Servilius Treus, to whom thoſe Books, were dedicated, was a Lawyer who had exerciſed ſeveral conſiderable employments in the Republick of Venice. They are all enumerated in this Epiſtle Dedicatory. He was one of the ſeven Commiſſioners who preſided over the building of *Palma nuova*; and he made a ſpeech on that occaſion which was printed, and applauded by Carbo, who did not fail to obſerve, that his friend poſſeſſed a very rare and uncommon talent, viz. his being very fit for buſineſs, and at the ſame time very learned. It is certain that theſe two qualities meet very ſeldom in the ſame perſon (2); for a ſtrong application to ſtudy, generally makes a man not very capable of exerciſing public employments, I mean of ſuch employments as are not of a literary kind. *Ut id* omnes *in te admirati ſunt quod in paucis reperitur doctrina*, ... in the ſame Work, folio, a 4, to *Itaque* excluſive.

(2) See the Preface to the *Oeuvres de Sarraſin.*

This Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated from Venice, the 5th of June 1597.

CARDAN (JEROM), a Phyſician, and one of the greateſt genius's of his age, was born at Pavia the 24th of September 1501 (*a*) [*A*]. As his mother was not married

(*a*) Cardan, *de vita propria*, pag. 12. edit. Paris 1643, 8vo.

[*A*] *He was born . . . the 24th of September* 1501.] I would not depend on what I read in Chapter II of his Life, *Ortus ſum an. M. D. VIII Calend. Octobris.* I ſhall not criticize on the ill conſtruction of thoſe words, tho' they make the reader doubt, whether Cardan was born the 1ſt of October 1508, or the 24th of September 1500, but will examine other particulars. Cardan relates, that he was ſeized with a fit of ſickneſs which had like to have carried him off, in the beginning of his eighth year (1); and that he was recovered when the French made rejoicings for the victory obtained by them over the Venetians near the Adda (2). It is certain, that this victory was won the 14th of May 1509; and it is very probable, that Cardan fell ſick towards the cloſe of September 1508; at which time he was entering into his eighth year, and therefore

(1) Cardan, *de Vitâ propriâ*, cap. 4. pag. 14. Paris edition 1643.

(2) *Convalui dum Galli, de victis in Alduæ confinii, Venetis celebrabant triumphum.* Cardanus, ibid.

married [*B*], ſhe did whatever lay in her power, when with child, to deſtroy the fruit of her womb; but the potions ſhe took for that purpoſe, had not the wiſhed for effect (*b*). She was three days in labour; and they were forced at laſt to tear the child out of her. His head, at his birth, was covered with black, curled hair (*c*). At four years old he was ſent to Milan (*d*), where his father was a Lawyer (*e*); and at eight years of age, being ſeized with a dangerous illneſs, he was devoted to St. Jerom. It was his father made this vow; he choſe rather to have recourſe to this Saint than to his familiar Dæmon, he boaſting highly that he had one. His ſon never thought proper to aſk him the reaſon of ſuch a preference (*f*). Being twenty years old he went and ſtudied in the Univerſity of Pavia; and two years after explained Euclid there. He went to Padua anno 1524; took the ſame year his Maſter of Arts degree; and towards the cloſe of 1525, that of Doctor of Phyſick (*g*). He married about the end of the year 1531 (*h*). He had been incapable, during the ten preceding years, of having any commerce with women [*C*], which was a great grief to him. He was full thirty three years of age, when he ſet up for Profeſſor of Mathematics at Milan; and two years after, he was offered a Profeſſorſhip in Phyſick at Pavia, which he refuſed, not ſeeing any likelihood of having his ſalary paid him (*i*). In 1539 he was made a Fellow of the College of Phyſicians at Milan; and anno 1543, he taught Phyſic publickly in that city. He did the ſame at Pavia the year following, but left off teaching at the year's end, becauſe his ſalary was not paid him, and returned to Milan (*k*). In 1547 he refuſed an advantageous employment which the King of Denmark offered him; the air and Religion of that country prompting him not to accept of the offer [*D*]. In 1552 he went into Scotland,

(*b*) Cardanus, *de vita propria*, pag. 7.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 8.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 13.

(*e*) See the remark [*S*], ſome particulars concerning him.

(*f*) Cardanus, *de vita propria*, pag. 14.

(*g*) Ibid. pag. 16, 17.

(*h*) Ibid. pag. 19.

(*i*) Ibid.

(*k*) Ibid. pag. 20.

therefore was born about the end of September 1501. If any of my readers ſhould not be ſatisfied with this proof, upon pretence that Cardan's illneſs might have begun in September 1507, they may ſee in what manner Cardan fixes, in another place (3), his thirty fifth year to 1536. Baillet was in the right to obſerve, that Authors vary and are very obſcure, with regard to the exact time of Cardan's birth and death (4). See the Note [*F*].

(3) Ibid. pag. 19, 20.

(4) Baillet, vol. 1. of the *Anti*, pag. 46, *& ſeq.*

[*B*] *His mother was not married.*] She was called Clara Micheria (5). I have not found any paſſage, where her ſon declares expreſly that ſhe was not married; he indeed ſays in one place that ſhe endeavoured to deſtroy the fruit of her womb, and that his father did not live with her; but thoſe two circumſtances do not imply that a woman is not married. Many married women take potions to deſtroy the infant they are going with: the books of the Caſuiſts manifeſt this but too much; and the Confeſſors know enough of this matter. Beſides, married perſons often ſeparate from bed and board. Should then the reaſon be aſked me, why I pronounce Cardan a baſtard; it is this. The two abovementioned circumſtances, which I ſaid did not imply a woman's not being married, are yet commonly a mark of illegitimate birth. If they had not been ſo with regard to Cardan, he would have declared it expreſly; for he would not have been ignorant of the conſequence which would naturally be drawn from his confeſſion. Since therefore he does not ſpeak of his mother's being married, after having related the two particulars on which I inſiſt; there is no room to doubt, but that he was begot in a criminal way. After he was ſeven years of age he was brought up at his father's; and at that time his mother and her ſiſter lived in his father's houſe. This does not prove that ſhe was married; ſince the ſame may happen to a kept miſtreſs. I have read in a modern Writer (6) that Cardan owns *, *that the College of Phyſicians of Milan would not admit him into their body, becauſe they ſuſpected that he was a baſtard.* The word *ſuſpected* is remarkable. It proves evidently, that the public did not know whether Cardan's father and mother had been really married. Be this as it will, the modern Writer juſt now cited, employs a very improper expreſſion, when he ſays, that *Cardan plainly declares himſelf a ſon of a whore; beginning the Hiſtory of his own Life by the action of his mother, who did whatever lay in her power to deſtroy him in her womb* (7). The word *Whore* is altogether improper in this place; not only becauſe Cardan does in no way own that his mother was a concubine; but becauſe, that ſuppoſing he had owned it expreſly, we yet ought not to conclude from thence that he had treated her ſo ignominiouſly. A concubine and a whore are generally two very different perſons. *Eſt enim meretrix quæ (ut loquitur Imp. in l. 22. C. ad L. Jul. de adult.) pudorem ſuum vulgi libidinibus proſternit, quæ paſſim venalem formam habet, & quæſtum inde facit* (8). i. e. "A whore "(according to the Emperor Juſtinian) is a woman "who proſtitutes herſelf to any one; and who lets "out her body to all men without exception, for profit "and hire."

(5) Cardanus, *de Vitâ propriâ*, pag. 6.

(6) La Mothe le Vayer, vol. 10. Lettre 43. pag. 345.

* *De Conſolatione*, lib. 3. cap. 2.

(7) La Mothe le Vayer, tom. 2. Lett. 63. pag. 38.

(8) Marquardus Freherus, *de Famâ*, lib. 2. cap. 11. pag. m. 211.

[*C*] *He married... in* 1531. *He had been incapable, during the ten preceding years, of having any commerce with women.*] He aſcribes this to the malignant influences of the conſtellation which preſided over his birth. The two inauſpicious Planets, with Sol, Venus, and Mercury, were in the human ſigns; for this reaſon, ſays he, I was not to decline from the human form; and becauſe Jupiter had the aſcendant, and Venus was predominant over the whole figure, I was only injured in the privy parts, adds he; ſo that from the age of one and twenty till to thirty one, I have not been able to have the leaſt commerce with women, which obliged me to bewail my fate, and to envy the happineſs of all other men. *Cum Sol & maleficæ ambæ & Venus & Mercurius eſſent in ſignis humanis, ideo non declinavi à forma humana; ſed cum Jupiter eſſet in aſcendente, & Venus totius figuræ domina, non fui oblæſus niſi in genitalibus, ut à xxi anno ad xxxi, non potuerim concumbere cum mulieribus, & ſæpius deſterem ſortem meam, cuique alteri propriam invidens* (9). When he enumerates the greateſt calamities of his life, he finds four, the firſt of which according to him, is that of not having been capable of diverting himſelf with the Fair Sex; the ſecond was the tragical end of his eldeſt ſon; the third, his being thrown into priſon; the fourth, the diſſolute life his younger ſon led. *Totidem maxima detrimenta & impedimenta, primum concubitus, ſecundum mortis ſævæ filii, tertium carceris, quartum improbitatis filii natu minoris* (10). In another place, he makes a longer enumeration of his misfortunes, and does not omit his impotency. *Infelicitates ſunt mors filiorum maximè ſæva, aut ſtultitia vel ſterilitas; impotentia ad congreſſum mulierum; paupertas perpetua, pugna, accuſationes, incommoda, morbi, pericula, carcer, injuria in præferendo immeritos tot & toties* (11). i. e. "My misfortunes "are, the very cruel death, the folly, or barrenneſs "of my children; my own impotency; my perpe"tual poverty, the diſſenſions in which I was engag"ed; accuſations, loſſes, diſeaſes, dangers, impriſon"ment; the injury that was ſo often done me, in pre"ferring ſo many worthleſs perſons before me."

(9) Cardanus, *de Vitâ propriâ*, cap. 2. pag. 8.

(10) Ibib. cap. 30. pag. 116.

(11) Ibid. cap. 46. pag. 259.

[*D*] *The air and Religion of that Country prompting him not to accept of the offer.*] His friend Andrew Veſalius would have procured him this employment. Cardan was to have had eight hundred crowns a year, and a table at Court. But he refuſed theſe advantages, for the following reaſon, among others, viz. becauſe he would have been obliged to forſake the Romiſh Religion in order to live quietly at that country. *Oblata eſt conditio D. CCC. Coronatorum in ſingulos annos à rege Daniæ, quam recipere nolui, cum etiam victus impenſam*

land [*E*], and came back to Milan about ten months after (*l*). He continued in this city till

(*l*) Cardan, *de vita propria*, pag. 22.

penſam ſuppeditaret, non ſolum ob regionis intemperiem, ſed quod alio ſacrorum modo conſuevisſent, ut vel ibi male acceptus futurus eſſem, vel patriam meam legem majorumque relinquere coactus (12). To judge of matters, from the idea, which one would at firſt entertain of Cardan's Religion, one would not have ſuppoſed him to be ſo very conſcientious. We ought to ſuſpect the overhaſty opinions which are formed of people on mere prejudices, and at firſt ſight, and go to the fountain head. With regard to my ſelf, after the peruſal of Cardan's work *de Vita propria*, I conſidered him as a ſuperſtitious perſon rather than a free-thinker. I own indeed that he himſelf confeſſes he had very little piety, *parum pius* (13); but he aſſures us in the preceding page, that tho' he was naturally very revengeful (14), he yet neglected to wreak his vengeance, whenever an opportunity offer'd for that purpoſe; he neglected it, I ſay, out of reverence to the Almighty. *Dei ob venerationem, & quod omnia hæc vana quantum ſint dignoſco, occaſiones oblatas ultionum etiam conſulto negligo* (15). No prayers nor conſtant attendance at Church, are equal to the worſhip which is paid to God in that manner; I mean in obeying his laws from the reverence we bear him, and in oppoſition to the ſtrongeſt propenſions of nature. A certain Writer therefore goes too far when he declares, that Cardan, by his own confeſſion, was *an impious man* (16). He boaſts his having refuſed a conſiderable ſum of money from the King of England, becauſe he would not allow him the titles which the Pope had deprived him of. *Renui quingentos, certè aliqui dicunt mille (veritatem ſcire non potui) quod titulo ipſius regis, in pontificis præjudicium ſubſcribere noluerim* (17). This is meant of King Edward, whoſe hand he had the honour to kiſs at London, in 1552. He relates, that having found among his father's manuſcripts, that prayers addreſſed to the holy Virgin, the firſt of April at eight in the morning, were very efficacious when joined to a *Pater* and an *Ave Maria*, he had offer'd up theſe prayers on very urgent occaſions, and received the greateſt benefit from them (18). He is angry with Polybius for denying the reality of apparitions, and ſuch other tenets of the religion of the Heathens (19). In fine, nothing can be wiſer and more ſolid, than the reflections made by him in the 22d chapter of his Life, where he lays down his religion and piety. Do the reaſons which he gives why he loved ſolitude, ſavour of impiety? When alone, ſays he, I am more than at any other time with thoſe I love, I mean with the Almighty and my good Angel. *Diligo ſolitudinem, nunquam enim magis ſum cum his quos vehementer diligo quam cum ſolus ſum: diligo autem Deum, & ſpiritum bonum: hos dum ſolus ſum contemplor, immenſum bonum, ſapientiam æternam, lucis puræ principium & autorem, gaudium verum in nobis, ubi periculum non eſt ne nos deſerat, veritatis fundamentum, amorem voluntarium, autorem omnium, qui beatus eſt in ſeipſo, & beatorum omnium tutela & deſiderium; juſtitia profundiſſima ſeu altiſſima, mortuos curans, & viventium non oblitus, ſpiritus autem mandato illius me defendebo, miſericors, conſultor bonus, & in adverſis auxiliator & conſolator* (20). i. e. "I love ſolitude; "for I am not at any time more with thoſe I love "from my ſoul, than when I am alone. I love God "and my good Angel; and theſe, when I am alone, "I contemplate; the boundleſs Good, eternal Wiſ"dom; the Fountain and Author of pure light and "knowledge; the Spring of true joy in the human "mind, which there is no danger of its ever loſing; "the Foundation of truth, diſintereſted love; the Crea"tor of all things, who is happy in himſelf, and "the Guardian and Protector of all who are happy; "the higheſt and moſt perfect Juſtice, extending its "care to the dead, and not forgetful of the living. "And the Angel who, by his command, is my De"fender; a kind and compaſſionate Counſellor; a "Helper and Comforter in diſtreſs."

Nevertheleſs I would not either deny or affirm what I have read in Martin del Rio. This Author aſſures, that Cardan had written a work on the Mortality of the Soul, which he uſed to ſhew ſometimes to his intimate friends (21). This work was never printed. On the contrary, a book of Cardan's was publiſhed on the Immortality of the Soul; in which, ſome were diſpleaſed at his ſaying, that fate and the advice of friends, would not ſuffer him to declare all his thoughts on that ſubject. This, ſay they, is a ſign, that he publiſhed this book merely from a political view, and that his heart was corrupt as before. *Cum eo ipſo opere (de Animarum Immortalitate) Cap. 13. pag. 280. apertè prodat fato ſe ac monitis prohiberi reliqua dicere quæ de Anima ſentiret, ſuſpicio eſt hunc Polypum ad eam ſcriptionem metu infamiæ adactum, verè anterius talè quid ſcripſiſſe contra Animæ Immortalitatem quale nonnulli referunt, idque doctrinæ venenum ejus in pectore etiam poſt editum eum quem retuli librum, delituiſſe* (22). But I believe theſe people are miſtaken. Dr. Parker, who has exhibited very happily the extravagancies and wild whims of Cardan, thinks he is much more an Enthuſiaſt than an Atheiſt, and I believe he is in the right. See pag. 77 of his Treatiſe *de Deo*. However it cannot be denied, but that Cardan's works are interſperſed with very pernicious doctrines. Father Theophilus Raynaud points out ſome of them, in the paſſage juſt cited; and concludes with proſcribing this Phyſician's works, in the following manner; the Chief, ſays he, of Atheiſts of the ſecond claſs. *Homo nullius religionis ac fidei, & inter clancularios Atheos ſecundi ordinis ævo ſuo facilè princeps.* i. e. "A man without either faith or "religion, and *Chief* of the ſecond claſs of ſecret A"theiſts, in his time."

The elder Scaliger relates ſome words from Cardan's work on the Immortality of the Soul, which are directly of the ſame import with the impious tenets of Averroës. Cardan affirms that there is but one underſtanding in the ſublunary regions; and that this underſtanding which is human ſo far only as the matter or ſubſtance of man is capable of receiving it, enters men, and thereby they produce intelligent acts; that it alſo approaches beaſts and ſurrounds, but cannot enter them, becauſe of the diſproportion of their matter; it therefore illuminates men internally, and irradiates beaſts externally only (23). This is all the difference Cardan allows between the underſtanding of men and that of Brutes. Thence it follows evidently that the ſouls of men are not more perfect than thoſe of brutes, which are inferiour to the former in matter only; whence it follows, that our ſoul is as mortal as that of a dog. If the Reader ſhould meet with other principles of this kind in the above mentioned work of Cardan, he muſt not wonder at it; for it is no more than a rhapſody of ſeveral pieces, which he had collected here and there from the works of Pomponatius and Auguſtin Niphus &c. *Ne vero tibi placeas in illis tuis Commentariis* (de Immortalitate Animæ) *quos confuſos diximus: nihil enim aliud ſunt quàm ſarrago præceptorum meorum, Pomponatii, Sueſſani, Dominici de Flandria, quæ tua feciſti ridiculis fabellis declamatoriis* (24). To conceal his plagiariſm, he intermixed declamations with the doctrines he uſed to ſteal from thoſe Philoſophers. Thomaſius might have added theſe words of Scaliger, to thoſe he quotes from Naudæus (25), to ſhew that Cardan had been a Plagiary (26).

[*E*] *In* 1552 *he went into Scotland.*] He relates, that the Archbiſhop of St. Andrews (27), Primate of the Kingdom, ſent for him; after having applied in vain to the Phyſicians of the King of France, and afterwards to thoſe of the Emperor (28). This Prelate paid him largely for his voyage. Cardan, by this means travelled thro' ſeveral countries; he croſſed France in going; and returned thro' the Low-Countries and Germany along the banks of the Rhine (29). It was on this occaſion he went to London, and calculated the Nativity of King Edward, of which I ſhall perhaps take notice in ſome other article.

I ſhall here add, that this Archbiſhop, then forty two years old, had been ſick ten years (30). His diſeaſe was a great ſhortneſs of breath, with which he had been troubled, every week continually, during two years (31). Till that time the intervals had been longer. The Archbiſhop began to recover from the moment Cardan preſcribed to him (32). This Phyſician quitted the Prelate ſeventy five days after his arrival; and left him preſcriptions, by which a complete cure was wrought in two years (33). This is all he relates concerning the voyage in queſtion; he does not

(12) Ibid. cap. 4. pag. 21. *See alſo* cap. 32. pag. 139.

(13) Ibid. cap. 13. pag. 59.

(14) *Ultionis deſiderium ultra vires nedum prona voluntas, ut illud placeat quod multi damnant verbo ſaltem.* At vindicta bonum vita jucundius ipſa. Ibid. pag. 57.

(15) Ibid. pag. 58.

(16) Teiſſier, *Elog.* tom. 1. pag. 496. See below note [*U*].

(17) Cardanus, *de Vitâ propriâ*, cap. 29. pag. 107.

(18) Cardanus, *de Vitâ propriâ*, cap. 36. pag. 166.

(19) Ibid. cap. 43. pag. 232.

(20) Ibid. cap. 35. pag. 315.

(21) Del Rio, *Diſquiſit. Magicar.* tom. 1. lib. 2. Queſtion 26. Sect. 2. pag. m. 255.

(22) Th. Raynaudus, *Erotem. IV de bonis ac malis Libris*, num. 44.

(23) *See* Scaliger, *Exercitat.* 307. num. 30. pag. m. 987.

(24) Idem, Scaliger, ibid. num. 31. pag. 939.

(25) The reader will find them in note [*Q*], citation (68).

(26) Thomaſ. *de Plagio Literario*, n. 376. pag. m. 165.

(27) He calls him *Amulthon*; but ſhould have ſaid *Hamilton*.

(28) Cardanus, *de Vitâ propriâ*, cap. 40. pag. 192. *See alſo* cap. 29.

(29) Ibid. cap. 29.

(30) Idem, ibid. cap. 40. pag. 192.

(31) Idem, cap. 29. pag. 104.

(32) Ibid. cap. 40. pag. 193.

(33) Idem, ibid.

till the beginning of Oct. 1552, and then went to Pavia; from whence he was invited to Bologna anno 1562. He taught in this laſt city till the year 1570, at which time he was thrown into priſon; and ſome months after he was brought home. He did not enjoy his full liberty on this occaſion, he being confined in his houſe, but was not long ſo. He left Bologna in September 1571, and went to Rome, where he lived without any public employment. He was admitted a Member of the College of Phyſicians, and received a ſalary from the Pope (*m*). He died at Rome the 21ſt of September 1575 (*n*), if we may credit Thuanus, who perhaps has not been accurate enough [*F*]. This account would ſufficiently prove to the reader, that Cardan was of a very fickle temper; but he will have a much better idea of the ſingular and odd turn of his mind, by peruſing what he himſelf tells us concerning his good and bad qualities [*G*]. This frankneſs is itſelf an evident proof that his ſoul was of a very peculiar caſt [*H*]. He informs us (*o*), that

(*m*) Ibid. pag. 21, 22.

(*n*) Thuan. lib. 42. pag. 155.

(*o*) Ibid. pag. 30.

not boaſt the prediction I ſhall here give. "This "Archbiſhop was ill of a dropſy which the Phyſi- "cians looked upon as incurable, but he was cured "by Cardan. . . . If we are to believe what is related "concerning this famous Aſtrologer, he gave a dread- "ful proof of his Art to the Archbiſhop whom he "had cured, when taking leave he ſpoke to him as "follows: *That he had been able to cure the Archbiſhop "of his ſickneſs; but could not change his deſtiny, nor "prevent his being hanged.* His prediction was veri- "fied by the event; and eighteen years after, this "Prelate was condemned (by the Commiſſioners ap- "pointed by Mary Queen Regent of Scotland) to be "hanged *. Which ſentence was executed. After this "we muſt not wonder, if ſome Hiſtorians, (eſpecially "the Scotch) call Cardan a Necromancer (34)." There are two reaſons which make me doubt, whether ſuch a prediction was made to this Archbiſhop. I, The firſt is, that Cardan was a man of too ſelfiſh a nature, and too well ſkilled in the quackery of Aſtrology, to make ſuch horrid menaces to a Prelate in ſo high a ſtation as this Archbiſhop. Aſtrologers very ſeldom tell a perſon of high diſtinction, that he is ſentenced by his ſtars to an ignominious death: they promiſe him all ſuch things, as they imagine he wiſhes for moſt earneſtly, and by that means dive the deeper into his purſe. Hence it is, that whenever a Nobleman endeavours not to be impoſed upon by them, he generally conſults this kind of people, without making himſelf known to them. II, My ſecond reaſon is, that had Cardan made this prediction, he would have boaſted of it in the work, wherein he relates his having cured this Archbiſhop; for at the time that he compoſed this work, this Prelate had ſome years before, met with the unhappy fate with which it is pretended Cardan threatened him: I therefore ſubmit it to my Reader whether he can ſuppoſe, that Cardan would have been ſilent, on an occaſion which ſo ſtrongly corroborated his Aſtrological Predictions.

* In 1570.

(34) Larrey's *Hiſtory of England*, vol. 1. pag. 711. anno 1551.

The Reader will find in Melvil's Memoirs, that John Hamilton Archbiſhop of St. Andrew, and brother to the Regent of the Kingdom, fell *dangerouſly ſick, having for ſome time loſt his ſpeech, ſo that his life was deſpaired of; but that he recovered both his ſpeech and health, by the aſſiſtance of an Italian Necromancer, called Cardan* (35).

(35) Melvil's *Memoirs*, pag. 45. of the Hague edition 1694.

[*F*] *He died . . . the 21ſt of September* 1575, *if we may credit Thuanus, who perhaps has not been accurate enough.*] If Cardan died the 21ſt of September 1575, he would have lived within three days of 74 years of age; and by that means, Thuanus would make him a year older than he really was (36). Moreover it appears from ſeveral paſſages of Cardan's life, that he was writing it during the year 1575. Naudæus found it to extend no farther than the 28th of April 1576. He therefore did not look into page 158, where Cardan's mentioned the firſt of October 1576 *Teſtamenta plura condidi ad hanc uſque diem quæ eſt calendarum menſis Octobris anni* M.D.LXXVI. If this date be juſt, Thuanus is miſtaken, both in the day and year *.

(36) *Cum tribus diebus minus ſeptuageſimum quintum annum impleviſſet.* Thuanus, lib. 62. pag. 155.

* [Father Niceron, tom. 14. pag. 248. ſays, that Bayle is miſtaken in this calculation, and that Thuanus is in the right, for which Father Niceron gave ſome reaſons, which the reader may conſult.] Addit. by the Tranſlator.

[*G*] *They will have an idea of the ſingular and odd turn of his mind, by peruſing what he himſelf tells us concerning his good and bad qualities.*] Beſides what is related in the text of this article, I ſhall here add; that he walked in ſo unequal and irregular a manner, that he doubtleſs was thought a madman. Sometimes he would walk very ſlow, and like a man who was deeply involved in thought; and then on a ſudden would ſcour along, and make very whimſical poſtures. *Inceſſus inæqualis cauſa fuit cogitatio. . . . Abire in proverbium poſſet inceſſus meus, nam eſt inconſideratus, dum aliena ab his quæ præ oculis ſunt meditor. . . Ambulatio modo celeris, modo tarda, modo capite & humeris erectis, modo inclinatis* (37). In Bologna, he took a pleaſure in riding publickly in a coach that had but three wheels (38). No man was ever more ſingular in his dreſs. Thuanus, who ſaw him at Rome obſerves, that his habit was quite different from that of all other men (39). His poverty was the cauſe of his whimſical dreſs; for when Cardan went to Scotland, he bought cloaths after the Scots faſhion. When he returned to Italy, having not wherewithal to buy others, and not being willing to ſell thoſe at too much loſs, he reſolved to wear them out. The whim and odd caſt of his behaviour cannot be better repreſented, than by the verſes of Horace which I ſhall cite preſently. He owns that they ſuit him exactly; and that had Horace been deſirous of drawing his character, he ought to have employed thoſe very verſes. *Non aliter de me ego ſentio quàm Horatius de ſuo Tigellio: quinimo Horatium dixerim tum de me ſub illius perſonâ locuum.*

(37) Cardanus, *de Vitâ propriâ*, cap. 21. pag. 84, 85.

(38) Naudæus, *in Judicio de Cardano.*

(39) Thuan. lib. 62. pag. m. 154. I cite his words below, citation (42).

Nil æquale homini fuit illi: ſæpè velut qui
Currebat, fugiens hoſtem: perſæpe velut qui
Junonis ſacra ferret; habebat ſæpe ducentos,
Sæpe decem ſervos: modo reges atque tetrarchas,
Omnia magna loquens; modo ſit mihi menſa tripes, &
Concha ſalis puri, & toga, quæ defendere frigus,
Quamvis craſſa queat *.

* Lib. 1. Sat. III. 9.

Quæras cauſam, imo cauſas; in promptu ſunt, varietas primo cogitationum & morum, deinde ut ſaluti prorſus conſulerem corporis; & quod cum mutaverim ſæpius Patriam, ſeu habitationis locum, coactus ſum etiam mutare veſtes; quas neque ob jacturam vendere, nec fruſtra ſervare conveniebat, ob id neceſſitas intulit legem (40). i. e. "I have juſt the ſame idea of myſelf as Ho- "race had of his Tigellius; and fancy this Poet was "ſpeaking of me when he drew that character.

(40) Cardanus, *de Vitâ propriâ*, cap. 20. pag. 82, 83.

"A moſt unſettled fellow, he would run
"As if he fled a robber or a dun;
"And ſtreight as in proceſſion gravely go,
"Now with two hundred ſervants, now but two:
"Sometimes he'd talk of Heroe's and of Kings,
"In mighty ſwelling numbers mighty things:
"And then again: Let gracious fortune give
"A little meat and drink enough to live:
"Let her a coat to keep out cold preſent,
"Altho' 'tis thick and coarſe, yet I'm content.

CREECH.

"If you aſk the cauſe or rather cauſes of this, it "is as follows: Firſt, the diverſity of my thoughts "and humours: Secondly, on account of my health; "again, by ſhifting my abode and going from "country to country, I am often obliged to change "my cloathes, which I could not conveniently ſell, "nor keep ſuperfluouſly; hence it was that neceſ- "ſity became a law." Cardan's mind was ſubject to the ſame irregularities. Read Thuanus's words in the following note.

[*H*] *This frankneſs is alone an evident proof that his ſoul was of a very peculiar caſt.*] Thuanus takes notice of it as a very ſingular and unuſual circumſtance. *Varia ejus vita*, ſays he (41), *& mores; pluraque ipſa de ſe* INAUDITA *in viro literas profeſſo ſimplicitate ſeu libertate ſcripſit, quam curioſus quiſquam à me exigat.* i. e. "His life and manners were different; and he "wrote ſeveral particulars relating to himſelf with a "ſimplicity

(41) Thuan. lib. 62. pag. 164.

that when nature did not make him feel any pain, he would excite that diſagreeable ſenſation in himſelf, by biting his lips, and ſqueezing his fingers till he cried out [*I*] ; and that he had been ſometimes prompted to lay violent hands on himſelf [*K*] ; that he took a pleaſure in rambling all night about the ſtreets (*p*) ; that he did not uſe to commit exceſs in the pleaſures of love [*L*], but that whenever he went greater lengths in it than was neceſſary, it prejudiced him very little ; that nothing was more delightful to him, than to ſpeak on ſuch ſubjects as might vex the company he was in (*q*) ; that he ſpoke on all ſubjects, but whether properly or improperly he minded not (*r*) ; that he had been ſo paſſionately fond of dice, as to ſpend whole days in playing at hazard, to the great prejudice of his family and reputation (*s*) ; for he even ſtak'd his furniture, and his wife's jewels (*t*) [*M*]. He himſelf relates theſe particulars and ſeveral others in the moſt unaffected manner. Nevertheleſs, had we his life accurately written by another hand, I do not doubt but we ſhould have found a great many more ignominious particulars in it than in this we are ſpeaking of, in which there are however ſeveral paſſages, that teſtify ſtill plainer than what has been related above, that Cardan was of a particular caſt of mind. He ſpeaks of a numberleſs multitude of prodigies, by which he foreſaw, either ſleeping or waking, what was to befall him. This made him believe that, like Socrates, and ſome other great men, he was under the care of a particular genius [*N*]. What ſhall

(*p*) Thuan. lib. 62. pag. 32.

(*q*) Ibid. pag. 60.

(*r*) Ibid. pag. 61.

(*s*) Ibid. pag. 81.

(*t*) Ibid. pag. 94.

" ſimplicity and freedom, *unheard of* in a Man of Let-
" ters, of which I can give examples to any curious
" perſon." He adds, that he was ſurprized to find him, in Rome, where he ſaw him a few years before he died, ſo much beneath his great reputation. This made him wonder at the judgment which Julius Cæſar Scaliger had formed of Cardan ; viz. that in certain things, he appeared ſuperior to human underſtanding ; and in a great many others, inferior to that of little children. *Romæ eum diverſo ab aliis cultu incedentem paucis ante obitum annis conſpicati & adlocuti, ac ſæpius admirati ſumus, cum celeberrimi tot ſcriptis hominis recordatio ſubiret ; neque tamen quidquam in eo quod tantæ famæ reſponderet animadverteremus : eoque magis Julii Cæſaris Scaligeri accerrimum judicium ſuſpeximus, qui divinum ingenium ſuum in opere de ſubtilitate exagitando, præcipuè exercuit inæqualitate illius ubique diligenter notata, qui in quibuſdam interdum plus homine ſapere, in pluribus minus pueris intelligere videtur* (42). We ſhall ſee in the Note [*T*], that it has been thought that Cardan was ſubject to fits of madneſs.

(42) Idem, ibid.

[*I*] *When nature did not make him feel any pain he would excite it . . . by biting his lips . . . till he cried out.*] This will be leſs ſurprizing, when the reaſon of it is known. He employed this method, in order to prevent a greater evil ; for when he happened to be free from pain, he felt ſuch violent, ſuch grievous fits and ſtarts of the ſoul, that theſe were more afflicting to him than the pain it ſelf. It is this circumſtance we are to admire, and which appears indeed incredible. *Fuit mihi mos (de quo plures admirabantur) ut cauſas doloris ſi non haberem, quærerem, ut dixi de podagra : unde plerumque cauſis morbificis obviam ibam (ut ſolum devitarem quantum poſſem vigilias) quòd arbitrarer voluptatem conſiſtere in dolore præcedenti ſedato : ſi ergo voluntarius ſit dolor, facilè ſedari potuerit : & quoniam experior me nunquam poſſe prorſus carere dolore, & ſi modo contingat, ſubit in animum impetus quidam adeò moleſtus, ut nihil poſſit eſſe gravius, ut multo minus malus ſit dolor, aut doloris cauſa, in qua nulla prorſus ineſt turpitudo, periculumve. Itaque ob hoc morſum labii, & digitorum diſtorſionem, & compreſſionem cutis, ac tenuis muſculi brachii ſiniſtri uſque ad lachrymas excogitavit* (43). He ſays elſewhere, that in his greateſt tortures of mind, he uſed to laſh his legs ſeverely with a whip ; to bite his left arm ; to faſt ; and it was a great eaſe to him to weep, but very often he could not. *In maximis animi doloribus crura verberabam virga, ſiniſtrum brachium mordebam acriter, jejunebam, levabar fletu multum, ubi contigiſſet flere, ſed perſæpe non poteram* (44).

(43) Cardanus, *de Vitâ propriâ*, cap. 6. pag. 30.

(44) Ibid. cap. 14. pag. 65, 66.

[*K*] *He had been prompted ſometimes to kill himſelf.*] This he calls heroick Love ; and he imagines that ſeveral other perſons have been poſſeſſed with it, though they did not own it. *Laboravi interdum etiam amore Heroïco, ut me ipſum trucidare cogitarem, verùm talia etiam aliis accidere ſuſpicor, licet hi in libros non referant* (45).

(45) Ibid. cap. 6. pag. 31.

[*L*] *He did not uſe to commit exceſs in the affair of love.*] Here follow his words. *Veneri neque immoderatè incubui, nec ex ſuperfluo uſu multum læſus ſum, nunc tamen manifeſtè ventriculum labefactat.* i. e. " I never
" was immoderate in my pleaſures with the other ſex,
" nor did I prejudice myſelf greatly, when I happened
" to abandon my ſelf too much to them ; but now
" they weaken my ſtomach." Obſerve, that in the title of the fourth chapter, he declares, that he writes his Hiſtory to the cloſe of October 1575 ; ſince therefore he ſays, *at preſent the commerce with women weakens my ſtomach very much* ; he conſequently muſt have diverted himſelf ſometimes at that ſport, at the age of threeſcore and fourteen. He therefore had ſome little compenſation for the ten years which he ſo much regretted ; for he perhaps would have employed them ſo ill, that he had not been able to live with regard to that point, till the age of ſixty.

[*M*] *He even ſtaked his wife's jewels and his furniture* (46)] He obſerves, that the miſery to which he was reduced, never obliged him to do any thing beneath his birth or virtue ; and that one of the methods he employed to ſubſiſt himſelf was, the making Almanacks. *Ephemerides ſcribebam* (47). He relates, that after having loſt all his money in Venice with his Landlord, who had cheated him, he ſtabb'd him with a dagger in the face ; recovered his money ; added that of his wounded Landlord, and forced his way out of the houſe. He alſo loſt his rings and cloaths, but had won them back again (48). We muſt not omit, that Cardan in conſideration of his having wounded the ſharper, threw down part of the money he had taken from him. All theſe particulars add no great honour to Cardan's memory, any more than what he relates, viz. of Profeſſor Curtius's indicting him for theft, becauſe he (Cardan) would not return what had been left with him in pawn : he declared, that he would keep the pledge in his hands, becauſe when Curtius had bound himſelf, there were no witneſſes preſent. *Ab eodem Curtio de furto accuſati, quod pignus retinerem pro ſponſione pecuniarum quam ſine teſte feceram* (49). How ſtrange is this conduct ! Did not theſe learned men treat one another like brutes ?

(46) *Alea averſa oppignerata ornamentis uxoris & ſuppellectile.* Cardanus, *de Vitâ propriâ*, cap. 25. pag. 94.

(47) Ibid. pag. 95.

(48) Ibid. cap. 30. pag. 111, 112.

(49) Ibid. cap. 14. pag. 67.

[*N*] *He believed that . . . . he was under the care of ſome particular genius.*] Were it poſſible for us to give credit to all Cardan relates, I ſhould believe his opinion was well grounded ; for methinks this cannot be explained ſolely by the general laws of the union of ſoul and body. Be this as it will, ſome perſons affirm, that he was very doubtful on this head. " He
" varies ſo much in ſpeaking of his genius, that after
" having expreſly declared in a Dialogue entitled *Te-*
" *tim*, that he had one which was Venereal com-
" pounded of Saturn and Mercury ; and in his work
" *de Libris propriis*, that this genius revealed himſelf
" to him in dreams ; he doubts in the ſame place,
" whether he really had one, or whether it was merely
" the excellence of his nature, which approached to
" immortality. *Sentiebam*, ſays he, *ſeu ex genio mihi*
" *præfecto, ſeu quod natura mea in extremitate humanæ*
" *ſubſtantiæ conditioniſque & in confinio immortalium po-*
" *ſita eſſet, &c.* and concludes at laſt, in his Book *de*
" *Rerum Varietate*, that he was not poſſeſſed of any, de-
" claring ingenuouſly, *Ego certe nullum Dæmonem aut*
" *Genium*

ſhall we ſay concerning the four ſingular qualities with which Nature endowed him [O]? viz. Iſt, That he was raiſed to extaſy whenever he pleaſed. IIdly, That he ſaw whatever objects he pleaſed. IIIdly, That he beheld in dreams all that was to befall him; and IVthly, That he knew it alſo by certain marks or ſpecks which roſe upon his nails. It has been doubted whether he believed the immortality of the ſoul (u). He was unhappy in his family [P]. Cardan has been juſtly blamed for having been ſo preſumptuous as to calculate the nativity of Chriſt [Q]. It is pretended that his Aſtrological predictions

(u) See the remark [D] at the firſt and ſecond break.

(50) Naudé, *Apologie des grans Hommes*, chap. 14. pag. m. 348.

" *Genium mihi adeſſe cognoſco* (50)." See what Naudæus has ſaid on the ſubject, in his *Judicium de Cardano*, printed with this Phyſician's Life.

[O] *What ſhall we ſay of the four ſingular qualities with which Nature endowed him.*] He ſpeaks of them in ſo poſitive a manner, that it will be neceſſary to quote his own words. *Quatuor mihi indita ſunt a natura, quæ nunquam aperire volui, & omnia (meo judicio) admiratione digna. Quorum primum hoc eſt, quod quoties volo, extra ſenſum quaſi in ecſtaſim tranſeo. . . . Sentio dum eam ineo, ac (ut verius dicam) facio, juxta cor quandam ſeparationem, quaſi anima abſcederet, totique corpori res hæc communicatur, quaſi oſtiolum quoddam aperiretur. Et initium hujus eſt à capite, maximè cerebello, diffunditurque per totam dorſi ſpinam, vi magnâ continetur: hocque ſolùm ſentio, quòd ſum extra meipſum; magnâque quâdam vi paululum me contineo. Secundum eſt, quòd cùm volo, video quæ volo, oculis, non vi mentis: velut imagines illas, de quibus dixi, cùm infans eſſem, me vidiſſe. Sed nunc credo ob occupationes, nec diu, nec perfectas, nec omnino ſemper cùm volo, nec tamen niſi velim. Moventur autem perpetuò quæ videntur imagines. Itaque video lucos, animalia, orbes, ac quæcunque cupio. Credo cauſam eſſe, vim virtutis imaginatricis, viſuſque ſubtilitatem. Tertium eſt, quod omnium quæ mihi ventura ſunt, imaginem video per ſomnum. Neque unquam auſim fermè dicere, verè autem dicere poſſum, meminiſſe, quod quicquam boni aut mali vel mediocris mihi evenerit, de quo prius & rarò ante multum, non fuerim per ſomnium præmonitus. Quartum eſt, quòd eorum, quæ mihi ventura ſunt, quanquam ſint perexigua, veſtigia in unguibus apparent. Nigra & livida malorum in medio digito, felicium alba; & ad honores in pollice, ad divitias in indice, ad ſtudia & res majoris momenti in annulari, ad exiguas inventiones in minimo: coacta, res firmas: ſi ſint veluti ſtellæ, res minus conſtantes & magis publicas verbiſque plenas* (51). i. e. " Nature has indulged me four faculties or endowments which I never would diſcloſe; " and all of them, I think, are worthy of admiration. The firſt of theſe is, my having the power, " whenſoever I pleaſe, to tranſport my ſelf out of my " ſenſes, in a kind of extaſy. . . When thus enwrapt, " I feel a certain ſeparation near my heart, as if my " ſoul were diſlodging; and this is communicated to " my whole body, as though a ſort of wicket were " opened. This begins from my head, principally " from the *cerebellum* or hinder part of it; and ſpreading it ſelf along my back-bone, cannot be reſtrained " but by a great force; all I feel is, that I am beſide " my ſelf; but, by a certain ſtrong reſiſtance, I am " able to contain my ſelf a little. . . . The ſecond faculty is, that I ſee, whenever I pleaſe, whatſoever " I deſire to ſee; and that, with my eyes, and not " by force of imagination, as thoſe images I ſaid I ſaw " in my fancy. But I at this time believe that theſe, " (from the multiplicity of my employments) are " neither laſting nor perfect; nor whenever I deſire " them, nor without I do deſire them. I therefore " can ſee groves, animals, worlds, and whatever I " wiſh to ſee. I take the cauſe of this to ariſe from " the ſtrength of my conceptive faculty, and the " ſharpneſs of my ſight. The third endowment is, " that I perceive in ſleep the images of all theſe things " which are to befal me. And I dare almoſt affirm " (and am ſure I can very truly affirm it) that I don't " remember any thing ever happen'd to me, whether " good, bad, or indifferent, but I was firſt admoniſhed of it in a dream. The fourth faculty is, that " even the ſmalleſt circumſtances which are to happen " to me, are foretold me by marks and ſpecks on my " nails. Black and blue ſpots on my middle finger, " betoken misfortune, and white the very reverſe; " upon my thumb they foretel honours; on my fore-" finger, riches; on my ring-finger, ſtudies and mat-" ters of greater concern; and laſtly, on my little " finger, inventions of leſs conſequence. If theſe " ſpecks lie thick together, they denote things ſolid " and durable; but if they are ſcattered like ſtars, " they foretel things leſs conſtant, and ſuch as are of " a public nature, and made up merely of promiſes." It is to be obſerved, that whilſt theſe voluntary extaſies laſted, he did not feel the very violent pains of the gout; and that when perſons talk'd near him, he did but juſt hear the ſound of their words, but did not underſtand their ſignification. By the way, he would not for a long time boaſt theſe four ſingular qualities. At laſt this mighty ſecret burthened him too much, ſo that he reveal'd it to the public in a work of his.

(51) Cardanus, *de Rerum Variet.* lib. 8. cap. 43.

[P] *He was unhappy in his family.*] His eldeſt ſon, having fallen in love with a girl of no fortune married her, and repented his folly, but too late. Inſtead of bearing it patiently, ſince what was done could not be undone, he had recourſe to a very criminal remedy, which was the poiſoning of his wife. He ſuffer'd the puniſhment which ſuch a crime deſerved; the Judges ſentenced him to be beheaded, and he accordingly was executed at midnight (52), in the priſon (53). Cardan's other ſon was a cheat and a villain; his father was forced to throw him into priſon more than once (54), and to cut his ear off (55), and at laſt to turn him out of doors, and diſinherit him (56). Cardan's daughter gave him but two uneaſineſſes; firſt, when he was obliged to pay her portion (57), and ſecondly, her not bearing children. He was ſo deeply afflicted at his eldeſt ſon's tragical end, that he had like to have died with grief; and ſome of the Judges condemned the ſon upon no other motive, but from the hopes they entertained, that it would bereave the father either of his life or ſenſes. *Confeſſi ſunt quidem è Senatu (ſed puto non de ſeipſis intelligi voluiſſe) eâ ſpe damnâſſe illum ut dolore interirem aut inſanirem, ab unoque quam parum abfuerim, ſuperi nôrunt, . . . ſed non ſucceſſit* (58). i. e. " Some of the Senators confeſſed, " (tho' I believe they did not mean themſelves) that " they condemned my ſon merely in the hopes that it " would either diſtract me or make me lay violent " hands on my ſelf. Heaven only knows how near I " was to one of theſe . . . however, their hopes were " not fulfilled." A ſurprizing circumſtance is, that altho' Cardan did not deny but that his ſon had poiſoned his wife, and had confeſſed it at laſt to the Judges (59); he yet thought that God's wrath did purſue the latter for the unjuſt ſentence they had paſſed; and that ſeveral of them came to an untimely end (60). He pretended, that his ſon being deceived in his marriage, ſince his wife having neither money or honour, had made him a poor cuckold, he therefore was not guilty for killing her.

(52) Idem, *de Vita propria*, cap. 37. pag. 169.
(53) Idem, cap. 27. pag. 99, 100.
(54) Ibid.
(55) Naudæus *in Judicio de Cardano.*
(56) Cardanus, *in Vitâ propriâ*, pag. 100.
(57) *A ſola filia præter dotis ſumptum nihil moleſti perpeſſus ſum.* Ibid.
(58) Ibid. cap. 10. pag. 45.
(59) Ibid. pag. 170.
(60) Ibid. cap. 41. pag. 215, 216.

Nate, haud immiti qui principe, juſſa ſenatus,
Exemplo infando veterum tam dira tuliſti:
Crimina fallacis properas dum tollere mœchæ.
Conjugibus noſtris jam tûto inſultet adulter
Plectitur egregii juvenis ſi dextera vindex (61).

(61) Idem, pag. 299. *See alſo* pag. 46, 47.

[Q] *He has been juſtly blamed for having been ſo preſumptuous, as to calculate the Nativity of Chriſt.*] Gabriel Naudæus makes two obſervations on this ſubject. I. He cenſures Joſeph Scaliger, for believing that Cardan was the firſt who ever attempted it. II. He takes notice, that Cardan had the vanity to paſs for inventor of it, rather than juſtify himſelf from the example of thoſe who had preceded him in this profane enterprize.

With regard to the 1ſt point, he begins by citing the very words of Scaliger. *Audi ſubtilitatem noſtri Sæculi: extitit ante* 44 *annos cymbalum genethliacorum, qui Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti thema edidit, & omnia quæ illi accederunt, ex poſitu ſtellarum neceſſario illi contigiſſe ratiocinatur; impiam dicam magis, an jocularem audaciam, quæ & Dominum ſtellarum ſtellis ſubjecerit,*

dictions were often enough ratified by the event [*R*]; but he himſelf owns, that the rules of Aſtrology proved falſe with regard to his own perſon (*x*). Some affirm, that Cardan having foretold that he ſhould die at a certain time; he abſtained from food, in order that his death might ratify his prediction [*S*], and that his continuing to live might not diſcredit the art he profeſſed. He was then afraid of ſurviving the falſity of his prophecies; he was ſo ſcrupulous with regard to the point of honour, that he could not bear the reproach of being a falſe Prophet, and of having diſhonoured his profeſſion. Few perſons in the ſame cauſe pretend to ſo much courage, or have ſo great a love for their art. They conſole themſelves, are not aſhamed, and continue in health (*y*). He wrote a very great number of books; for the Lyons edition of his works printed anno 1663, contains

(x) See the remark [*R*].

(y) See the remarks [*I*] and [*K*] of the article COMENIUS.

cerit, & natum eo tempore putarit, quod adhuc in lite poſitum eſt, ut vanitas cum impietate certaret (62). i. e. "Mark the ſubtlety of our age. About forty "four years ago, there aroſe a moſt noiſy calculator "of nativities, who publiſhed a ſcheme of that of our "Lord Jeſus Chriſt; and pretended to prove, that "whatever had happened to him, had come to paſs "neceſſarily from the poſition of the ſtars. I know "not whether to call this an impious or wanton at"tempt, in thus ſubjecting the Lord of the ſtars to "their power; and imagining him to be born at a "certain point of time, when that æra is ſtill con"teſted; ſo that the whole appears to be a conteſt "between vanity and impiety." After this, Naudæus mentions four Authors, who a long time before Cardan, had calculated the nativity of Chriſt. The lateſt of theſe is Tiberius Ruffilianus Sextus of Calabria, who lived under Pope Leo X. He undertook to maintain publickly 400 propoſitions at Bologna, at Florence, and at Padua: the Friars cenſured twelve of them as being ſomething heretical; and that which chiefly contributed to his condemnation was the following. *Chriſtum quoad corporis compaginem elementariam aſtris ſuppoſitum, ejuſque genituram, & Prophetam magnum, & ea quæ circa corpus evenerunt, præſertim violentum ejus mortis genus, nuntiaſſe non inconvenit.* i. e. "That "Chriſt was ſubjected to the ſtars, as to his elemen"tary contexture; and that it is not improper to cal"culate his nativity; and to ſhew that he was a "great Prophet, and all thoſe things which happened "to his body, eſpecially his cruel death." The Author of theſe propoſitions, being exaſperated againſt thoſe cenſors, publiſhed a Book entitled *Apologeticus adverſus cucullatos*, wherein he exhibited the Horoſcope of our Saviour's nativity under three different figures. *Tria Chriſti geneſeos themata ſecundum tres rationabiles differentium doctorum opiniones luculenter enarravit* (63). Before him, Cardinal Peter de Alliaco, Biſhop of Cambray, who died under Pope Martin V, not only maintained, that Chriſt's nativity might be judged by the obſervations of Aſtrology; but he alſo propoſed a ſcheme of his nativity. *Præterquam contendit Chriſti nativitatem prænoſci potuiſſe ex genethliacis obſervationibus, ejuſdem inſuper nativitatis ſchema cæleſte propoſuit in elucidario Aſtronomicæ Concordiæ* (64). Albertus Magnus, had maintained before Peter de Alliaco, that the rules of Aſtrology might take place with regard to our Saviour's Horoſcope. Albumazar, who lived before Albertus Magnus, has diſcovered ſeveral particulars relating to Chriſt, according to the principles of Aſtrology. Theſe are the four Authors produced by Naudæus; ſome of them were cited by Roger Bacon, by Picus of Mirandula, and by Robert Holkot; whence he concludes, that Thuanus (65) and Scaliger were in the wrong to believe, that Cardan deſerves to be charged with being the inventor of this profane calculation. *Unde mirari ſatis non poſſum illos non viſos, nec auditos unquam fuiſſe duobus illis eruditorum Coryphæis Thuano & Scaligero qui ſaltem ex Bacchone, Pico Mirandulano, aut commentariis Roberti Holcot in ſapientiam Solomonis, diſcere potuiſſent, erratum à nonnullis ante Cardanum hunc errorem fuiſſe, ut Chriſtum falſis, & commentitiis aſtrorum imaginibus ſubmitterent: nec propterea æquum eſſe ut Cardanus, quaſi ſceleris iſtius primus opifex fuerit, tam acerbè ab illis vapulet* (66). i. e. "Whence I cannot enough wonder, that theſe were "never heard of by thoſe profound ſcholars Thuanus "and Scaliger, who at leaſt might have ſeen in Ro"ger Bacon, Picus of Mirandula, or Robert Holcot's "Commentary on the wiſdom of Solomon, that ſome "had given into this error before Cardan, and ſub"jected Chriſt to the fictitious influence of the ſtars; "and therefore the two Authors abovementioned, "ought not to have inveighed ſo heavily againſt Car"dan, as tho' he had been the firſt who attempted "that impious calculation." Without going ſo far backwards, tho' Writers might have been deſired to look into Sixtus of Sienna, in order to ſee what was Cardinal de Alliaco's opinion on this matter (67).

(62) Scaliger *in Prolegomenis ad Manilium.*

(63) Naudæus, *in Judicio de Cardano.*

(64) Idem, ibid.

(65) See what Thuanus ſays; *Extremæ amentiæ fuit, imò impiæ audaciæ aſtrorum commentitiis legibus aſtrorum Dominum velle ſubjicere, quod ille tamen exarata ſervatoris noſtri genitura fecit.* Thuanus, lib. 62. pag. 155. i. e. "It was "the greateſt "madneſs, or "rather the "moſt impious "boldneſs, to "pretend to ſub"ject the Lord "of the Stars, "to their ficti"tious laws; "and yet he "preſumed to do "this, by draw"ing our Savi"our's Horo"ſcope."

(66) Naudæus *in Judicio de Cardano.*

(67) See on this ſubject, citation (14), of the article AILLI.

With regard to the ſecond point, Naudæus affirms that Cardan having found his advantage in ſuppreſſing the names of the Authors, from whom he borrowed the calculation of Chriſt's nativity (for by this means he was looked upon as the firſt inventor of it;) would never tell the names of thoſe perſons when he was proſecuted for this horoſcope. *Patet inde quam vafer Cardanus fuerit, nam cum certo certius exploratum valeret, themata Chriſti natalitia ab Alliacenſi & Tyberio Ruffiliano exarata fuiſſe, nec illum latere poſſent quæ Picus Albumaſar, & Bacchonus de illis dixerant, noluit tamen eorum unquam meminiſſe, ut vulgo literatorum, inventum iſtud ſuum fuiſſe, perſuaderet; quod ei poſtquam ex voto ceſſit non ſecus ac in igne contigerat, quem nullum eſſe ſub concavo Lunæ, poſt Laurentium Vallam, ſed illius tamen ſuppreſſo nomine, primus aſſeruit, noluit deinceps quantumvis ab æmulis urgeretur & in diſcrimen capitis veniret, vel minimum de illis auctoribus mentionem injicere, maluitque de ſua impietate tot rumores diſſeminari, quam ex opinione tam audacis facti, partam gloriam amittere* (68).

(68) Naudæus, *in Judicio de Cardano.*

[*R*] *It is pretended, that his Aſtrological predictions were often enough verified by the event.*] Thuanus relates, that Cardan made Aſtrology to be in repute, by the ſucceſs he had in calculating nativities. *Judiciariæ quam vocant fidem apud multos adſtruxit, dum certiora per eam quam ex arte poſſint plerumque promere* (96). But Naudæus does not agree to this. He refers us to Scaliger, and to Alexander de Angelis, who relate, that the chief of Cardan's horoſcopes have been quite contrary to the event (70). Cardan himſelf owns, that by the knowledge he had in Aſtrology, he was perſuaded, that he ſhould not live above forty years, or at moſt would not reach forty five; and this was alſo the opinion of all his acquaintance. He adds, that this belief did him great prejudice. *Aſtrologiæ cognitio quam tum habebam, & ut mihi videbatur, & omnes aiebant me non exceſſurum* XL *vitæ annum, certè non ad* XLV *perventurum, multum obfuit* (71).

(69) Thuan. lib. 62. pag. 155.

(70) Naudæus, *in Judicio de Cardano.*

[*S*] *He abſtained from food, in order that his death might ratify his prediction.*] Thuanus relates, that this was believed. *Cum tribus diebus mixus ſeptuageſſimum quintum annum impleviſſet, eodem quo prædixerat anno & die, videlicet* XI Kalend. *Octobris defecit,* ob id, *ne falleret, mortem ſuâ inediâ acceleraſſe creditus* (72). i. e. "When he got within three days of threeſcore "and fifteen years of age, he died in the very ſame "year and on the very day (the XI of the Calends of "October) which he himſelf had foretold; it being "generally thought, that he haſtened his end by re"fuſing ſuſtenance, purpoſely that he might not con"tradict his prediction." Scaliger aſſerts it as an undoubted fact; I will cite his words after obſerving, that Cardan's father died in the ſame manner in 1524. He abſtained from all ſuſtenance, and lived thus for nine days (73). This man's eyes were white, he ſaw in the night time, and could ſee without ſpectacles (74). Here follow Scaliger's words. *Idem Genethliacus quum multis ante annis diem & horam mortis ſuæ determinâſſet, & appetente tempore nihilominus benè valeret, quanquam jam octogenario major, ne artem contumeliæ exponeret, inediâ conſtituit mori. Quod neſcio ſerius, an citius ante conſtitutum ab eo tempus contigerit. Res nota eſt: neque noſtrum eſt mentiri. Omnino fecit, quod ille in Epigrammate,* αἰσχυνθεὶς Πετόσιριν ἀπήγξατο. *Lege totum*

(71) Cardanus, *de Vita propria,* cap. 13. pag. 43, 44. *See alſo* pag. 184. wherein he ſays, *Quod ad Aſtrologiam quæ prædicere docet operam dedi, & nimis quam debui fidi quoque in perniciem meam.* See alſo his *de Prudentiâ Civili,* cap. 130.

(72) Thuan. lib. 62. pag. 155.

(73) Cardanus, *de Vitâ propriâ,* pag. 17.

(74) Ibid. pag. 10.

contains ten volumes in folio. His poverty was one reaſon why he wrote ſo great a number of books, the digreſſions and obſcurity whereof often puzzle the readers [*T*]. He did not write ſo great a number of books without being a plagiary (*z*). He apologizes for himſelf from the example of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, for his having wrote his own life (*aa*). Naudæus aſcribes this juſtification to him (*bb*); but it is certain this example is improperly mentioned; ſince the work aſcribed to Marcus Aurelius is a collection of moral inſtructions which he preſcribes to himſelf, and not the hiſtory of his life. Some writers have aſſerted, that Naudæus has publiſhed Cardan's life, but they are miſtaken, for it is only a diſcourſe wherein Naudæus delivers his thoughts on Cardan's character. He could not but own that Cardan was a madman [*U*]. However Naudæus does him juſtice with regard to all other particulars, as his ſenſe, his learning, &c. The elder Scaliger wrote againſt Cardan, and thought, but without any grounds for it, that his criticiſm was the occaſion of his death [*X*].

(*z*) See the remark [*D*], citations (24) and (26); and the remark [*Q*], citation (68).

(*aa*) Cardanus, *in Præf. Libri de Vita propria.*

(*bb*) Naudæus *in Judicio de Cardano.*

The

(75) Scalig. *Prolegomen. ad Manilium.*

tum Epigramma. Nihil melius hujus Genethliaci exitum expreſſerit. Nam idem minus rei fuit (75). i. e. "The ſame fortune-teller, when he had foretold many "years before the day and hour of his death, and "when the time drew near, he yet found himſelf in "very good health, tho' he was upwards of fourſcore "years old; to prevent his bringing a ſcandal upon "his art, he reſolved to ſtarve himſelf. I cannot "ſay whether he died ſooner or later than the time "he had fixed upon. However, the fact is well "known, nor would I aſſert a falſity. His conduct "was exactly like that of the man in the Greek Epi"gram, which I deſire you to read quite through. "Nothing can expreſs more exactly the exit of this "fortune-teller, for he was alſo the ſame kind of coun"terfeit."

[*T*] *His poverty was one reaſon why he wrote ſo great a number of Books; the digreſſions and obſcurity whereof often puzzle the readers.*] Theſe meet with ſuch particulars as they never expected; and in his Arithmetic ſeveral diſcourſes concerning the Motion of the Planets, the Creation, and the Tower of Babel. They alſo find in his Logick, a judgment on Hiſtorians, and on thoſe who have wrote Epiſtles. He owns, that he uſed to make digreſſions, to fill up the ſheet ſooner, his bargain with the Bookſeller being at ſo much a ſheet; and that he wrote as much for a livelihood, as for reputation. *Ut miſſos faciam (excurſus) quos de rebus ſuis frequentiſſimos habet: eo tantum fine, quemadmodum alicubi fatetur, ut plura folia typographis mitteret, quibuſcum antea de illorum prælio pepigerat; atque hoc modo fami, non ſecus ac famæ ſcriberet* (76). With regard to his obſcurity, the Author I cite alledges ſome reaſons for it (77); and the following among others, viz. that Cardan was of opinion, that ſeveral things which were familiar to him, need not to be related; and beſides, his lively and extenſive genius hurried him from one place to another; and he did not give himſelf the trouble to explain what was to be the middle, and the band or tye of thoſe two extreams. He is not the only Writer who is guilty of this fault.

(76) Naudæus, *in Judicio de Cardano.*

(77) Idem, ibid.

[*U*] *Naudæus could not but own, that Cardan was a madman.*] The thought which Seneca aſcribes to Ariſtotle, viz. that all great Wits have a mixture of madneſs, *nullum magnum ingenium ſine mixtura dementiæ* (78), is not juſt with regard to Cardan, It cannot be ſaid with reſpect to him, that madneſs is mingled with great wit: we here muſt take things in another ſenſe, and ſay, that great wit is mixed with madneſs; great wit ought to be conſider'd only as an appendix or adjunct to folly or madneſs. Thoſe who think I exaggerate on this occaſion, may, if they pleaſe, adhere to Naudæus's opinion on this matter. He approves thoſe who declare, that Cardan's way of life was very like that of a madman. *Ut mittam aliorum etiam graviſſimorum virorum judicia, qui Cardanum miras de ſeipſo fabulas concitâſſe, & inſanienti proximum vixiſſe non perperam aſſerunt* (79). It is a very certain ſign, adds this Author, that Cardan was not always in his ſenſes, when we ſee the prodigious contradictions which are in his works. They cannot be imputed to a defect of memory, nor to artifice: the little relation there is betwen theſe ſeveral variations, is owing to the different fits of madneſs with which he was ſeized. *Enimvero non ſemper eum ſui compotem fuiſſe, ſed æſtu quodam raptum indicio eſt omnium certiſſimo, varietas illa pugnantium inter ſe ſententiarum, quas non eſt quod aliquis oblivione eorum quæ jam dixerat, aut aſtu, vafricieque, prolatas ab eo fuiſſe, ſibi perſuadeat, cum ſe in rebus aliis memorem ad miraculum uſque præſteterit; & artis ac vafriciei ſuſpicionem omnem elevet, quod grandia quidem, ſed contraria ſemper, nunquam autem connexa, & ſibi mutuo cohærentia loqueretur* (80). Another ſtrong proof of his madneſs or folly, is the ill he has publiſhed concerning himſelf. He could have ſued any Poet who ſhould have treated him as unhandſomely as he does himſelf. He owns, that his ſtar had inſpired him with an impious, revengeful, treacherous ſoul; and which was addicted to ſorcery, to ſlanders, and all ſorts of uncleanneſs, and filled with a great number of ſhameful vices which he enumerates. *Ingenium ſi quis inimicus tale illi affinxiſſet quale ſuum eſſe in themate natalitio teſtatus eſt, potuiſſet in illum agere merito ea lege pœnaque lata, malo quæ nollet carmine quemquam deſcribi. Nam ex Venere loci Lunæ ac Mercurii domina, & Mercurio multum, Saturno mediocriter commiſta animum ſibi effictum ait, in diem viventem, nugacem, religionis contemptorem &c* (81). Naudæus pretends, that Cardan was the very man he deſcribed himſelf; but I had rather aſſert, that Cardan pretended only to ſhew, what the malignant influences of his ſtar would have rendred him, had he not corrected them; for he confeſſed, that the ſciences relating to Divination were fruſtrated of their certainty with regard to his perſon. By the rules of Palmeſtry, it had been pronounced that he was a dunce; *Ut Chiromantici rudem eſſe pronunciârint ac ſtupidum, inde ubi nôrunt puduerit* (82); and by thoſe of Aſtrology, he was to die before the age of forty five (83). It is univerſally known, in what manner Socrates juſtified the Phyſiognomiſt, who had accuſed him of ſo many defects. I muſt not omit, I, that Naudæus aſſerts, that Cardan, who boaſted his having never told a lie, was a great liar; and proves him ſuch on certain occaſions. II, That Dr. Parker is of Naudæus's opinion, with regard to our Cardan's madneſs, and has calculated the chief ſymptoms of it (84).

(78) Seneca, *de Tranquill. animi, ſub fin.*

(79) Naudæus, *in Judicio de Cardano.*

(80) Idem, ibid.

(81) Idem, ibid.

(82) Cardanus, *de Vita propria*, cap. 5. pag. 24.

(83) See note [*R*].

(84) Parker, *Diſputat. de Deo*, Sect. 25.

[*X*] *The elder Scaliger wrote againſt Cardan, and thought, but without reaſon, that his criticiſm was the occaſion of his death.*] Without deviating ever ſo little from probability, it may be aſſerted that a ſtrong deſire of gaining fame, by eclipſing the glory of his opponent, prompted Julius Cæſar Scaliger to write againſt Cardan. Had the ſpirit of contradiction reigned leſs in him, he would have acquired more glory in this conteſt; but what the Greeks have called ἀμετρίαν τῆς ἀνθολχῆς an immoderate deſire of claſhing with others, has greatly injured Scaliger's reputation. It was in purſuance to this principle, he maintained that Parrots are ugly creatures. Had Cardan advanced this, Scaliger would have objected to him what is found in the ancient Poets, with regard to the beauty of thoſe birds. Voſſius has written a very judicious Criticiſm on this contradictory temper of Scaliger; and at the ſame time, points out the particulars in which thoſe two antagoniſts were ſuperior or inferior to each other. *Scaliger*, in Exercitat. 246. *quia Cardanus Pſittacum commendarat à colorum varietate, ac præterea fulgore, quod & Apuleius facit in ſecundo Floridorum, contrà contendit eſſe deformem, non modo, ob fœditatem roſtri, ac crurum, & linguæ, ſed etiam quia ſit coloris fuſci ac cinericii, qui triſtis. Quid faciamus ſummo viro? Si Cardanus ea dixiſſet, provocaſſet ad judicia Poëtarum: atque adeo omnium hominum. Nunc quia pulchri dixit coloris, ille deformis contendit. Hoc contradictionis ſtudium, quod ubique in hiſce Exercitationibus ſe prodit, ſophiſtâ dignius eſt, quàm philoſopho.*

The addition I ſhall here give relates to Cardan's book *de Subtilitate*, which was refuted by Julius Cæſar Scaliger (*cc*) [*Y*]. We ſhall give ſome additions to Mr. Bayle [*Z*]. (*cc*) See the remark [*X*].

CARION

Majorem etiam modeſtiam, dum ſalſe adeò tractat Cardanum, meritò paſſim requiras: præſertim ſi cogites, ſcribere adverſus virum ſummum, ſtudiis quidem humanitatis, & Metaphyſices, non paulò inferiorem: at non ſcientiâ naturæ, matheſeos autem omnibus diſciplinis, in quibus parum omnino Scaliger videbat, albis quod dicitur equis prævertentem (85). i. e. "Scaliger, in his "246th *Exercitation*, becauſe Cardan had praiſed "the Parrot, for the ſplendor and variety of its co- "lours, as Apuleius has done in his ſecond *Florida*, "he aſſerts, on the contrary, that it is ugly, not "only upon account of its diſagreeable beak, legs "and tongue; but alſo becauſe of its brown, aſh and "dull colour. What muſt be done with this very "great man? Had Cardan aſſerted theſe particulars, "Scaliger would have appealed to the judgment of "the Poets, and that of mankind in general; but "now becauſe Cardan declares, that the colours of "the Parrot's plumage are beautiful, he on the con- "trary aſſerts that they are ugly. This ſpirit of con- "tradiction which he betrays in every part of the "Exercitations in queſtion, becomes a Sophiſter rather "than a Philoſopher. We judge Scaliger not to have "behaved ſo modeſtly as he ought to have done, in "treating Cardan ſo very roughly, eſpecially when "we call to mind, that Scaliger was writing againſt "a very great man, who was little inferior to him in "the ſtudies of Humanity and Metaphyſicks; but "greatly his ſuperior in Phyſicks, and all the branches "of the Mathematicks, with which Scaliger was in- "deed but very little acquainted." Naudæus is in a greater paſſion againſt Scaliger, than Voſſius; he blames him for not reading the ſecond edition of Cardan's work. This cenſure is well grounded; for is it juſt, becauſe a critic will not loſe the pains he had taken in pointing out errors, that therefore a Writer ſhould be publickly condemned, for errors he had corrected. Scaliger publiſhed his criticiſm three years after the ſecond edition of his antagoniſt's work had appeared in print. He was afraid of finding in this ſecond edition, ſeveral paſſages corrected, which would have interrupted the joy which his having pointed out errors had filled him with; and have prevented him from publiſhing the cenſure of an error which Cardan had corrected. Theſe were the reaſons which made him not read the ſecond edition in queſtion. This is Naudæus's firſt obſervation. *Nam primùm quis ferat Scaligerum Exercitationes ſuas triennio poſt ſecundam librorum de ſubtilitate editionem evulgaſſe, nec tamen illam videre voluiſſe, nec mendis illis peperciſſe quæ poſtrema hac diligentia ſublata à Cardano fuerant, ne videlicet laboris ſui quantumvis fruſtra impenſi fructum amitteret.* His ſecond remark is, that Cardan juſtified himſelf ſo well, that ſuppoſing ſome objections were left which he could not anſwer, they ought to be conſidered as trifling. *Præterea quis neſcit Cardanum, Actione prima in calumniatorem librorum de ſubtilitate, ſic omnes illius aculeos retudiſſe, objectiones diluiſſe, accuſationes infregiſſe, ut eorum ratio haberi non debeat, quæ ſupereſſe forſan ex tanto numero poſſent? nam homo fuit Cardanus, & humani à ſe nihil alienum putavit: nec adeo mirum eſt illum erraſſe, quin multo magis admiratione dignum ſit, tam raro, & in tam paucis, ac minimis ceſpitaſſe.* i. e. "Who does not know "that Cardan, in his firſt anſwer to the rude cen- "ſurer of his treatiſe *de Subtilitate*, blunted ſo well "the edge of his ſatyr, removed all his objections, "and invalidated ſo happily all his accuſations, that "we muſt not wonder if ſome ſhould ſtill remain un- "anſwered, among ſo great a multitude? for Cardan "was a man, and thought himſelf obnoxious to error "as well as others. Nor ought we ſo much to won- "der that he erred, as that he ſhould err ſo ſeldom, "and that his miſtakes ſhould be ſo very inconſi- "derable." It is obſerved in the third place, that Scaliger himſelf committed more errors than he charged Cardan with, during the nine years in which he was giving this criticiſm. *Imò verò auſim ego pignore depoſito contendere multo plures nævos eſſe, quos Scaliger Exercitationibus ſuis immiſtos reliquit, quam eos quibus adverſus Cardanum tam procaciter exagitandis totos novem annos inſudavit.* In fine, he obſerved that the motive which prompted Scaliger to write againſt Cardan, was not ſo much from a love for truth, as from a deſire of oppoſing and combating all the moſt learned men of that age. *Non tam eruendæ veritatis ſtudio, quam ut effræni deſiderio ſuo ſatisfaceret, cum illis omnibus congrediendi, quos ſuo tempore, literarum, eruditionumque Principes haberi cognoverat.* To theſe four obſervations, I may add a fifth; viz, that Scaliger imagined, that his critique had killed poor Cardan; and upon this he writ a Preface filled with elaborate reflections (86): wherein he beſtowed the higheſt encomiums on Cardan; and declared his extreme ſorrow at his having gained a victory, which had thereby loſt the republic of letters ſo great a man as Cardan. The truth of the ſtory is, that Cardan ſurvived Scaliger fifteen or twenty years *; and by Naudæus's ſecond obſervation, we may diſcover, whether Scaliger's book could poſſibly give Cardan much uneaſineſs.

(85) Voſſius, *de Origin. & Progr. Idol.* lib. 3. cap. 80. pag. m. 1163.

(86) The reader will find it at the end of his *Harangues contre Eraſme*, printed in Toulouſe, anno 1620, pag. 63. It was not to ſerve as a Preface to the 16 books *Exercitationum Exotericarum*, as is ſaid in the *Hiſtory of Cardan*, pag. m. 334; but to the 16th book.

* [Scaliger died in 1558, and Cardan in 1576.] Addit. Rem.

[*Y*] *The addition I ſhall give, relates to Cardan's book* de Subtilitate, *which was refuted by Julius Cæſar Scaliger.*] Cardan employed but eight months in writing it, and gave his manuſcript to John Petreius a Bookſeller of Nuremberg, in order that he might get it printed. He dedicated it to Ferdinand de Gonzaga, Governor of the Milaneze. The firſt edition is in folio, and dated anno 1550 (87): nevertheleſs, the Author declares in an Epiſtle Dedicatory, dated from Paris the 21ſt of April 1552; that ſince the firſt edition, he had ſpent three years in correcting and enlarging the work. *Quos octo menſium ſpatio abſolveram, perpetuo triennio emendati atque aucti in publicum ſub nomine tuo prodirent.* This Epiſtle Dedicatory is that of the ſecond edition, and is inſcribed to the above mentioned Ferdinand de Gonzaga. By the ſecond edition, I mean that which was publiſhed after the firſt reviſal of this work, and which was made public in the beginning of 1554 (88). That of Nuremberg had been already pirated at Lions. Scaliger's critique on the latter appeared in 1557; and nevertheleſs Cardan objects to this antagoniſt, that he had employed almoſt nine years in criticiſing him (89). Cardan reviſed his work a ſecond time, and ſent the manuſcript (corrected and enlarged by him) to a Bookſeller of Baſil (90) in order that he might get it printed; and annexed to it his anſwer to Scaliger, entitled, *Hieronymi Cardani in Calumniatorem Librorum de Subtilitate Actio prima.* It does not deſcend to particulars, being only a general anſwer. As Ferdinand de Gonzaga was dead, the Author ſought for a new patron. He dedicated this third edition to Don Gonſales Ferrand of Cordova, Duke of Sueſſe. He put no date to his Epiſtle Dedicatory, but I believe it was writ in 1560. I have nevertheleſs ſeen the Dedication to the ſecond Edition, in a copy printed at Baſil in folio, *ex Officina Petrina*, anno 1560. The *Actio prima in Calumniatorem* is annexed to this copy. I do not think that Cardan reviſed his work after that time. I do not find any marks of a third reviſal, in Henricpetri's Edition of 1582, in 8vo (91). I have by me a Lyons Edition, *apud Bartholomæum Honoratum*, 1580 in 8vo, which is agreeable to the firſt reviſal. The *Actio in Calumniatorem* is not inſerted in it, which ſhews the utmoſt negligence in the Bookſeller of Lyons of whom we are ſpeaking. He did not know, that twenty years before, an Edition had been publiſhed greatly ſuperior to that which he pirated. We have a French tranſlation of this work of Cardan, by Richard le Blanc; and printed at Paris, anno 1556 in 4to. (92).

(87) *Epitome Bibliot. Geſneri*, pag. 346.

(88) Cardani *Act. in Calumniat.* pag. m. 1019.

(89) Idem, ibid. pag. 1028.

(90) Called *Henric. Petri.*

(91) Geſner's *Epitome* does not mention this edition in 8vo; but the folio only.

(92) Du Verdier, *Biblioth. Françoiſe*, pag. 1222.

[*Z*] *We ſhall give ſome additions to Mr. Bayle,*] Cardan's father (Facio Cardan) was Doctor of Phyſic, and of the Civil and Canon Law. He was a good Mathematician, and publiſhed a work of the Mathematical kind, whoſe title may be ſeen in a modern Author *, who alſo gives (with his epitaph) a few other particulars concerning him. He likewiſe relates ſome curious circumſtances concerning Cardan's mother, and her bringing him into the world †. He was exceedingly vain, of which ſome inſtances are given ‡; eſpecially of his boaſting that he had acquired the Greek, Latin, French and Spaniſh tongues, without

* Father Niceron's *Memoirs pour ſervir à l'Hiſt. des Hommes Illuſt.* tom. 14. pag. 235. Paris 1731. 12mo.

† Idem, pag. 236, 237.

‡ Pag. 256, 257.

CARION (JOHN), Profeſſor of Mathematicks in the Academy of Frankfort on the Oder, was born at Buetickheim in Germany (*a*). He publiſhed an Ephemerides, or Aſtronomical Tables, which extend from the year 1536 to 1550. He made public another book intitled *Practicæ Aſtrologicæ* (*b*). He did not gain much reputation by the two pieces above-mentioned; but he gained great fame by a Chronicle that was not written by him [*A*], and

(*a*) Geſner, *in Biblioth.* folio 399.

(*b*) Melch. Adam. *in Vitis Philoſoph.* pag. 104.

without learning them. The Author of an Engliſh Piece entitled, *the Mechaniſm of the Mind*, printed at London in 1703, 12mo, ſeems to be miſtaken, in aſcribing what follows to Cardan, viz, that being in his old age, he wept for grief at his not being able to underſtand his own works *. It is obſerved, that the dates in ſeveral of Cardan's works, often contradict one another; which is owing, either to the Printers, or to Cardan himſelf, who depending on his memory for them, was thereby ſometimes apt to miſtake †. The Reader will find the titles of all his Works, the ſubjects they treat of, and ſometimes the judgment of them, in the Book whence I have extracted theſe particulars.

* Idem, pag. 238.

† Idem, pag. 281.

[*A*] *He gained great fame by a Chronicle that was not written by him.*] It has borne a multitude of impreſſions, and been tranſlated into many languages. Here follows the hiſtory of this affair. Carion having written a Chronicle, intended to have it printed at Wittemberg, but wanted to have Melancthon correct it. Melancthon, inſtead of correcting it, drew up another, and publiſh'd it in Wittemberg under Carion's name. He compoſed it in the German Tongue. This work was tranſlated into Latin in 1538, by Herman Bonnus, a Clergyman of Lubec, and Principal of the College (1). Melancthon finding the vaſt encouragement this book met with, made a new Latin verſion of it, which, after reviſing and making ſome additions to it, he publiſhed in 1558 (2). He publiſhed it two years after, enlarged with a ſecond part. The work conſiſted then of three books. The two firſt include the firſt part, and extend, from the beginning of the world, to our Saviour's time. The third book forms the whole ſecond part; and reaches from Auguſtus to Charlemain excluſive. Peucer, after the diſeaſe of Melancthon his father-in-law, continued this work, and publiſhed, in 1562, the fourth book, which extends from Charlemain to Frederic II. Three years after he publiſhed the fifth book, which ends with the death of the Emperor Maximilian, in 1519. In 1572 (3) he made an edition of the whole work, i. e. of what he himſelf and Melancthon had written; and promiſed to continue the Hiſtory to his own times (4), but did not keep his word. The edition now before me of Carion's works is of Geneva 1625, in 8vo (5); and contains, in an appendix, an epitome of Hiſtory, from the coronation of the Emperor Charles V, to the death of Rodolphus, in 1612. Euſebius Menius tranſlated this Chronicle into German (6). Simon Goulart publiſhed a French Tranſlation of it, anno 1579. He printed a ſecond edition of it in 1595; and each time he added a Supplement of his own writing, to the time in which he lived. I ſhall take notice hereafter of the French Verſion which John de Blond publiſhed.

(1) Melancthon, *in Epiſt. Dedicat. Chronic. Carionis*, edit. 1558.
(2) Idem, ibid.

(3) At Wittemberg in folio, *apud Joannem Cratonem.*
(4) See the *Epiſtle Dedicat.* to the edit. of 1572.
(5) *Apud Samuelem Criſpinum.* There is one of anno 1617, *apud eundem*; and one of Frankfort, 1594, in 2 vol. 8vo. *See* Michael Hertzius's *Bibliotheca Germanica*, num. 502, 508.
(6) Melch. Adam, *in Vitis Phil.* pag. 125. This German tranſlation was printed at Frankfort in 1566, folio.
(7) It is the 117th of book 4. and is dated *die ſolſtitiali*, 1531.

It is to be obſerved, that Carion's manuſcript was ſent to Melancthon in 1531, which appears from a Letter of the latter (7). I'll give a long extract of it, becauſe it will let my readers into Carion's character. *Accepi tuam diſputationem de Prædictionibus Carionis. Quanquam autem iſte vehementer affirmat, ſe nihil præter ſiderum poſitum in conſilium adhibere, tamen multis non ſatis perſuadet hoc. Et ars meo quoque judicio non poteſt tam diſertè de ſingularibus eventibus pronunciare, ſed vir eſt, quantum ego quidem cognovi, candidus & Suevicæ ſimplicitatis plurimum referens. Miſit huc Χρονικὰ excudenda, ſed eâ lege, ut ego emendarem. Sunt multa ſcripta negligentiùs. Itaque ego totum opus retexo, & quidem Germanicè, & conſtitui complecti præcipuas mutationes maximorum Imperiorum.* i. e. "Your "Diſputation concerning the Predictions of Carion is "come to hand. Altho' he ſtrongly inſiſts, that he "formed them altogether from the poſition of the "ſtars, yet many are not ſufficiently perſuaded that he "ſays true. And indeed it is my opinion, that the "art it ſelf cannot pronounce ſo very exactly on par-"ticular events. But the Author of this work, ſo "far as I am able to judge, is a candid perſon, and "ſeems to poſſeſs a great deal of the Schwabian ſim-"plicity. He ſent his Chronicle to be printed in this "city, but upon condition that I ſhould reviſe it. He "has written many things careleſly; for which reaſon "I am new-modelling the whole in the German "Tongue: and ſhall interſperſe the work with the "principal Revolutions of the greateſt Empires." We find, by this paſſage, that Melancthon gave the work, which he had been deſired to correct, an entire new form. We ſhall preſently ſee, that he quite blotted out Carion's manuſcript from one end to the other; and yet would have the Chronicle he himſelf drew up in its ſtead, printed under Carion's name. This he would have done, not only in the firſt edition, which is in the German language, and printed at Wittemberg in 1531; but alſo in the ſucceeding ones which are in Latin, and were corrected and enlarged by him. The ſame was obſerved, after his death, in Peucer's Continuations. Read what follows: *Nomen Chronici Carionis retinui, quod mutare illud Autor primus ſanctæ beatæque memoriæ Philippus Melancthon ſocer meus noluit. Occaſio nominis hujus inde extitit, quod cum Johannes Carion mathematicus ante annos quadraginta cæpiſſet contexere Chronicum, & recognoſcendum illud atque emendandum, priuſquam prælo ſubjiceretur, miſiſſet ad Philippum Melancthonem, hic, quod parum probaretur, totum abolevit una litura, alio conſcripto, cui tamen Carionis nomen præfixit: ſed & hoc cum retexiſſet, amici nomen & memoriam, a cujus primordiis ἀΦορμὴν prima Chronici contexendi nata atque profecta eſſet, titulo poſteritati commendare voluit* (8). i. e. "I have retained "Carion's name, and for this reaſon, becauſe the firſt "author of it, Philip Melancthon, my father-in-law, "of bleſſed memory, would not change it. The oc-"caſion of its being printed under his (Carion's) name "is as follows: John Carion the Mathematician, "having been compoſing a Chronicle forty years, ſent "it to Philip Melancthon, to reviſe and correct be-"fore it went to preſs. Melancthon after peruſing "it, did not approve it in any manner, ſo that he "effaced the whole, and drew up another, which he "nevertheleſs publiſhed under Carion's name. And "when he afterwards retouched the work, he would "tranſmit to poſterity the name and memory of his "friend, who had firſt drawn up the plan of that "Chronicle, and been the occaſion of his writing it." But I am alſo to obſerve, that there is ſome reaſon to believe, that Carion publiſh'd the work he himſelf had compoſed. This Mr. Sagittarius does not doubt of, and is only ſurprized at this conduct of Carion (9). He had, among his Books, two German Editions of this Author's Chronicle, the one in 4to, the date of which he does not know; the other in 8vo, which extends to the 16th of April 1521, the Epiſtle Dedicatory whereof is dated 1531 (10). This does not correſpond with Melancthon's work; for, even where it was moſt augmented by the Author, it extends but to the beginning of Charlemain's reign. Here follows another difficulty. The Swiſs declared, that moſt of the particulars which are related in that Chronicle concerning their Nation, are ſo many falſities. *Qui inter Helvetios noſtros hiſtoriarum patriæ non imperiti ſunt, pleraque falſa eum de rebus noſtris ſcripſiſſe affirmant* (11). i. e. "Such of my countrymen (the Swiſs) as are not "unſkilled in the hiſtory of their country, affirm, that "moſt of the particulars he has wrote concerning it "are falſe." Bullinger refuted publickly the falſities he met with in it, concerning a battle which the Swiſs loſt near Zurich, anno 1531 (12). This alſo, for the reaſon I have given above, cannot ſuit in any manner with the work written by Melancthon. On the other ſide Geſner, who relates theſe obſervations of the Swiſs, had juſt before pointed out the work of Carion, by ſuch characteriſticks as agree admirably well with that of Melancthon. He had juſt before ſaid, that Carion's Chronicle, printed in the German Tongue, at Wittemberg anno 1538, had been printed at Hall in

(8) Peucer, *Epiſt. Dedicat. Chronici Carionis* edit. 1572, *ſub finem.*

(9) *Miror ipſum Carionem illud edidiſſe.* i. e. "I am ſurprized "that Carion "ſhould publiſh "it." Gaſpar Sagittarius, *Introductio ad Hiſtoriam Eccleſiaſt.* pag. 98.
(10) Idem, ibid.

(11) Geſner, *in Biblioth.* folio 399, *verſo.*

(12) Bullingerus, *in reſponſione ad Joan. Cochlei Libellum de Scripturæ & Eccleſiæ Autoritate circa finem capitis xxix. apud* Geſner. ibid.

and which was highly esteemed by the Protestants [*B*]. He died at Berlin, anno 1538 (*c*). Moreri

(*c*) Melch. Adam, *Vit. Philosoph.* pag. 105.

in Suabia anno 1539; and at Lyons anno 1543, translated into Latin by Hermannus Bonnus, entitled, *Chronicorum libellus, maximas quoque res gestas ab initio mundi apto ordine complectens, ita ut annorum ratio ac præcipuæ vicissitudines, quæ in regna, in religionem, & in alias res magnas incidunt, quam rectissime cognosci queant.* i. e. "A book of Chronicles, containing, in their "proper order, the most memorable transactions that "have happened from the beginning of the world; in "such a manner that the chronology, and particularly "the revolutions which have happened in Kingdoms, "in Religion, and other great matters, may be ex-"actly known." This title represents very well the plan and character of Melancthon's Chronicle; and it is well known that this Author acknowledged publickly as his work, that which Herman Bonnus had translated into Latin (13). The abovementioned Gesner observes that Carion dedicated his Book, in 1531, to Joachim Marquis of Brandenburg; which suits perfectly with Melancthon's work, as is manifest from the following words of an Epistle Dedicatory (14): *Cum autem prima editio illustrissimo Principi Electori patri tuo dedicata sit, ne transferre munus in aliam familiam viderer, filio dedicare hanc editionem volui, quia patrem ipsum cui jam Historia Ecclesiæ & Imperiorum notissima est, scio vellet talia jam à filiis legi, & se vivo vos in possessionem doctrinæ venire.* i. e. "Having "dedicated the first edition to the illustrious Electoral "Prince your father; I did not think proper to trans-"fer my offering to another family; and therefore "have dedicated this to the son, because I know that "your father, who is perfectly well acquainted with "history both ecclesiastical and civil, would have his "sons acquire this kind of learning in his Life." Let it not be objected, that at the same time that these words were written, the Elector of Brandenburg, to whom the first edition was dedicated, was living; which cannot agree with the Elector of anno 1531 (15). This, I say, is nothing to the purpose; for the person to whom this first edition was dedicated, was not created Elector, at the time when the Chronicle in question first appeared in print. I will make another remark: Du Verdier informs us, that *the Chronicle of John Carion the Philosopher, containing the most memorable Transactions from the creation of the world to the reign of Henry II; translated into Latin by John le Blond*, was printed several times at Paris and at Lions (16). Does this denote the work of Melancthon, a Chronicle which he extended only to Charlemain? It rather denotes the Chronicle of Carion, which he carried as far as 1530, if Keckerman may be credited (17). We have nothing more to suppose, but that the French Translator continued it to his own time.

The result of this is, that it is uncertain whether two works did not appear under Carion's name, the one written by Carion himself, and the other by Melancthon. It is probable that Carion did not acquiesce with the judgment of that learned man, when he found that instead of retouching some passages in his Chronicle, it had been entirely laid aside, and a new one composed in its stead. Perhaps therefore he published his work, whilst, on the other side, a work written by another was published under his name. If this be the case, we have two Chronicles, one of which was continued to the year it was printed in. Perhaps too, Melancthon consented to have all such additions made to his Chronicle, as the reviser might think proper; and having left this to Carion's discretion, the latter printed his work in the same form he had received it back from Melancthon, and added a continuation of it down to his own times. If this be the case, we have only one German edition under Carion's name. We may suppose naturally enough, that Melancthon, having revised his work a long time after and translated it into Latin, retrenched all such particulars as himself had not writ. Thus his Latin Chronicle appears to have been continued, in the first Edition, no farther than Cæsar, and in the second, no farther than Charlemain. They who understand German, and have an opportunity of consulting the Libraries in Germany, are desired to clear up this point, and to give the proper proofs relating to it.

Since what the reader has just now was printed, my doubts have been cleared up. I have seen a Latin Chronicle of Carion, dedicated by him to Joachim Marquis of Brandenburg, and divided into three books, which extend from Adam, to the expedition of Soliman into Hungary, anno 1532. The Author concludes with four or five prophesies, which he applies to Charles V, and all which were proved false. The dedication is dated at Berlin anno 1531. The Edition I my self make use of is of Paris, anno 1563, in 16mo, for Jaques Dupuis; and contains a supplement to the 29th of September 1560.

I have also seen Jean le Blond's French translation, printed at Paris, by Stephen Grouleau, anno 1556, in 16mo. There is no appendix with regard to the universal History, but only with respect to that of Francis I, and of Henry II. That of Francis I begins at the first year of his reign.

[*B*] *Which was highly esteemed by the Protestants.*] Andrew Franckenberg speaks of it as follows: *Chronicon Carionis magna sui parte retextum, tanto judicio tantaque dexteritate perfecit* (Melancthon) *ut nihil in eo genere & compendiaria ratione præstantius extare sciamus* (18). i. e. "Carion's Chronicle, the greatest part "of which has been cast into a new form, was per-"fected by Melancthon with so much judgment and "accuracy, that we do not know of any finer "piece in the compendiary way." He had so high an esteem for it, that he took it for his model, in the work I quote from (19); and made an Oration, *de Magnitudine rerum divinarum & politicarum quæ in Chronico Philippi continentur* (20). i. e. "Of the Great-"ness of the Things both ecclesiastical and civil, con-"tained in the Chronicle of Philip (Melancthon)." We may believe that Victorinus Strigelius was almost of the same opinion, since he made several historical lectures on this Chronicle (21). Stephen Prætorius looks upon all those as tasteless who are not pleased with this most learned and elegant Epitome, as he calls it. *Eruditissima & elegantissima epitome omnium fere historiarum totius mundi est Chronicon Philippi Melancthonis, quod qui non degustavit, is vere bardus est* (22). Let us add to this the testimony of Boeclerus: *In hoc (Chronico) ea sunt ad summam rerum & Historiæ universalis contextum spectantia, judicia, monita, præcepta, ut de alio hujus generis & instituti volumine similia polliceri nemo facile queat* (23). i. e. "This Chro-"nicle contains such judgments, remarks and pre-"cepts, with regard to the drawing up an Epitome "and universal History; that no one could easily pro-"mise so much concerning another work, of the same "kind and on a like plan." The Writer who quotes these judgments, shews that he himself approves of them. *Meretur*, says he (24), *hoc ipsum, quod vulgò Carionis, rectius tamen Philippo-Peucerianum appellaretur* Chronicon, *inter selectissimaque utriusque Historiæ (Ecclesiasticæ ac Civiles) monumenta computari, atque a studiosa juventute diligenter legi, lectumque aliquoties repeti.* i. e. "This "Chronicle, that commonly goes by the name of "Carion, but which is more justly that of Melancthon "and Peucer, deserves to be ranked among the most "excellent monuments of History both ecclesiastical "as well as civil; and to be studied very diligently "by youth, not only once, but very often." He is displeased, that the Authors whence the several passages are borrowed are not cited. His censure is very just; this being a capital fault in a work of that kind, and indeed is a fault in most books. La Popeliniere, who has bestowed great encomiums on this Chronicle, has observed another fault in it, and that is, a spirit of prejudice. It may not be improper to cite the whole passage in question. "John Carion the Mathemati-"cian is reputed to be the Author of the Chronicles, "first printed in Germany, and afterwards in other "places under his name. Tho' having presented the "first draughts of them, as I have been informed "(25) to Philip Melancthon his master, in order for "him to revise, add and correct it at pleasure; he "drew his pen over the whole piece, and composed "it anew; and, at the same time, from his natural "sweetness of temper, suffered him to print them un-"der his name. They show great learning and care. "But what is still remarkable is, his endeavours to "make them of advantage to the reader, by his ex-"patiating

(13) See the *Epistle Dedicatory* of Melancthon, to the edition of 1558.

(14) That of the edition of 1351. Melancthon dedicated this edition to Sigismund of Brandenburg, Archbishop of Magdeburg, son to the Elector Joachim II.

(15) Joachim I, who died in 1535, having succeeded his father anno 1499. Heiss. *Histoire de l'Empire*, tom. 2. pag. m. 331.

(16) Du Verdier Vau Privas, *Bibliotheque Francoise*, pag. 665.

(17) Keckerm. *de Natura & propriet. Hist.* cap. 5. *apud* Magirum, *Eponymol.* pag. 182.

(18) Andr. Franckenbergius, lib. 3. *Institutionum Antiquitatis & Historiar.* pag. 237. *apud* Gasparum Sagittarium, *Introduct. ad Historiam Ecclesiast.* pag. 97, 98.

(19) Suas *Institutiones Antiquitatis & Historiarum ad Chronicon Carionis Melancthonianum potissimum accommodavit.* Sagittarius, ibid. pag. 101. i. e. "He "formed his "Institutions of "Antiquity and "History, chiefly according "to Melancthon's Chroni-"cle of Carion.

(20) It was printed at Wittemberg in 1589. Idem, ibid.

(21) *Scholas Historicas in idem Chronicon scripsit.* Keckerm. *de Natura & Propriet. Histor. in Auctar.* cap. 6.

(22) Steph. Prætorius, *in Ordine Studiorum, apud* Sagittar. *Introduct. ad Hist. Eccles.* pag. 98.

(23) Boeclerus, *Dissert. de Utilit. ex Historiæ Univers. Compositione capiendâ*, pag. 16, *apud* Sagittar. ibid.

(24) Sagittar. ibid. pag. 97.

(25) He might have quoted a book printed within these 27 years, viz. Peucer's Dedication to the edition of 1572. See the quotation (8) above.

Moreri has committed a puerile error [C]. I ſhall make ſome obſervations in oppoſition to other writers [D].

" patiating generally on the moſt ſhining examples, " in order to habituate him to virtue; and ſometimes " raiſing him to the ſkies, there to admire the divine " Providence, in the ſo greatly famous methods of " governing the world. He nevertheleſs ſometimes " exceeds the duties of a Chronologer by his prolixity; " and that of an Hiſtorian by the diverſity of his paſ- " ſions (26)." Simon Goulart has beſtowed theſe applauſes on Carion's work (27), without blending them with this cenſure. I am to obſerve, that the Writers of the other party condemn very much this Chronicle. *Poſſevinus ſuo more*, theſe are Keckerman's words (28), *inſectatur Chronicon Melanctbonis ſine ulla ratione & fronte*. i. e. " Poſſevinus, according to his uſual cu- " ſtom, inveighs againſt Melancthon's Chronicle, " without the leaſt reaſon." Surius lets fly whole vollies of injurious reflections on Peucer, for his continuing that Chronicle (29). He had been injuriouſly treated in the Epiſtle Dedicatory to the 5th Book.

(26) La Popeliniere, *Hiſtoire des Hiſtoires*, lib. 9. pag. 481. This work was printed in 1599.
(27) See the *Epiſt. Dedicat.* to his Tranſlation.
(28) Keckerm. *de Natura & Prop. Hiſt.* in *Auct.* cap. 6.
(29) Surius, *Comment. Rerum in Orbe geſtar. ad ann.* 1565.

[C] *Moreri has committed a puerile error.*] I give it that name, becauſe it is very like thoſe which ſchool-boys make in tranſlating their exerciſe. Here follow his words. *Cario underſtood the languages, Polite Literature and Mathematicks. He taught them with applauſe in Wittemberg and other places.* The import of this is, that he taught all theſe things in ſeveral univerſities; whereas in fact he only taught the Mathematicks at Francfort upon the Oder. Here follow the words which Moreri attempted to tranſlate. they are very eaſy, and yet he did not underſtand them, *A teneris optimarum literarum & artium ſtudioſus fuit, inque pluribus Germaniæ Academiis, præſertim in Witebergenſi . . . cum laude verſatus* (30). This evidently ſignifies, that Cario gained applauſe whilſt he ſtudied at Wittemberg, and in ſeveral other univerſities of Germany. But this is not, *teaching in them with applauſe.*

(30) Melch. Adam. *in Vit. Philoſoph.* pag. 104.

[D] *I ſhall make ſome obſervations, in oppoſition to other Writers.*] The epitomizers of Geſner, take notice of an addition of 1528, which is an error. The firſt edition could not precede the year 1531. Keckerman relates that Melancthon publiſhed in 1540, a Chronicle, from the creation to Charlemagne (31). He ought to have ſaid, in 1560. Zeiller has committed the ſame error (32), he having copied Keckerman verbatim. He is guilty of another miſtake, where he aſſerts, that Peucer continued this Chronicle to his time (33); but he ought to have ſaid, till 1519. He obſerves, that Peucer died in 1602. Mr. Sagittarius makes uſe of an odd kind of proof, to ſhew that Melancthon and Carion were good friends (34). He cites a paſſage extracted from the Dedication to Carion's Chronicle, prefixed to the edition of 1558. This paſſage declares, that Melancthon had heard Capnion ſay, that the Elector Palatine cauſed an epitome of the ancient Monarchy to be drawn up by Dalburg Biſhop of Worms, by Rodolphus Agricola, and by Capnion. He doubtleſs imagined that, inſtead of *Capnion*, we ſhould read *Carion* in the following words, *Sæpe audivi narrare Capnionem &c.* i. e. " I have often heard " Capnion ſay &c;" but he then committed another error; for he thought that a man born in 1499 (35), had joined in a work with Rodolphus Agricola, who died in 1485.

(31) Keckerm. *de Naturâ & Prop. Hiſt. in Auct.* cap. 6.
(32) Martinus Zeillerus, *in Hiſtoricis*, Part 2. pag. 34. He cites Keckerman. *de Hiſt.* pag. 207.
(33) Idem, ibid. pag. 114.
(34) *Interceſſiſſe tamen Melancthoni cum Capnione ſingularem amicitiam ſequentia produnt.* Sagittar. *Introd. ad Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſt.* p. 99. He writes in the margin, *Amicitia Philippi cum Carione.*
(35) He obſerves this of Carion, pag. 69.

CARMILIANUS (PETER), a Latin Poet, and an Engliſhman, lived in the beginning of the ſixteenth Century. Eraſmus and Andrew Ammonius ſpeak contemptibly enough of him. He publiſhed, among other Poems, an Epitaph on the King of Scotland, who had been killed in a battle won by the Engliſh in 1513. The judgment which was paſſed upon that Epitaph will be ſeen in the remark [A], and which at the ſame time will make the reader not wonder, that no one ſhould have taken notice of this Poet. The profound obſcurity in which he is buried, is one of the chief reaſons which excited me to devote this little article to his memory. I ſhall obſerve the ſame with regard to ſome others.

[A] *The judgment which was paſs'd on it will be ſeen in the Remark.*] Ammonius wrote the following words on this ſubject to Eraſmus. *Hoc prætereundum non eſt P. Carmelianum Regis Scotorum Epitaphium nuper edidiſſe muliebribus maledictis refertum, quod Pinſonicis characteribus excuſum propediem leges. Eo Carmilianus magis ſibi placet, ſeque magis miratur quam Catullianus ille Suffenus, & tamen niſi ego admonuiſſem* pullulare *prima correpta poſuiſſet. Utcunque multa reſtant quæ rideas, & inprimis aliquos invenire qui ejuſmodi ineptias ſeriò laudent* (1). i. e. " I muſt not omit, that Peter Carmilianus has " lately publiſhed an Epitaph on the King of Scotland, " filled with womaniſh railings, and which you will ſoon " read, printed by Pinſon. Carmilianus is highly " delighted with himſelf upon that account, and ad- " mires himſelf more than Suffenus does in Catullus; " and nevertheleſs, if I had not corrected him, he " would have made the firſt ſyllable in *pullulare* ſhort. " There are many more things you'll laugh at, and " particularly that there are ſome perſons who ſeriouſly " applaud ſuch ſtuff" This Letter of Ammonius is dated in Nov. 1515; and is the XLth of Eraſmus's eighth Book. Here follows Eraſmus's anſwer on that occaſion: *Carmiliani Epitaphium vidi, cumque legerem* pullulare, *hic, inquam, ſcabies eſt; deinde cum ſciſcitanti reſpondiſſent eſſe Carmiliani, reſpondi, ſanè ipſo dignum eſt. Id quidem ſic acceperunt quaſi dixiſſem Scotorum Rege dignum: quibus pluſculum erat naſi, ſubriſere. Sed næ tu homo nimium es candidus qui belluæ iſtius famæ conſulas: ità me Deus amet magno emerim ſi ſiluiſſes.* i. e. " I have ſeen the Epitaph written by Carmilia- " nus; and the moment I read the word *pullulare*; " this, ſays I, is a ſcab. Afterwards, upon my en- " quiring who had wrote it, I was anſwered Carmilia- " nus; to which I replied it is really worthy of him. " This anſwer was by ſome underſtood, as tho' I had " declared it to be worthy of the King of Scotland. " However, ſome who were ſharper, ſmiled at the " joke. But you certainly were too good-natur'd, to " concern your ſelf for the reputation of ſuch a looby. " I wiſh to God you had taken no notice of him." This anſwer of Eraſmus, dated in November 1511, is the XXth Epiſtle of Book the eighth. Hence the reader may judge of the accuracy of thoſe who drew up the Order of Eraſmus's Epiſtles, and dated thoſe which had no date to them (2).

(1) Epiſt. Eraſm. 40. lib. 8. pag. 435.
(2) See the end of the Remark [B] of the Article (ANDREW) AMMONIUS.

CARNEADES, a famous Grecian Philoſopher, was of Cyrene (*a*). He founded the third Academy [A], which, properly ſpeaking, differed not from the ſecond (*b*); for, excepting Carneades, I ſay, the ſucceſſor of Hegeſinus. Let us cite Cicero. *Cujus* (Arceſilæ) *primò non admodum probata ratio, . . . proximè a Lacyde ſolo retenta eſt: poſt autem conficta a Carneade, qui eſt quartus ab Arceſila: audivit enim Hegeſinum, qui Evandrum audierat Lacydis diſcipulum, quum Arceſilæ Lacydes fuiſſet* (3). He had ſaid in another place, that the Academy of Arceſilaus maintained it ſelf without any variation

(*b*) Founded by ARCESILAUS. See his Article.
(*a*) Diogen. Laertius, lib. 4. num. 62. Plutarch. *Sympoſ.* lib. 8. cap. 1. pag. 717.

[A] *He founded the third Academy.*] I obſerve elſewhere (1), that Diogenes Laertius is not to be regarded, when he attributes this foundation to Lacydes. Lacydes punctually followed the Hypotheſis of Arceſilaus his Predeceſſor; and we do not find that Evander, who ſucceeded him or Hegeſinus (2) who ſucceeded Evander, made any innovation therein. It was Carneades who made himſelf head of a new party;

(1) In the Article LACYDES, Remark [A].
(2) Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromat.* lib. 1. pag. 301. calls him *Hegeſilaüs.*
(3) Cicero, *Academ. Quæſt.* lib. 2. folio 203, B.

excepting a few mitigations, which were of no uſe but to throw duſt in people's eyes, he was as vehement a defender of uncertainty as Arceſilaüs [*B*]. He found it in the moſt evident

ation till the time of Carneades. *Quæ* (Academia) *uſque ad Carneadem perducta, qui quartus ab Arceſila fuit, in eadem Arceſilæ ratione permanſit* (4). Clemens Alexandrinus obſerves that the middle Academy flouriſhed till Hegeſilaüs the predeceſſor of Carneades (5). I ſhall below cite St. Auguſtin, who attributes to Carneades the having made an innovation in the Academy of Arceſilaüs.

(4) Idem, ibid. lib. 1. *in fine.*

(5) Clemens Alexand. *Strom.* lib. 2. pag. 301.

[*B*] *He was as vehement a defender of uncertainty as Arceſilaüs.*] The words of Cicero follow, which teſtify that Carneades confirmed the hypotheſes of Arceſilaüs: *Hæc in philoſophia ratio contra omnia diſſerendi, nullamque rem apertè judicandi, profecta a Socrate, repetita ab Arceſila,* CONFIRMATA *à Carneade, uſque ad noſtram viguit ætatem.* i. e. "This method of diſ-"puting againſt all things, and determining nothing "openly, which proceeded firſt from Socrates, and "was afterwards taken up by Arceſilaüs, and CONFIR-"MED by Carneades, flouriſhed till our own time (6)." Here are others which acquaint us that with reſpect to incomprehenſibility, he carried matters as far as the other. *Ex hoc illud eſt natum, quod poſtulabat Hortenſius, ut id ipſum ſaltem perceptum a ſapiente diceretis, nihil poſſe percipi. Sed Antipatro hoc idem poſtulanti, quum diceret, ei qui affirmaret nihil poſſe percipi conſentaneum eſſe, unum tamen illud dicere percipi poſſe, ut alia non poſſent, Carneades acutius reſiſtebat. Nam tantum abeſſe dicebat ut ei conſentaneum eſſet, ut maximè etiam repugnaret. Qui enim negaret quidquam eſſe quod percideretur, eum nihil excipere; ita neceſſe eſſe ne id ipſum quidem quod exceptum non eſſet, comprehendi & percipi ullo modo poſſe* (7). i. e. "Hence proceeded the demand "of Hortenſius, that you ſhould allow your wiſe man "to comprehend this at leaſt, that nothing can be "comprehended. But when Antipater demanded the "ſame thing, and ſaid it was fitting that he who "affirmed nothing could be comprehended, ſhould ad-"mit that this one thing might be comprehended, "*viz.* that all other things were incomprehenſible, "Carneades with great vigour denied it; and ſaid it was "ſo far from being fitting for him, that he ſhould oppoſe "it with all his might. For whoever denies that there "is any thing which may be comprehended, excepts "nothing: and therefore it neceſſarily follows that "even that which is not excepted, cannot any way "be comprehended or underſtood at all." You ſee he taught that thoſe who ſay nothing can be comprehended, and there is nothing certain, ought by a neceſſary conſequence to ſay, that even this propoſition itſelf, *there is nothing certain, we can comprehend nothing*, is alſo uncertain, and incomprehenſible. But he was one of thoſe who affirmed that nothing can be comprehended: therefore he went as far as Arceſilaus. *Duo placet eſſe Carneadi genera viſorum. In uno hanc diviſionem: alia viſa eſſe quæ percipi poſſint, alia quæ non poſſint. In altero autem, alia viſa eſſe probabilia, alia non probabilia. Itaque quæ contra ſenſus, contraque perſpicuitatem dicantur, ea pertinere ad ſuperiorem diviſionem, contra poſteriorem nihil dici oportere. Quare ita placere, tale viſum nullum eſſe ut perceptio conſequeretur; ut autem probatio, multa: etenim contra naturam eſſet, ſi probabile nihil eſſet, & ſequitur omnis vitæ ea quam tu, Luculle, commemorabas everſio. Itaque & ſenſibus probanda multa ſunt, teneatur modo illud, non ineſſe in his quicquam tale, quale non etiam falſum nihil ab eo differens eſſe poſſit. Sic quicquid accideret ſpecie probabile, ſi nihil ſe offeret quod ſit probabilitati illi contrarium, utetur eo ſapiens, ac ſic omnis ratio vitæ gubernabitur.* i. e. "The opinion of Carneades was, that there were two "kinds of appearances. In the one he made this di-"viſion: that there were ſome appearances which "might be comprehended, and others which could not. "In the other, that ſome appearances were probable, "and others not probable. Therefore that whatever "was ſpoken againſt the ſenſes, and againſt evidence, "belonged to the former diviſion; but that againſt "the latter nothing needed to be ſaid. Wherefore this was "his opinion; that no appearance was ſuch as that com-"prehenſion neceſſarily followed, but there were many "which induced approbation: for it would be againſt "nature if nothing were probable, and the overturn-"ing of all methods of life, which you, Lucullus, "was mentioning, would follow. Therefore many "things are to be approved by the ſenſes; only let "this be held to, that there is not in theſe any ſuch "thing, but that there may be a falſity which may "in no reſpect differ from it. So whatever happens "apparently probable, if nothing offers to contradict "that probability, let the wiſe man make uſe of "it, and thus every inſtitute of life will be regu-"lated (8)." You ſee he admitted only probabilities for the uſe of life, and that as to other matters, he did not think there was any certainty or evidence. He had laboured with all his might to overthrow the cuſtom of aſſenting to that which is not evident (9): did they undertake to do more in the middle Academy? They had reaſon to ſay, that the pains he had taken on that account was a Herculean labour, and they might have added that the Hero might more eaſily have got the better of two thouſand monſters, every one more terrible than the hydra of Lerna, or the Lion of Nemea, than Arceſilaus or Carneades could have obliged mankind not to judge, that is to ſay, not to aſſent to any thing which had not been made evident by due examination.

(6) Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, lib. 1. pag. m. 14.

(7) Idem, *Academ. Quæſt.* lib. 4. pag. 1067, ed. Gronoviane, 1692, in 4to, (m. folio 204. *B.*]

(8) Idem, ibid. pag. 1077. *ejuſd. editionis*, (m. folio 209. *D.*)

(9) *Ego enim etſi maximam actionem puto repugnare viſis, obſiſtere opinionibus, aſſenſus lubricos ſuſtinere, credoque Clitomacho ita ſcribenti: Herculis quendam laborem exanclatum à Carneade, quod ut feram & immanem belluam ſic ex animis noſtris aſſenſionem, id eſt, opinationem & temeritatem extraxiſſet, tamen &c.* Cicero, *Academ. Quæſt.* lib. 4. folio 210, *D.*

Let us obſerve that the innovation of Carneades conſiſted only in this: he did not deny, as Arceſilaus did, that there were no truths; but he maintained that we could not certainly diſcern them. *Sint iſta vera*, ſays an Academic in Cicero, *vides enim jam me fateri aliquid eſſe veri, comprehendi ea tamen & percipi nego* (10). Add hereto this other paſſage: *Non enim ſumus ii, quibus nihil verum eſſe videatur, ſed ii, qui omnibus veris falſa quædam adjuncta eſſe dicamus, tanta ſimilitudine, ut in iis nulla inſit certa judicandi & aſſentiendi nota. Ex quo exiſtit & illud, multa eſſe probabilia, quæ quanquam non perciperentur, tamen quia viſum hæberent quendam inſignem & illuſtrem, his ſapientis vita regeretur* (11). i. e. "For we are not the men "who think there is nothing true, but who ſay that "ſome falſe circumſtances ſtick to all truths, and with "ſo great likeneſs, that there is no certain mark in "them by which we may give our judgment and aſ-"ſent. From whence it alſo follows, that many "things are probable, which, though they be not per-"fectly underſtood, yet becauſe they have a certain "remarkable and illuſtrious appearance, by them is "the life of a wiſe man regulated." It is alſo aſſerted that Arceſilaus denied there were any probable things (12): Carneades did not deny it, and was even of opinion that probability ought to determine us to act, provided nothing was abſolutely decided (13). He had yet ſome farther indulgence, he permitted the wiſe man to judge in ſome caſes. *Si ulli rei ſapiens aſſentietur unquam, aliquando etiam opinabitur: nunquàm autem opinabitur, nulli igitur rei aſſentietur. Hanc concluſionem Arceſilas probat. Confirmabat enim primum & ſecundum. Carneades nonnunquam ſecundum illud dabat aſſentiri aliquando: ita ſequebatur etiam opinari* (14). i. e. "If the wiſe man ever aſſents to any thing, he will "ſometimes alſo judge. But he never will judge; "for which reaſon he will aſſent to nothing. Arce-"ſilaus approves of this concluſion. For he con-"firmed both the firſt and the ſecond. Carneades "ſometimes allowed that a man might give his aſſent: "whence it followed that he might alſo judge." This condeſcenſion of Carneades made a breach in his ſyſtem, and they ſay Arceſilaüs was more conſiſtent than he. *Ex his illa neceſſario nata eſt ἐποχὴ, id eſt aſſenſionis retentio, in qua melius ſibi conſiſtit Arceſilas, ſi vera ſunt quæ de Carneade nonnulli exiſtimant. Si enim percipi nihil poteſt, quod utrique viſum eſt, tollendus aſſenſus eſt. Quid enim eſt tam futile, quàm quicquam approbare non cognitum? Carneadem autem etiam heri audiebamus ſolitum eſſe delabi interdum, ut diceret opinaturum, id eſt, peccaturum eſſe ſapientem* (15). i. e. "From hence neceſſarily aroſe that Epoche, or "ſuſpenſion of aſſent, wherein Arceſilaus was more "conſiſtent with himſelf, if thoſe things be true of "Carneades which ſome ſuppoſe. For if nothing can "be

(10) Idem, ibid. folio 211, *B.*

(11) Idem, *de Natura Deorum*, pag. m. 15.

(12) *See* Voſſius, *de Philoſoph. ſectis*, pag. 76.

(13) *See* Cicero, *Academ.* lib. 2. folio 210, *B.*

(14) Idem, ibid. folio 207. B. *See alſo* folio 210, *D.*

(15) Idem, ibid. folio 206, *C.*

dent notions [C]. It is not agreed whether he wrote any books or not: ſome Authors aſſure us he compoſed none; while others ſeem to ſay the contrary (c). What is related of

(c) See the Remark [I] at the end.

" be comprehended, which was the opinion of both, " aſſent muſt be wholly taken away. For what is ſo trifling as to approve of any thing which is not known? " But we alſo heard Carneades yeſterday ſometimes " uſe to condeſcend ſo far, as to ſay a wiſe man might " give his judgment, that is, might commit a fault." But it is certain Carneades always returned to the *Epoche*, which was, as we may ſay, the analyſis of his creed. This appears from the expoſition of his opinion to be found at the end of the Academic Queſtions of Cicero. I ſhall ſet it down here: *Quid Catulus ſentit? Quid Hortenſius? Tum Catulus. Ego ne inquit? ad patris revolvor ſententiam, quam quidem ille Carneadeam eſſe dicebat, ut percipi nihil putem poſſe, aſſenſurum autem non percepto, id eſt, opinaturum ſapientem exiſtimem, ſed ita ut ſi intelligat ſe opinari, ſciatque nihil eſſe quod comprehendi & percipi poſſit, per inoxiam illam omnium rerum comprobans, illi alteri ſententiæ, nihil eſſe quod percipi poſſit, vehementer aſſentior. Habeo inquam ſententiam tuam, neque eam admodum aſperno. Sed quid tibi tandem videtur Hortenſi? Tum ille ridens, tollendum. Teneo te inquam. Nam iſta Academiæ eſt propria ſententia* (16). i. e. " What thinks Catulus? " What thinks Hortenſius? Then ſaid Catulus, Do " you aſk me? I fall back into my father's opinion, " which he ſaid was that of Carneades, ſo that I think " nothing can be perfectly underſtood; yet I ſuppoſe " a wiſe man may aſſent to what is not fully underſtood, that is, may give his judgment, but yet ſo " as that he may at the ſame time know that he " judges only, and that there is nothing which can be " comprehended and perfectly underſtood. Approving " therefore of the Epoche we have been ſpeaking of " in all things, I fully aſſent to that other opinion, " that there is nothing which can be comprehended. " I underſtand your opinion, ſaid I, nor do I much " diſlike it. But what think you Hortenſius? I, ſaid " he laughing, am for denying the whole, [that is, " both comprehenſion and aſſent.] I have you faſt, ſaid " I; for that is the proper opinion of the Academy." But there is more ſtill to be ſaid; for ſome people who might very well know it have maintained that he did not approve of Philoſophers paſſing their judgment. *Licebat percipere nihil, & tamen opinari: quod à Carneade dicitur probatum. Equidem Clitomacho pluſquam Philoni aut Metrodoro credens, hoc magis ab eo diſputatum, quàm probatum puto* (17). i. e. " A man " might comprehend nothing, and yet give his judgment; which is ſaid to have been approved by Car- " neades. Truly I give more credit to Clitomachus " than to Philo or Metrodorus, and am of opinion that " was a point rather diſputed than approved of by " him." It ſeems to me, therefore, that we may ſuppoſe he retained the ground of Arceſilaüs's doctrine, but that out of policy, and to take from his adverſaries the moſt ſpecious pretexts of declaiming and turning him into ridicule, he granted them ſome degrees of probability which ought to determine the wiſe man to chuſe ſuch or ſuch a ſide in the practice of civil life. He plainly ſaw that without this he could never anſwer the moſt odious objections, he could never prove that his principle did not reduce a man to inaction, and the moſt ſhameful quietiſm. All things well conſidered, it is the ſame thing to ſay, *there are no truths*, and to ſay, *there are ſome, but we have no rule to diſcern them from falſhood*. If Arceſilaüs had maintained the firſt of theſe two propoſitions, he ought to be compared to thoſe fiery horſes, which follow their impetuoſity to the bottom of precipices. But I have ſome difficulty to believe that he abſolutely denied the exiſtence of truths. He was ſatisfied, as I think, to maintain that they were impenetrable by the mind of man. The heat of diſpute hindred him perhaps from expreſſing himſelf ſo prudently as they did afterwards in the Academy of Carneades. This latter took better precautions, that he might not become altogether ſo odious as the other. *Carneades primo illam velut calumniandi impudentiam, qua videbat Arceſilam non mediocriter infamatum, depoſuit, ne contra omnia velle dicere quaſi oſtentationis cauſa videretur* (18). i. e. " Carneades firſt laid aſide that impudence, as it " were of impeaching all things, by which he ſaw Arce- " ſilaüs had gotten no ſmall infamy, leſt he ſhould " ſeem to diſpute againſt every thing out of oſtenta- " tion." Theſe words of St. Auguſtin are leſs diſadvantageous to Carneades than to Arceſilaüs: yet Numenius judged otherwiſe of theſe two Academics; he is leſs angry with Arceſilaüs than with the other. He ſuppoſes that Arceſilaüs was ſincere, deceiving others, and deceiving himſelf alſo; whereas Carneades, believing nothing of what he ſaid, and uſing among his friends a language of confidence quite different from his lectures, ſought only to amaze his ſcholars, and to play with the arguments on either ſide (19). He built, he pulled down, he had no ſooner eſtabliſhed a probability, than he overturned it himſelf. Ἦγε δ' ἂν κἀθεὶς, κἀ ἀπίθανεν, ἀντιλογίας τε κἀ γραφὰς λεπτολόγους συνέφερε τῇ μάχῃ ποικίλλων, ἐξαπατητικός τε κἀ καταφαντικός τις ἦν, καὶ μεθοτέρωθεν ἀντιλογικός. *Idem afferebat, idem auferebat, pugnamque ſuam contrariis ſententiis, & verſutis quibuſdam ac ſubtilibus argutiis cum multiplici varietate miſcebat, affirmando ſimul ac negando, & oppoſitis utrinque rationibus diſputando* (20). By acknowledging that there were truths and falſhoods in nature, but ſo concealed that they could not be certainly diſcerned from one another (21), he was a more dangerous knave than Arceſilaüs. Ἦν γὰρ λῃστὴς κἀ γόης σοφώτερος. *Fur ergo præſtigiatorque fuit ſolertior* (22). Cicero ſays a thing which may be oppoſed to Numenius. The latter pretends that the public doctrine of Carneades, and his domeſtic doctrine, did not agree at all; that in public he perplexed every thing, to combate the Stoics; but that among his intimate friends he had no other opinions than thoſe of the common people. Ὅμως δὲ, καίτοι καὐτὸς ὑπὸ Στοϊκῆς φιλονικίας εἰς τὸ φανερὸν κυκῶν, πρός γε τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ ἑταίρους ἀπορρήτων ὁμολόγου τε κἀ ἀλήθευε, κἀ ἀπεφαίνετο, ἃ καὶ ἄλλος τῶν ἐπιτυχόντων. *Et tamen ille ipſe, qui Stoïcos vellicandi ſtudio palam cuncta miſcebat, clam ſodales inter ſuos eadem omnia fatebatur, vereque ac certo pronunciabat, quæ alius quivis e populo* (23). This does not agree with the paſſage where Cicero aſſures us that Clitomachus was never able to diſcover what appeared the moſt probable to Carneades, whoſe favourite ſcholar he had been for many years (24). *Cujus* (Calliphontis) *quidem ſententiam Carneades ita ſtudioſe defenſitabat, ut eam probare etiam videretur, quanquam Clitomachus affirmabat nunquam ſe intelligere potuiſſe quid Carneadi probaretur* (25).

Several people will blame the heap of quotations we have juſt now ſeen: I foreſaw their diſdain, their diſguſt, and their magiſterial cenſures, and was reſolved not to regard them. I had rather ſubmit to be a tranſcriber for the eaſe of thoſe who are deſirous of informing themſelves hiſtorically of the opinions of the ancients, without ſtirring from their ſeat, and to ſee the original proofs, I mean the witneſſes own expreſſions. This has been my motive on a hundred other occaſions.

[C] *He found* uncertainty *in the moſt evident notions.*] All Logicians know that the foundation of the ſyllogiſm, and conſequently the faculty of reaſoning, is built on this Maxim, *Thoſe things which are the ſame with a third, are the ſame with each other. Quæ ſunt idem uno tertio ſunt idem inter ſe.* It is certain that Carneades oppoſed it ſtrongly; ſince he diſplayed all his ſubtleties againſt the following, *Thoſe things which are equal to a third are equal to each other.* Galen informs us of this in a Diſcourſe which has been printed with one of the Books of Sextus Empiricus, and he even ſays that the ſcholars of that Philoſopher had left in writing all the ſophiſms which their maſter had made uſe of to combate this common and moſt evident notion, and that neither they, nor any of the Academies who had lived after him, had taken the pains to ſolve thoſe ſophiſms: he adds, that there is no leſs malignity in preſerving thoſe objections in a book, without taking notice of their deficiency, than in inventing them. I ſet down his words, according to the verſion of Eraſmus. *Carneades ne illud quidem quod eſt omnium evidentiſſimum concedit eſſe credendum, quod magnitudines uni cuipiam æquales, ſint etiam inter ſeſe æquales. Rationes igitur quibus conatur deſtruere & hæc & alia permulta, quæ tibi evidenter apparent creduntque eſſe vera, adhuc in*

(16) Idem, ibid. *in fine, folio* 213. D.

(17) Idem, ibid. folio 208, A.

(18) Auguſtin. lib. 3. *contra Academicos, apud* Aldobrandin. *Not. in Diogen. Laertium*, lib. 4. num. 28.

(19) Τοῦ γὰρ ἓν ἀπαγαν τοὺς ἄλλους, αὐτὸς ἔμενεν ἀνίξαπάτητος, ὃ μὴ πρόσων τοῦ Ἀρκεσιλάου. ἐκεῖνος γὰρ περιεχόμενος τῇ φαρμακίᾳ τοὺς συγκορυβαντιῶντας, ἔλαθεν ἑαυτὸν πρῶτον ἐξαπατικὸς μὴ γεγονὼς, πεπεῖσθαι δ' ἀληθῆ εἶναι, ἃ λέγει διὰ τοὺς ἀπαξαπάντων ἀναιρέσεως χρημάτων. *Quippe, cum in fraudem alios & errorem impelleret, tum fallebatur ipſe nunquam; id quod locum in Arceſila non habebat. Is enim dum cæteros ſuis ſecum maleficiis, ac præſtigiis, Corybantum more inſanientes circumferret, non ſentiebat quam ſeſe primum ipſe deciperet, dum ſibi quoque vera eſſe quæ diceret, omnia ſimul ac ſemel abolendo, perſuadebat.* Numenius *apud* Euſeb. *Præp. Evang.* lib. 14. cap. 8. pag. 737, C.

(20) Idem, ibid. B.

(21) Idem, ibid. pag. 738. A.

(22) Idem, ibid.

(23) Idem, ibid. D. *See alſo* pag. 739, A.

(24) *A Clitomacho ſumam, qui uſque ad ſenectutem cum Carneade fuit.* Cicero, *Academ. Quæſt.* folio 209, D.

(25) Idem, ibid. folio 213, A.

of his application to ſtudy is very ſingular [*D*]. He was the Antagoniſt of the Stoics, and applied himſelf with great earneſtneſs to refute the Works of Chryſippus [*E*], which had

hunc uſque diem ſervatas habemus, proditas ſcriptis, ab illius diſcipulis collectas. Solutiones autem nec ab illis, nec ab alio quopiam Academicorum qui poſt Carneadem fuerunt, datæ ſunt. Ea res ſola declarat, iſtius rationes omnes eſſe ſophiſmata: nobiſque quærendæ ſunt, ô diſcipuli, iſtarum ſolutiones. Improbum eſt enim hoc: attamen nihilo minus improbum fecerunt illi qui ſcripſerunt quidem has, cæterùm vobis non indicârunt quales eſſent (26).

(26) Galenus, in Libro *de optimo docendi genere*, at the end of the *Pyrrhonianæ Hypotypoſes*, printed by Henry Stephens, in 1562, pag. 220, 221.

[*D*] *What is related of his application to ſtudy is very ſingular.*] He was as laborious as any man could be, and ſo intent on his ſtudy that he neglected to cut his nails, and let his hair grow (27). He was ſo far from chuſing to ſpend his time otherwiſe than in his ſtudies, that he not only avoided entertainments (28), but forgot even to eat at his own table (29), and his maid-ſervant Meliſſa, who was alſo his concubine, was obliged to put the victuals into his hand, or perhaps into his very mouth. I expreſs my ſelf thus, becauſe the Latin Author, whom I am going to cite, has kept to general phraſes. Let us obſerve, that the concubine's care was divided, between the fear of interrupting Carneades, and that of letting him ſtarve to death. This obſervation is not uſeleſs; we may infer thence that our Philoſopher was not well pleaſed to be interrupted in his meditations, not even when the occaſion of it was to give the body neceſſary nouriſhment. *Carneades laborioſus & diuturnus ſapientiæ miles: ſiquidem nonaginta explctis annis, idem illi vivendi ac philoſophandi finis fuit. Ita ſe mirificum doctrinæ operibus addixerat, ut cum cibi capiendi cauſâ recubuiſſet, cogitationibus inhærens, manum ad menſam porrigere oblivîſceretur. Sed enim Meliſſa, quam uxoris loco habebat, temperato inter ſtudia non interpellandi, ſed inediæ ſuccurrendi officio, dexteram ſuam neceſſariis uſibus aptabat. Ergo animo tantummodo vitâ fruebatur, corpore verò quaſi alieno & ſupervacuo circumdatus erat* (30). Add to this what I ſhall ſay preſently concerning the remedy he made uſe of to augment the ſtrength of his mind.

(27) Φιλόπονος δὴ ἀνθρωπος γέγονεν ἐκ παιδὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τῆς ἄλλης... ἕθην καὶ ἰκμὰς καὶ ἐνθρυπτὸν ἔσχατα ἀσχολία τῶν περὶ τὸς λόγους. *Fuit autem vehementer ſtudioſus... quocirca & cæſariem & ungues nutriebat, tanta erat in literas intentione.* Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 62.

(28) Idem, ibid. num. 62.

(29) Val. Maximus, lib. 8. cap. 7. num. 5. *in Extr.* pag. m. 687, 688.

(30) Idem, ibid.

Muretus, by a ſlip of memory, has taken Chryſippus for Carneades. *Prodeat in medium Chryſippus*, ſays he (31), *qui ſæpe ſtudio intentus tanta voluptate perfruebatur, ut eum tanquam extra ſe poſitum cibi potioniſque caperet oblivio.* i. e. "Let Chryſippus ſtep forth, who often enjoyed ſuch pleaſure when intent on ſtudy, that, like one in an exſtaſy, he forgot to eat and drink." On Muretus's word, another learned man has ſince attributed to Chryſippus what belongs only to Carneades (32); but he obſerves, it is true, that Valerius Maximus ſpeaks of the latter, and not of the former (33). Let us ſet down his words; we ſhall ſee he ſays that the food was put into Chryſippus's mouth: *Aut Chryſippum denique repetam, quem inter etiam epulas tam intemperantem ſtudii fuiſſe ajunt, ut evolante ad alia ingenio, manus ceſſaret, & hianti ori ancilla Meliſſa cibum ingerere deberet* (34) He is no Plagiary, though he makes uſe of the words of Fromondus (35); for he refers us to him. Here, therefore, are three Authors who have committed the ſame fault: I doubt not but they have a good many companions.

(31) Muret. *Orat.* 2. vol. 1. pag. m. 17.

(32) Jacobus Thomaſius, *Oration.* pag. 148, 156. edit. Lipſ. 1683.

(33) Idem, ibid. *in margine*, pag. 156.

(34) Idem, ibid. pag. 156.

(35) Libertus Fromondus, *Philoſoph. Chriſtian. de Anima*, pag. 211.

[*E*] *He was the antagoniſt of the Stoics; and he applied himſelf . . to refute the works of Chryſippus.*] The former part of this remark is teſtified by the following paſſage of Cicero. *Sed is* (Carneades) *ut contra Stoicos, quos ſtudioſiſſimè ſemper refellebat, & contra quorum diſciplinam ingenium ejus exarſerat* (36). He read with attention the writings of the Stoics, and above all thoſe of Chryſippus, and refuted them (37). He ſucceeded ſo well therein, that he ſaid that had it not been for Chryſippus, he ſhould not have become what he was. Εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἦν Χρύσιππος οὐκ ἂν ἦν ἐγώ. *Niſi Chryſippus fuiſſet, non eſſem ego* (38). A great many others might ſay the ſame thing: they have been obliged to the antagoniſts they have had for all their glory: they would have been ſunk in idleneſs, or at leaſt they would have made ſtudy a domeſtic amuſement, if the deſire of ſurpaſſing them had not inſpired them with the reſolution of acquiring great knowledge, and of imparting it to the public. The neceſſity of defending one's ſelf againſt an ambitious and turbulent aggreſſor, has given birth to books which have procured a great deal of glory to people who thought of nothing leſs than of ſetting up for Authors. Our Carneades is not in this laſt predicament. It was he who began the quarrel: he choſe for his antagoniſt one of the moſt celebrated Philoſophers of the Sect of the Stoics, and wiſhed ſo ardently to overcome him, that when he prepared to encounter him he armed himſelf with a doſe of hellebore, in order to have his mind more free, and to excite the fire of his imagination againſt him with greater violence. *Idem* (Carneades) *cum Chryſippo diſputaturus, helleboro ſe antè purgabat, ad exprimendum ingenium ſuum attentius, & illius refellendum acrius* (39). I wiſh he who ſaid this had not uſed the word *cum*: which would make one believe that a verbal diſpute was there intended; but this is a falſe imagination, ſince Chryſippus was not alive when Carneades undertook to refute him. Pliny (40), and Aulus Gellius (41), aſſert that he made uſe of that remedy to anſwer the books of Zeno. Some Moderns ſuppoſe this Zeno to be not the Head of the Stoics, but Zeno of Tarſus, the ſcholar and ſucceſſor of Chryſippus (42). This may be; but as Mr. Menage has judiciouſly obſerved (43), it may alſo be underſtood of the Founder of the Stoics. I cannot wholly applaud his critique on Jonſius. He cenſures him with reaſon for having ſaid that Valerius Maximus aſſerts that Carneades took hellebore deſigning to write againſt Zeno (54). He ſhould have ſaid, *deſigning to diſpute with Chryſippus.* He very falſly charges him with having accuſed Petronius, Tertullian, St. Jerome, and St. Auguſtin, of a miſtake in ſaying *that Carneades purged his brain with white hellebore when he wrote againſt Chryſippus* (45). This fault of Mr. Menage is the more aſtoniſhing, becauſe he had but juſt quoted the words of Jonſius; here they are: *Quod tamen Chryſippo tribuit perperam Petronius in Satyrico. Tertullianus Libro de Anima cap.* 6. *Hieronymus Commentario in Epiſtolam ad Galatas* (46). They clearly ſignify that thoſe three Authors are in the wrong to attribute that to Chryſippus which Pliny, Valerius Maximus, and Aulus Gellius have related of the hellebore of Carneades. Jonſius ſpeaks not of St. Auguſtin at all. This fault of Monſieur Menage is not his only one; for he ſays expreſly that Petronius, Tertullian, and St. Jerome, affirm that *Carneades purged his brain with white hellebore, when he wrote againſt Chryſippus* (47). But it is certain that theſe three Authors ſpeak only of the hellebore taken by the latter. Mr. Menage ſays it himſelf in another book (48). I ſhall make one more remark againſt him. He is miſtaken in ſaying that Fulgentius names Zeno when he ſpeaks of the hellebore of Carneades (49): this is not true; he names only Carneades (50). If the originals had been conſulted, new matter might have been found to criticiſe Jonſius, who has placed Fulgentius among the Authors who have ſaid that Carneades prepared himſelf by a doſe of hellebore to write againſt Zeno. I take notice of theſe ſmall ſlips with a view only of accuſtoming Authors to the moſt ſevere exactneſs; for if they be guilty of the leaſt remiſſneſs, they occaſion many others to commit miſtakes and to hand them from one to another.

(36) Cicero, *Tuſcul. Quæſt.* lib. 5. folio 276, *D.* He ſays in the 2d Book *de Natura Deorum*, folio 297, *B.* that *Carneades libenter in Stoicos invehebatur.*

(37) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 62.

(38) Idem, ibid.

(39) Val. Maximus, lib. 8. cap. 7. num. 5.

(40) *Candidum* (elleborum) . . . *quondam terribile, poſtea tam promiſcuum, ut plerique ſtudiorum gratia ad pervidenda acrius quæ commentabantur, ſæpius ſumpſiterint. Carneadem reſponſurum Zenonis libris.* Plin. lib. 25. cap. 5. pag. 390, 391.

(41) Aulus Gellius, lib. 17. cap. 15.

(42) Jonſius, *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſoph.* pag. 117. Ouzelius, *in* Aulum Gellium, *cited by Mr.* Baillet, *Jugemens*, tom. 1. pag. 420.

(43) Menage, *Anti-Baillet*, tom. 1. pag. 154.

(44) Ibid. pag. 153.

(45) Ibid.

(46) Jonſius, *de Script. Hiſtor. Philoſ.* pag. 117.

(47) Menage, *Anti-Baillet*, tom. 1. pag. 153.

(48) Idem, *Not. in Diog. Laert.* lib. 4. num. 62. pag. m. 184.

(49) Menage, *Anti-Baillet*, tom. 1. pag. 154.

(50) *Sed in quibus & Carneades reſudat elleborum.* Fulgent. *Mytholog.* lib. 1. *ſub fin. præfat.* pag. m. 27.

Obſerve that Fulgentius makes mention alſo of Chryſippus's hellebore. *Ego vero Chryſippi ellebori rancidulo acrore poſtpoſito cum Muſis aliquid blandius fabulabor* (51). i. e. "But I, rejecting the offenſive acrimony of Chryſippus's hellebore, will diſcourſe gaily a little with the Muſes." So here are almoſt as many Authors for Chryſippus, as for Carneades. You have for the latter Valerius Maximus, Pliny, Gellius, St. Auguſtin (52), and Fulgentius; and for the former, Petronius, Tertullian, St. Jerome, and the ſame Fulgentius. Mr. Menage to theſe laſt adds Lucian (53); but he brings him in by head and ſhoulders, for the paſſage which he cites contains no more than that Chryſippus could not enter into the Iſland of the Happy, till after four purgations by hellebore (54). There is another paſſage in Lucian which is more tractable: it is that where he makes Chryſippus ſay that a man cannot become wiſe without drinking hellebore three times one after another (55). See alſo Lucian's Hermotimus towards the

(51) Idem, *de Virgiliana Continentia*, pag. m. 140.

(52) Auguſt. lib. 1. *contra Creſconium*, cap. 19. cited by Mr. Baillet, *Jugem. des Poet.* tom. 1. pag. 199.

(53) Menag. *Not. in Diog. Laert.* lib. 4. num. 62.

(54) Lucianus, *Veræ Hiſt.* lib. 2. pag. m. 757. tom. 1.

(55) Idem, *in Vitar. Auctione*, pag. 377. tom. 1.

had been of late the chief pillar of their Portico. He was master of a surprizing eloquence, which appeared formidable to the Roman Senate [*F*], when he was at Rome with

the end. You will find there some ground to conclude that if Mr. Menage had quoted that place, he might have proved what he asserted. In this diversity of opinions, I should chuse to follow those who ascribe all this to Carneades (56); but perhaps Chrysippus also swallowed hellebore to clear his understanding.

(56) *See* Schoock. *Fabul. Hamel.* pag. 125, 126.

Let us observe by the way, that Charles Stephens, Lloyd, and Hofman, are mistaken when they say that Carneades was the good friend, and the faithful follower, of the Philosopher Chrysippus, *Chrysippi maximè studiosus.* I shall take notice below (57), that there were some doctrines which he maintained for no other reason than to oppose the Stoics.

(57) In the Remark [*K*].

[*F*] *He was master of a surprizing Eloquence, which appeared formidable to the Roman Senate.*] It was so powerful, that he never maintained any thing without proving it, nor did he ever attack any thing without utterly overthrowing it. *Carneadis vero vis incredibilis illa dicendi & varietas perquam esset optanda nobis, qui nullam in illis suis disputationibus rem defendit, quam non probârit, nullam oppugnavit quam non everterit* (58). After this commendation, is there any need to alledge these other words of Cicero? *Hinc hæc recentior Academia emanavit, in qua extitit divina quadam celeritate ingenii, dicendique copia Carneades* (59). That is, "Hence proceeded this new Academy, in which Carneades appeared, indued with a divine quickness of understanding, and eloquence of speech (59)." Numenius has compared the Eloquence of Carneades to a rapid river which drives before it whatever it meets. This elogy will be better perceived in the original Greek which I am going to cite. Εἴτί που ἰδιόν τι καὶ θαῦμα ἰχνεύων λόγων, ἐξηγείρετο λάβρος, οἷον ποταμὸς ῥοώδης, σφοδρῶς ῥέων, πάντα καταπιμπλὰς τὰ τῇδε κ τὰ ἐκεῖθι, κ εἰσέπιπτε, κ συνέσυρε τὰς ἀκούσας διὰ θερύων. *Quod si alto quodam & exaggerato dicendi genere opus esset, tum enimvero vehementi ac rapido cursu ferebatur, ut amnis quidam incitatus & rapax, qui omnia passim inundet & obruat: sic in auditorem incumbebat, eumque secum magno cum fragore strepituque rapiebat* (60). He adds that this Philosopher charmed his auditors to that degree, that he led them captive to a submission to his sentiments, and that either by force or by dexterity he subdued even those persons who had taken the most exact precautions against him. This deserves to be told in Greek. Καὶ μέντοι λέγων ὁ Καρνεάδης ἐψυχαγώγει κ ἠνδραποδίζετο. ἦν δὲ κλέπτων μὲν ἀφανὴς, φαινόμενος δ' ληστὴς, αἰρῶν κ δόλῳ κ βίᾳ τὺς κ πάνυ σφόδρα παρεσκευασμένους. *At enim vero Carneades interea dicendi facultate auditorem permulcebat, idemque captivum trahebat: & fur occulte, manifeste prædo, vel fraude vel aperta vi paratissimum etiam quemque capiebat* (61). None of his adversaries, continues he, could withstand him; they were inferior to him in eloquence; he alone triumphed, all his opinions got footing; the opinions of others were all rejected. Πᾶσα γὰρ Καρνεάδᾳ διάνοια ἐνίκα, κ ἰδέμία ἠτιᾶτο ἄλλως· ἐπὶ κ οἷς προσιπολέμει, ἦσαν ἐκεῖ ἀδυνατώτεροι. *Omnis quippe Carneadis vincebat opinio, alia cujuslibet nulla prorsus, cum adversarios omnes longè dicendo inferiores haberet* (62). Antipater would needs oppose him (63), but how? He never durst appear before him, neither at the public Lectures, nor walking abroad, nor in conversation. He held his tongue: not a word escaped out of his poor mouth; he attacked him at a distance only and secretly, by some Books which he composed. Posterity saw them: they were not even able to support themselves against Carneades when dead, so far were they from being able to withstand him in his flourishing condition, surrounded by so bright a glory. Βιβλία κατέλιπε γράψας τοῖς ὕστερον, οὐτε νῦν δυνάμενα, κ τότε ἀδυνατώτερα πρὸς οὕτως ἄνδρα ὑπέμειναν φανέντα, κ καταδόξαντα εἶναι τοῖς τότε ἀνθρώποις τὸν Καρνεάδην. *Libros tantum posteris relinquebat, verum ejusmodi, qui ne nunc quidem, tum vero multo minus Carneadem illum, qui tantus ac tam admirabilis ejus ævi hominibus videbatur, sustinere possent* (64). Let us conclude with a fine passage of Lactantius. *Carneades Academicæ sectæ Philosophus, cujus in differendo quæ vis fuerit, quæ eloquentia, quod acumen, qui nescit, is ex prædicatione Ciceronis intelliget aut Lucilii, apud quem differens Neptunus de re difficillima, ostendit non posse id explicari, nec si Carneadem ipsum Orcus remittat* (65). What an idea! What an elogy! Neptune is introduced, who discoursing on a matter of very great difficulty, shews that it could not be explained, even tho' Carneades should rise from the dead. Let us go on to his Roman Embassy. It furnishes testimonies of his eloquence which suffer us not to doubt of this fact. Rhetoricians left their Schools, to go to his Auditory (66).

(58) Cicero, *de Orat.* lib. 2. folio 78, *D.* See ibid. folio 88, *A. the elogy given to his local memory; but there are some Critics who think that instead of* Carneades, *we should read there* Charmidas. *See* Jonsius, pag. 191. *Yet* Quintilian, lib. 11. cap. 2. pag. m. 518, *writes* Carneades.

(59) Cicer. *de Orat.* lib. 3. cap. 18. *fin.*

(60) Numenius, *apud* Eusebium, *Præpar. Evangel.* lib. 4. cap. 8. pag. 737. *C.*

(61) Idem, ibid. pag. 738. *B.*

(62) Idem, ibid. *C.*

(63) Idem, ibid.

(64) Idem, ibid. *D.*

(65) Lactant. lib. 5. cap. 14. pag. m. 336.

The Athenians, being condemned to pay a fine of five hundred talents, for having plundered the city of Oropus, sent Embassadors to Rome, who got the fine mitigated to one hundred talents (67). Carneades the Academic, Diogenes the Stoic, and Critolaüs the Peripatetic, three celebrated Philosophers, were charged with this Embassy (68). Before they had audience of the Senate, each of them made Orations in the presence of a great number of persons, and a peculiar character was admired in each of them (69). Strength and rapidity were the character of Carneades (70). Here follows something more remarkable. Cato the Censor was of opinion that those Embassadors should be immediately sent back, because it was very difficult to discern the truth thro' the arguments of Carneades. *Cato Censorius, in illa nobili trium sapientiæ procerum ab Athenis legatione, audito Carneade, quamprimum legatos eos censuit dimittendos, quoniam illo viro argumentante, quid veri esset haud facile discerni posset* (71). The Athenian Embassadors, said they in the Senate, were not sent so much with design to obtain something of us by way of persuasion, as to force us to comply with whatever they pleased. Εἰς τοσοῦτον ἐνέτρεψαν τὴν σύγκλητον βουλὴν, ὡς εἰπεῖν αὐτοὺς, ἔπεμψαν Ἀθηναῖοι πρεσβεύοντας, οὐ τοὺς πείσοντας, ἀλλὰ γὰρ τοῦς βιασομένους ἡμᾶς ἅπασι ὅσα θέλουσιν. *Qui tanta gravitate dicendi Senatum perpulerunt, ut diceret, Miserunt Athenienses legatos, non ut nos persuaderent, sed qui cogerent nos facere, quod ipsis collibitum esset* (72). It is not necessary to say that this constraint signified no more than that there was no withstanding the Discourses of Carneades. Consult Plutarch, who will acquaint you that the Roman youth were so charmed by the fine discourses of Carneades, that they renounced pleasures, and all other exercises, to follow the passion of philosophizing, with which he had inspired them, and with which they were seized as it were by enthusiasm. Λόγῳ κατεῖχεν, ὡς ἀνὴρ Ἕλλην εἰς ἔκπληξιν ὑπερφυὴς πάντα κηλῶν κ χειρούμενος, ἔρωτα δεινὸν ἐμβέβληκε τοῖς νέοις, ὑφ' οὗ τῶν ἄλλων ἡδονῶν κ διατριβῶν ἐκπεσόντες ἐνθουσιῶσι περὶ φιλοσοφίαν. *Vulgatumque fuit, virum Græcum ad miraculum usque eximium, omnia delenientem & allicientem, mirum infudisse juventuti ardorem, per quem reliquarum voluptatum & oblectamentorum obliti, quasi fanatici raperentur ad philosophiam* (73). This did not please Cato: he was afraid lest for the time to come young people would chuse rather to study than to go to war; and he censured in the Senate the conduct which was observed with respect to those Philosophical Embassadors. Let us give them their answer as soon as possible, represented he, and let us send them home: they are men who persuade folks whatever they please (74). He spoke in this manner, nor for any particular hatred to Carneades, as some have believed, but because he despised all Philosophy in general, and the whole Grecian learning (75). Those last words of Plutarch ought not to hinder us from believing that Cato above all things apprehended the subtilty of wit and strength of argument with which our Carneades maintained either side of the question: such people are dangerous: they may prejudice the best causes, as Cicero said of him (76): they sometimes prove white to be black: they resemble that son of Mercury of whom it is said,

Nascitur Autolycus, furtum ingeniosus ad omne,
Qui facere assuêrat, patriæ non degener artis,
Candida de nigris, & de candentibus atra (77).

That is,

"To Mercury Autolycus she brought,
"Who turn'd to thefts and tricks his subtle thought;
"Possess'd he was of all his father's sleight,
"At will made white look black, and black look
"white."

(66) Diog. Laertius, lib. 4. num. 62.

(67) *See* Pausanias, lib. 7. pag. 216, 217.

(68) Aulus Gellius, lib. 7. cap. 14. Macrobius, *Saturnal.* lib. 1. cap. 5.

(69) Idem, ibid.

(70) *Violenta & rapida Carneades dicebat.* Aulus Gellius, lib. 7. cap. 14. *Facundia Carneadis violenta & rapida.* Macrob. *Saturn.* lib. 1. cap. 5.

(71) Plinius, lib. 7. cap. 30. pag. m. 52.

(72) Ælian. *Hist. Var.* lib. 3. cap. 17. pag. m. 189.

(73) Plutarch. *in Catone majore,* pag. 349. *E.*

(74) Περὶ παντὸς οὖ βουλοιντο ῥαδίως πεῖθειν δύνανται. *Persuadere facile quidvis valent.* Idem, ibid. pag. 350, *A.*

(75) Idem, ibid.

(76) *Ut Carneadi respondeatis, qui sæpe optimas causas ingenii calumnia ludificari solet.* Cicero, lib. 2. *de Repub. apud* Nonium, *Voce* Calumnia, pag. m. 263.

(77) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 11. ver. 314.

with two other Embaſſadors. They ſay he ſpoke admirably one day in the behalf of juſtice, and the next day againſt it [G]. The ſubtilties with which he combated that virtue appeared terrible to Cicero [H], and enough to prevent the laying of ſolid foundations

[G] *He ſpoke one day in behalf of Juſtice, and the next day againſt it.*] This was his element: he delighted in demoliſhing his own work, becauſe all this in the end did ſervice to his grand principle, that there are only probabilities or reſemblances of truth in the mind of man; from whence it follows that between two things directly contradictory, either this or that may be choſen indifferently, for the ſubject of a diſcourſe ſometimes negative, and ſometimes affirmative; but let us come to the proofs of our text. Lactantius will furniſh us with them. *Is* (Carneades) *cum Legatus ab Athenienſibus Romam miſſus eſſet, diſputavit de juſtitia copioſè, audiente Galba, & Catone Cenſorio maximis tunc Oratoribus. Sed idem diſputationem ſuam poſtridie contraria diſputatione ſubvertit, & juſtitiam, quam pridie laudaverat, ſuſtulit, non quidem Philoſophi gravitate, cujus firma & ſtabilis debet eſſe ſententia, ſed quaſi oratorio exercitii genere in utramque partem differendi. Quod ille facere ſolebat ut alios quodlibet aſſerentes poſſet refutare* (78). i. e. "He (*Carneades*) being ſent Embaſſador to Rome by "the Athenians, diſputed eloquently concerning Juſtice, "in the preſence of Galba and Cato the Cenſor the "greateſt Orators of that time. But the next day "he overthrew his former arguments by a contrary "diſputation, and deſtroyed Juſtice, which he had "praiſed the day before, not indeed with the gravity "of a Philoſopher, whoſe opinion ought to be firm "and ſtable, but for a kind of oratorial exerciſe of "diſputing on either ſide. Which he uſed to do, that "he might refute others who aſſerted any thing as "certain." Lactantius adds that it was not difficult for that Philoſopher to refute all that was ſaid in behalf of juſtice; for the Pagans could not know it, becauſe they were ignorant of true Religion, which is the ſource and foundation of it. *Erat facillimum juſtitiam radices non habentem labefactare, quia tum nulla in terra fuit; ut, quid eſſet aut qualis à Philoſophis cerneretur .... cujus origo in religione, ratio in æquitate eſt. Sed ii, qui primam illam partem neſcierunt, ne ſecundam quidem tenere potuerunt* (79). If they knew it not, they could not maintain it; it muſt therefore neceſſarily ſuccumb when attacked by a Sophiſt. *Expoſui cauſam, cur Philoſophi nec invenire juſtitiam, nec defendere potuerunt. Nunc redeo ad id, quod intenderam. Carneades ergo, quoniam erant infirma, quæ à Philoſophis diſſerebantur, ſumpſit audaciam refellendi, quia refelli poſſe intellexit* (80). i. e. "I have ſhewn the reaſon "why the Philoſophers could neither find out juſtice, "nor defend it. I return now to what I firſt intended. "Carneades, therefore, ſeeing thoſe arguments which "the Philoſophers advanced were weak, had the boldneſs to refute them, becauſe he knew they might be "refuted (80)." Lactantius proceeds to give us the ſubſtance of Carneades's diſputation againſt Juſtice, and acquaints us that that Philoſopher argued in this manner. If there were any ſuch thing as Juſtice, it would be founded either on poſitive Law, or on the Law of nature. But it is founded neither on poſitive Law, which varies according to different time and place, and is by every nation accommodated to their own intereſt and advantage; nor on the Law of nature, becauſe this Law is no more than a propenſion which nature has given all ſorts of animals towards that which is uſeful for them, and it cannot be regulated according to this propenſion without committing a thouſand frauds: the reſult of which is that it cannot be the foundation of juſtice, therefore &c. He ſhewed by a great many examples that the condition of mankind is ſuch, that if they will be juſt, they act imprudently and fooliſhly; and that if they will act prudently, they become unjuſt: from whence he concluded that there was no juſtice; for a virtue inſeparable from folly cannot paſs for juſt. Lactantius acknowledges that the Pagans were not capable of refuting this argument, and that Cicero durſt not undertake it. *Ita ergo juſtitiam cum in duas partes diviſiſſet, alteram civilem eſſe dicens, alteram naturalem, utramque ſubvertit; quod illa civilis ſapientia ſit quidem, ſed juſtitia non ſit, naturalis autem illa juſtitia ſit quidem, ſed non ſit ſapientia. Arguta hæc planè, & venenata ſunt, & quæ M. Tullius non potuerit refellere. Nam cum faciat Lælium Furio reſpondentem, proque juſtitia dicentem, irrefutata hæc tanquam foveam prætergreſſus eſt, ut videatur idem Lælius non naturalem, quæ in ſtultitiæ crimen venerat, ſed illam civilem defendiſſe juſtitiam, quam Furius ſapientiam quidem eſſe conceſſerat, ſed injuſtam* (81). After this he gives the ſolution of it from the light of faith (82), and obſerves that Carneades, knowing on the one hand that juſt men are not fools, was ignorant on the other of the true reaſon why they appeared to be ſo; which engaged him to make the beſt uſe of this opportunity of declaiming in favour of incomprehenſibility, his darling principle. *Senſit igitur Carneades, quæ ſit natura juſtitiæ, niſi quòd parum altè proſpexit, ſtultitiam non eſſe, quanquam intelligere mihi videor, qua mente id fecerit. Non enim verè exiſtimavit eum ſtultum eſſe qui juſtus eſt; ſed cum ſciret non eſſe, & rationem tamen, cur ita videretur, non comprehenderet, voluit oſtendere, latere in abdito veritatem, ut decretum diſciplinæ ſuæ tueretur, cujus ſumma ſententia eſt, nihil percipi poſſe* (83). Let us not forget a very good obſervation of Quintilian. He ſays that though Carneades argued for injuſtice, yet for all that he behaved himſelf according to juſtice. It was the uſual way of the Academics: their ſpeculation was ſuſpended between two contraries; but their practice was fixed to one of them. *Neque enim Academici cùm in utramque diſſerunt partem, non ſecundum alteram vivunt. Neque Carneades ille, qui Romæ audiente Cenſorio Catone non minoribus viribus contra juſtitiam dicitur diſſeruiſſe, quàm pridie pro juſtitia dixerat, injuſtus ipſe vir fuit* (84). It is the caſe of all the world: men live not according to their principles (85).

[H] *The ſubtilties with which he attacked* juſtice *ſeemed terrible to Cicero.*] One of the beſt works of that illuſtrious Roman is the Treatiſe *de Legibus*. He there lays down this foundation, that there is a natural law, that is to ſay, actions which are by their nature juſt, and which we are obliged to do, not becauſe we live in a ſociety which by a poſitive law ſubjects thoſe who do them not to a penalty, but becauſe of the juſtice and rectitude which accompanies them independently of human inſtitution. He aſſerts that he ought to ſuppoſe this, if he would build on well choſen and well concerted principles, and yet he does not expect every body will approve them; he promiſes himſelf only the approbation of the old Platonics, and that of the Peripatetics and Stoics. He does not trouble himſelf about the School of Epicurus; which made profeſſion to keep at a diſtance from Politics: he leaves it therefore to philoſophize in that retreat after its own manner; but he begs quarter of Arceſilaus and Carneades. He fears that if they came to attack him, they would make too wide breaches in the edifice which he imagined he had raiſed. He does not find that he has courage enough to repel them, wherefore he wiſhes not to be expoſed to their anger, he deſires to appeaſe them, and will enter into no war with them. Let us ſee his Latin. *Vereor committere, ut non bene proviſa & diligenter explorata principia ponantur: nec tamen ut omnibus probentur, nam id fieri non poteſt, ſed ut eis qui omnia recta atque honeſta per ſe expetenda duxerunt, & aut nihil omnino in bonis numerandum, niſi quod per ſeipſum laudabile eſſet, aut certe nullum habendum magnum bonum, niſi quod vere laudari ſua ſponte poſſet. His omnibus ſive in Academia vetere cum Speuſippo, Xenocrate, Polemone manſerunt: ſive Ariſtotelem & Theophraſtum cum illis re congruentes, genere docendi paululum differentes, ſequuti ſunt: ſive, ut Zenoni viſum eſt, rebus non commutatis immutaverint vocabula: ſive etiam Ariſtonis difficilem atque arduam, ſed jam tamen fractam & convictam ſectam ſequuti ſunt, ut virtutibus exceptis atque vitiis, cætera in ſumma æqualitate ponerent; his omnibus hæc quæ dixi probantur: ſibi autem indulgentes, & corpori deſervientes, atque omnia quæ ſequantur in vita, quæque fugiant, voluptatibus & doloribus ponderantes, etiam ſi vera dicunt (nihil enim opus eſt hoc loco litibus) in hortulis ſuis jubeamus dicere, atque etiam ab omni ſocietate reipublicæ, cujus partem nec norunt ullam, nec unquam noſſe voluerunt, pauliſper ſaceſſant*

(78) Lactant. lib. 5. cap. 14. pag. 336, 337.

(79) Idem, ibid. pag. 337.

(80) Idem, ibid. cap. 16. pag. 340, 341.

(81) Idem, ibid. pag. 342.

(82) *Nobis facilior eſt iſta defenſio, quibus cæleſti beneficio familiaris eſt ac penitus nota juſtitia, quique illam non nomine ſed re novimus.* i. e. "This defence "is more eaſy "to us, to "whom, by the "favour of heaven, juſtice is "familiar, and "perfectly well "known, and "who are acquainted with "it not by name, "but in reality." Lactant. cap. 17. pag. 343.

(83) Idem, ibid.

(84) Quintil. *Inſtit. Orat.* lib. 12. cap. 1. pag. m. 557.

(85) Compare the Elogy which Cleanthes gave to Arceſilaus above in the Article of ARCESILAUS, Citation (91).

tions in Works designed to treat of right and of laws. He demonstrated the discourses of the Stoics in behalf of Religion to be absurd [*I*], and I wonder he was suffered to attack them so vigorously on that head; for the reasons which he alledged against them were very fit utterly to subvert all the Pagan Deities. There is nothing more christian-like than one of his doctrines of Morality [*K*]. His argument against the Oracles of Apollo

cessant rogemus: perturbatricem autem harum omnium rerum Academiam hanc ab Arcesila & Carneade recentem exoremus, ut sileat. Nam si invaserit in has, quæ satis scite nobis instructæ & compositæ videntur rationes, nimias edet ruinas, quam quidem ego placare cupio, submovere non audeo (86). According to this idea, Carneades might have passed for a destroying Angel (87).

(86) Cicero, lib. 1. *de Legib.* folio 330 verso.

(87) *We have seen in the preceding page, Citation* (81), *that* Cicero, *introducing Lælius speaking in behalf of Justice, against Furius, who had spoken for Injustice, left several Arguments of Carneades unanswered. It was in his Books* de Republica. *See* St. Augustin, *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 2. cap. 21.

[*I*] *He demonstrated the discourses of the Stoics in behalf of Religion to be absurd.*] This is what may be gathered from the following words of Cicero addressed to the Stoics. *Si vos sequar, dic quid ei respondeam, qui me sic roget: Si Dii sunt, sunt ne etiam Nymphæ Deæ? si Nymphæ, Panisci etiam & Satyri? Hi autem non sunt, ne Nymphæ quidem Deæ igitur. At earum templa sunt publice vota & dedicata. Quid igitur? ne cæteri quidem ergo Dii, quorum templa sunt dedicata? Age porrò Jovem & Neptunum Deum numeras? ergo etiam Orcus frater eorum Deus, & illi qui fluere apud inferos dicuntur, Acheron, Cocytus, Styx, Phlegethon, tum Charon, tum Cerberus Dii putandi. At id quidem repudiandum: ne Orcus quidem igitur. Quid dicitis ergo de fratribus? Hæc Carneades agebat non ut Deos tolleret: quid enim Philosopho minus conveniens? sed ut Stoicos nihil de Diis explicare convinceret. Itaque insequebatur. Quid enim, aiebat, si ii fratres sunt in numero Deorum, num de patre eorum Saturno negari potest, quem vulgo maxime colunt ad occidentem? Qui si Deus est, patrem quoque ejus Cælum esse Deum confitendum est. Quod si ita est, Cæli quoque parentes Dii habendi sunt Æther & Dies, eorumque fratres & sorores, qui à genealogiis antiquis sic nominantur, Amor, Dolus, Metus, Labor, Invidentia, Fatum, Senectus, Mors, Tenebræ, Miseria, Querela, Gratia, Fraus, Pertinacia, Parcæ, Hesperides, Somnia, quos omnes Erebo & Nocte natos ferunt. Aut igitur hæc monstra probanda sunt, aut prima illa tollenda* (88). i. e. "If I follow you, tell me what I "shall answer to him who should ask me this question: If there be gods, are there nymphs also who "are goddesses? if there be nymphs, are there also "sylvan gods and satyrs? But there are no such beings as these, and therefore no nymphs? Yet temples are publickly vowed and dedicated to them. "What then, are not the rest Gods to whom temples are dedicated? To come nearer, do you reckon "Jupiter and Neptune to be Gods? consequently their brother Pluto will be a God, and the rivers which "are said to flow in hell, Acheron, Cocytus, Styx, "and Phlegethon; Charon and Cerberus also must be "deemed Gods. But this is not to be admitted: neither "therefore is Pluto a God. What say ye then of his "brothers? Thus Carneades argued, not to prove there "were no Gods; for what could be more unbecoming "a Philosopher? but to convince the Stoics that they "said nothing satisfactory concerning the Gods. Therefore he proceeded. What then, said he, if those brothers are in the number of the Gods, can it be denied of their father Saturn, who is principally worshipped by the common people in the west? And if "he be a God, we must also allow his father the "Heaven to be a God. Which if it be so, the parents of Heaven, Æther and Day, are also to be held "Gods, and also their brothers and sisters, who are "thus named in the ancient genealogies; Love, Deceit, Fear, Labour, Envy, Necessity, Old Age, "Death, Darkness, Misery, Complaint, Favour, Fraud, "Obstinacy, the Fates, the Hesperides, Dreams, all which "are said to be the issue of Erebus and Night. Either these monsters therefore must be admitted, or the "former must be denied." You may read in Cicero himself the whole sequel of this argument, which is very long. We see in another place that Carneades had produced so many reasons against those who say that the Gods have done a thousand things on earth for the advantage of mankind, that he had raised a desire in a great many people to inform themselves what was to be believed concerning them. *Contra quas Carneades ita multa disseruit, ut excitaret homines non socordes ad veri investigandi cupiditatem* (89). It has been said elsewhere (90) that if Carneades had undertaken to plead the cause of the Pagan Religion, *he would have seen that Eloquence run aground* which was so irresistible. Let us add here, that when he pleaded against this same cause, it was easy for him to triumph. The contrary side melted before his Eloquence like wax before the fire. Observe that Mr. Foucher, who excuses it as much as he can (91), makes use of too indulgent an evasion, and of conjectures which are not at all compatible with the facts.

(88) Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, lib. 3. pag. m. 625.

(89) Idem, ibid. lib. 1. pag. 7.

(90) *Pensées diverses sur les Cometes*, num. 124. pag. 361.

(91) Foucher, *Dissert. sur la Philos. des Academiciens*, livr. 3. pag. 159.

WHETHER Carneades wrote any books.

Two passages of Cicero which I have cited seem to prove that Carneades wrote some books; for there is no likelihood that the arguments of a Philosopher should be cited, which were known only by tradition: but I may answer that they might be cited according as they were found in the works of some of his scholars. It is thus that Cicero sets down some other dogms of Carneades, by citing the books of Clitomachus (92). This is no demonstrative proof, therefore, against those who affirm that Carneades composed nothing. Plutarch expressly asserts it (93): others say that some letters were handed about which he had written to Ariarathes King of Cappadocia; but that all the rest had been composed by his scholars, and that he left no writings behind him (94). The existence of these letters does not refute Plutarch; for the letters which a man writes, without designing to publish them, do not make him an Author, I mean do not hinder his being reckoned among those who have composed no work. Pliny and Aulus Gellius are against Plutarch: they assure us Carneades took hellebore to write against Zeno (95). I do not produce Fulgentius; for probably the Carneades whom he cites (96) is the Poet (97), and not the Philosopher. It would be more to the purpose to cite Cicero, who has spoken of a writing of Carneades on this thesis, *It seems that a wise man would be afflicted at the loss of his country.* This writing was inserted by Clitomachus in the work of consolation which he addressed to his countrymen the Carthaginians. *Legimus librum Clitomachi, quem ille eversa Carthagine misit consolandi causa ad captivos cives suos. In eo est disputatio scripta Carneadis, quam se ait in commentarium retulisse: quum ita positum esset, videri fore in ægritudine sapientem patria capta. Quæ Carneades contra dixerit, scripta sunt* (98). Cicero knew the strong and subtile reasons which Carneades urged against divination. *Nobismet ipsis quærentibus quid sit de divinatione judicandum, quod à Carneade multa acute & copiose contra Stoicos disputata sint* (99). But yet, once more, this does not prove that they subsisted in any book of that Philosopher. I have said above (100) that his objections against the maxim, *Quæ sunt æquali unitertio sunt æqualia inter se*, were also known.

(92) Cicero, *Acad. Quæst.* lib. 2. folio 209, *D.*

(93) Plutarch. *de Fort. vel Virtute Alexandri*, pag. 328, *A.*

(94) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 62. pag. 265.

(95) See the Remark [*D*].

(96) *Nam & Carneades in libro Telesiaco ita ait,* πᾶσα τύχη ἀϊσθησιν φρονοῦντος κατοικεῖ, *id est, omnis fortuna in sensu habitat sapientis.* Fulgent. *de Virgil. Contin.* pag. m. 145.

(97) Diogenes Laertius, lib. 4. num. 66. makes mention of the Poet Carneades.

(98) Cicero, *Tuscul. Quæst.* lib. 3. folio 263, *B.*

(99) Cicero, *de Divinat.* lib. 1. *circa init.* folio m. 304, *C.*

(100) In the Remark [*C*], Citation (26).

[*K*] *Nothing more christian like than one of his moral doctrines.*] I shall here transcribe from a Canon of Dijon, to the end it may not be said that if I were a Divine, I would not speak thus of the opinions of a Philosopher who invincibly refuted the Religion of the Pagans, the only one which he was acquainted with. "Here is one of his maxims: If a man privately "knew that an enemy or any other person, whose "death might be of advantage to him, would come "to sit down on the grass, under which there lurked "an asp, he ought to give him notice of it, even "tho' he could not be reproach'd for having kept silence "on this occasion. *Si scieris, inquit Carneades, aspidem occultè latere uspiam, & velle imprudentem alium super eam assidere, cujus mors tibi emolumento futura sit, improbe feceris nisi monueris ne assideat, sed impune tamen id te constaret feciisse: quis enim coarguere possit* (101)? This doctrine is admirable, "and is doubtless most worthy of Christianity; for "what is there more worthy of Christianity than to do "good to ones enemy, and to do it without any hope "of being recompensed for it in this world (102)?" These are the words of Mr. Foucher; he almost repeats them in the IVth chapter of the IId book.

(101) This passage is *Cicero's*, lib. 2. *de Finibus*, folio m. 223, *A.* *and not* lib. 1. as it is quoted by Mr. Foucher, *Dissertat. sur la Philosophie des Academiciens*, liv. 1. chap. 8. pag. 158.

(102) Foucher, ibid. pag. 46, 47.

But since we are upon a point of morality of Carneades,

Apollo had ſome ſtrength [*L*]. It is thought he would have left the ſucceſſion to his Chair of Philoſophy to his diſciple Mentor, if he had not broke with him for having catched him in bed with his miſtreſs [*M*]. Some ſay he lived fourſcore and five years (*d*): others

(*d*) Diogenes Laert. lib. 6. num. 65. Lucian. *in Macrob.* pag. 640. tom. 2.

neades, let us ſay ſomething likewiſe of his opinion concerning the nature of the ſupreme good. The ultimate end of man, ſaid he, is to enjoy the principles of nature (103). Mr. Foucher thinks that this means, *To exerciſe in perfection all the functions of the underſtanding and will, without being hindred, either by ignorance or prejudices, or by any other exterior obſtacle* (104). Cicero obſerves that Carneades maintained this opinion only to contradict the Stoics, and that if virtue had been joined to the felicity he mentions, the meaſure of true happineſs would have been filled up. *Quæ poſſunt eadem contra Carneadeum illud ſummum bonum dici, quod is non tam ut probaret* (105), *protulit, quàm ut Stoicis, quibuſcum bellum gerebat, opponeret. Id autem ejuſmodi eſt, ut additum ad virtutem autoritatem videatur habiturum, & expleturum cumulate vitam beatam* (106). He has ſaid in another Book: *Honeſte vivere fruentem rebus his, quas primas homini natura conciliet, & vetus Academia cenſuit, ut indicant ſcripta Polemonis, quæ Antiochus probat maxime, & Ariſtoteles ejuſque amici nunc proxime videntur accedere. Introducebat etiam Carneades, non quo probaret, ſed ut opponeret Stoicis, ſummum bonum eſſe frui his rebus, quas primas natura conciliaviſſet* (107). i. e. "That we ſhould "live virtuouſly, and enjoy thoſe things which nature "principally provides for man, was the opinion of the "old Academy, as appears from the writings of Po"lemo, which Antiochus chiefly approves, and to the "ſame opinion do Ariſtotle and his friends at preſent "ſeem nearly to accede. Carneades alſo introduced "this propoſition, that the ſupreme good conſiſted in "enjoying thoſe things which nature had provided in "the firſt place, not with deſign to prove it, but only "to oppoſe the Stoics." Some other paſſages of Cicero (108) clearly teſtify that Carneades confined happineſs to the enjoyment of natural good, without including moral good. It is proper to obſerve that on this head he put the Stoics and the Peripatetics to a nonplus; for he demonſtrated to them that their controverſies concerning the ſupreme good were nothing but a diſpute about words. *Carneades tuus egregia quadam exercitatione in dialecticis, ſummaque eloquentia rem in ſummum diſcrimen adduxit, propterea quod pugnare non deſtitit in omni hac quæſtione quæ de bonis & malis appelletur, non eſſe rerum Stoicis cum Peripateticis, controverſiam, ſed nominum* (109). He judged of the thruſts exchanged between the two ſects, as Umpire of the field, and ſhewed the one that thoſe things which they called goods, and which the other called only conveniencies, were not worth deſiring, ſince the one aſcribed no greater advantages to them than the other. *Quorum controverſiam ſolebat tanquam honorarius arbiter judicare Carneades. Nam quum quæcunque bona Peripateticis, eadem Stoicis commoda viderentur, neque tamen Peripatetici plus tribuerent divitiis, bonæ valetudini, cæteriſque rebus generis ejuſdem, quàm Stoïci, quum ea re, non verbis ponderarentur, cauſam eſſe deſiderandi negabat* (110). One of his victories over the Stoics was to drive them from a poſt, in which they had maintained themſelves a conſiderable time. They had ſaid that good repute without ſome advantage was not worth ſtirring a ſtep for. But they could not withſtand Carneades, and ſaw themſelves obliged to aſſert that it was worthy of our choice for its own ſake (111). Every one knows they made a diſtinction between good, and the things which deſerved preference.

(103) *Carneadi frui principiis naturalibus eſſet extremum.* Cicero, *de Finib.* lib. 2. folio 221, *C.*

(104) Foucher, *Diſſertat. ſur la Philoſ. des Academ.* pag. 158.

(105) Add hereto theſe words of the 5th Book *de Finibus*, folio 239. *Voluptatis Ariſtippus, non dolendi Hieronymus, fruendi rebus his quas primas ſecundum naturam eſſe diximus, Carneades non ille quidem autor ſed defenſor diſſerendi cauſa.*

(106) Cicero, *de Finib.* lib. 2. folio 222, *A.*

(107) Idem, *Acad. Quæſt.* lib. 2. fol. 212. *B, C.*

(108) In his 2d Book *de Finibus*, folio 221, *D*; and in the 5th Book, folio 239 verſo.

(109) Idem, ibid. lib. 3. fol. 230, *A.*

(110) Idem, *Tuſcul.* lib. 5. *ſub fin.* folio 278, *D.*

(111) Idem, *de Finib.* lib. 3. 231.

[*L*] *His argument againſt the oracle of Apollo had ſome ſtrength.*] He aſſerted that that Deity could not foretel things to come, unleſs they depended on a neceſſary cauſe: he deprived him of the knowledge of all contingent events, as of Oedipus's parricide for inſtance; for there being no cauſe which neceſſarily forced that man to kill his father, it could not be foreſeen that he would kill him: what is to come cannot be known but when all the efficient cauſes of an action are known. He alſo aſſerted that the Gods who preſided over the oracles could not know what was paſt, when there remained no ſigns which might ſerve for tracks to direct them back to the time of the event. He meant, without doubt, that there was no other track which could ſerve for this purpoſe, beſides the concatenation of natural cauſes which act without any uſe of liberty; and that therefore the acts of man's free-will breaking the chain, hindred the Gods from extending their view to ages paſt, when there remained no ſenſible monument of the events. *Dicebat Carneades, ne Apollinem quidem futura poſſe dicere, niſi ea, quorum cauſas natura ita contineret, ut ea fieri neceſſe eſſet. Quid enim ſpectans Deus ipſe diceret Marcellum eum qui ter conſul fuit, in mari eſſe periturum? Erat quidem hoc verum ex æternitate, ſed cauſas id efficientes non habebat, ita ne præterita quidem ea quorum nulla ſigna tanquam veſtigia extarent Apollini nota eſſe cenſebat, quo minus futura. Cauſis enim efficientibus quamque rem cognitis, poſſe denique ſciri quid futurum eſſet. Ergo nec de Oedipode potuiſſe Apollinem prædicere, nullis in rerum natura cauſis propoſitis, quur ab eo patrem interfici neceſſe eſſet, nec quicquam ejuſmodi* (112). Chryſippus had eluded the inſtance taken from a man who is predeſtined to die, dying of courſe, whether he makes uſe of medicines, or whether he does not: he had eluded this, I ſay, by ſuppoſing the complication of predeſtined events, as that ſuch a man ſhall make uſe of a Phyſician and recover. For which reaſon the medicines are then an annex to the fatality of the recovery. *Omnes igitur hujus generis captiones eodem modo refelluntur. Sive tu adhibueris medicum, ſive non adhibueris, convaleſces, captioſum. Tam enim eſt fatale Medicum adhibere, quàm convaleſcere. Hæc ut dixi confatalia ille apellat* (113). Carneades was not ſatisfied with this anſwer; but to refute it thoroughly, he ſhewed the great inconvenience of it, I mean the extinction of liberty. If you join in this manner, ſaid he, in the decrees of deſtiny the cauſes with the effects, every thing will be done by neceſſity, and nothing will be in our power; every thing will depend on an anterior cauſe, and all are linked together by a natural and indiſſoluble band. His meaning will be better comprehended from the Latin words of Cicero. *Carneades genus hoc totum non probabat, & nimis inconſiderate concludi hanc rationem putabat: itaque premebat alio modo, nec ullam adhibebat calumniam, cujus erat hæc concluſio: Si omnia antecedentibus cauſis fiunt; omnia naturali colligatione conſerta contextaque fiunt, quod ſi ita eſt, omnia neceſſitas efficit. Id ſi verum eſt, nihil eſt in noſtra poteſtate. Eſt autem aliquid in noſtra poteſtate. At ſi omnia fato fiunt, omnia cauſis antecedentibus fiunt: non igitur fato fiunt quæcunque fiunt* (114).

(112) Idem, *de Fato*, folio 325, *C. D.*

(113) Idem, ibid. *C.*

You ſee that the diſputes of the Auguſtinians with the Jeſuits and with the Remonſtrants, on the conſequences of Predeſtination, were on foot among the ancient Philoſophers. You ſee that Carneades has furniſhed a difficulty for the Predeſtinarian Divines to object to their adverſaries, that God could not foreſee future things, if they depended on an indifferent cauſe. There are none but the Socinians, who have had the ſincerity to acknowledge the evident force of this objection: but into what an abyſs have they thrown themſelves by this act of ingenuity! It obliges them to give up the preſcience of God, and what can be more monſtrous than to admit a God who knows not the actions of men otherwiſe than gradually as they are done?

(114)‖ Idem, ibid.

[*M*] *He broke with Mentor, for having catched him in bed with his miſtreſs.*] To leave no ambiguity, I am obliged to ſay that Mentor was caught in bed with the miſtreſs of Carneades his Profeſſor. Carneades did not then diſpute on probability, nor on incomprehenſibility: he was altogether like other men; he took what his eyes had diſcovered to him, of the infidelity of his concubine and his ſcholar, to be a thing certain, and what he very well comprehended, and he thereupon broke with Mentor. This latter became his Antagoniſt; oppoſed ſubtilties to ſubtilties, and refuted the Acatalepſy. Καρνεάδη ϑ' γένηται γνάφιμος Μέντωρ μὲν ὁ πρῶτος, ὃ μὲν διάδοχος. ἀλλ' ἔτι ζῶν Καρνεάδης ἐπὶ παλλακῇ μοιχὸν εὑρὼν, οὐχ ὑπὸ παιδικῆς φαντασίας, οὐδ' ὡς μὴ καταληφὼς, ὡς δὲ μάλιστα πιστεύων τῇ ὄψει, ἀφ' καταλαβὼν, παρητήσατο τῆς διατριβῆς. *Mentorem Carneades primum habuit diſcipulum, non tamen ſucceſſorem. Quod enim illum adhuc vivens cum pellice ſua repererat, non jam viſo tantum probabili, aut quaſi minus hominem comprehenderet, at ſuis maximè credens oculis, eumque verè comprehendens,*

others ſtretch his life to ninety (e). His death is placed in the fourth year of the 162d Olympiad (f). I do not believe there is any good ground to ſubſtitute a different chronology, as Petavius has done (g), or that it can be made out that he lived at the ſame time with Epicurus. A Diſpute has ariſen on this laſt point, between two Moderns [N] who

(e) Cicero, *Academ. Quæſt.* lib. 2. folio m. 203, *B.* Valer. Maxim. lib. 8. cap. 7. pag. m. 687.

(f) Diogen. Laert. lib. 4. num. 65.

(g) See the Remark [P], num. 6.

comprehendens, ejus deinceps operam & conſuetudinem repudiavit (115). This is what Numenius informs us. Diogenes Laertius ſpeaks of it with more brevity (116). This was a baſe action of Mentor: he was the chief ſcholar of Carneades; he had free admittance into his houſe, as if he had been his ſon; and he abuſed that privilege to debauch the Philoſopher's concubine. The diſorders occaſioned by love cannot be ſufficiently lamented. It is a brutiſh paſſion, which ſtifles all ſentiments of gratitude and generoſity. You meet with people who would not for all the world rob their friend of the value of a penny: they would ſuffer inſupportable remorſe of conſcience, if they could reproach themſelves with having betrayed him in the ſmalleſt affair: the moſt ſhining generoſity dwells in their ſoul in all other reſpects; but they make no ſcruple to debauch his wife or his daughter. No friendſhip is proof againſt the dæmon of impurity: every thing ſeems to him to be fair prize. *Non hoſpes ab hoſpite tutus.* The rights of hoſpitality, which are ſo ſacred, ſo inviolable, ſtop him not. On the contrary, he therein finds his preparatives, and the forwarding of his affairs.

(115) Numenius, *apud* Euſebium, *Præpar. Evang.* pag. 738, *D.*

(116) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 63.

[N] *I do not believe . . . that he lived at the ſame time with Epicurus. A diſpute has ariſen on this point between two Moderns.*] I mean Mr. Foucher Canon of Dijon, and Mr. Lantin Counſellor in the Parliament of the ſame City. The Pieces publiſhed by them on this controverſy are to be found in the *Journal des Savans* (117). The queſtion in debate is, *Whether Carneades was contemporary with Epicurus.* Mr. Foucher has aſſerted it in his Hiſtory of the Academics, and has maintained it by four arguments in a Memorial communicated to Mr. Couſin (118). They were refuted by Mr. Lantin (119), and in a manner that will not admit of a good reply, in my opinion. He has found in Cicero (120) a deciſive fact; which is that Carneades came to Rome with the two other Embaſſadors of the Athenians under the Conſulſhip of Publius Scipio and Marcus Marcellus. Now that Conſulſhip coincides with the year of Rome 598, which is the ſecond of the 155th Olympiad, and about a hundred and twelve years later than the death of Epicurus. It is not true therefore that Epicurus and Carneades lived at the ſame time: wherefore Mr. Foucher cannot be ſupported by that paſſage of Cicero (121), where it is ſaid that Carneades the intimate friend of Epicurus, *Epicuro perfamiliaris*, made a viſit to Arceſilaüs. Either Cicero's memory muſt have failed him, or he ſpeaks of a different Carneades from ours (122), or elſe the tranſcribers muſt have put Carneades there inſtead of ſome other Philoſopher, as has happened to them in other places (113). Mr. Foucher without doubt perceived the force of this argument; but having found new difficulties, he would not yield till Mr. Lantin had ſolved them (124). He believes that poſſibly the Conſulſhip under which the three Philoſophers came as Embaſſadors to Rome, might be that of a *Scipio the Bald*, and a Marcellus *in the year 531 or 532 of the foundation of Rome. . . . And if ſo*, Carneades *would have lived twenty years with Epicurus, and would have been deputed at the age of ſixty . . and might have lived yet thirty years after his Embaſſy, ſince he did not die till ninety.* But it is eaſy to ſhew that that Embaſſy was a great deal later than the year 532.

In the firſt place, we are informed by Pauſanias (125), that the plundering of Oropus was poſterior to the reduction of Macedonia into a Roman Province, and it is certain that Perſeus, the laſt King of Macedon, was not brought to Rome till the year 587. It is not poſſible, therefore, that an Embaſſy, deſigned to moderate the fine which the Athenians had been condemned to pay for plundering of Oropus (126), ſhould belong to the year of Rome 532. In the ſecond place, Cato was an old man at the time of this Embaſſy: Plutarch takes notice of it. Ἦδη ὁ ἀνὴρ γέρων ὑπὸ γήρως γεγονὼς πρέσβεις Ἀθήνηθεν ἦλθον εἰς Ῥώμην οἱ περὶ Καρνεάδην, &c. *Eo jam ſene legati Athenienſium Romam adventârunt Carneades, &c* (127). Now Cato was born in the year of Rome 519; for Cicero (128) makes him ſay that at the age of ſixty five he adviſed the paſſing of the law Voconia, under the Conſulſhip of Philippus and Cœpio, which coincides with the year 584. It is not poſſible therefore that theſe three Athenian Embaſſadors could come to Rome in the year 532. My third Reaſon follows: I have taken it from the very paſſages which Mr. Foucher has produced in favour of his own cauſe. Scipio and Lælius were very young at the time of that Embaſſy (129), and they looked on old age as yet at a diſtance in the year of Rome 601. Read Cicero's Treatiſe *de Senectute*, where Cato ſpeaks to them as an old man to young people, and where he takes notice that Scipio Africanus had then been dead thirty three years (130), his death happening a year before himſelf (Cato) was Cenſor. He died therefore in the year 568. It is conſequently impoſſible that Carneades could come to Rome with the character of Embaſſador from Athens in the year 532. For, if Lælius and Scipio were then fifteen, they would have been above fourſcore before the third Punic War, which is abſolutely falſe; and nothing would be more ridiculous than Cato's talk in the Dialogue *de Senectute*. He would have been younger than they. Wherefore I cannot conceive the reaſon which induces Mr. Foucher to ſupport his opinion by a proof drawn from Scipio and Lælius being young men when thoſe Philoſophers were deputed to the Roman People. Cicero has placed the Embaſſy of the three Philoſophers under the Conſulſhip of Publius Scipio and Marcus Marcellus. M. Lantin judges this Conſulſhip to be that of *P. Scipio Naſica*, and *M. Marcellus*, in the year of Rome 598. Here is what has been objected to him. "The Marcellus, under whoſe Conſulſhip Carneades "was ſent to Rome, was dead before the Marcellus, "who was the Collegue of Scipio Naſica, was Con"ſul. For we find in the Dialogue *de Senectute*, "that the firſt had already loſt his life before the 592d "year of Rome; whereas the Collegue of Scipio "Naſica was not Conſul with him till the year 599, "at which time it is certain that the Embaſſy of Car"neades had been already performed. Therefore it "was not under the Conſulſhip of Scipio Naſica and "Marcellus that Carneades went to Rome, ſince the "Embaſſy was over before that Conſulſhip, and Mar"cellus, who had been Conſul at that time, was al"ready dead; which is teſtified by Cicero in the ſame "Dialogue, in theſe words: *Cujus interitum ne cru"deliſſimus quidem hoſtis honore ſepulturæ carere paſſus "eſt.* i. e. "Whoſe death even the moſt cruel ene"my ſuffered not to be deprived of the honour of bu"rial (131)." To refute this paſſage it is ſufficient to obſerve that the Latin Words, which conclude it, relate to the brave Marcellus who performed ſo many glorious exploits during the ſecond Punic War, and for whom Hannibal made an honourable funeral in the year of Rome 545. Cato was then but ſix and twenty. It was therefore under none of the Conſulſhips of this Marcellus that Carneades was deputed to the Romans. Neither have I been able to gueſs for what reaſon the year of Rome 592 is pitched on here.

(117) Under the 6th of Auguſt 1691, pag. m. 500; under the 24th of March 1692, pag. 197; and under the 8th of December 1692, pag. 704.

(118) It is in the *Journal des Savans* of the 6th of Auguſt 1691.

(119) *Journal des Savans*, 1692, pag. 206, &c.

(120) *Quæſt. Acad.* lib. 4. in my edition it is in the 2d Book, folio 212, *D.*

(121) It is at the end of the 5th Book *de Finibus.*

(122) *This is viſible; for he had ſeveral times named our Philoſopher in the preceding pages without any addition of diſtinction. Would he have bethought himſelf at the end of the Book to characterize him by* Epicuro perfamiliaris?

(123) *See* Jonſius, *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſ.* pag. 191. *where he ſhews that we ought to read* Charmidas, *and not* Carneades, *in ſome Paſſages of* Cicero.

(124) See the *Journal des Savans*, 1692, pag. 704, *& ſeq.*

(125) Pauſanias, lib. 7. pag. 216.

(126) This was the end of the Embaſſy of the three Philoſophers. *See* Plutarch. *in Catone majore*, pag. 349; A. Gellius, lib. 7. cap. 14.

(127) Plutarch. *in Catone majore*, pag. 349, *D.*

(128) Cicero, *de Senectute*, cap. 5. pag. m. 398.

(129) *Quibus adoleſcentibus Stoïcum Diogenem, & Academicum Carneadem video ad Senatum ab Athenienſibus miſſos eſſe legatos*, Cicero, *Tuſcul.* lib. 4. cited by Monſ. Foucher in the *Journal des Savans*, pag. 706.

(130) The Manuſcripts vary here; ſome have 35 years, and others 33.

(131) *Journal des Savans* 1692, pag. 705.

who have publiſhed the Pieces written by them on the Controverſy in the *Journal des Savans*. I ſhall examine it a little. Plutarch has preſerved us this judicious ſaying of Carneades (*b*), Riding is the only thing which young Princes learn perfectly: their other maſters flatter them, and thoſe who wreſtle with them ſuffer themſelves to fall; but a horſe throws to the ground without diſtinction of poor or rich, of ſubject or ſovereign, all the unſkilful who get on his back. I ſhall take notice of a miſtake of Saldenus [*O*], and of the faults of Moreri [*P*]. I have ſpoken elſewhere (*i*) of a CARNEADES, who was one of the friends of Epicurus, and, as it ſeems to me, was not a different perſon from

(*b*) Carneades, *apud* Plutarch. *de Diſcrim. Adulat. & Amici*, pag. 58, *F.*

(*i*) Above, Citation (96) of the Article ARCESILAUS.

Scipio here intended is manifeſtly the ſame who deſtroyed Carthage in the third Punic war, and afterwards Numantia, it muſt neceſſarily be that the journey of thoſe Philoſophers was taken towards the end of the VIth Century of Rome, and not in 532. This Scipio was not yet born in the year 532; for when he was created Conſul in 606, he had not attained the age which was required by the laws to obtain that dignity (132). He ſtood for the office of Ædile only; but, to ſatisfy the Tribunes of the people, a diſpenſation of age was granted him (133). His youth when the Athenian Deputies philoſophized at Rome, is one of the beſt arguments which Mr. Lantin could oppoſe to Mr. Foucher. I wonder he has paſſed ſo ſlightly over the teſtimony of Aulus Gellius which was objected to him: he contents himſelf with obſerving that it is not an authority *which can be put in compariſon with that of Cicero* (134). Methinks he might have given a better anſwer: he might have denied that Aulus Gellius ſays what Mr. Foucher imputes to him, *that Carneades was ſent Embaſſador about the year* 534 (135). Here are the words of A. Gellius: *Ac deinde annis ferè poſt quindecim bellum adverſus Pœnos ſumptum eſt: atque non nimium longè M. Cato Orator in civitate & Plautus Poëta in ſcena floruerunt: iiſdemque temporibus Diogenes Stoïcus & Carneades Academicus, & Critolaus Peripateticus ab Athenienſibus ad Senatum populi Romani negotii publici gratia legati ſunt: neque magno intervallo poſtea Q. Ennius, &c.* (136). i. e. "And then, about fifteen years after, the war againſt "the Carthaginians was undertaken: and no very "long time after, M. Cato the Orator and Plautus the "Poet flouriſhed, the one in the city, the other on "the theatre: about the ſame time Diogenes the Stoic, "Carneades the Academic, and Critolaus the Peripa"tetic, were ſent Embaſſadors by the Athenians to the "Roman Senate on public buſineſs: and not a great "while after Q. Ennius &c." One would ſooner find here the year 560, than the year 534, ſince the Conſulſhip of Cato coincides with the year of Rome 558, and Plautus died but in 596 (137). Let it not be imagined that I approve of the Chronology of Aulus Gellius: his uncertain manner of expreſſion by *non nimium longe: iiſdem temporibus: neque magno intervallo poſtea*, is enough to render it contemptible. Theſe are terms without any exactneſs: they are ſtretched or contracted, ſometimes more, and ſometimes leſs, as Caſaubon judiciouſly obſerves (138).

(132) According to Livy, lib. 44. pag. m. 867. *he was in his 17th year when Perſeus was taken, that is in the year* 585.

(133) *See* Sigonius *in Faſtis, ad ann.* 606.

(134) *Journal des Savans* 1692, pag. 209.

(135) *Journal des Savans* 1691, pag. 513.

(136) Aulus Gellius, lib. 17. cap. 21. *in fine.*

(137) Cicero, *in Bruto*, pag. m. 104.

(138) Caſaubon. *in Athen.* lib. 5. cap. 18. pag. 385.

I know a great many Readers will cry out, that I ſtand on trifles more than I ought, and that they care not to be informed whether Carneades came to Rome in the year 532, or in the year 598; but I little regard the falſe taſte of ſuch Cenſors: and it would ill become me to be ſo ſqueamiſh with regard to inquiries which an illuſtrious Counſellor of the Parliament of Burgundy, and an illuſtrious Canon of the Capital of the ſame Province, have judged not unworthy of their attention, and which they have communicated to the public under the direction of a famous Preſident in the Court of the Mint at Paris (139). If any one ſhould have a mind to anſwer the cenſure of thoſe nice Gentlemen, who deſpiſe diſcuſſions of this kind, for me, I would deſire him to apply to me the following verſes of Terence:

(139) Mr. Couſin, Author of the *Journal des Savans*.

Faciunt næ intellegendo ut nihil intellegant,
Qui cum hunc accuſant, Nævium, Plautum, Ennium
Accuſant, quos hic noſter auctores habet:
Quorum æmulari exoptat neglegentiam
Potius, quam iſtorum obſcuram diligentiam (140).

(140) Terentius, *in prologo* Andriæ.

That is,

"But in reality by pretending to too much under"ſtanding, they ſhew they underſtand nothing; who "when they find fault with our Author, find fault with "Nævius, Plautus, and Ennius, whom he followed "in this reſpect; and whoſe happy negligence he "chuſes to imitate rather than the obſcure exactneſs "of the former.

[*O*] *I ſhall take notice of a miſtake of Saldenus.*] Having mentioned the obſcurity of the Philoſopher Heraclitus, he obſerves that Epicurus and Carneades had the ſame defect. *Germani huic fuerunt* Epicurus & Carneades Cyrenæus, *novæ Academiæ principes, quorum* hic *adeo à* Clytomacho *obſcurus dictus fuit, ut nunquam percipere ſe potuiſſe aſſeverarit, quænam ſcriptorum ejus mens ſenſuſque fuerit* (141). i. e. "Nearly of kin to "him were *Epicurus* and *Carneades the Cyrenæan*, "Heads of the New Academy, *the latter* of whom "was by *Clytomachus* ſaid to be ſo obſcure, that he "declared he could never underſtand the meaning or "ſenſe of his writings." To make no animadverſion on his Epicurus, who was as much Head of the new Academy, as I am Patriarch of Conſtantinople; I ſhall only ſay, that it is utterly falſe that Clitomachus complained of the obſcurity of the writings of Carneades. He ſaid no more than that he could never diſcover what were the opinions which Carneades approved (142). This did not proceed from the obſcurity of his expreſſions, but from the Scepticiſm of that Philoſopher. He found no certainty in any thing; he maintained and refuted ſucceſſively the ſame doctrines: this was the reaſon why it could not be diſcerned whether he approved any one of them. I do not accuſe honeſt Saldenus of having miſunderſtood the words of Cicero, which acquaint us with what concerns Clitomachus: I make no doubt but he would have underſtood them, if he had taken them from the ſource; but he found them in a place of baniſhment, where they had loſt their natural ſhape. He is excuſable therefore for having miſtaken them. He ſaw them in ſome modern book, whither they arrived not till after they had rambled thro' countries of all ſorts. They had been ſo abuſed by robbers, that they had nothing of their patrimony left, and had paſſed thro' ſo many hands, that if they had received but a little knock at every conveyance, it would have been more than ſufficient to have killed them outright. Let us reaſon in the ſame manner with regard to an infinite number of paſſages which are copied from the firſt modern Writer one meets with. Theſe are poor fugitives who have been rifled, lamed, ſtigmatized, &c; ſhould a man wonder that their condition is miſtaken, and that the quality of their birth cannot be diſcovered?

(141) Guilielmus Saldenus, *de Libris*, pag. 124.

(142) See above, Citation (25). the words of Cicero, which inform us of this fact.

[*P*] . . *and the faults of Moreri.*] I. Nothing is more falſe than to aſſert that Carneades *ſucceeded Chriſippus*, This fault has been corrected in the ſecond Dutch Edition. II. It is true that he applied himſelf more to Moral Philoſophy than to Natural (143); but it is falſe that excepting Moral Philoſophy *he neglected every thing elſe*. Could he have maintained the epoche with the ſtrength and eloquence that he did, if he had neglected Natural Philoſophy, Logic, Rhetoric, &c? III. Can the ſtrong meditation which makes a man forget to eat at table be called a *deep lethargy?* Can he be more broad awake than in ſuch a condition? IV. Valerius Maximus does not ſay, that *he purged his brain with hellebore* (144) . . . . *to diſpute againſt Zeno:* it ſhould have been *againſt Chryſippus*. V. He did not poiſon himſelf *when he was informed that Antipater had taken poiſon.* We read the direct contrary in Diogenes Laertius. That Hiſtorian relates (145) that Carneades had a great averſion to death, and that he often repeated theſe words, *Nature which has put together will alſo diſſipate.* His meaning was that he would leave her to act alone, and

(143) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. *in Carneade, init.* num. 62.

(144) The words are miſerably placed in the Original: they may ſignify *he purged his brain of hellebore.*

(145) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 64.

from that voluptuous Epicurean who is named Corniades in the editions of Plutarch (*k*). There is no manner of foundation to ſuppoſe, that when Cicero ſpeaks of this friend of Epicurus, he means Carneades who founded the third Academy. See the Remark [*N*], and the marginal Note (122). I ſhall examine in another place (*l*) the paſſage of Diogenes Laertius, which imports that one of the Scholars of Epicurus changed ſides, and joined himſelf to Carneades; and I ſhall acquaint the Reader with what Mr. de la Monnoie thinks of that matter.

(*k*) See the Remark [*S*] of the Article EPICURUS, at the end.

(*l*) In the Remark [*D*] of the Article EPICURUS, at the end.

and not prevent her by killing himſelf. When he was told that his adverſary Antipater (146), a Philoſopher of the ſect of the Stoics, had poiſoned himſelf, a ſudden fit of courage againſt death ſeized him, then give me ſome too, cried he. What would you have, aſked his attendants? Some mellow wine, replied he. From whence it appears that if the fancy took him to imitate his antagoniſt, it did not laſt long. Diogenes Laertius banters him for this puſillanimity, and reproaches him for having choſen rather to linger and pine away with the Phthiſic, than to put an end to his life at once (147). Father Labbe ought to have known thoſe particulars, and not have ſaid that he *killed himſelf by poiſon* (148). VI. If it be hard to *fix the year of his death*, it is not for the reaſon given by Moreri; it is not, ſay I, becauſe Diogenes Laertius makes him to have lived eighty five years, and Cicero allows him ninety. This difference contributes nothing at all to the difficulties in fixing the year wherein Carneades died; for the year of his birth is not known, and if it were known, we need only remove the year of his death five degrees either backward, or forward, according as we prefer or poſtpone the authority of Cicero to that of Diogenes Laertius: ſo the difficulty would not be great. However it is great; but for other reaſons, which you may ſee diſcuſſed in the two Authors whom Father Labbe is going to name to you: "There is a great deal of diffi-" culty in determining the year of this Philoſopher's " death, as the ſame Father Petau has obſerved in his " Miſcellaneous Exercitations on the works of Julian the " Apoſtate. Jonſius, in his Treatiſe of Philoſophical " Hiſtory (149), judiciouſly anſwers the objections " which that Father had made with great erudition " againſt the common opinion founded on the teſtimony " of Apollodorus, produced by Diogenes Laertius (150)." Moreri, intending to make ſome uſe of the firſt lines of this paſſage, has done it with ſo little attention that he has been guilty of a blunder. VII. It is not true that *Apollodorus quoted by the ſame Diogenes . . . aſſerts . . . that there was an eclipſe of the moon* at the time of Carneades's death. Diogenes tells it from a *hearſay*, but without quoting Apollodorus. Take notice he ſubjoins, that it ſeemed as if the faireſt of all the heavenly bodies next the ſun would bear a part in the misfortune of Carneades (151). Take notice beſides that others ſay the ſun was darkened at the ſame time (152). VIII. The Athenians having pillaged the city of Oropus, it cannot be ſaid that *they were the occaſion of its being pillaged*. This expreſſion is by no means proper in this place. IX. It is falſe that Carneades would not follow probability; for he confeſſed that a man ought to regulate himſelf by it in practice (153). X. Moreri ſhould not have cited Plutarch's piece againſt Colotes, ſince there is no mention of Carneades to be found therein; XI. But he ſhould have cited Father Rapin (154), from whom he has tranſcribed almoſt a whole page word for word.

(146) See the Remark [*F*], Citation (63).

(147) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 65.

(148) Labbe, *Chronolog. Franc.* tom. 2. pag. 395. *ad ann. Romæ* 625.

(149) Pag. 189, *& ſeq.*

(150) Labbe, *Chronol. Franc.* tom. 2. pag. 396.

(151) Συμπαθῆσαι, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, αἰσθομένην τοῦ μετ' ἥλιον παλλίστου τῶν ἄστρων. *Ut compati ſibi videri poſſit pulcherrimum poſt ſolem ſidus.* Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 64.

(152) Suidas, *in* Καρνεάδης.

(153) See above Remark [*B*], Citation (8).

(154) Rapin, *Compariſon de Platon & d'Ariſtote*, Part 4. chap. 1. pag. m. 369.

☞ CARPENTER (GEORGE Lord), Baron of Killaghy in the Kingdom of Ireland, deſcended from an antient and good family in Herefordſhire [*A*], was born at Ocul in that county, February the 10th 1657 (*a*). His father was Mr. Warncomb Carpenter, ſixth ſon of Thomas Carpenter Eſq; [*B*] of the Homme in the pariſh of Dilwyn in Herefordſhire. His mother was daughter to Mr. Taylor of the ſame county, and widow to Mr. John Hill, by whom ſhe had one ſon [*C*]. George Lord Carpenter was the youngeſt of ſeven children, whom his father left at his death, and was educated at a private ſchool in the country. In the year 1672 he went into the third Troop of Guards as a private Gentleman, and was afterwards appointed Quarter Maſter to the Regiment of Horſe commanded by the Earl of Peterborough, and went through the ſeveral poſts of Cornet, Lieutenant, Captain, &c. till he was advanced to that of Lieutenant Colonel of the Regiment, in which commiſſion he continued thirteen years, though the Regiment was almoſt conſtantly in ſervice. In 1693 he married Alice, daughter of William Lord Viſcount Charlemount, who having a conſiderable joynture from her firſt huſband James Margetſon Eſq;, by the ſale of part of it for her life he was enabled to purchaſe the Regiment of Dragoons, which he commanded till his death. He ſerved in all the firſt wars in Ireland and Flanders, and the laſt in Spain, with unblemiſh'd honour and reputation, and diſtinguiſhed himſelf to great advantage by his courage, conduct, and humanity. At the unfortunate battle of Almanza in Spain he commanded the rear, and brought up the laſt ſquadron in the retreat, which ſaved the baggage of the army. At the battle of Almenara he was wounded, but receiv'd the compliments of Charles then King of Spain, now Emperor of Germany, for his conduct in the engagement. He was again deſperately wounded [*D*] in defending the Breach at Britmega againſt

(*a*) From Manuſcript Memoirs communicated to us, from whence we have extracted moſt of the particulars of this Article.

[*A*] *Was deſcended from an ancient and good Family in Herefordſhire.*] The Family had been poſſeſſed of a conſiderable eſtate in that County for above four hundred years. A great part of this eſtate together with the manour of the Homme in the Pariſh of Dilwyn, was left in the year 1733 to the preſent Lord Carpenter by his couſin Thomas Carpenter Eſq; who dying without iſſue was the laſt of the eldeſt branch of the family.

[*B*] *His father was Mr. Warncomb Carpenter, ſixth ſon of Thomas Carpenter Eſq;*] He had a conſiderable joynture with his wife, beſides fifteen hundred pounds given him by his father, which was a very handſome fortune at that time for a younger ſon. But being a man of ſpirit, and zealouſly attached to the royal cauſe, he was an Officer in the King's Army during the civil wars, and at the battle of Naſeby had both his legs ſhot through by a muſket-ball. The wound breaking out again ſome years afterwards occaſioned his death, when his fortune was greatly reduced; and he left but a very ſmall ſupport for a large family of ſeven children.

[*C*] *His mother was . . . widow to Mr. John Hill, by whom ſhe had one ſon.*] This ſon, whoſe name was William, being a ſervant and favourite of the Duke of York, afterwards King James II, was by him made Governor and Captain General of the Leeward Iſlands, which being afterwards taken by the French, he bravely retook them, and continued Governor of them with great reputation till his death.

[*D*] *He was again deſperately wounded.*] It was by a muſket-ball, which having broken part of his

againſt the whole French and Spaniſh army, where they were at laſt taken priſoners. In 1705 he was made a Brigadier General; in 1708 Major General; and in 1710 Lieutenant General. In 1714 he was choſen Member of Parliament for Whitchurch in Hampſhire; and the year following was appointed Envoy Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Emperor, whoſe perſonal regard and eſteem he had gained, while he ſerved under that Prince in Spain. But the rebellion breaking out that year, he was ſent into the North, where he not only prevented the rebels from ſeizing Newcaſtle, and marching into Yorkſhire, but having overtaken them at Preſton, where they were inveſted by Major General Wills, he, by altering the diſpoſition which that General had made, cut off entirely both their eſcape and their receiving any ſupplies, which immediately reduced them to a capitulation (*b*). In the beginning of February 171⅝ he ſent a challenge to General Wills, but they were prevented from fighting [*E*]. In 1716 he was appointed Governor of Minorca, and Commander in chief of his Majeſty's forces in Scotland; and in 1719 was created Baron Carpenter of Killaghy in the Kingdom of Ireland [*F*]. In 1722 he was choſen Member of Parliament for the City of Weſtminſter, and upon all occaſions voted for what he thought to be the real good of his country, without any regard to party. In October 1731 being near ſeventy four years of age, he began to labour under a failure of appetite, and having had a fall, by which his teeth were looſened on that ſide, which had not been wounded, he was capable of taking but little nouriſhment, which together with old age and a decay of nature put an end to his life February the 10th 173½. He was interred near his beloved wife in the chancel of the pariſh church of Owſelbury in Hampſhire, where a monument of marble was erected to his memory [*G*] by

(*b*) See an Account of his conduct in this affair in *A True Relation of the Purſuit of the Rebels in the North, and of their Surrender at Preſton to Lieutenant General Carpenter, commanding in chief his Majeſty's Forces there,* join'd to a Plan publiſhed under this Title, *An exact Plan of the Town of Preſton, with the Barricades of the Rebels, and the Diſpoſition of the King's Forces, under the Command of Lieutenant General Carpenter and Major General Wills.* See likewiſe *The Political State of Great Britain for Feb.* 1615-16, vol. 11. pag. 179, & ſeqq.

jaw-bone, and beat out all his teeth on one ſide, lodged itſelf in the root of his tongue, where it remained a whole year before it was extracted. For the greateſt part of this time his life was not expected, he labouring under the moſt ſevere pain, and being incapable of ſwallowing any thing but liquids.

[*E*] *In the beginning of Feb.* 171⅝ *he ſent a challenge to General Wills, but they were prevented from fighting.*] We ſhall repreſent this affair in the words of Mr. A. Boyer, the author of the *Political State of Great Britain*(1). *On Monday February 6th the Town was ſurprized, and all the well-affected concerned to hear, that Lieutenant-General Carpenter and Lieutenant-General Wills, two Officers, who on all occaſions had diſtinguiſhed themſelves for their bravery and conduct, and who had lately ſo well deſerved of their King and Country, were like to fight a duel. The truth is, a challenge was ſent for that purpoſe from General Carpenter to General Wills, and Colonel Churchill, who carried it, was to be ſecond to the firſt, and Brigadier Honeywood to the other. But this affair having taken vent, and reached the ears of the Duke of Montague, his Grace prevented the combat by ſending a guard into the field; after which the Duke of Marlborough interpoſed in, and allayed this unhappy quarrel, at which all the enemies of the Government did heartily rejoice. The ſubject matter of it is not yet fully known, but was then, and is ſtill reported to be an old grudge upon a diſpute, that happened between theſe two great men in Spain, and which having bled afreſh at Preſton, upon the competition of the command, they wiſely thought fit to defer the deciſion of it till they met in London, and in the mean time to act with all the chearfulneſs and unanimity againſt the rebels.*

(1) For February 1715-16, vol. 11. pag. 177, 178.

[*F*] *In* 1719 *was created Baron Carpenter of Killaghy in the Kingdom of Ireland.*] The preamble to his Patent is as follows in Engliſh. "Since we and our "predeceſſors have liberally beſtowed titles of honour "on perſons eminent for arts and qualifications proper "to a peaceable reign; we judge it reaſonable, that "military virtue, which ſeems for many years paſt "to have been a principal ſupport of the Government, "ſhould be diſtinguiſhed by due rewards. For this "reaſon eſpecially we have thought fit to advance our "faithful and beloved GEORGE CARPENTER Eſq; "Lieutenant-General of our Armies, to the Peerage of "this Kingdom, a perſon who having applied him-"ſelf early to the profeſſion of Arms has paſſed thro' "all military employs, to the rank he now bears by "ſlow and gradual promotions, his ſervices always "preceding his advancement. When Britain was de-"livered from arbitrary power, he readily embraced "the intereſts of the Revolution, and ſerved under "King William of glorious memory, firſt in the re-"duction of this Kingdom, and afterwards in Flan-"ders, behaving himſelf as a brave and induſtrious "Officer. After the ſhort interval of an unſafe peace, "the war breaking out again with greater violence, "and ſpreading itſelf almoſt through all Europe, "Spain was the ſcene of his ſervices. Earl Stanhope, "Chief Commander of the Britiſh Forces in that "Kingdom, freely imparted to him his deſigns, and "in the execution of them ſucceſsfully experienced "his courage and conduct. When the General's pre-"ſence was required in England, he intruſted him "with the command of his troops, as being fully aſ-"ſured, that the public cauſe would ſuffer no diſad-"vantage by his management; for his diligence and "circumſpection in performing the duties of his em-"ployment were not leſs remarkable than his con-"ſtancy and preſence of mind in the time of action, "and moſt imminent danger. By his integrity, pru-"dence, and evenneſs of temper, he not only gained "the affections of his countrymen, but the eſteem "and regard of the Generals of the Allies, and even "of his Imperial Majeſty. We have had a proof "of his loyalty and abilities in an inſtance very be-"neficial to the public; for when ſedition, which "was ſeaſonably repreſſed in other places, had taken "root in the County of Northumberland, and there "broke out into an open rebellion, he, by our com-"mand, haſtened thither to extinguiſh this flame of "civil war though with unequal numbers. He pre-"vented the rebels ſeizing Newcaſtle, intended by "them for their place of arms; hindered their march-"ing into Yorkſhire; and at laſt having overtaken "them at Preſton, where they were inveſted by other "of our troops, block'd them up more cloſely, and ob-"liged them to ſurrender. By which ſucceſs peace "was reſtored to England, which much conduced to "the ſubduing the rebels in Scotland. For theſe rea-"ſons, that a perſon ſo well deſerving of Britain and "Ireland, allied by marriage to a noble Family of "that Kingdom, may from himſelf tranſmit an ho-"nour to his poſterity; we create him a Peer &c."

[G] *A monument of marble was erected to his memory.*] It has the following Epitaph inſcribed upon it: *Here lies the Right Honourable George Lord Carpenter, Colonel of his Majeſty's own Regiment of Dragoons, Governour of the Iſland Minorca, Lieutenant-General and Commander in Chief of his Majeſty's Forces in North-Britain, deſcended from an ancient Family in Herefordſhire, and bred in arms, having been fifty nine years in the Army, and paſſed thro' all military employs from a private Gentleman in the Horſe-Guards to the Rank, in which he died; by ſlow and gradual promotions, his ſervices always preceding his advancement. He ſerved thro' the whole courſe of the laſt wars of England with France in Ireland, Flanders, and Spain, with honour and reputation; was never abſent from his poſt, when there was any action, or that action was expected; and was as remarkable for his great humanity, as for his courage and preſence of mind in time of ſervice and moſt imminent danger. By his prudence, integrity and evenneſs of temper during the Spaniſh war, he not only gained*

by his ſon, the preſent Lord Carpenter, who was the only child that ſurvived him.

ed the affections of his countrymen, but the eſteem and regard of the General of the Allies and of the Emperor himſelf; to whom he was appointed Envoy Extraordinary, and Plenipotentiary in 1715. *He married Alice, daughter to the Lord Charlemount, by whom he left iſſue only one ſon, who erected this monument to the memory of the beſt of Fathers.* Obiit 10° die Februarii 1731. Ætat. 74. T.

CARRANZA (BARTHOLOMEW) a native of Miranda (*a*) in Navarre, was one of the moſt illuſtrious Dominicans of the ſixteenth Century. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the Council of Trent, anno 1546 [*A*], and eſpecially in the debate about reſidence (*b*). He not only aſſerted, that reſidence is of divine right, but alſo that the contrary opinion is a diabolical doctrine (*c*). Philip of Auſtria, who had been his diſciple (*d*), took him with him (*e*) when he went into England to marry Queen Mary. He thought Carranza had great abilities for combating and extirpating the Proteſtant Religion, which had taken deep root in that country. This Dominican employed his utmoſt endeavours in this miſſion. He cauſed books to be burnt, men to be baniſhed, and the Univerſity of Oxford to be reinſtated. He was the Queen's Confeſſor, and pleaſed Philip ſo well, that he raiſed him to the principal Biſhoprick of Spain, (the Archbiſhoprick of Toledo) anno 1557 (*f*). He aſſiſted the Emperor Charles V in his expiring moments (*g*) [*B*]; a circumſtance which chiefly contributed to the report that was ſpread of this Emperor's dying in the Lutheran principles [*C*]; for, as early as the year 1559, Carranza was ſeized by the Inquiſition, as a Heretic (*h*). After having defended himſelf in Spain

(*a*) Hence it is that he is alſo called Bartholomew de Miranda.

(*b*) Fra. Paolo, lib. 2. pag. m. 201.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 240.

(*d*) Vinc. Baron. *Apolog.* tom. 2. lib. 5. pag. 237.

(*e*) Nichol. Antonio, *Biblioth. Hiſpan.* tom. 1. pag. 147.

(*f*) Idem, ibid.

(*g*) Who died the 21ſt of September 1558.

(*h*) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1559, num. 29.

[*A*] *He ſignalized himſelf in the Council of Trent, anno* 1546.] Moreri is miſtaken in ten years, when he aſſerts, that Carranza *ſpoke before the Council, the 1ſt Sunday in Lent of the year* 1556 the *Oraiſon of his which is ſtill extant. Oraiſon* is here an improper term; it ſhould have been *Sermon*. Nicholas Antonio who fixes it expreſly to anno 1546, made uſe of the word *Concio* (1). No Council was held in 1556.

(1) Nicol. Anton. *Bibl. Hiſp.* tom. 1. pag. 148.

[*B*] *He aſſiſted Charles Vth in his expiring moments.*] No one can deny this: Famianus Strada owns, that Bartholomew de Miranda Archbiſhop of Toledo, adminiſtred the Sacraments of the Church to that Emperor when dying. *Toletano Antiſtite procurante quæ Chriſtiano ritu luctanti Animæ ſuppeditantur adjumenta* (2). i. e. "The Archbiſhop of Toledo adminiſtering thoſe helps, which are given to the departing ſoul, after the manner uſed by Chriſtians." Father Paul did not know this circumſtance; or he would have mentioned it in the paſſage where he ſpeaks of Conſtantius Pontius, and of our Bartholomew Carranza (3). Pallavicino the Jeſuit, who gives him no quarter, accuſes him of having aſcribed to Pontius what related to Carranza: for Father Paul ſays, that Conſtantine Pontius aſſiſted that Emperor, till he reſigned his breath. *Illius* (Carranzæ) *loco Pontium accepit Suavis hallucinatus: nam revera Carolo moribundo adfuit Caranza, & pro dignitate quam obtinebat extrema Eccleſiæ officia illi præſtitit in vitæ exitu* (4). i. e. "Father Paolo miſtook Pontius for Carranza; for 'tis certain "that Carranza attended on the Emperor Charles "in his dying moments; and, by virtue of his dignity, performed to him the laſt offices of the Church, "as he was leaving the world." Thus we find Father Palavicina declaring, that Bartholomew Carranza adminiſtred the laſt offices of Religion to the Emperor Charles V. Nicholas Antonio aſſerts the ſame thing (5). I'll cite Campana as a fourth teſtimony in the following Note.

(2) Strada, *de Bello Belg.* lib. 1. Dec. 1. pag. m. 15.

(3) Fra-Paolo, vol. 5. pag. m. 399.

(4) Palavic. *Hiſt. Conc. Trident.* lib. 14. cap. 11. *ſub fin.*

(5) N. Anton. *Bilioth. Hiſp.* vol. 1. pag. 148.

[*C*] *... Which ... has given occaſion to ſay, that this Emperor died in the Lutheran principles.*] It is univerſally known, that Carranza loſt his Archbiſhoprick and his liberty, as being a heretick; and that after fifteen or ſixteen years impriſonment, he was declared ſuſpected of hereſy; and condemned as ſuch to make his abjuration, and other penalties (6). We therefore muſt not think it ſtrange, that from different motives, ſeveral Roman Catholicks as well as Proteſtants, ſhould ſuſpect, that Charles V died almoſt in the Lutheran principles; ſince he was deſirous of reſigning his breath in the arms of ſuch an Archbiſhop. The Spaniſh Hiſtorians were perfectly well acquainted with the grounds of theſe preſumptions or conjectures; for which reaſon, not being able to deny but that Carranza aſſiſted this Emperor in his laſt moments; they aſſert that Charles V ſent for him with no other deſign but to cenſure and reprimand him. Count de la Roca gives the following turn to this circumſtance. *Don Bartholomew de Carranza, Archbiſhop of Toledo, was preſent at the interment of the Immortal Charles V, which was attended by all his family. This Prelate was come a little before to St. Juſtus, where the Emperor waited for him with great impatience, upon his being told that, during the ſtay he had made in England, he had imbibed ſome heterodox opinions, which afterwards brought him into great trouble; and this prompted this gracious and Catholic Prince to reprimand him* (7). This Author was far from aſſerting, that the Emperor was prepared for death by Carranza; but his ſilence is nothing to the purpoſe, ſince Cardinal Palavicino, who adopts the reaſon why Carranza was preſent at this ceremony (8), according to John Anthony de Vera (9), declares expreſly, that this Archbiſhop adminiſtred to the dying Prince, all the comforts which the Church indulges on ſuch occaſions; *Extrema Eccleſiæ officia illi præſtitit in vitæ exitu* (10). Spondanus, having perceived the artifice of the Spaniſh Hiſtorians, thought himſelf obliged to oppoſe the teſtimony of Campana to that of Sandoval, Hiſtorian and Panegyriſt of the Emperor Charles V. Sandoval owns, that his Imperial Majeſty ſaw Carranza; but declares that he did not ſpeak to him; tho' he was deſirous of queſtioning him on ſome erroneous opinions which, as it was reported, Carranza maintained. Spondanus, notwithſtanding this relation of Sandoval, gives entire credit to Campana, who tells us in the Life of Philip II, that Charles V thanked Carranza, for coming to aſſiſt him in ſo great an exigency; that he confeſſed his ſins to him, received the Sacrament from his hand; and diſcourſed with him on religious ſubjects till he expired. *Carolum gratias ei egiſſe de adventu ad ipſum in tali neceſſitate, & confeſſum ei eſſe peccata ſacramentaliter, atque Euchariſtiam de ejus manu ſumpſiſſe, ac multa ſpiritualia colloquia cum eo habuiſſe uſque ad tranſitum: quod & nos verum putamus, cum plures id aſſerant* (11). Spondanus is perſuaded that all this is true, notwithſtanding the ſeveral aſſertions of Sandoval; who denied it upon no other account, but from the apprehenſions he was under, leſt ſuch a particular ſhould make Charles V be conſidered as an heretick. *Sed Sandovalium, qui nonniſi laudes Caroli proſequitur, timuiſſe, ne ſi diceretur Carolus Sacramenta in fine à Miranda, qui poſtea ... infamatus eſt de prava doctrina, ſuſcepiſſe, & extrema verba cum eo habuiſſe, id in Caroli dedecus ac quoddam animæ periculum verteret* (12).

(6) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1559, num. 29.

(7) *Hiſtoire de Charles Quint.* pag. m. 347.

(8) *Cauſa cur illic adeſſet, ea fuit, quod delato ad Carolum rumore ſiniſtræ opinionis, quæ de corrupta Archiepiſcopi mente ſpargebatur, ad ſe hominem accerſiri juſſerat, ut ipſum commoneret.* Palavic. *Hiſt. Concil. Trident.* lib. 4. cap. 11.

(9) He is the ſame with Count *de la Roca.*

(10) Palav. *Hiſt. Concil. Trident.* lib. 4. cap. 11.

(11) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1558, num. 6.

(12) Idem, ibid.

We have already ſeen that Father Paul makes no mention of this circumſtance; but he made amends for it another way, and did not let ſlip the opportunity of repreſenting Charles V, as a Prince who was ſuſpected to entertain heterodox opinions; for in relating the ſevere executions which were made in Spain, he obſerves, that the Spaniards burnt *the effigy of Conſtantine Pontius (he had died ſome days before in the priſons of the Inquiſition,) who had been Confeſſor to Charles V in his retirement; and who had ſeen him breath his laſt* (13). He had been impriſoned immediately

FACTS concerning the Confeſſor of Charles V.

(13) Fra-Paolo, Book 5. pag. 399.

Spain till the year 1567, he was carried to Rome, where he ſuffered a long impriſonment; at laſt his ſentence was pronounced, anno 1576. The purport of it was, that although there were no certain proof of his having imbibed heretical notions; nevertheleſs, as the preſumptions againſt him were very ſtrong, he therefore muſt make a ſolemn abjuration. Having ſubmitted to this order, he was ſent to the Monaſtery *della Minerva* (*i*), and there died a little after (*k*), viz. the 2d of May 1576, aged threeſcore and twelve years. Very wonderful things are related concerning his patience [*D*]. His chief works are, *Summa Conciliorum*, and a Spaniſh Catechiſm in folio, which was put into the *Index Expurgatorius* [*E*].

(*i*) This is a Monaſtery of Dominicans in Rome.

(*k*) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1596. num. 29. Nicol. Antonio, *Biblioth. Hiſp.* tom. 1. pag. 147.

The reader will meet with an ample relation, concerning the merit and the incidents of Carranza's life, in Varillas's preface to his 5th Tome of his *Hiſtory of Hereſy*. Read alſo the 13th book of the ſame Hiſtory. He did not forget to obſerve, that the General of

diately after the death of that Prince (14). *This laſt execution*, adds he, *tho' only upon an effigy, ſtruck greater terror than all the reſt; every one concluding from thence, that no toleration or mercy could be expected from a Prince, who did not ſpare even a perſon, all whoſe ignominy would reflect on the memory of his own father* (15). Mezerai carries this reflection farther, ſince that after having related, that Philip cauſed ſeveral Lutherans to be burnt, *even the effigy of Conſtantine Pontius, Confeſſor to Charles V, who had attended him till he expired*; he adds, *We are not to wonder, that he did not fear to caſt an odium on his father's memory, ſince, if we may credit ſome authors, he would have proſecuted him; and have burnt his bones, as tho' he had been an heretic: and that nothing but the following conſideration prevented his putting it in execution, viz. that had his father been a heretick, he would have forfeited his dominions; and conſequently had no right to reſign them to his ſon* (16). We are here informed of a great many particulars. I. That Conſtantine Pontius was Confeſſor to Charles V. II. That he acted as ſuch when that Emperor was near his end, and when he breathed his laſt. III. That his effigy was burnt. IV. That this was a blot in the memory of Charles V. V. That Philip would have had his Royal Father condemned for hereſy, had not ſome important political reaſons prevented him. Mezerai relates this laſt particular, from the teſtimony of ſome Authors; and others aſſert it without the leaſt reſtriction (17). We ſhall ſee below (18), the authority on which Brantome grounds it. I believe we may venture to aſſert, that this is a very doubtful incident. The 1ſt and the 2d particulars are not allowed by the Spaniſh writers (19). They own indeed, that Conſtantine Pontius (20) was Chaplain to Charles V; but deny that he ever was his Confeſſor; and affirm that Pontius was impriſoned by the Inquiſition, before that Emperor died. Count de la Roca delivers himſelf as follows. "When the "Inquiſitors ſeized Conſtantine Pontius at Sevil, Charles "Vth ſpoke theſe words; *If Conſtantine be a here-* "*tick, he is a great one* (21)." That Prince's laſt Confeſſor was called Francis Villalva (22). The third incident is true; and with regard to the 4th, we may aſſert that the conviction of Conſtantine Pontius, has given occaſion to entertain certain ſuſpicions with reſpect to the Emperor Charles V. I muſt not forget to obſerve that Carranza does not ſeem to have been in any manner the Spiritual Director of that Monarch; and that in caſe he adminiſtred the Sacraments to him, in his expiring moments; the reaſon of this we are told, was becauſe the Monaſtery of St. Juſtus was in his dioceſs. Carranza had ſet out for that Convent, as ſoon as he heard of the Emperor's ſickneſs; and arrived there the night before his Imperial Majeſty died. *Placidiſſime expiravit* (Carolus) *præſente Bartholomæo Carranza à Miranda Archiepiſcopo Toletano Ordinis Dominicani, loci ordinario, qui audita ejus infirmitate accurrerat, & pridie obitus advenerat, ſumma ejus, ut quidam ſcribunt, conſolatione* (23). i. e. "Charles the "Vth breathed his laſt with great calmneſs, in pre- "ſence of Bartholomew Carranza of Miranda, Arch- "biſhop of Toledo, a Dominican, and Ordinary of "the place; who, upon the news of his illneſs, haſted "thither; and arrived the day before he expired, to "the great conſolation of that Monarch, as ſome "write." I ſhall be more particular on this part of Charles the Vth's Hiſtory, in Note [*D*] of his Article; and will point out ſome errors committed by the Abbot of St. Real.

(14) *Nella quale* (pregione) *per imputatione d'Hereſia fu poſto immediate dopo la morte dell' Imperatore.* Amelot de la Houſſaye has not mentioned this.

(15) Amelot de la Houſſaye *has here placed the marginal note following.* Nothing prevented his condemning his memory as an Heretick, but the apprehenſions he was under, that in caſe his father had been ſuch, the reſignation he had made of his dominions in his favour, would be reputed void, becauſe of his entertaining heretical notions.

(16) Mezerai, *Abr. Chronol. anno* 1559, vol. 5. pag. 9.

(17) Amelot de la Houſſaye. I cited his words in citation (15) above.

(18) In the note [*S*] of the Article CHARLES V.

(19) *See* Cardinal Palavicino, *Hiſt. of the Counc. of Trent*, lib. 14. cap. 11. num. 3.

(20) I give him his name, in compliance with the vulgar error. I have hinted ſufficiently in the Article PONTIUS CONSTANTIUS, that this is not his real name.

(21) Count de la Rocca, *Hiſt. of Charles V.* pag. m. 335.

(22) Palavic. *Hiſt. Concil. Trident.* lib. 14. cap. 11. *Ex* Joanne Antonio Vera, & Sandovallio.

(23) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1558, num. 9.

[*D*] *Wonders are related of his patience.*] One of the nobleſt proofs, that can be given of this, is, that altho' he knew himſelf to be innocent, he yet did not blame his Judges. *Juſt before his death (on the feſtival of St. Athanaſius who was the greateſt Prelate, and had ſuffered more perſecutions than any of his time) in preſence of the Holy Sacrament which he was to receive, and of all the Monks belonging to the Convent della Minerva at Rome, where he died* (24); *he proteſted with tears in his eyes*, by the glorious Saviour whom he was going to receive, and before whom he was to give an account of all his actions in a few hours that he had never offended him mortally in matters of faith; that nevertheleſs, he conſidered the ſentence as juſt which had been pronounced, in conſequence of what had been ſworn and proved againſt him. *This action perſuaded the people ſo fully of his innocence, that when he was buried (which was on a working day) all the ſhops were ſhut, as tho' it had been Eaſter Sunday. The people paid as much veneration to his corps, as tho' he had been a Saint* (25).

(24) Conſequently the following words of Thuanus, lib. 84. pag. 76. are not true: *Tædio carceris miſer Caranca, cum nihil contra ipſum probaretur, tandem extinctus eſt.* i. e. "Carranza, againſt "whom nothing "could be proved, being worne "out by his "long impriſon- "ment, at laſt "died.

(25) The Count de la Roca, *Hiſt. de Charles Quint*, pag. 348.

The juſtice which the common people on this occaſion did Carranza, by acknowledging his innocence and bewailing the oppreſſion it met with, is extremely laudable. The common people are not always blind (26); however they only did part of their duty at this time; for they ought likewiſe to have ſhewn their reſentment againſt that unjuſt tribunal, for having ſo long perſecuted this excellent man; or at leaſt ſhould have ſhewed, that they wiſhed thoſe wicked Judges might be branded with infamy; for can any thing be more ſhocking, than to ſee a learned Prelate, againſt whom no proof can be exhibited, abſolutely unable to get from the paws of thoſe informers, till after having ſuffered a long and cruel impriſonment; and that he could not obtain his releaſe, without branding his own reputation, merely to ſave the credit of thoſe villainous informers? To conceal the unjuſtice which had been done Carranza, the Inquiſitors were forced to declare, that there were ſome ſuſpicions of his being an heretick; otherwiſe they had been too much expoſed to the complaints and hatred of the people. It was by this means they impoſed on the public; and for this very reaſon the public ought to have been offended. However, this would be requiring too many things, at one and the ſame time, from the common people. None but wiſe men are capable of perceiving this double iniquity; and of paying humble ſubmiſſion to the decrees of Providence, which not only ſuffers the tribunal of the inquiſition, (that true abomination introduced into the holy places) to triumph and reign during ſo many years in ſeveral parts of the Chriſtian World; but alſo, to extend, by inſenſible degrees, its phylacteries; and to ſpread its fibres and roots in all parts.

REFLECTIONS on the juſtice done to Carranza, by the common people.

(26) *Interdum vulgus rectum videt, eſt ubi peccat.* Hor. Epiſt. 1. lib. 2. ver. 63.

[*E*] *He writ . . . a Spaniſh Catechiſm . . . which has been placed in the Index Expurgatorius.*] According to Nicholas Antonio, this Book was the cauſe of the perſecution which was raiſed againſt Carranza. *Qui liber Autori ſua infortunii tota cauſa fuiſſe dicitur: quare prohibitus eſt in Romano Indice* (27). See in Father Paul, in what manner the Biſhop of Lerida exclaims againſt the congregation of the Index, which had approved this Book. The Biſhop of Lerida *inveighed againſt the approbation given by that body, and quoted ſome paſſages*

(27) Anton. *Biblioth. Hiſp.* tom. 1. pag. 148.

of the Jeſuits favoured Carranza. An advocate for the Dominicans (*l*) took advantage of this circumſtance, in order to anſwer a Jeſuit, who endeavoured to make the Orthodoxy of this great Prelate ſuſpected. The General of the Jeſuits was bound in gratitude to ſerve Carranza, it being he who gave the Jeſuits leave to ſettle in Toledo, which his Predeceſſor had rigorouſly oppoſed (*m*).

(*l*) Vincent. Baron. *Apolog.* tom. 1. pag. 64.

(*m*) Idem, ibid.

paſſages of the Book which, when taken in the ſenſe he gave them, ſeemed to merit cenſure; and what was ſtill worſe, he attacked the conſcience of the Prelates, who formed this congregation. The chief of them complained to the Pope's Legates about it; but the diſpute was ended, on the Biſhop of Lerida's making ſome excuſes: and on condition; that no copies ſhould be given of the atteſtation which had been put into the hands of Bartholomew Carranza's agent. The Count de Luna Embaſſador of Spain, got this atteſtation from the agent (28).

(28) Fra-Paolo, Book 8. *anno* 1563, pag. m. 724.

CARTEROMACHUS (SCIPIO) a native of Piſtoia in Tuſcany, was one of the ableſt men of the ſixteenth Century. He was very well ſkilled in the Latin and Greek tongues [*A*], and very happy in explaining the difficult paſſages of antient Authors. He was greatly reſpected at Venice, and would not have left it, had he not found that the tumults and confuſion of the war, would not ſuffer him to purſue his ſtudies in peace. He withdrew to Rome, and was there patronized by Cardinal Francis Alidoſi. He followed him to Ravenna, and after that Cardinal had loſt his life in that city, he returned to Rome. Pope Leo the Xth placed him near the perſon of Julius de Medicis, as a man of letters, and he very probably would have been raiſed to ſome honourable and lucrative employment, had he not died before he had an opportunity of reaping advantage of his maſter's friendſhip (*a*). I ſhall cite an Author who aſſures us, that he lived with Cardinal de Medicis in 1512 (*b*). This Cardinal was afterwards Pope Leo the Xth. I ſhall quote another Author, who informs us that Carteromachus was averſe to oſtentation, and that he died at about forty three years of age [*B*].

(*a*) Extracted from Pierius Valerianus, *de Litterator. Infelicitate*, lib. 2. pag. m. 72, 73.

(*b*) See the Remark [*A*], Citation (3).

[*A*] *He was very well ſkilled in the Latin and Greek Tongues.*] This appears from his writings. *Quâ literaturâ fuerit ſive carmen Græcè ſive Latinè pangeret, ſive orationem elucubraret, ex multis ejus ſcriptis unicuique erudito viro licet inſpicere* (1). i. e. "Every "learned man may ſee, by the many writings of "Carteromachus, how ſkilful he was, both in Greek "and Latin, in compoſing either verſes or proſe." Alcyonius declares that he had very great ſkill in the Greek tongue. *Cui* ſays he (2), *tametſi Latinus eſt, attamen vel Græci ipſi in ſuæ linguæ cognitione & ſubtilitate primas deferunt.* i. e. "Who, tho' he be an "Italian, yet the Greeks themſelves would allow him "the preheminence, in the knowledge of their tongue, "and the delicacies of it." Some pages after, he makes Julius of Medicis, ſpeak as follows to Cardinal John de Medicis his couſin, who afterwards was Pope Leo X. *Multos Græca literatura inſignes viros domi habes, ad quorum æmulationem non deſiſtis cum omni genere exercitationis, tum maxime ſtilo augere partam eloquentiam; atque inter hos maximè eminet Scipio Carteromachus, quem honorificentiſſime pro tua natura liberaliſſimeque tractas, cum præſertim videas illum quanquam Latinum Græce ſic loqui & ſcribere, ut ſolus poſt veterum Græcorum Platonis, Socratis, Demoſthenis, & Strabonis interitum, orbæ eloquentiæ tutor relictus videatur* (3). i. e. "You have with you many men, fa-"mous for their knowledge in the Greek tongue, in "emulation of whom you never ceaſe to im-"prove the eloquence you poſſeſs, in exerciſes of every "kind, and eſpecially in diction. Among theſe Sci-"pio Carteromachus is particularly conſpicuous, to "whom you, from your uſual good nature, indulge "the moſt honourable and beneficent treatment; par-"ticularly as you find, that he, tho' an Italian, both "writes and ſpeaks Greek in ſo great perfection, that "he, ſince the time of thoſe ancient Greeks, Plato, "Socrates, Demoſthenes and Strabo, ſeems to be the "only ſurviving protector of eloquence."

(1) Pier. Valerian. *de Literat. Infelic.* lib. 2. pag. 72.

(2) Petrus Alcyonius, *in Medice Legato poſteriore*, folio g. ii *verſo*.

(3) Alcyonius, *in Medice Leg. poſteriore, ſub fin.* Note that this Dialogue of Alcyonius relates to the time of John de Medicis's embaſſy, about *anno* 1512.

[*B*] *He was averſe to oſtentation and died at about forty three years of age.*] People were forced to provoke and ſpur as it were Carteromachus; for otherwiſe, it would have been impoſſible to gueſs from his converſation, that he was a man of letters. What a noble elogium is this, and how few learned men deſerve it! The writer who beſtows it on him is very worthy of credit, he ſpeaking of a perſon deceaſed, with whom he had been perſonally acquainted. Bononiæ *primùm videre contigit* Scipionem Carteromachum, *reconditæ & abſolutæ eruditionis hominem, ſed uſque adeo alienum ab oſtentatione, ut ni provocâſſes, juràſſes eſſe literarum ignarum. Cum eo poſt* Romæ *fuit mihi propior familiaritas. Et deceſſit haud multò major annis quadraginta duobus* (4). i. e. "I happened to be firſt "acquainted with Scipio Carteromachus, at Bononia. "He was a man of prodigious erudition, and this he "concealed ſo induſtriouſly, and was ſo averſe to "oſtentation, that unleſs he was ſtrongly excited, you "would ſwear he was wholly ignorant of Literature. "I afterwards became more familiarly acquainted with "him in Rome. Carteromachus died at a little above "forty two years of age." The epiſtle of Eraſmus, whence I extracted theſe words, is dated the 1ſt of March, 1524.

(4) Eraſm. Epiſt. 5. lib. 23. pag. 1209. He ſays in his Ciceronianus, *Scipionem Carteromachum agnoſco, virum citra oſtentationem in utraque literatura doctum.*

☞CARTES (*a*) (RENE' DES), one of the moſt eminent Philoſophers and Mathematicians of the ſeventeenth Century, was deſcended of an antient and noble family in Touraine in France, and younger ſon of Joachim Des Cartes, Counſellor in the Parliament of Rennes, by Jane Brochard, daughter of the Lieutenant General of Poictiers. He was born at La Haye in Touraine March 31ſt 1596 (*b*), and had the ſurname of Du Perron, a Lordſhip belonging to the family, given him, in order to diſtinguiſh him from his elder brother. His mother died ſoon after his birth; and his father ſome years after married Anne Morin, daughter to the chief Preſident of the Chamber of Accounts at Nants, by whom he had a ſon and a daughter (*c*). The cares of this new family did not divert him from the care due to his ſon René, whom he uſed to call the *Philoſopher*, on account of the inſatiable curioſity of the child in aſking the reaſons of every thing which he met with (*d*). He was ſent therefore to the Jeſuits College at La Fleche in 1604, and put under the tuition of Father Charlet, who was related to him. Here he made a great

(*a*) Dr. Thomas Teniſon, afterwards Archbiſhop of Canterbury, in his *Account of the Lord Bacon's Works*, pag. 5, 13. prefixed to the *Baconiana, or Certain genuine Remains of Sir Francis Bacon*, edit. London 1679. erroneouſly calls our Anthor *de Chart.*

(*b*) *La Vie de M. Des Cartes reduite en abregé par Monſ Baillet*, liv. 1. edit. Paris 1693, in 12mo, and *Les Hommes Illuſtres, qui ont paru en France pendant le xvii Siecle. Par Mr. Perrault*, tom. 1. pag. 124. edit. Paris 1701.

(*c*) Baillet, *ubi ſupra.*

(*d*) Idem, ibid. *and* Perrault, *ubi ſupra.*

great progreſs in the learned Languages and polite Literature [*A*], and contracted an intimacy with ſeveral young Gentlemen, who proved eminent in the Republic of Letters, and particularly Marine Merſenne, afterwards known by the name of Father Merſenne (*e*). Having paſſed thro' his courſe of Philoſophy without any great ſatisfaction to himſelf, he left the College in Auguſt 1612, and reſolved to abandon his Books and the purſuit of ſcience, and ſpent the winter of the year 1612 and the beginning of 1613 in the city of Rennes in paying viſits to his family, in learning to ride the great horſe, and to fence, and other exerciſes ſuitable to his quality. His Father deſigned him for the Army; but his tender years and the weakneſs of his conſtitution not permitting him to expoſe himſelf ſo early to the fatigues of war, he was ſent to Paris in the ſpring following, without any perſon to inſpect his conduct, except a *Valet de Chambre* and a Lacquey or two, ſo that tho' he did not launch out into any groſs extravagance or debauchery, yet he was ſometimes engaged in gaming (*f*), in which he had prodigious ſucceſs (*g*). Here he renewed his acquaintance with ſeveral perſons, who ſerved to reclaim him from his averſion to ſtudy, and particularly Monſ. Mydorge, and Father Merſenne, whoſe converſation revived in him a deſire after truth; and though that Father removed to Nevers in 1614, yet his departure was ſo far from occaſioning in our Author any thoughts of returning to his former diverſions, that it inſpired him with a reſolution of retiring from the world, and engaging in a ſevere courſe of ſtudy; which he purſued till he was found out and interrupted by his friends. He departed for Holland in May 1616, and inliſted himſelf in the Prince of Orange's troops as a volunteer [*B*], and while he lay in garriſon at Breda during the truce between the Spaniards and Dutch, ſolved a problem in Mathematics to the ſatisfaction of Iſaac Beekman, Principal of the College of Dort [*C*]. During his ſtay at Breda he likewiſe wrote a treatiſe of Muſic [*D*], and laid the foundation of ſeveral of his works.

(*e*) Baillet. *ubi ſupra*, and Perrault, *ubi ſupra*.

(*f*) Perrault, pag. 125. *and* Baillet, *ubi ſupra*.
(*g*) Baillet, *ubi ſupra*.

[*A*] *Here he made a great progreſs in the learned Languages and polite Literature.*] He had brought with him to the College an uncommon paſſion for learning, with a ſolid judgment, and a great quickneſs and vivacity of genius; and in all the courſe of his ſtudies in polite Learning, which was five years and an half, he never diſcovered the leaſt affectation of ſingularity, except that which emulation produced in endeavouring to gain an advantage over thoſe of his companions, who had ſurpaſſed the reſt. He ſhewed likewiſe the greateſt eaſineſs and compliance of temper imaginable, and paid the utmoſt ſubmiſſion to his Tutor's will. With theſe excellent diſpoſitions he made himſelf Maſter of the Latin and Greek Tongues, which he early apprehended to be of the utmoſt importance for the underſtanding of the ancient Authors. He had a greater affection for Poetry, than thoſe, who conſidered him only as a Philoſopher, could imagine; and he had even a talent that way, which ſhewed that he had a true reliſh for the beauties of that Art. He found likewiſe a prodigious pleaſure in the Fables of the Ancients, not ſo much on account of the myſteries of Natural and Moral Philoſophy veiled under them, as becauſe they awakened his genius by the moſt agreeable turns of fancy in the texture of them. In reward for his exact diſcharge of his duty, he was diſpenſed with attending ſo cloſely to the Lectures as his companions; and this liberty he made uſe of to ſatisfy the paſſion, which he felt in him, to acquire a clear and certain knowledge of every thing, that conduces to the advantage of life; which they put him in hopes of attaining by means of his humanity ſtudies. Upon this account he did not confine himſelf to what was taught in the College, but read over all the moſt rare and valuable books of ſcience, which he could procure (1). And tho' ſome perſons have ſuſpected, that in the whole courſe of his life he had but a very ſmall regard for books; yet, as Mr. Baillet obſerves, he paſſed this judgment upon them even at that time, that the reading of good books, is converſing, as it were, with the greateſt genius's and moſt valuable men of former Ages, who were the Authors of them; and that it is a ſtudied converſation, in which they diſcover only their beſt thoughts (2).

(1) Baillet, *Vie de Des Cartes reduite en abregè*, liv. 1. *and* Carteſii, *Diſſertat. de Methodo*, pag. 2, 3. edit. 4to, Amſtelodami 1664, in 4to.
(2) Carteſ. *de Methodo*, pag. 3, 4. *and* Baillet, *ubi ſupra*, lib. 1. *See likewiſe* Monſ. Baſnage de Bauval's *Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Savans*, Mois de Juin 1693, Art. 1. pag. 535. 3d edit. Rotterdam 1701.

[*B*] *Inliſted himſelf in the Prince of Orange's Troops as a Volunteer.*] As his mind was already poſſeſſed of a ſtrong paſſion for the diſcovery of truth, to which he was reſolved ſome time or other to apply himſelf, his deſign was not to become a great ſoldier under the diſcipline of that Prince; ſo that in determining to bear arms, he reſolved never to appear in any reſpect forward as an Actor, but every where to be but as a ſpectator of the tranſactions of the ſeveral States and Kingdoms. He turned ſoldier for no other end, but to obſerve the different turns of human nature, and to endeavour to fortify himſelf againſt all the accidents of life. That he might not be uneaſy under the power of any ſuperior, he refuſed upon his firſt entrance all command and all engagements, and always ſupported himſelf at his own charges. But merely in form and to keep up the cuſtom, he received once his pay, and had the curioſity to preſerve that piece of Money all his life, as a teſtimony of his having ſerved in the Army. He really took a delight in war at that age; but this inclination of his was abated by time. He was always averſe to indolence and debauchery in the Army. He ſhewed himſelf as active as the moſt forward of the ſoldiers, and employed his leiſure hours in ſtudy, while others were engaged in riot and extravagance (3).

(3) Baillet, *ubi ſupra*, liv. 1.

[*C*] *Solved a problem in Mathematics to the ſatisfaction of Iſaac Beekman, Principal of the College of Dort.*] A perſon unknown having cauſed the Problem to be fixed up in the ſtreets of Breda, Des Cartes ſeeing the concourſe of paſſengers, who ſtop'd to read the Note, which was written in Dutch, deſired one who ſtood near him to explain to him in Latin or French what was contained in that paper. The man promis'd to ſatisfy him upon condition, that he would engage to ſolve the Problem. Monſieur Des Cartes accepted of the condition with ſuch a reſolute air, that the man little expecting ſuch a thing from a young Cadet in the Army, gave him his name in writing, with the place where he lived, in order that he might bring him the ſolution of the Problem. Monſr. Des Cartes found by the Note that his name was Iſaac Beekman, and that he was Principal of the College of Dort; upon which returning to his lodging, he applied himſelf to the examination of the Problem, and found the ſolution of it very readily. The next day he viſited Mr. Beekman, who ſeemed ſurprized at his having ſolved the Problem ſo ſpeedily; but his wonder was much more increaſed when he began to diſcourſe with the young Gentleman, whoſe knowledge he found much ſuperior to his own in thoſe ſciences, in which he had employed his whole time for ſeveral years. He therefore deſired his friendſhip and correſpondence, which our Author immediately agreed to, and returned his civilities with the moſt unreſerved friendſhip and confidence, though he was younger than Mr. Beekman by near thirty years (4).

(4) Idem, ibid.

[*D*] *During his ſtay at Breda likewiſe, he wrote a Treatiſe of Muſic.*] He compoſed it in Latin. He was willing to intruſt the perſon, to whom it was addreſſed, with the original, on condition, that he ſhould let no body ſee it, becauſe as he judged it to be very imperfect, he was apprehenſive leſt it ſhould become public, either by being printed, or by a great number of copies being taken of it. Beekman, who was eſteemed one of the chief Mathematicians of the

works [*E*]. He left Breda in July 1619 (*b*), and went to Maeſtricht, Aix la Chapelle, Mentz, and Francfort, where he was preſent at the Coronation of the Emperor Ferdinand II; and entered himſelf as a volunteer in the army of the Duke of Bavaria, in Oct. 1619. Here in his winter-quarters in the Dutchy of Newburgh, upon the banks of the Danube, he found himſelf in a place ſo little frequented by people, whoſe converſation might afford him any diverſion, that he entered upon a ſtrict courſe of Meditation upon the moſt important ſubjects, and endeavoured to diveſt himſelf intirely of his former prejudices. During this retirement he was informed of the ſociety of *Roſacrucians*, and endeavoured to find out ſome of them, but in vain. In the ſpring following he attended the Duke of Bavaria's army into Suabia, and arrived at Ulm in June 1620, where he ſpent the winter following, and became acquainted with John Faulhaber, who encouraged him in the ſtudy of the Mathematicks. He was preſent at the ſiege of Prague, and after the taking of it, paſſed in 1621 into Hungary under Count de Bucquoy, and was preſent at the ſiege of Preſbourg, Tinaw, and other places; but the raiſing of the ſiege of Newhauſell, with the loſs of his General, who was killed there, determined him to abandon the profeſſion of arms, ſo that he quitted the Imperial ſervice July 28th. the next day after the raiſing the ſiege of New-Hauſell, and returned to Preſbourg. Upon this he began his travels into the North, and viſited Sileſia, the utmoſt parts of Poland, Pomerania, the coaſts of the Baltic, the Marquiſate of Brandenburg, Holſtein, Eaſt-Friſeland, and Weſt-Friſeland, in his paſſage to which he was in danger of being murdered by the ſailors [*F*]. From Weſt-Friſeland he went into Holland, and afterwards to Rennes in France towards the middle of March. In the beginning of Lent the year following he went to Paris, where he cleared himſelf from the imputation of being a Roſacrucian, and declared againſt the Mathematics [*G*], and applied himſelf again to that of Ethics and Natural Philoſophy [*H*]. He afterwards went to Bretagne and Poictou where he ſold his eſtate, took a journey

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

Age, did not think it too imperfect for him, and imagining that Des Cartes had diſowned it, claimed it as his own compoſition; upon which our Author thought proper to acknowledge it. His friends could never obtain his conſent to the publication of this treatiſe during his life; and his enemies having procured an imperfect copy ſought an occaſion to be revenged upon him after his death. But they were ſo far from caſting any blemiſh upon his memory, that they drew upon him the admiration of all, who knew that it was the compoſition of a youth of twenty two years of age. The multitude of editions and the tranſlations of it into Engliſh and French, are a ſtrong proof how much it is valued (5). It was printed under the title of *Compendium Muſicæ* at Utrecht 1650 in 4to, and Amſterdam 1656 in 4to. An Engliſh Tranſlation of it was publiſhed at London in 1653. Father Poiſſon of the Oratory tranſlated it into French, and his Tranſlation of it was printed with the neceſſary Explications at the end of Des Cartes's Mechanics at Paris 1668 in 4to.

(5) Baillet, *ubi ſupra*.

[*E*] *Laid the foundation of ſeveral of his works.*] Mr. Baillet informs us, that among his juvenile meditations we find his opinion concerning the *Souls of Brutes*, which he ſuppoſes to be mere mechaniſm, andwhich he wrote an account of twenty years before he publiſhed his doctrine concerning the Diſtinction between a *thinking* and an *extended ſubſtance*; and that he had not ſo much as peruſed at that time St. Auguſtin, or Gomez Pereira, or any other Author, who was capable of affording any hint of this notion; and that it appears, that he never ſaw Pereira in his whole life; but that it was from ſome of his friends, and ſome who envied him, that he was informed, that there was ſome affinity between his opinion and that of the Spaniſh Phyſician. Mr. Bayle in his *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (6) tells us, that Monſr. Des Cartes had finiſhed his *Meditations*, without ever reflecting upon the nature of the ſouls of Brutes, or abandoning the common opinion, which he had imbibed in his infancy; and that afterwards when he came to conſider the conſequences of his doctrine concerning the Diſtinction between a thinking and extended ſubſtance, he perceived that the ſenſe of animals overturned the whole œconomy of his Syſtem. And Mr. Bayle obſerves, that perhaps this difficulty was ſtarted to him by others, and not the reſult of his own reflection; but that as he read very few Books, it is probable that he never ſaw or heard of Pereira's *Antoniana Margarita*, printed at Medina del Campo in the year 1554. However Mr. Bayle's ſuppoſition, that Des Cartes never thought of this point till he had finiſh'd his Syſtem, is directly contrary to Mr. Baillet's account abovementioned; wherein he aſſures us, that our Author formed that hypotheſis, when he was very young.

(6) *Mois de Mars* 1684, Art. 11.

[*F*] *In his paſſage to which he was in danger of being murdered by the ſailors.*] They imagining him to be a Merchant, and that he had a large ſum of money about him, and perceiving him to be a foreigner, who had little acquaintance in the country, and a man of a mild diſpoſition, reſolved to murder him and throw his body into the ſea, and diſcourſed of their deſigns before his face, not knowing that he underſtood any language except French, in which he ſpoke to his Valet de Chambre. Monſr. des Cartes diſcovering their intent, ſtarted up of a ſudden, and drawing his ſword, ſpoke to them in their own language, in ſuch a tone as ſtruck a terror upon them, and threatned to run them through, if they preſumed to ſtir. Upon this they behaved very civilly to him afterwards, and landed him ſafe at the place, whither he was bound (7).

(7) Baillet, *ubi ſupra*.

[*G*] *Declared againſt the Mathematics.*] He had long been convinced by experience of the little advantage of the Mathematics, eſpecially when men ſtudy them only for themſelves, without applying them to other things. And ſince the year 1620 he had wholly laid aſide Arithmetic; tho' the great affection, which he had for Geometry, continued longer with him, becauſe the Mathematicians of Holland and Germany, whom he met with during his travels, continued to exerciſe him in that ſcience by the Queſtions and Problems, which they propounded to him. But it appears that his eſteem for it was abated from the year 1623, if it be true that in 1638 it was above fifteen years that he had declared he had quite laid aſide Geometry, and would never more meddle with the ſolution of any Problem, except at the requeſt of ſome friend (8).

(8) Idem, ibid.

[*H*] *He applies himſelf again to the ſtudy of Ethics and Natural Philoſophy.*] He had once indeed been tempted to diſcard the ſtudy of the latter, finding himſelf diſcourag'd in it by the little certainty, which he diſcovered in his Obſervations. He determined therefore to confine himſelf wholly to the ſtudy of Morality; but it was not long before he was convinced that the ſtudy of Natural Philoſophy was not altogether uſeleſs with regard to that of Ethics, and that the progreſs he made in diſcerning truth from falſhood would be of great advantage to him in the regulation of his actions. This conſideration occaſioned him to return to the obſervation of nature, ſince the moſt certain means to know how we ought to live, is to know what kind of world it is we live in, and who is the Creator of this Univerſe, which we inhabit. And he often declared ſince that time, that the inſight, which he gained into Phyſic, had been very ſerviceable to him in eſtabliſhing

(9) Idem, ibid.

journey through Swiſſerland to Italy. Upon his return he ſettled at Paris, where his reputation procuring him a great number of friends, his retirement was interrupted by frequent viſits. This induced him to endeavour to conceal himſelf; but being diſcovered, he went to the ſiege of Rochelle in 1628, and returned to Paris in the beginning of November. A few days after his return, at an aſſembly of men of learning at the houſe of Monſignor Bagni, the Pope's Nuncio, he was prevailed upon to explain his ſentiments with regard to Philoſophy; upon which the Nuncio urged him to publiſh his ſyſtem *; for which purpoſe our Author retired to Amſterdam about the latter end of March 1629, and from thence to Friſeland, to a place near Franeker, where he began his Metaphyſical Meditations [*I*], and ſpent ſome time in Dioptrics, to which he had applied himſelf in France. About ſix months after he returned to Amſterdam, where he ſpent three months more upon his Mathematical Meditations; but the Treatiſe which he had begun upon that ſubject, was interrupted by his other ſtudies at the beginning of the next Year, and he did not reſume it till about ten Years after. It was during his reſidence in Friſeland that he drew up his Diſcourſe of Meteors [*K*]. After he was ſettled in Amſterdam he ſeriouſly undertook the ſtudy of Phyſic, Anatomy and Chemiſtry [*L*], and rejected an opportunity offered him of going into the Levant with Count de Marcheville, Embaſſador from the King of France to the Grand Seignior, but ſoon after took a ſhort tour to England, and not far from London made ſome obſervations concerning the declinations of the Magnet. Upon his return he determined to propound no more queſtions to any perſons, and only to reſolve thoſe propounded to himſelf. He admitted Monſieur Ville-Breſſieux, who had a prodigious genius for the Mathematics and Chemiſtry, into his family; and in the ſpring of the year 1633 removed to Deventer, where Henry Renneri, one of his firſt diſciples, was appointed Profeſſor of Philoſophy. Here he applied himſelf to compleat ſeveral works, which he had left unfiniſhed the year before, and reſumed his ſtudies in Aſtronomy, and in the ſummer following finiſhed his *Treatiſe of the World* [*M*]. The next year he removed to Amſterdam, and ſoon after took

* Idem, ibid. lib. 2.

ſtabliſhing certain foundations in Morality or Ethics; and that it was abundantly more eaſy for him to find the ſatisfaction which he look'd for in this point, than in ſeveral others, which related to Phyſic, tho' he had employed more of his time therein. So that, as Mr. Baillet obſerves, after all theſe enquires he might boaſt, not ſo much that he had found out the means of preſerving life, as that of not being afraid of death, and that he prepared himſelf for it, exempt from the diſquietude common to thoſe, whoſe wiſdom is derived from other men's inſtructions, and grounded upon foundations, which depend only upon the prudence and authority of other men (9).

(9) Idem, ibid.

[*I*] *Where he began his* Metaphyſical Meditations.] It was there that he renewed his old proteſtations before the altar to labour only for the glory of God and the benefit of mankind; and therefore reſolv'd to begin his meditations concerning the Exiſtence of God and the Immortality of the Soul. But that he might undertake nothing, which had any affinity with Divinity, he conſider'd God only as the Author of Nature; and it was not natural Religion, but only revealed, that he excluded from his deſigns (10).

(10) Idem, lib. 3.

[*K*] *It was during his reſidence in Friſeland that he drew up his* Diſcourſe of Meteors.] He was at firſt ſollicited to give his thoughts concerning the *Parhelia* obſerved at Rome in March 1629. The Obſervations were ſent to him by Father Merſenne, and before that by Henry Reneri, a new acquaintance, whom he had got upon his arrival in Holland, and who was afterwards one of the firſt, who publicly taught his Philoſophy. Reneri received them from Gaſſendus, then in Holland, who wrote a Diſſertation upon that *Phænomenon* in his Travels, before Monſr. Des Cartes. It is to theſe Obſervations upon the *Parhelia* that the world is obliged for that excellent Treatiſe of Meteors, which our Author publiſh'd ſome years after (11).

(11) Idem, ibid.

[*L*] *He ſeriouſly undertook the ſtudy of Phyſic, Anatomy, and Chemiſtry.*] He imagined, that nothing was more capable of promoting the temporal felicity of mankind than an happy union of Phyſic with Mathematics. But before he was in a capacity of contributing any comfort or relief to men's labours, or could multiply the conveniencies of life by Mechanics, he thought it neceſſary to find out ſome way or other to ſecure the human body from thoſe evils, which might diſturb its health, or deprive it of power and force to labour. Upon this perſuaſion he began to put his deſign in execution by the ſtudy of Anatomy, in which he employed all the winter, which he ſpent in Amſterdam. He declares, that he had ſo much zeal for the knowledge of it, that he went almoſt every day to a Butcher's ſhop to ſee him kill beaſts, and cauſed the parts of ſuch animals to be brought home to his lodgings, as he deſigned to anatomiſe at his own leiſure. And this was his frequent practice in other places, where he reſided afterwards. He joined the ſtudy of Chemiſtry to that of Anatomy in the latter end of the year 1629; and he aſſures us, that he learned daily in this ſcience, as he did in the other, ſome things, which did not occur to him in Books. But before he would apply his mind to the Diſcovery of Diſeaſes and their Remedies, he had a deſire to know whether there was any method of finding out a medicine grounded upon infallible Demonſtration (12).

(12) Idem, ibid.

[*M*] *In the ſummer following he finiſhed his treatiſe of the world.*] He called it *his world*, becauſe it was the idea of a world, which he had imagined anſwerable to the world, in which we live; and it contained an Abridgment of all his Natural Philoſophy; that is, of all that he could come to the knowledge of with regard to material things, except what relates to light, which he intended to explain in its full extent. That he might not be engaged to follow or refute opinions commonly received amongſt the learned, he was willing to reſign this ſame world to the exerciſe of their brains in diſputing about it, and to treat only of that, which might happen in a new world, ſuppoſing that God ſhould create ſufficient matter in the imaginary ſpaces to form ſuch an one. He ſuppoſed that God would agitate the parts of this matter in a various and confuſed manner, ſo as to make a Chaos, or an indigeſted confuſed maſs; and that in proceſs of time he would only afford nature his ordinary concurrence, and ſuffer her to act agreeably to the laws, which he hath eſtabliſhed. Upon this ſuppoſition he deſcribes this matter, as it was at firſt; ſhews what thoſe laws of nature were; and demonſtrates, that the greateſt part of the matter of this Chaos would in compliance with theſe laws range themſelves in ſuch a manner, as to reſemble our heavens &c. He proceeds then to the explication of the nature of the ſoul, and endeavours to ſhew, that it cannot be derived from the powers of matter as the other things were, which he treats of; but that it is created. He reviſed this treatiſe in order to ſend it to Father Merſenne, to be printed at Paris with the King's privilege, at the time when he heard that Galileo was caſt into the Inquiſition for aſſerting the Earth's Motion. This alarmed Des Cartes, as he was perſuaded, that Galileo's opinion was the moſt

took a journey into Denmark and the Lower Parts of Germany, in company with Monſieur Ville-Breſſieux. The winter following afforded our Author an opportunity for thoſe obſervations, which he made upon Snow of ſix Points or Angles, and upon that occaſion to make others upon Hail and Rain. He afterwards wrote a fixth Diſcourſe of them, publiſhed in his Treatiſe of Meteors. In the latter end of Autumn 1635 he went to Lewarden in Friſeland, where he remained to the year 1637, and wrote his *Treatiſe of Mechanics* [*N*]: he returned to Amſterdam about the beginning of March, and made a great many curious obſervations concerning the Circles about Candles (*g*). In 1637 he publiſhed his four Treatiſes concerning *Method*, *Dioptrics*, *Meteors*, and *Geometry* [*O*], and ſoon after took a journey to Breda, and into Flanders, to viſit Monſieur de la Baſſe Governor of Doway. At his return he ſettled at Egmond, a pleaſant village in North-Holland, where the publick exerciſe of the Roman Catholick Religion was undiſturbed and publick, and ſoon perceived the fruits, which the reading of his book produced; and was obliged to anſwer the objections of Fromond, Regius Profeſſor of the Holy Scriptures in Louvain, of Plempius, a Dutch Phyſician in the ſame Univerſity, and Ciermans, Profeſſor of the Mathematicks in the Jeſuits College there. In France his book was received according to the different prejudices of the readers; and Monſieur Fermat in particular made ſome objections againſt it; but was afterwards reconciled to our Author, who had likewiſe a diſpute with Monſieur Petit, Monſieur Morin, Regius Profeſſor of Mathematicks at Paris, and Monſieur Beaugrand, Secretary to the King of France. He reſolved now to diſcontinue his application to abſtract Geometry, though he determined to continue that part of it, which is converſant about the Phænomena of Nature, and wrote an Explanation of the obſcure paſſages in his Book, for the uſe of his friend Monſ. des Argues; and conſented, that a Dutch Gentleman, one of his friends, ſhould draw up a regular Introduction to his Geometry, to facilitate the underſtanding of it to all kinds of readers. About the end of the year 1638 he deſired to be excuſed from anſwering any more Problems, and drew up a ſeries of the beſt objections which had been put to him, and of the moſt curious Problems, which had been propounded, in order to be printed with his anſwers (*h*). Whilſt they fatigued him in France with Objections and Problems, there was ſcarce any thing thought of in Holland

(*g*) Idem, ibid. lib. 3.

(*h*) Idem, ibid. lib. 4.

moſt probable, and proper for the explication of all *Phænomena*; and upon this hypotheſis he built the greateſt part of his Syſtem of the World; ſo that not being able to retrench it without rendering all the reſt defective, he thought it more adviſeable to ſuppreſs the Treatiſe abovementioned, than to publiſh it imperfect, or expoſe himſelf to the cenſure of the Inquiſitors at Rome, by maintaining an hypotheſis, which they had condemned without underſtanding it. However he reſolved to review this work, and to new-model his Explication of the Earth's Motion, in order to ſhew how it may be denied in oppoſition to Galileo, tho' in reality it be carried about, and the hypotheſis of Copernicus remain in full force. This he did not attempt ſo much out of regard to the Inquiſition, as to explain thoſe paſſages of Scripture, which are commonly alledged againſt this opinion (13). An Abridgment of this Treatiſe was publiſhed at Paris 1664 in 8vo under the following title: *Le Monde de Des Cartes, ou le Traité de la Lumiere & des autres principaux Objets des Sens. Avec un Diſcours de Mouvement local & un autre des Fievres, compoſés ſelon les Principes de cet Auteur.* This firſt edition is very imperfect: but Mr. Clerſelier afterwards corrected the errors by the original, and publiſh'd it very exactly at Paris 1677 in 4to at the end of Des Cartes's *Traité de l'Homme*. It is printed in Latin in his *Opera Poſthuma* (14).

(13) Baillet, *ubi ſupra*, lib. 3.

(14) Niceron, pag. 306, 307.

[*N*] *His* Treatiſe of Mechanics.] It was written for the uſe of Monſr. de Zuilechem, his friend and correſpondent, Counſellor and Secretary to the Prince of Orange (15). In 1668 there was printed at Paris in 4to, *Traité de la Mecanique compoſé par M. Des Cartes. De plus l'Abrigé de la Muſique du même Auteur, mis en François avec éclairciſſemens neceſſaires, par N. P. P. D. L.*. i. e. "Nicolas Poiſſon, Prêtre de l'Oratoire." This, as Father Niceron obſerves (16), is but a ſmall part of a large work, which our Author had a deſign of compoſing, but never wrote. It was publiſhed in Latin in his *Opera Poſthuma*.

(15) Baillet, *ubi ſupra*, lib. 3.

(16) Pag. 297.

[*O*] *His* four *Treatiſes concerning* Method, Dioptrics, Meteors, and Geometry.] They were printed at Leyden in 4to under the following title, *Diſcours de la Methode pour bien conduire ſa raiſon, & chercher la Verité dans les Sciences. Plus la Dioptrique, les Meteores, & la Géometrie.* Theſe four Treatiſes, which are Eſſays towards his Philoſophy, were publiſhed at firſt without his name, he deſiring to be unknown, in order that he might hear the more freely the judgment, which was paſſed upon them. In the *firſt* of theſe Treatiſes he begins with divers conſiderations upon the Sciences; and then propoſes the principal Rules of Method, which he obſerved for his own uſe in the conduct of his reaſon. He afterwards points out ſome rules of Morality, which he had deduced from his Method; and propounds ſome arguments, by which he evinces the Exiſtence of a God, and explains the Nature of the human Soul. In the laſt place he makes a deduction of things, which he ſuppoſed requiſite for the proceeding further in the ſtudy of Nature. His Treatiſe of *Dioptrics* is divided into ten parts, which form ſo many ſhort Diſcourſes or Diſſertations concerning Light, Refraction, the Eye and Senſes, the Images formed at the bottom of the eye, Viſion, Spectacles, and cutting of Glaſſes. His Treatiſe of *Meteors* is divided into ten chapters, and in it he treats of Terreſtrial Bodies, of Vapours and Exhalations, of Salt, of Winds, of Clouds, Rain, Snow, and Hail; of Tempeſts, Lightning, and other Fires kindled in the air; of the Rain-bow; of the Colour of Clouds; of Circles or Crowns appearing ſometimes about the Stars; and of Parhelia's. His Treatiſe of Geometry is divided into three Books. Stephen Curcellæus, a famous Divine among the Arminians, tranſlated ſome years after the three firſt Treatiſes into Latin, without meddling with that upon Geometry, either becauſe he ſuppoſed it to be above his reach, or becauſe he had heard that ſome other perſon was engaged in that deſign. Des Cartes reviſed his Tranſlation, and took that opportunity to make ſome alterations in his firſt Treatiſe; upon which they were publiſhed under this title: *Renati Des Cartes Specimina Philoſophiæ, ſeu Diſſertatio de Methodo rectè regendæ rationis, Dioptrice & Meteora ex Gallico Latinè verſa, & ab Autore emendata.* Amſterdam 1644 in 4to, and 1656 in 4to. After this Francis van Schooten, Profeſſor of Mathematics at Leyden, tranſlated his Geometry into Latin, and added his own Commentaries to it, with the excellent Notes of Monſr. de Beaune, Counſellor in the Preſidial of Blois, which had been a long time handed about in manuſcript among the Mathematicians. This Tranſlation was printed under this title: *Renati Des Cartes Geometria cum Florimondi de Beaune Notis, ex Gallico Latinè, Interprete & Commentatore Franciſco a Schooten.* Leyden 1649 in 4to. *Accedit Compendium Muſicæ.* Francfort upon the Meine 1695 in 4to (17).

(17) Niceron, pag. 296, 297.

Holland but diſcarding the old Philoſophy, and following his. The Univerſity of Utrecht was Carteſian from its foundation by means of Renneri; and Henry Regius, a young Phyſician, declared openly in his favour, though he was afterwards vehemently attacked by Gilbert Voetius, Profeſſor of Divinity there. Des Cartes removed now to Harderwick near Utrecht, and thence to Leyden, and not long after was invited to ſettle in England by Sir Charles Cavendiſh, brother to the Earl of Newcaſtle [*P*]. About this time he was attacked by the Jeſuits, and particularly Father Bourdin. At the latter end of the year 1641 Lewis XIII King of France invited him to his Court upon very honourable conditions; but there were no ſollicitations powerful enough to wean him from his retirement (*i*). In 1641 he publiſhed his *Meditations concerning the Exiſtence of God, and the Immortality of the Soul* [*Q*]. Voetius abovementioned being choſen Rector of the Univerſity of Utrecht the ſame year, procured Des Cartes's Philoſophy to be prohibited, and wrote againſt him, who immediately publiſhed a Vindication of himſelf [*R*]. The

(*i*) Idem, ibid. lib. 5.

[*P*] *Not long after was invited to ſettle in England by Sir Charles Cavendiſh, brother of the Earl of Newcaſtle.*] He was invited thither with his friend Monſr. Mydorge, and they were both to be ſettled there under King Charles I. Our Author did not appear backward to the acceptance of this offer, eſpecially conſidering what he was aſſured of, as Monſr. Baillet tells us, that *the King was a Catholic in his heart.* Sir Charles Cavendiſh, the promoter of this deſign, and his brother, the Earl of Newcaſtle, were both acquainted with our Philoſopher; and the former was an excellent Mathematician, and a great Admirer of Des Cartes's Philoſophy. But the civil wars breaking out in England prevented the ſucceſs of this affair.

[*Q*] *In* 1641 *he publiſh'd his* Meditations &c.] They were printed at Paris in 8vo under the following title: *Meditationes de primâ Philoſophiâ, ubi de Dei Exiſtentiâ & Animæ Immortalitate.* In the *firſt* of theſe *Meditations* he propounds the reaſons why we may doubt of all things in general, and eſpecially of material things, till we have eſtabliſhed a better foundation in ſcience than has hitherto been laid. He ſhews that the advantage of this general doubting conſiſts in delivering us from all kinds of prejudices, and diſengaging our minds from ſenſe, in order that we may not any longer doubt of the things, which we ſhall afterwards diſcover to be true. In the *ſecond* he ſhews, that the ſoul making uſe of its own liberty in ſuppoſing that the things, of whoſe exiſtence there may ariſe the leaſt doubt, do not exiſt at all, in effect acknowledges, that it is impoſſible, but that at the ſame time it muſt exiſt itſelf; which ſerves to make it diſtinguiſh the things, which belong to it from what relates to the body. In the *third* he produces and diſplays the beſt argument he hath for the Exiſtence of God, without uſing any compariſon drawn from corporal things. In the *fourth* he endeavours to prove, that all things, of which we have a clear and diſtinct idea, are true; and explains the nature of error in judgment, and the diſcernment of truth from falſhood. In the *fifth* he explains the Nature of a Body in general; and demonſtrates the Exiſtence of God in a new manner; and ſhews that the Certainty of Demonſtrations themſelves depend upon the Knowledge of God. In the *ſixth* he ſhews the Difference between the Action of the Underſtanding and that of the Imagination; and proves that the Soul of Man is really diſtinct from the Body, tho' it is ſo cloſely united, that it forms as it were the ſame thing with it. He explains likewiſe the ſeveral Errors, which proceed from the ſenſes, with the means to avoid them; and exhibits thoſe reaſons, from which we may conclude the Exiſtence of things material (18). Several objections were ſent him againſt this work. The firſt ſett was drawn up by a Divine of Louvain, and Native of Antwerp, whoſe name was Caterus, who would not ſuffer his name to be prefixed to them. The ſecond objections were made by divers Divines and Philoſophers at Paris, and collected by Father Merſenne. The Anſwer of Des Cartes to theſe Objections is accompanied with a piece written by him, containing the reaſons for the proof of the Exiſtence of God, and the Diſtinction between the human Soul and Body, ranged in a geometrical manner. The third ſett of Objections were made by Mr. Thomas Hobbes. The fourth came from Anthony Arnaud. The fifth from Gaſſendus. The ſixth from divers Divines, Philoſophers, and Geometricians, as appears from the title given them by Father Merſenne, who publiſh'd the Book. The ſecond edition of the *Meditations* in Latin was printed at Amſterdam by Elzevir in 1642 in 12mo; and the Author corrected it in the title of the Paris Edition, and ſubſtituted the term *Diſtinction between the Soul and Body* inſtead of the *Immortality of the Soul*, which was not ſo ſuitable to it. He added the ſeventh ſett of Objections propoſed to him by Father Peter Bourdin a Jeſuit, with his Anſwers, a Letter to Father Dinet of the ſame Society with relation to his Diſpute with that Father, and an Addition at the end of the fourth Objection concerning Tranſubſtantiation, which Father Merſenne had thought proper to retrench in the Paris Edition. A late edition was publiſhed with this title: *Meditationes de primâ Philoſophiâ, in quibus adjectæ ſunt in hâc ultimâ editione utiliſſimæ quædam animadverſiones ex variis doctiſſimiſque Autoribus collectæ, cum Autoris Vitâ breviter ac concinnè conſcripta.* Amſtelodami (that is, *Neapolt*) 1719 in 8vo. This edition was publiſh'd by Giovacchino Poeta. The *Meditations* were tranſlated into French, and printed at Paris 1647 in 4to under the following title: *Les Meditations Metaphyſiques de René des Cartes touchant la premiere Philoſophie, dans leſquelles l'exiſtence de Dieu & la Diſtinction réelle entre l'Ame & le Corps de l'Homme, ſont démonſtrées. Traduites du Latin de l'Auteur par M. le D. D. L. N. S.* (i. e. Monſr. le Duc de Luines). *Et les Objections faites contre ces Meditations par diverſes perſonnes tres-doctes, avec les Réponſes de l'Auteur, traduites par Mr. C. L. R.* (i. e. Clerſelier). Des Cartes, who reviſed theſe Tranſlations, took the opportunity of correcting his own work, and explaining ſome paſſages, the ſenſe of which was not ſufficiently clear in the Latin, without meddling however with the ſtyle; which renders theſe Tranſlations preferable to the Latin Original. A ſecond edition was publiſhed at Paris 1661 in 4to; but the beſt is the third edition, which is *divided into Articles, with Summaries by R. F.* (i. e. René Fedé, Doctor of Phyſic of the Faculty of Angers), and printed at Paris 1673 in 4to (19).

(18) Baillet, *ubi ſupra*, lib. 5.

(19) Niceron, pag. 295-300.

[*R*] *Who immediately publiſh'd a Vindication of himſelf.*] It was entitled, *Epiſtola Renati Des Cartes ad celeberrimum Virum D. Giſbertum Voëtium in quâ examinantur duo libri nuper pro Voëtio Ultrajecti ſimul editi; unus de Confraternitate Marianâ, alter de Philoſophiâ Carteſianâ.* Amſterdam 1643 in 12mo, and in the Collection of his *Letters* Tom. II. p. 541. In this piece he anſwers a Book written againſt him by Martin Schoockius, with a long Preface by Voetius, under the title of *Philoſophia Carteſiana, ſive admiranda Methodus novæ Philoſophiæ Renati Des Cartes.* Utrecht 1643 in 12mo. And he added a Confutation of a Book written by Voetius againſt the Confraternity of Bois-le-Duc. Nor was our Author ſatisfied with having cenſured Schoockius, but proſecuted him for the ſlanders publiſh'd againſt him in his book. At laſt the Univerſity of Groningen, to whom that affair was referred, gave ſentence April 10th 1645, decreed that Des Cartes ſhould content himſelf with the Declarations, which Schoockius had made: 1. That he had written merely at the inſtigation of Voetius, who furniſhed him with the Memoirs relating to every thing perſonal in his Book, and particularly with regard to his pretended Atheiſm, and the long and invidious Parallel between him and Vanini. 2. That thoſe, who had the care of publiſhing his Book, had added without his conſent moſt of the things, of which Des Cartes complained. 3. That he acknowledged Des Cartes to be a man of probity and honour, who was by no means an Atheiſt, as he had been made very wrongly to aſſert (20).

(20) Niceron, pag. 301, 302.

The ſame year he took a voyage into France, where he found the edition of his *Principles* [*S*], and the Latin Tranſlation of his Eſſays finiſhed, and the Copies ſent from Holland. He dedicated his *Principles* to his illuſtrious diſciple, Elizabeth, Princeſs Palatine, daughter of Prince Frederic V Elector Palatine, and King of Bohemia. Having viſited his friends at Paris, he departed for Holland about the end of October, and retired to Egmond, with a reſolution to apply himſelf wholly to the knowledge of Animals, Plants, and Minerals. In June 1645 he publickly renounced his diſciple Regius, who had preſumed to advance ſeveral notions of his own, and had ſtollen his Treatiſe of Animals. He had now directed his application with freſh vigour to Anatomy; and being viſited at this time by a Gentleman who deſired to ſee his Library, he ſhewed him nothing but a calf which he was going to diſſect. He was a little diverted from this ſtudy by the queſtion concerning the Quadrature of the Circle, agitated in 1645 between Longomontanus and Mr. John Pell; which queſtion he declared impoſſible to be ſolved. He paſſed the ſevere winter of that year at Egmond, and compoſed two ſmall works, the former againſt Gaſſendus's *Inſtances*, and the latter of the Nature of the Paſſions. About the ſame time he had a diſpute with Monſieur Roberval concerning Vibrations, and carried on a correſpondence upon moral Philoſophy with the Princeſs Elizabeth. In the beginning of the year 1647 he anſwered ſome queſtions propoſed by Chriſtina Queen of Sweden, and Monſieur Chanut, the Reſident of France in that Kingdom [*T*]. But the pleaſure of this correſpondence was diſturbed by the clamours, which Ravius, Principal of the College at Leyden, and Triglandius, Profeſſor of Divinity there, raiſed againſt his Philoſophy in that Univerſity; but they were both ſoon after enjoined ſilence with regard to him, though they afterwards wrote againſt him. In June he took a journey to France, where the King ſettled on him a penſion of three thouſand Livres, and returned to Holland about the end of September. In November he received a letter from Monſieur Chanut, deſiring in Queen Chriſtina's name his opinion of the Sovereign Good; which he ſent her with ſome letters, which he had formerly written to the Princeſs Elizabeth upon the ſame ſubject, and his treatiſe of the Paſſions [*U*]. The Queen was ſo highly pleaſed with them, that ſhe wrote him a letter of thanks with her own hand. In May following he took a third journey into France, where Gaſſendus and he were reconciled, and in September returned to Egmond. In March following Schooten's Tranſlation of his Geometry was publiſhed. The Queen of Sweden having invited him into that Kingdom, he arrived at Stockholm in the beginning of October, where he was received with the higheſt civility by her Majeſty, who engaged him to attend her every morning at five a clock (*k*) to inſtruct her in his Philoſophy, and deſired him to reviſe and digeſt all his writings, which were unpubliſhed [*X*], and to form a compleat Body of Philoſophy from them. She propoſed likewiſe to ſettle him

(*k*) Perrault, pag. 117. *and* Baillet, *ubi ſupra.*

[*S*] *The Edition of his* Principles.] It was printed at Amſterdam by Elzevir 1644 in 4to under the title of *Principia Philoſophiæ*; and tranſlated into French, and publiſh'd at Paris 1647, 1651, 1658 in 4to under the following title: *Les Principes de la Philoſophie, écrits en Latin par Réne Des Cartes, & traduits en François par un de ſes Amis.* The Abbé Picot made this Tranſlation, which was reviſed by Des Cartes. There was an Engliſh Tranſlation printed with ſome Remarks upon the Work itſelf at London 1653 in 4to. This Work is divided into four parts; the firſt of which contains the Principles of human Knowledge. The ſecond treats of the Laws of Nature, and the Principles of natural Things, the Proprieties of Bodies, Space, Motion, &c. The third contains a particular Explication of the Syſtem of the World, and more eſpecially of the Heavens and celeſtial Bodies, The fourth treats of the Earth.

[*T*] *He anſwered ſome queſtions propoſed by Chriſtina Queen of Sweden, and Monſr. Chanut, the Reſident of France in that Kingdom.*] The Queen had diſputed with Monſ. Chanut, concerning this queſtion; *When a man carries love or hatred to exceſs, which of theſe two irregularities is the worſt?* The Reſident ſent this queſtion to our Author without acquainting him which ſide of it was taken by the Queen. Upon this Des Cartes drew up a fine diſſertation upon love publiſhed in the firſt volume of his letters. In this piece he diſcuſſed three points; firſt, What love is? Secondly, Whether mere natural light teaches us the love of God? Thirdly, Which of the two exceſſes of love or hatred is the worſt? This proved highly ſatisfactory to the Queen, except with regard to one paſſage, from which it appeared that Des Cartes was not of their opinion, who maintain the *world to be finite*. And ſhe ſignified her doubt, whether it is poſſible to admit the hypotheſis of an infinite world, without claſhing with the Chriſtian Religion. Monſr. Chanut, was deſired to acquaint him with this objection, upon which he anſwered, that he did not ſuppoſe the world to be *infinite*, but *indefinite* (21).

(21) Baillet, *ubi ſupra*, lib. 7.

[*V*] *His treatiſe of the paſſions.*] It is entitled, *Traité des Paſſions de l'Ame*, and was printed at Amſterdam 1650 in 12mo, at Roan 1651 in 12mo, and at Paris 1664 and 1679 in 12mo. A Latin Tranſlation of it was publiſhed at Amſterdam 1656 and 1664 in 4to. with ſeveral other works of our Author. He had written this treatiſe in 1646 for the uſe of Princeſs Elizabeth, and ſent it in manuſcript to the Queen of Sweden about the end of the year following. He afterwards reviſed it at the requeſt of his friends, and enlarged it by one half, and in this ſtate it was publiſhed (22).

(22) Niceron, pag. 303, 304.

[*X*] *Deſired him to reviſe and digeſt all his writings which were unpubliſhed.*] The moſt conſiderable of them were printed after his death, and are as follow. *L'Homme de René Des Cartes, avec les Remarques de Loüis de la Forge, & un Traité de la Formation du Fœtus par le même Des Cartes.* Paris 1664 in 4to. Theſe two pieces were likewiſe printed at Paris 1677 in 4to. with *le Monde de Des Cartes, ou le Traité de la Lumiere* &c. Monſr. Clerſelier publiſhed the two pieces above mentioned. Two years before the French Edition of the *Traité de l'Homme*, a Latin tranſlation of it was printed under the following title: *Renatus Des Cartes de Homine, figuris & Latinitate donatus à Florentio Schuyl, inclytæ urbis Sylvæ Ducis Senatore, & ibidem Philoſophiæ Profeſſore.* Leyden 1662 and 1664 in 4to. Tho' the figures which accompanied this tranſlation, are beautiful enough, yet they are not ſo proper to explain the text of Des Cartes as thoſe of Meſſrs. de la Forge and Gutſchowen in the French edition of 1664. Beſides Mr. Schuyl not having the advantage of a good copy of the Original, his verſion is defective. But he has given a preface to it, which may be conſidered as a maſter-piece in the kind, and was thought ſo excellent by Monſr. Clerſelier, that he ſubjoined it to his French edition of Des Cartes's Treatiſe, in order

him in Sweden upon very honourable terms, and to allow him a revenue of three thouſand crowns *per annum*, with an eſtate, which ſhould deſcend to his heirs and executors for ever, and to form an Academy, of which he was to be Director. But theſe deſigns were broke off by his death [Y], which happened February the 11th 1650 (*l*), he being then fifty three years, ten months, and eleven days old. His body was interred at Stockholm, and ſeventeen years afterwards removed to Paris, where a magnificent monument was erected to him in the church of Saint-Genevieve du Mont (*m*). Several works have been written on occaſion of our Author and his Philoſophy [Z]. Monſieur Baillet (*n*) has given us a particular account of the qualifications of his mind and body, and highly recommends him for his contempt of wealth and fame, his love of truth, his modeſty,

(*l*) Perrault, pag. 127. *and* Baillet, *ubi ſupra*.

(*m*) Baillet, lib. 7.

(*n*) Ibid. lib. 8.

der to render it more compleat (23). John Daniel Major having found a fragment in manuſcript of Des Cartes, intitled, *Explication des Engins*, tranſlated it into Latin, and publiſhed it at Kiel in 1672. He took all the liberty with it, which he thought proper; but at the bottom it appears that this piece is not at all different from Des Cartes's *Mechanics* mentioned above (24). But the moſt conſiderable of our Author's poſthumous writings are his Letters, printed in three volumes by Monſr. Clerſelier, under the following title: *Lettres de René Des Cartes, où ſont traités les plus belles Queſtions touchant la Morale, la Phyſique, la Medicine, & les Mathematiques, données au Public par le Sieur Clerſelier*. Paris 1667 in 4to. They were tranſlated into Latin, and printed by Elzevir at Leyden 1668 in 4to. Theſe Letters contain a great many curious things relating to the Diſputes, which Des Cartes had with the learned men of his time. Monſr. Clerſelier publiſh'd them from the Minutes of our Author, which it is probable are not exactly conformable to the Originals, which he ſent, ſince in tranſcribing them he made frequent alterations (25). *Renati Des Cartes Opuſcula Poſthuma, Phyſica & Mathematica*. Amſterdam 1701 in 4to. This volume contains ſeveral ſmall Tracts or Fragments of our Author, which had never been publiſh'd before except in Low-Dutch, to which are added three others, which had been already printed in Latin or French. The pieces contained in this Collection are, 1. *Mundus, ſeu Diſſertatio de Lumine, ut & aliis ſenſuum objectis primariis*. This is a Tranſlation of the French piece abovementioned, intitled, *Le Monde de Des Cartes &c.* made from the firſt edition, which is full of faults. 2. *Tractatus de Mechanicâ, unà cum Elucidationibus N. Poiſſonii è Gallico Sermone in Latinum tranſlatus*. 3. *N. Poiſſonii Elucidationes Phyſicæ in Carteſii Muſicam*. This had already been publiſhed in French. 4. *Regulæ ad directionem ingenii, ut & inquiſitionem Veritatis*. This treatiſe, which is imperfect, contains excellent rules for the direction of the mind in the ſearch of truth. 5. *Inquiſitio Veritatis per Lumen Naturæ*. This piece, which is a ſequel of the other, is ſtill more imperfect; for there is only the beginning remaining. 6. *Primæ Cogitationes circa generationem Animalium*. 7. *De Saporibus*. It is a Fragment, which contains but two pages. 8. *Excerpta ex MSS. Renati Des Cartes, quæ Algebram ſpectant*. Theſe are only ſome Problems. A new edition has been publiſh'd at Paris of his works in French in fifteen volumes in 12mo, and contains as follows: *Lettres de M. Des Cartes, ou l'on a joint le Latin de pluſieurs Lettres, qui n'avoient été imprimées qu'en François, avec une Traduction Françoiſe de celles, qui n'avoient juſqu'à preſent paru qu'en Latin*, 1724, ſix volumes. *Les Meditations Metaphyſiques touchant la premiere Philoſophie*, 1724, two volumes. *Diſcours de la Methode, pour bien conduire ſa Raiſon, & chercher la Verité dans les Sciences. Plus la Dioptrique, les Meteores, la Mechanique, & la Muſique*, 1724, two volumes. *Les Principes de la Philoſophie*, 1724, one volume. *Les Paſſions de l'Ame. Le Monde, ou Traité de la Lumiere. Edition augmentée d'un Diſcours ſur le Mouvement local & ſur la Fievre, ſur les Principes du même Auteur*, 1728, one volume. *L'Homme de René Des Cartes, & la Formation du Fœtus; avec les remarques de Louïs de la Forge*, 1722, one volume.

(23) Niceron, pag. 304, 305, 306.

(24) Idem, pag. 307.

(25) Idem, pag. 307, 308.

[Y] *His Death.*] Upon his return from the Queen on the firſt of February, he found himſelf ſeized with the illneſs, which put an end to his life. The next day he was attacked by a continued fever with an inflammation in the lungs. Monſr. Chanut, the French Embaſſador, who had juſt recovered of the ſame kind of diſtemper, would have him treated in the ſame way with himſelf; but his brain being ſeized, he could not be prevailed upon to hear the advice of his friends, and obſtinately refuſed to be let blood, crying out, when it was mentioned to him, *Gentlemen, ſpare French blood*. However he agreed at laſt to it, but then it was too late (26). He deſired then that his Confeſſor Father Viögué, who was employed in the exerciſe of his miſſion ſome leagues from Stockholm, might be ſent for; and requeſted thoſe, who were preſent, not to diſcourſe with him any longer except about the mercy of God, and the reſignation, with which he ought to ſuffer the ſeparation of his ſoul. He remained very quiet the two laſt days, and departed peaceably in the arms of the Embaſſador and Father Viögué (27).

(26) Niceron, pag. 291, 292.

(27) Baillet, lib. 7.

[Z] *Several works have been written on occaſion of our Author and his Philoſophy.*] We ſhall mention ſome of the moſt conſiderable. *Petri Danielis Huetii Cenſura Philoſophiæ Carteſianæ*. Paris 1689, in 12mo. *Reponſe au Livre, qui a pour titre*, P. Danielis Huetii Cenſura Philoſophiæ Carteſianæ. *Par Pierre Silvain Regis*. Paris 1691 in 12mo. *Gerardi de Vries Prof. Philoſ. Ultraj. de Renati Carteſii Meditationibus à Petro Gaſſendo impugnatis Diſſertatiuncula Hiſtorico-Philoſophica*. Utrecht 1691 in 8vo. Mr. Baſnage de Bauval in his *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans* (28) tells us, that this Author thro' his whole Diſſertation ſhews in a very ingenious manner his averſion to Des Cartes. *Hiſtoire de la Conjuration faite à Stockholm contre M. Des Cartes*. Paris 1695 in 12mo. This pretended Hiſtory is a mere piece of raillery. The qualities, accidents, and ſubſtantial forms, which Des Cartes had rejected in his Philoſophy, are the formidable enemies, which conſpired againſt him. When they had come to a reſolution among themſelves, and he was ſolemnly declared an Innovator, and as ſuch ſentenced to be cut off from the Society of the Learned, Heat was commiſſioned to execute the ſentence, and acted with ſuch violence in the body of this Philoſopher, as to raiſe a fever in it attended with a delirium, which deſtroyed his health in a few days, in ſpite of all the knowledge, which he had obtained. *Danielis Lipſtorpii Specimina Philoſophiæ Carteſianæ*. Leyden 1653 in 4to. We find in this work a Life of Des Cartes compiled from theſe particulars, which the Author had learn'd from Mr. Schooten, and Dr. Raey, a Phyſician. There are a great many errors in it, but it contains ſeveral things very curious (29). *Renati Carteſii Vita a Petro Borello conſcripta*, publiſhed at the end of a Book of Borellus's intitled, *Hiſtoriarum & Obſervationum Medico-Phyſicarum Centuriæ IV. Caſtris* 1653 in 12mo. Paris 1656 in 8vo. Francfort 1670 and 1676 in 8vo and in p. 580 of the firſt volume of the *Memoriæ Philoſophorum Henningi Witten*. It appears that Borellus wrote this piece merely from what he learned of Monſr. de Ville-Breſſieux, who had lived ſome time with Des Cartes; ſo that he is only to be depended upon for ſome general facts. He has not very much troubled himſelf about particular circumſtances, which might ſerve to verify his facts; nor obſerved any order with regard either to time or the things themſelves; nor given this piece any elegance of ſtyle or regularity of method. In ſhort the manner, in which he has confounded every thing, is ſuch, that there is nothing more remarkable in this piece, than the Author's addreſs in throwing together ſo many faults in ſo ſhort a compaſs. It was tranſlated into Engliſh, and publiſh'd at London 1670 in 24mo, under the title of *a Summary or Compendium of the Life of the moſt famous Philoſopher* Renatus Des Cartes. *Written originally in Latin by* Peter Borellus *Phyſician to the French King. To which is alſo added an Epitome of his Life*

(28) Sept. 1691. Art. 3. pag. 27.

(29) Niceron, pag. 311, 312.

modeſty, diſintereſtedneſs, moderation, piety, and ſubmiſſion to the authority of the Church. We ſhall give his character from ſome other writers in the note [*AA*]. He imagined

Life by Marcus Zurius Boxhornius, *Hiſtoriographer at Leyden*. But to proceed to the other writings relating to our Author: *Joannis Tepellii Hiſtoriæ Philoſophiæ Carteſianæ*. Nuremberg 1674 in 12mo. This piece is divided into ſix chapters; the firſt of which relates to the Life of our Author. It is full of errors, and very ſuperficial. *Voyage du Monde de Des Cartes*. Paris 1691 in 12mo. This was written by Father Daniel the Jeſuit, and was tranſlated into Latin and Engliſh. *Nouvelles difficultes propoſées par un Peripateticien à l'Auteur du Voyage du Monde de Des Cartes, touchant la Connoiſſance des Bêtes. Avec la Refutation de deux Défenſes du Syſteme general de Des Cartes*. Paris 1693 in 12mo. This was likewiſe written by Father Daniel. *Recueil de quelques Pieces curieuſes concernant la Philoſophie de M. Des Cartes*. Amſterdam 1684 in 12mo. *Nouveaux Mémoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire du Carteſianiſme, par M. G. de l'A.* Utrecht 1693 in 12mo. This was written by Monſr. Huet, Biſhop of Avranches. *La Vie de M. Des Cartes*. Paris 1691 in 4to in two volumes. This was written by Monſr. Baillet (30), who publiſh'd an Abridgment of it at Paris 1693 in 12mo under the following title, *La Vie de M. Des Cartes reduite en abregé*.

(30) See the Article of BAILLET, pag. 587. vol. 2.

[*AA*] *We ſhall give his character from ſome other Writers in the Note.*] Dr. Barrow in his *Opuſcula* (31) tells us, that he was undoubtedly a very good and ingenious man, and a real Philoſopher, and one who ſeems to have brought thoſe aſſiſtances to that part of Philoſophy, which relates to Matter and Motion, which perhaps no other had done, that is, a great ſkill in Mathematics, a mind habituated both by nature and cuſtom to profound meditation, a judgment exempt from all prejudices and popular errors, and furniſhed with a conſiderable number of certain and ſelect experiments, a great deal of leiſure, entirely diſengaged by his own choice from the reading of uſeleſs Books, and the Avocations of Life, with an incomparable acuteneſs of wit, and an excellent talent of thinking clearly and diſtinctly, and expreſſing his thoughts with the utmoſt perſpicuity. Samuel Mareſius likewiſe in his *Theolog. Elenchtic. Nov. Synops.* (32), Alexander Morus in his Preface to Euſebius's *Chronicon*, Morhof in his *Polyhiſtor* (33), Bullart in his *Academie des Sciences*, and other Writers ſpeak of him with great commendation. The great Dr. Edmund Halley in a *Paper concerning Optics* communicated to Mr. Wotton, and publiſhed by the latter in his *Reflections upon antient and modern learning* (34), writes as follows: *As to* Dioptrics, *tho' ſome of the ancients mention* Refraction, *as a natural effect of tranſparent Media; yet Des Cartes was the firſt, who in this Age has diſcovered the laws of* Refraction, *and brought* Dioptrics *to a Science.* M. Wotton, in the Book juſt mentioned, tells us (35), that "our Author, "who came ſoon after the Lord Bacon, did not perfectly tread in his ſteps, ſince he was for doing too "great a part of his work in his cloſet; concluding "too ſoon before he had made experiments enough; "but to a vaſt genius he joined an exquiſite ſkill in "Geometry, ſo that he wrought upon intelligible prin"ciples in an intelligible manner, tho' he very often "failed of one part of his end, namely a right expli"cation of the Phænomena of Nature; yet by mar"rying Geometry and Phyſics together, he put the "world in hopes of a maſculine off-ſpring in proceſs "of time, tho' the firſt productions ſhould prove abor"tive." This paſſage was animadverted upon by Mr. John Keil in the *Introduction* to his *Examination of Dr. Burnet's* Theory of the Earth, and vindicated by Mr. Wotton in his *Defence of the Reflections upon antient and modern learning* (36). The learned and ingenious Mr. Thomas Baker in his *Reflections upon Learning; wherein is ſhewn the Inſufficiency thereof in its ſeveral particulars, in order to evince the Uſefulneſs and Neceſſity of Revelation remarks* (37), that the Carteſians have been obſerved to be no friends to Logic, and that their maſter has left nothing extant upon that ſubject, except ſome ſcattered expreſſions; unleſs a Treatiſe of *Method* muſt be interpreted a Logic, which notwithſtanding is more properly metaphyſical. "One "of his firſt principles of reaſoning, after he had "doubted of every thing, ſeems to be too circular to "be ſafely built upon; for he is for proving the Being "of a God from the Truth of our Faculties, and the "Truth of our Faculties from the Being of a God. "He had better have ſuppoſed our Faculties to be "true; for they being the inſtruments, that we make "uſe of in all our proofs and deductions, unleſs we "ſuppoſe them to be true, we are at a ſtand, and can "go no farther in our proofs. So that the way of "ſuppoſing ſeems to be more rational than that of "doubting." The ſame Author likewiſe in his ſeventh Chapter (38) conſiders the Natural Philoſophy of Des Cartes, and obſerves, that among all the antient opinions none have been revived with more general approbation, than thoſe of Democritus and Epicurus, the Founders of the Atomical or Corpuſcular Philoſophy; an ill omen to Religion, when they who have explicated the Production of the World by the laws of Mechaniſm without a God, have been ſo generally followed. *In this*, ſays Mr. Baker, *Mr. Des Cartes has been too ſucceſsful, whom tho' it would be very unjuſt to charge with a denial of a God, whom he ſuppoſeth to have created matter, and to have impreſſed the firſt motion upon it; yet in this he is blameable, that after the firſt motion is impreſſed, and the wheels ſet a going, he leaves his vaſt machine to the laws of Mechaniſm, and ſuppoſeth that all things may be thereby produced without any further extraordinary aſſiſtance from the firſt Impreſſor. The ſuppoſition is impious, and as he ſtates it, deſtructive of itſelf, for not to deny him his laws of motion, moſt of which have been evidently ſhewn to be falſe, and conſequently ſo muſt all be, that is built upon them, his Notion of Matter is inconſiſtent with any motion at all; for as ſpace and matter are with him the ſame, upon this ſuppoſition there can be no motion in a* Plenum. This Mr. Baker ſhews by obſerving, that motion is only the ſucceſſion of bodies from one place to another: but how ſhould they ſucceed from one place, if there be no room to ſucceed them in the next, which there cannot be, if all be full? And the difficulty is ſtill greater upon the firſt framing of things, before the ſubtile matter is produced, that was to ſuit itſelf to all the ſolid interſtices, betwixt the larger ſolid bodies, which muſt needs clog and interfere with one another, unleſs we allow ſome fluid matter, that will yield and give way to the other's motions. Mr. Des Cartes imagines he anſwers all this by a ſucceſſion of bodies in a circular motion: "but I think, *ſays* "*Mr. Baker*, this motion carries its own confutation "with it, and that nothing can be ſuppoſed more ab"ſurd than to imagine, that upon the motion of every "little atom, the whole frame of things muſt be diſ"turbed and ſet a going. Motion is one of Mr. Des "Cartes's darling principles, and by this and matter, "he pretends to ſolve the greateſt difficulties that are "in nature. And it is very remarkable, that he has "not failed more in any of his notions, than in theſe "two great fundamentals of his Philoſophy; for al"lowing him theſe, his other explications hang toge"ther ſomewhat better." *But this it is to frame* Hypotheſes *out of one's own imagination without conſulting nature, which Mr. Des Cartes has not done, for it was equal to him what* Hypotheſis *he went upon, and Father Merſennus (f) told him that a* Vacuum *was as much in faſhion, and as agreeable to the taſte of the Age, as a* Plenum *then ſeemed to be, we ſhould have had an* Hypotheſis *grounded upon a* Vacuum, *and no doubt as ſpecious and plauſible, as that we now have, perhaps more plauſible, being more conſonant to his own ſenſe, as having been his firſt deſign, and the other only hammer'd out by the direction of his confident Merſennus. And it is a wonderful thing, that men ſhould run mad after ſuch an* Hypotheſis, *which, as it has not the leaſt ground in nature, ſo the Author himſelf never believed it. It has been anſwered and effectually confuted in all its branches, by ſeveral hands, but by none better than the Author of* A Voyage to the World of Des Cartes, *which tho' not always concluſive, is every where ingenious, and confutes him in his own way, for one romance is beſt anſwered by another.* Mr. Leibnitz tells us (40) that he had an infinite regard for our Author, who was a very learned man, and had read more than his followers imagine; and that he was one of thoſe, who had added moſt to the

(31) Pag. 156.

(32) Tom. 2. Controverſ. 21.

(33) Pag. 297.

(34) Cap. 24. pag. 601, & ſeqq. 3d edit. London 1705, in 8vo.

(35) Cap. 27. pag. 348.

(36) Pag. 3, 4, 5, 6. edit. London 1705, in 8vo.

(37) Cap. 5. pag. 73. 4th edit. London 1708.

(38) Pag. 97, & ſeqq.

(f) *Vide* Rapin, *Reflex.* pag. 423.

(40) *Miſcellanea Leibnitiana*, pag. 350. edit. Lipſiæ 1718, in 12mo.

imagined it to be poſſible to prolong life very conſiderably beyond the common period, and thought he had diſcovered the method [*BB*]. He was never married, but had one

the diſcoveries of their predeceſſors; but that thoſe, who reſt entirely in him, are much miſtaken in their conduct. This he obſerves, is true even with regard to Geometry itſelf; in which Des Cartes, as great a Geometrician as he was, did not proceed ſo far as ſome perſons ſuppoſe; ſince his Geometry is confined. Mr. Leibnitz has given ſome inſtances of this in the *Acta Eruditorum* of Leipſic. The ſame writer likewiſe remarks (41), that Des Cartes endeavoured to correct ſome errors with regard to Natural Philoſophy, but that his preſumption and contemptuous manner of writing, together with the obſcurity of his ſtyle, and his confuſion, and ſevere treatment of others, are very diſagreeable. *Carteſius voluit emendare quædam in Phyſicis; diſplicet tamen audacia & faſtus nimius, conjunctus cum ſtyli obſcuritate, confuſione, maledicentiâ.* He informs us (42), that Des Cartes's demonſtration of the exiſtence of God was made uſe of by St. Anſelm Archbiſhop of Canterbury in his Book *contra Inſipientem*, and by St. Thomas Aquinas, and other Scholaſtic Writers. And obſerves (43), that our Author wanted to have it thought, that he had never made uſe of Books, but that all his knowledge was owing to himſelf; whereas it is certain, that he had read a great number of books, and ſtudied Logic under the Jeſuits at Flêche; and that he was well verſed in the Scholaſtic Philoſophy, which has much excellent matter in it, tho' intermixed with much droſs. Mr. John Keil, in the *Introduction* (44) to his *Examination of Dr.* Burnet's Theory of the Earth, tells us, that our Author has encouraged ſo very much the preſumptuous pride in the modern Philoſophers, that they think they underſtand all the works of nature, and are able to give a good account of them, "whereas neither he, nor any of his followers have "given us a right explication of any one thing. So "ridiculous are the things he has delivered in his "principles of Philoſophy, that it is a wonder how "they ſhould be believed by any; but it is ſtill a "greater wonder how they came to be ſo much ap"plauded and received among the learned, as they "were." Mr. Keil then ſets down ſome of the *ſtrange ſchemes and unaccountable fancies* of our Philoſopher; and obſerves (45), that notwithſtanding thoſe and many other of his abſurd notions he had a ſtrong party of the Philoſophers on his ſide, and great was the outcry againſt Ariſtotle for his tyrannical uſurpation of the liberty and property of the Philoſophers to think and ſay what they had a mind, *tho' what they ſaid was much more abſurd than* Ariſtotle's Ἐντελέχια, *or the ſchoolmen's* ſubſtantial Forms, *which muſt give way to Monſr.* Des Cartes's *ingenious hypotheſis, who, as his followers pretended, could ſolve all the Phænomena in nature by his principles of matter and motion, without the help of attraction or occult qualities. He was the firſt world-maker this Century produced; for he ſuppoſes God at the beginning created only a certain quantity of matter and motion; and from thence he endeavours to ſhew how by the neceſſary laws of Mechaniſm, without any extraordinary concurrence of the Divine Power the world and all that therein is might have been produced. Nay he was ſo bold, that he pretended he could ſolve that inſuperable problem, viz. having a quantity of matter and motion to produce any animal. But with what confidence could he pretend to ſolve ſo intricate a problem, who blundered ſo much in the eaſieſt and moſt abſtracted things in nature (for ſuch are the laws of motion) that of the ſeven rules he has given us about motion, there is but one of them true?* He afterwards (46) tells us, in anſwer to a paſſage in Mr. Wotton's *Reflections and ancient and modern learning*, that Des Cartes was ſo far from applying Geometry and obſervations to Natural Philoſophy, that his whole ſyſtem is but one continued blunder upon the account of his negligence in that point; which he could eaſily prove by ſhewing, that his theory of the *Vortices*, upon which Des Cartes's ſyſtem is grounded, is abſolutely falſe; and that Sir Iſaac Newton has ſhewn, that the periodical times of all bodies, which ſwim in *Vortex*, muſt be directly as the ſquares of their diſtances from the center of the *Vortex*. But it is evident from obſervations, that the planets in turning round the ſun, obſerve quite another ſort of law than this; for the ſquares of their periodical times are always as the cubes of their diſtances; and therefore ſince they do not obſerve that law, which of neceſſity they muſt, if they ſwim in a *Vortex*, it is a demonſtration, that there are no *Vortices*, in which the planets are carried round the ſun. Beſides if the earth were carried in a Vortex, it muſt neceſſarily move faſter, when it is in the beginning of *Virgo*, where the fluid is in a narrow ſpace, (and by conſequence moves ſo much the ſwifter) than it would do when it is in the beginning of *Piſces*, and that in the proportion as three to two, which is directly againſt experience and obſervation. It is impoſſible therefore, upon this and a great many other accounts, which Sir Iſaac Newton has ſhewn in his *Principia*, that the earth and the other planets can move in a *Vortex*. So that the notion of a Vortex being ruined, as Dr. Keil obſerves (47), "the whole *Carteſian* ſyſtem muſt of neceſſity fall to the "ground; and that world whoſe origination he pretend"ed to have deduc'd from mechanical principles, muſt be "a wild chimera of his own imagination." Mr. de Voltaire in his *Letter* on *Des Cartes* and Sir *Iſaac Newton* (48) obſerves, that *nature had favoured the former with a ſhining and ſtrong imagination, whence he became a very ſingular perſon both in private life, and in his manner of reaſoning. This imagination could not conceal itſelf even in his Philoſophical works, which are every where adorned with very ſhining, ingenious metaphors. Nature had almoſt made him a Poet; and indeed he wrote a piece of Poetry for the entertainment of Chriſtina Queen of Sweden, which however was ſuppreſſed in honour to his memory.* He remarks likewiſe, that he extended the limits of Geometry as far beyond the place where he found them, as Sir Iſaac did after him; and taught firſt the method of expreſſing curves by equations; that he applied this geometrical and inventive genius to Dioptrics, which, when treated by him, became a new art; and that if he was miſtaken in ſome things, the reaſon is, that a man who diſcovers a new tract of land, cannot at once know all the properties of the ſoil. Thoſe who come after him, and make theſe lands fruitful, are at leaſt obliged to him for the diſcovery. Mr. de Voltaire acknowledges, that there are innumerable errors in the reſt of Des Cartes's works; and tells us, that Geometry was a guide which he himſelf had in ſome meaſure formed, and which would have ſafely conducted him thro' the ſeveral paths of Natural Philoſophy; yet at laſt he abandoned this guide, and gave entirely into the humour of framing Hypotheſes; and then Philoſophy was no more than an ingenious romance fit only to amuſe the ignorant. "He was miſtaken in the na"ture of the ſoul, in the proofs of the exiſtence of a "God, in matter, in the laws of motion, and in "the nature of light. He admitted innate ideas; he "invented new elements; he created a world; he made "man according to his own fancy; and it is juſtly ſaid, "that the man of Des Cartes is in fact that of Des "Cartes only, very different from the real one. He "puſhed his metaphyſical errors ſo far, as to declare "that two and two make four, for no other reaſon "but becauſe God would have it ſo. However it will "not be making him too great a compliment if we "affirm that he was valuable even in his miſtakes. "He deceived himſelf, but then it was at leaſt in a "methodical way. He deſtroyed all the abſurd chi"mæra's, with which youth had been infatuated for "two thouſand years. He taught his contemporaries "how to reaſon, and enabled them to employ his "own weapons againſt himſelf. If Des Cartes did "not pay in good money, he however did great ſer"vice in crying down that of a baſe alloy."

[*BB*] *He imagined it to be poſſible to prolong life very conſiderably beyond the common period, and thought that he had diſcovered the method.*] Mr. Des Maizeaux in his *Life of Monſr.* de St. Evremond, prefixed to the firſt volume of that Author's works, printed in Engliſh at London 1728 in 3 Volumes, tells us (49), that Sir Kenelm Digby informed Monſr. de St. Evremond, that having read the writings of Des Cartes, he reſolved to go to Holland to ſee him; and found him in his retirement at Egmond. After having diſcourſed with him a long time without making himſelf known, Monſr.

(41) Idem, pag. 181.

(42) Ibid. pag. 63, and 75.

(43) Ibid. pag. 234.

(44) Pag. 10. 2d edit. London 1734, in 8vo.

(45) Pag. 11, 12.

(46) Pag. 13.

(47) Pag. 14, 15.

(48) *Letters concerning the Engliſh Nation*, Letter 14.

(49) Pag. 42.

one natural daughter, whoſe name was Francina [*CC*], and who died when ſhe was but five years of age. Father Rapin (*n*) having obſerved, that Des Cartes's principles of Motion, Figure, and Extenſion, are almoſt the very ſame with thoſe of Democritus and Epicurus, tells us, that Father Merſenne, who was his Reſident at Paris, having mentioned one day in an aſſembly of learned men, that Des Cartes, who gained a great reputation by his Geometry, was drawing a Syſtem of Natural Philoſophy, in which he admitted a *Vacuum*, that notion was ridiculed by Roberval and ſome others; upon which Merſenne wrote to him, that a *Vacuum* was not then in faſhion at Paris (*o*), which obliged Des Cartes to change his ſcheme, in complaiſance to the Natural Philoſophers, whom he ſtudied to pleaſe, and admit the *Plenum* of Leucippus; "ſo that, ſays Father Rapin, the excluſion of a *Vacuum* became one of his principles, merely out of "political conſiderations (*p*)." Rapin mentions no authority for this ſtory; and the reader will obſerve, that he was a very zealous Ariſtotelian, extremely prejudiced againſt any new Syſtems of Philoſophy. Des Cartes is ſaid to have been extremely obliged to Mr. Thomas Harriot's *Artis Analyticæ Praxis* for many of his improvements in Algebra and Geometry [*DD*].

(*n*) *Reflexions de Phyſique, Reflex.* x. *Oeuvres*, tom. 2. pag. 423, 424. edit. Amſterdam 1709.

(*o*) *A la mode a Paris.*

(*p*) *Par politique.*

CARTHAGENA

Monſr. Des Cartes, who had ſeen ſome of his works, told him, that he did not doubt but he was the famous Sir Kenelm Digby. *And if you, Sir*, replied the Knight, *were not the illuſtrious M.* Des Cartes, *I ſhould not have come over from England on purpoſe to ſee you.* Then Sir Kenelm ſaid to the Philoſopher, "That our ſpeculative diſcoveries were indeed pretty and agreeable, "but that after all they were too uncertain and unprofitable to take up a man's whole thoughts; that life "was almoſt too ſhort to attain to the right knowledge of neceſſary things; and that it would be much "more worthy of him, who ſo well underſtood the "frame of the human body, to ſtudy ways and means "to prolong it, than to apply himſelf to the bare "ſpeculations of Philoſophy." Des Cartes aſſured him, that *he had already conſidered that matter, and that to render a man immortal, was what he would not venture to promiſe; but that he was very ſure it was poſſible to lengthen out his life to the period of the Patriarchs.* When Monſr. de St. Evremond told Mr. Des Maizeaux this particular, he added, that they were not ignorant in Holland, that Des Cartes flattered himſelf he had made this diſcovery, and that he had heard ſeveral perſons talk of it, who had known that Philoſopher; that Des Cartes's friends in France alſo knew it; and that Abbot Picot, his diſciple and martyr, being perſuaded that he had found out this great ſecret, would not believe the news of his death, and that when he was aſhamed to doubt of it any longer, he cried out, *'Tis done and over; the world will ſoon be at an end!* It is certain, as Mr. Des Maizeaux obſerves (50), that Des Cartes thought he had found out a way to prolong the life of man. *I never took ſo much care*, ſaid he to Mr. *de Zuylichem*, who aſked him what he was employed about; *I never took ſo much care to preſerve my life as now; and whereas I thought death could abridge me of but* THIRTY *or* FORTY years *at moſt, it cannot ſurprize me now, without depriving me of the hope of* ABOVE AN HUNDRED YEARS (51). *For it ſeems evident to me, that if we only guarded againſt certain errors, that we are uſed to commit in our courſe of diet, we might without any other invention attain to an old age much longer and more happy than now we do. But becauſe I have need of a great deal of time and experience to examine every thing proper to this ſubject, I am now compoſing* a ſhort ſyſtem of Medicines, which *I hope while I am engaged in this work to obtain ſome reſpite from nature, and conſequently to be able to proſecute my deſign better hereafter* (52). Monſr. Baillet tells us in his life of Des Cartes (53), that the Abbot Picot having accompanied him to Holland in 1647, conformed to his courſe of diet during the three months, which he ſtayed with him at Egmond, and that he was ſo pleaſed with it, that at his return to France he ſeriouſly renounced that good eating and drinking, which before he liked well enough, and was reſolved to reduce himſelf to the rules of M. Des Cartes, thinking it would be the only way to promote the ſucceſs of the ſecret, which he pretended was found out by our Philoſopher, in order to make men live four or five hundred years. And the ſame writer tells us in another place (34), that this Abbot was ſo fully perſuaded, that Des Cartes could not be miſtaken in his notions on this point, that he would have ſworn it would have been impoſſible for him to die as he did at the age of fifty four; and that had it not been for ſome unaccountable violent cauſe (like that which put his machine in Sweden out of order) he would have lived five hundred years, after having found the art to live out ſeveral ages.

(50) Pag. 42.

(51) Des Cartes wrote this from Egmond in 1638, at the age of forty two years. He died twelve years after.

(52) *Lettres de M. Des Cartes*, tom. 2. pag. 374.

(53) Tom. 2. pag. 448.

(54) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 452, 453.

[*CC*] *Had one natural daughter, whoſe name was Francina.*] She was born at Deventer July the 19th 1635, and died at Amersford September the 7th 1640 (55). He publickly owned her for his daughter, tho' it is not known who her mother was, he not being married to her. He lamented his daughter's death in ſuch a manner as ſhewed that true Philoſophy cannot ſtifle natural affection. The ſorrow, which overwhelmed him for this loſs, would incline us to believe, that ſhe was his only child. But his enemies have not ſcrupled to father more upon him. This charge, tho' ſupported by the authority and writings of a grave Miniſter at Utrecht, he only treated with contempt, and anſwered, that not having made a vow of chaſtity, and not being exempt from human frailties, he ſhould make no ſcruple at all to own them before the world, if he had any; but tho' he had none, yet he conſented not to paſs for a great Saint with a Miniſter, who had no good opinion of the gift of continence in the Prieſts of the Romiſh Church, who live in celibacy. He ſoon repaired the breach, which was made in the regularity of his life, with which he honoured his ſolitude and the profeſſion of his Philoſophy, and reſtored his celibacy to its former perfection, even before he had gained the name of father. And in ſhort the public had never come to the knowledge of this humbling circumſtance of his life, if he had not made an open confeſſion of it himſelf by writing the hiſtory of his dear Francina in the firſt leaf of a book, which was ſeen by many perſons (56).

(55) Niceron, pag. 288.

(56) Baillet, *ubi ſupra*, lib. 5. *See likewiſe* Monſ. de Voltaire's *Letters concerning the Engliſh Nation*, Letter 14.

[*DD*] *Des Cartes is ſaid to have been greatly obliged to Mr. Thomas Harriot's* Artis Analyticæ Praxis, *for many of his improvements in Algebra and Geometry.*] This Treatiſe of Mr. Harriot was publiſhed after his death, which happened July 2d 1621 (57), by Mr. Walter Warner in 1631 at London in a thin folio, under the following title, *Artis Analyticæ Praxis ad æquationes Algebraicas novâ, expeditâ, & generali methodo, reſolvendas, tractatus poſthumus &c.* Dr. John Wallis in his *Treatiſe of Algebra both Hiſtorical and Practical* (58) has given a very particular account of this work, and tells us in his *Preface*, that Mr. Harriot in that Book *hath taught (in a manner) all that, which hath ſince paſſed for the Carteſian Method of Algebra, there being ſcarce any thing of (pure) Algebra in Des Cartes, which was not before in Harriot, from whom Des Cartes ſeems to have taken what he hath (that is purely Algebra,) but without naming him. But the application thereof to Geometry or other particular ſubjects, (which Des Cartes purſues) is not the buſineſs of that Treatiſe of Harriot.* In another place (59) likewiſe he obſerves, that "Harriot hath made very many advantageous "improvements in this art, and hath laid the foundations, on which Des Cartes (though without naming "him) hath built the greateſt part (if not the whole) "of his Algebra or Geometry, without which that "whole ſuperſtructure of Des Cartes (I doubt) had "never been." In ſeveral of the following Chapters he remarks what Des Cartes appears to have borrowed from Harriot, and in his LIIId Chapter (60) he expreſſes

(57) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 461. 2d edit. London 1721.

(58) Printed at London 1685, in fol.

(59) Cap. 30. pag. 126.

(60) Pag. 198.

CARTHAGENA (JOHN) was firſt a Jeſuit, and afterwards a Franciſcan. He was born in Spain, and was a Profeſſor in Salamanca; but he afterwards went to Rome, and there taught Divinity with applauſe, under the Pontificate of Paul V. He died at Naples in 1617 (*a*). No man was ever more devoted to the intereſt of the Court of Rome than Carthagena, or ever exaggerated more the rights of the Popes. This appears by the works he publiſhed, on the Diſputes between Paul V and the Republick of Venice [*A*]. Theſe furniſhed the French with materials to defend themſelves againſt the malicious complaints of the Spaniards [*B*]. Carthagena alſo advanced certain extravagant ſuppoſitions, with regard to the grace of God indulged to ſome Saints [*C*]. I ſhall

(*a*) *See* Nicholas Antonio, *Bibliotb. Hiſpan.* tom. 1. pag. 511, 512.

preſſes himſelf thus: *But pure Algebra, as it ſimply conſiders the computation and management of proportion (abſtract from the conſideration of any particular ſubject,) none before him* (61) *had ſo accurately deliver'd by a genuine deduction from its true principles. And what Des Cartes (who hath borrowed his Algebra from him, and others ſince him) have added to it, are built upon thoſe foundations, which he had laid.* Dr. Wallis then relates the following ſtory, which Dr. John Pell, who had not long before told it to him, had from Sir Charles Cavendiſh, only brother to William then Earl, and afterwards Duke of Newcaſtle, a perſon of honour, well ſkilled in the Mathematics, who about that time lived at Paris. He diſcourſing there with Monſr. Roberval concerning that piece of Des Cartes, then lately publiſh'd, *I admire*, ſaith Roberval, *that notion in Des Cartes of putting over the whole equation to one ſide, making it equal to nothing; and how he lighted upon it.* "The reaſon why you admire it, *ſaith* "*Sir Charles*, is becauſe you are a Frenchman; for if "you were an Engliſhman, you would not admire it." *Why ſo?* ſaith Monſr. Roberval. "Becauſe, *ſaith* "*Sir Charles*, we in England know where he had it, "namely from *Harriot's Algebra*." *What Book is that?* ſaith Monſr. Roberval, *I never ſaw it.* "Next "time you come to my chambers, *ſaith Sir Charles*, "I will ſhew it you." Which a while after he did, and upon peruſal of it Monſr. Roberval exclaimed with admiration, *Il l'a veu! Il l'a veu!* i. e. "He "had ſeen it! he had ſeen it!" finding all that in Harriot, which he had before admired in Des Cartes, and not doubting but that Des Cartes had it from thence. In confirmation of what Dr. Wallis has aſſerted upon this point, we may obſerve, that Des Cartes came over to England about the very year 1631 (62), in which Harriot's Book was publiſhed; and therefore it is improbable, that it could eſcape the knowledge of a perſon ſo deeply engag'd in mathematical enquiries as our Author. To this we ſhall add a paſſage out of a Letter of Monſr. Carcavi to our Author, dated at Paris September 24th 1649 (63). "Monſ. Roberval "aſſures me, what I would not mention to you, but that "it concerns your intereſt to know it, that he could "reproach you with what an anonymous Author, "who wrote a ſmall Tract in Algebra (ſome believe "him to be a Jeſuit) objects to you, that in the formation of equations you only copy what was publiſh'd in the year 1631 by an Engliſhman, whoſe "name was Hariot, and who is very little known to "us here, at leaſt to me." T.

(61) Mr. Harriot.

(62) *See* Baillet, *ubi ſupra*, lib. 3. *and* Niceron, pag. 285.

(63) *Lettres de Monſieur Des Cartes*, Lett. lxxviii. tom. 3. pag. 457. edit. Paris 1667, 4to.

[*A*] *He publiſhed Works on the Diſputes between Paul V and the Republic of Venice.*] Here follow the titles of them, *Pro eccleſiaſtica libertate & poteſtate tuenda adverſus injuſtas Venetorum leges*, printed at Rome 1607 in 4to. *Propugnaculum Catholicum de jure Belli Romani Pontificis adverſus Eccleſiæ jura violantes.* Printed at Rome 1609 in 8vo.

[*B*] *Theſe furniſhed the French with materials, to defend themſelves againſt the malicious complaints of the Spaniards.*] They were eternally complaining of the alliances which the French concluded with Proteſtant Powers. They amplified very much, and employed hyperboles to diſcredit expreſly the league, which had been concluded in favour of the Elector Palatine, of which (ſaid theſe people) the King of England is the Head; and thereupon, they threw out ſuch floods of injurious expreſſions againſt this Monarch, that *they were juſt upon the point of diſplaying all that infamous Satyr, which they formerly printed againſt him*, under the title of *Corona Regia* (1). To this, among other things, Father Carthegena was objected (2), tho, *in Rome, a Spaniſh Monk, writing to the Pope, in favour of the Pope, and by his command, employs a whole chapter to prove* *, "that the Pope may, with a ſafe con- "ſcience, and whenever he thinks proper, call infidel "ſoldiers to his aſſiſtance, to oppoſe all ſuch as ſhall "violate the liberties of the Church." The ſame Monk was produced (3) writing *a Book purpoſely* (4) *to prove, that it is lawful to make war againſt Catholicks, if it ſhould be neceſſary*; and concluding with theſe words, "It does not belong to the ſubjects of a "King, to examine whether the cauſes of a war are "juſt." This other maxim of the ſame Monk was cited on this occaſion (5). *The Eccleſiaſticks are obliged, by a divine as well as human right, to maim and put to death the enemies of the Church, for the defence of the State, without being guilty thereby of any irregularity: and they may take and poſſeſs the eſtates of the enemies, with as much reaſon as ſecular ſoldiers.* But the writers on both ſides, the Spaniards with their complaints againſt the French Leagues, and the French with their apologies, had little thought of futurity; and did not know that, before the end of the Century, the proofs would be changed into objections on both ſides. Now both parties may ſay,

(1) Ferrier, *Catholique d'Etat.* p. 151. in the *Collection of Hiſtorical Pieces*, publiſhed anno 1643.
(2) Idem, ibid. pag. 138.

* *Propugnac. Catholic. de Jure Belli Romani Pontificis*, lib. 3. cap. 1.
(3) Ferrier, *Catholique d'Etat*, pag. 95.
(4) It is the *Propugnaculum Catholicum.*
(5) Ferrier, *Catholique d'Etat*, pag. 87.

Mutemus clypeos, Danaûmque inſignia nobis
Aptemus (6).
That is,
"Then change we ſhields, and their devices bear."
Dryden.

(6) Virgil. Æn. lib. 2. ver. 389.

Whilſt a ſpectator, who is not attached by either party, will make the following reflection:

Neſcia mens hominum fati ſortiſque futuræ (7).
That is,
"O mortals! blind in fate."

(7) Idem, ibid. lib. 10. ver. 501.

[*C*] *Carthagena . . advanced ſome extravagant ſuppoſitions, with regard to the Grace of God indulged to ſome Saints.*] He pretended that St. Joſeph, and many more, were juſtified before they were born. Claudius Dauſqueius or Dauſquius, Canon of Tournay, wrote againſt this wild notion; and declared, among other particulars, that Carthagena wreſted, in a very raſh manner, the ſenſe of the Scriptures. *Palam in oculis Eccleſiæ Romanæ præcipiti temeritate in ſacras literas involavit, eaſque obtorto collo in affectatæ novitatis patrocinium interpretando contra Concilii Tridentini edicta depravavit* (8). i. e. "He publickly, in preſence of "the Church of Rome, ſeized with raſh hands the "ſacred writings; and interpreting them contrary to "the Decrees of the Council of Trent, corrupted and "wreſted them to patronize the novel tenets he affected to advance." A Flemiſh Franciſcan took pet at this, and publiſhed a book againſt this Canon; who made a reply in as furious terms as his adverſary. This doctrine of Carthagena is ſeen in his *Homiliæ ſacræ, cum Catholicæ tum Morales de Religionis Chriſtianæ arcanis.* If the judgment of Dauſquius on this work may be relied on, it conſiſts of a mere rhapſody of words, diſplayed in high flown words (9). *Iſta incurioſa curioſitate victus Carthagena volumina iſta, quibus orbis cymbalum audire meruit (an etiam voluit) inſcribit* De Religionis Chriſtianæ Arcanis. *Quia ſcilicet arcano quodcunque Moſes volumine clauſit, & de* Arcanis Catholicæ Veritatis *quæcunque Galatinus compilavit veritate, diligentia, immanitate ſuperavit Carthagena* (10). i. e. "Carthagena vanquiſhed by that incurious curio- "ſity, entitled thoſe Books, by which he merited (nay "deſired) to be called the *Drum of the World, de Reli-* "*gionis Chriſtianæ Arcanis*, (of the Myſteries of the Chriſtian

(8) See the Treatiſe of *Dauſquius, S. Joſephi Sanctificatio extra uterum*, pag. 82.

(9) *In illa voluminum Carthagenæ immanitate verboſiſſima (cui loquacitate cedit unicus ſcriptor ab omni ævo) Cenſores &c.* Dauſquius, *in* S. Joſephi Sanct. extra uterum, pag. 109.
(10) Ibid. pag. 116.

I ſhall give ſome ſpecimens of his manner of thinking in the laſt remark.

" Chriſtian Religion). For Carthagena exceeded in a " monſtrous extravagancy, whatever Moſes included " in his volume of Myſteries; or what Galatinus had " compiled with fidelity and care, in his work on the " Secrets and Myſteries of the Catholic Truth." There is a treatiſe in the volumes in queſtion, entitled, *Arcana Deiparæ, ac Joſephi Myſteria*, i. e. " The Se- " crets of the Virgin Mary, and the Myſteries of Jo- " ſeph." The Author gives us therein a relation that is equally rude and impertinent (11); viz. that St. Joſeph may be rank'd among the Martyrs, becauſe the jealouſy, which tortur'd his ſoul, when he took notice, from time to time, of his wife's increaſing pregnancy, was an inſupportable torment. *Cum ergo B. Joſeph immani zelotypiæ dolore angeretur, neque levamen hoc quod ei adſumere licebat, quæritaret, Evangeliſta dicente, cum eſſet juſtus, noluit eam traducere, conſequens eſt cor ejus graviſſimo doloris vulnere fuiſſe exulceratum. . . Profecto hujuſmodi perplexitas & pluſquam civile bellum inter ſenſum & rationem, non poterat non immaniter viſcera Joſephi diſrumpere & excarnificare . . cogitatio illa non potuit non eſſe illi grave martyrii genus* (12). He corroborates his thought by the authority of Solomon. *Cum zelotypicus amor ſit, ut ait Solomon, dura ſicut infernus æmulatio, non poteras non vehementer & abſque ulla interruptione Joſephi cor tranſverſari, ſicut & infernus ſummopere torquet, & nec per momentum excruciare ceſſat* (13). i. e. " Since the paſſion " of jealouſy, as Solomon obſerves, is grievous as hell, " it was impoſſible but Joſeph's heart muſt be vio- " lently and inceſſantly transfixed; as hell tortures to " an exceſſive degree, and is every moment torturing." How are our myſteries expoſed by ſuch aſſertions, and what a door is opened to profane raillery, when writers preſume to make ſuch martyrdoms as theſe! The Canon of Tournay had great reaſon to inveigh againſt ſuch wild fancies, and give them the name of Blaſphemies. *Senſus virgineum uterum intumeſcentem videns adulteram judicabat.* Theſe are Carthagena's words, and here follow thoſe of the Canon (14). *Joſephus Chryſoſtomi teſtificatione cavebat vel minimam Virgini afferre moleſtiam, & tu dicis* Joſephum eam adulteram judicaſſe. *Impiè. Ac ſi dicat*, Manifeſtaque crimina pleno Fert utero. i. e. " Joſeph, accord- " ing to the teſtimony of St. Chryſoſtom, was care- " ful not to give the Virgin the leaſt uneaſineſs; and " you ſay, that Joſeph *imagined her to be an adul- " tereſs*. How impious is this! as tho' he ſhould ſay, " *Her ſwelling womb ſhews her guilt evidently*."

(11) Dauſquius, ibid. pag. 119. calls it *Blaſphemia propudioſa*, i. e. " A filthy " Blaſphemy."

(12) Tom. 2. lib. 4. Homil. 3. pag. 123. num. *cæterum, apud* Dauſquium, ibid.

(14) Ibid. pag. 122.

(15) *Apud* Dauſquium, pag. 121.

A Profeſſor of Louvain reap'd very little benefit from theſe judicious reflections made by the Canon of Tournay. " He one day roſe to the higheſt ex- " ceſſes of impiety and impudence united; for, ex- " plaining St. Joſeph's uneaſineſs; and attempting to " give a reaſon, why he had thoughts of abandoning " the bleſſed Virgin, he ſaid, that it was becauſe this " great Saint was afraid to paſs for a C . . . *timebat* " *vocari C . . .*; modeſty will not allow me to write, " what this man was not aſhamed of ſpeaking before " a numerous auditory." Theſe are the very words I have extracted from a book printed at Colen, in 1685, entitled *the Hiſtory of the Intruſion of the Sieur du Bois, into the Scripture-Profeſſor's Chair, in the Univerſity of Louvain; and the manner of his exerciſing that employment, with reflections on the cauſes of the credit and reputation he enjoys.*

☞CASAUBON (ISAAC), a learned writer in the beginning of the ſeventeenth Century, was born at Geneva February the 18th 1559 [*A*]. His father's name was Arnold Caſaubon, and his mother's Jane Roſſeau, who both retired to Geneva on account of the perſecution for Religion. Our Author was educated at Creſt, a ſmall town in Dauphiné, whither his father was invited to be Miniſter, after the perſecution ceaſed (*a*). He ſtudied under the direction of his father till he was nineteen years of age [*B*]; when he was ſent to Geneva to continue his ſtudies (*b*). He made a great progreſs in the Greek tongue under Francis Portus of the Iſle of Candy, who was Profeſſor of that language, and whom he ſucceeded in the year 1582, when he was but twenty three years old. In 1583 he publiſhed his notes on Diogenes Laertius [*C*], which he dedicated to his father, and the year following his *Lectures upon Theocritus* [*D*], which he dedicated to Henry Stephens the Printer at Geneva, whoſe daughter he married April the 28th 1586. This probably is what gave occaſion to his enemies to aſſert, that he had ſpent his youth in correcting the proofs of this Printer, which is falſe, though no blemiſh to

(*a*) Bernard, *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, Mois du Juillet* 1710, *Art.* 1. pag. 5, 6. *and* Niceron, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire des Hommes Illuſtres*, tom. 18. pag. 118. edit. de Paris 1732.

(*b*) Bernard, pag. 6. *and* Niceron, pag. 119.

[*A*] *Born at Geneva February* 18*th* 1559.] This appears from his 879th Letter in Mr. Theodore Janſon ab Almeloveen's edition of his Letters printed at Rotterdam 1709 in folio; which Letter is addreſſed to John Prideaux. And therefore Moreri is extremely miſtaken in aſſerting that he was born at Bourdeaux, a village in Dauphiné. His father indeed was a native of that place, and this might occaſion the confounding him with his ſon.

[*B*] *He ſtudied under the direction of his father till he was nineteen years of age.*] The vivacity of his genius, and the happy diſpoſition, which he ſhewed to learning, even from his infancy, occaſioned him to apply himſelf to it very early; and he made ſo quick a progreſs in it with his father's aſſiſtance, who was his only Preceptor, that at nine years of age he was able to ſpeak and write Latin with great eaſe and correctneſs. But his father's engagements obliging him to be almoſt always abſent from home for three years, he forgot entirely all that he had learn'd of him, and was obliged at twelve years of age to begin his ſtudies again, which he did with an incredible ardour, and almoſt by himſelf, his father's frequent abſence not permitting him to inſtruct him but at intervals. But as this method could not carry him any great length, he was ſent in 1578 to Geneva, to proſecute his ſtudies under the Profeſſors, who taught there. And his indefatigable application ſoon made him recover the time, which he had loſt before (1).

(1) Niceron, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire des Hommes illuſtres*, tom. 18. pag. 118, 119. edit de Paris 1732.

[*C*] *In* 1583 *he publiſhed his Notes on Diogenes Laertius.*] They were printed *Morgiis* 1583 in 8vo under the following title: *In Diogenem Laertium Notæ Iſaaci Hortiboni*. He wrote theſe Notes at twenty five years of age, and had a deſign to enlarge them very much afterwards; but other employments prevented him. He dedicated them to his father, who commended him indeed for his pains, but told him, that he ſhould value one remark upon the ſacred books more than all the works, which he promiſed with regard to profane writers. After that he applied himſelf in good earneſt to thoſe ſtudies, which had ſome relation to Religion, and wrote ſome Notes on the New Teſtament. When Henry Stephens, his father-in-law, publiſhed an edition of Diogenes Laertius in 1594 in 8vo, he added the Notes of our Author, which have been ſince inſerted in all the editions of Laertius. Caſaubon took the name of *Hortibonus*, which ſignifies the ſame thing as *Caſaubonus*, becauſe Caſau in Dauphiné means a *Garden*; ſo that Ravius has made a pleaſant miſtake in his manuſcript Notes upon Geſner's *Bibliotheca*, where he treats Caſaubon as a plagiary from Hortibonus, as Placcius obſerves in his Book *de Pſeudonymis* (2).

(2) Idem, pag. 133, 134.

[*D*] *His* Lectures upon Theocritus.] They were publiſh'd at Geneva 1584 in 12mo under the following title; *Iſaaci Hortiboni Lectiones Theocriticæ*; in the edition of this Author by John Criſpinus. Theſe Notes, which have been reprinted ſeveral times ſince, were publiſhed likewiſe under the name of *Hortibonus*, which Caſaubon preferred to his own, as more ſuitable to a Latin Book. He dedicated theſe *Lectures* to Henry Stephens, whoſe daughter he married two years after (3).

(3) Idem, pag. 134, 135.

to his reputation, if it had been true. In 1587 he publiſhed his *Strabo* at Geneva [*E*], and the ſame year his edition of the New Teſtament with Notes [*F*]. He ſtudied Philoſophy and Civil Law under Julius Pacius, and applied him likewiſe to the Oriental Languages and Rabbins (*c*). Soon after this he publiſhed his Notes upon Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus [*G*], and an edition of Polyænus's *Stratagems* [*H*], and had a ſhare in that of Dicæarchus [*I*]. In 1590 he publiſhed an edition of Ariſtotle in Greek and Latin [*K*], and in 1591 an edition of Pliny's Letters with Notes, and the antient Latin Panegyrics [*L*]. Some time after this he fell into great trouble, of which he complains extremely in his Letters, by being ſurety in a great ſum for Mr. Wotton an Engliſhman, which he was obliged to pay. This ſtraitened him, till he was reimburſed by the care of his friends, and particularly of Joſeph Scaliger, about a year after (*d*). He publiſhed his edition on Theophraſtus's *Characters* in 1592 [*M*], and Apuleius's *Apology* in 1594 [*N*], and his Commentary upon Suetonius in 1595 [*O*]. In the mean time he was not eaſy at Geneva, either becauſe he could not pleaſe Henry Stephens his father-in-law, a moroſe and peeviſh man, or had not a ſufficient ſubſiſtence, or becauſe he was himſelf of an unſettled temper (*e*). He therefore accepted the place of Profeſſor of the Greek Tongue and Polite Learning, which was offered him at Montpellier [*P*], and was highly eſteemed and followed there, and ſeemed well contented with his ſituation. But this did not laſt long, for what had been promiſed him was not performed, and his ſalary was not duly paid; and in ſhort he was ſo uneaſy, that he ſays in one of his Letters, that he was juſt about returning to Geneva (*f*). In 1598 he went to Lyons on account of his edition of Athenæus [*Q*]. He lodged there at the houſe of Mery de Vicque, a man of conſiderable

(*c*) Bernard, pag. 7. *and* Niceron, pag. 121.

(*d*) Bernard, pag. 8.

(*e*) Idem, pag. 9. *and* Niceron, pag. 121.

(*f*) Bernard, pag. 10. *and* Niceron, pag. 122.

[*E*] *In* 1587 *he publiſhed his* Strabo *at Geneva.*] It was printed in folio under the following title: *Strabonis Geographiæ Libri XVII. Græce & Latine, ex Guil. Xylandri Interpretatione, edente cum Commentariis Iſaaco Caſaubono.* Our Author's Commentaries were publiſhed with Additions in the edition of Strabo at Paris 1620 in fol. and have been inſerted in all the editions ſince (4).

(4) Idem, pag. 135.

[*F*] *His edition of the New Teſtament with Notes.*] It was printed at Geneva 1587 in 16mo with this title: *Novum Teſtamentum Græcum cum Notis Iſaaci Caſauboni in quatuor Evangelia & Actus Apoſtolorum.* Theſe Notes of our Author are inſerted in the *Critici Sacri*.

[*G*] *His Notes upon* Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus.] *Animadverſiones in Dionyſium Halicarnaſſenſem*, and were printed in the edition of that Author, which he publiſhed at Geneva 1588 in fol. with the Tranſlation of Æmilius Portus. This edition is not taken notice of by Fabricius in his *Bibliotheca Græca*. Theſe are not very conſiderable, becauſe Caſaubon did not put his laſt hand to them, and was too precipitate in the publication of them (5).

(5) Idem, pag. 135, 136.

[*H*] *An edition of* Polyænus's Stratagems.] It was printed at Lyons 1589 in 16mo under the following title: *Polyæni Stratagematum Libri VIII. Græcè & Latinè, edente cum Notis Iſaaco Caſaubono.* Caſaubon was the firſt who publiſhed the Greek Text of this Author. But the Tranſlation is not his own, as is erroneouſly aſſerted in the *Bibliotheca Curioſa* of Hallervoord; but was done by Juſtus Vultejus, who publiſh'd it in 1550 in 8vo.

[*I*] *Had a ſhare in that of* Dicæarchus.] It was printed at Geneva 1589 in 8vo and entitled, *Dicæarchi Geographica quædam, ſive de Vitâ Græciæ; ejuſdem Deſcriptio Græciæ verſibus Græcis iambicis ad Theophraſtum; cum Iſaaci Caſauboni & Henrici Stephani Notis.*

[*K*] *In* 1590 *he publiſh'd an edition of Ariſtotle in Greek and Latin.*] It was printed at Lyons in fol. under the following title: *Ariſtotelis Opera, Græcè, cum variorum Interpretatione Latinâ, & variis Lectionibus & Caſtigationibus Iſaaci Caſauboni.* It was reprinted at Geneva 1605 in fol. Theſe Notes are only marginal ones, and Caſaubon tells us, that he wrote them in the intervals of his other engagements.

[*L*] *An edition of* Pliny's Letters with Notes, *and the antient* Latin Panegyrics.] It was printed at Geneva 1591 in 12mo under the following title: *Plinii Epiſtolarum Libri IX. & ejuſdem, Pacati, Mamertini, Nazarii, Eumenii, Auſonii, ac Claudiani Panegyrici, cum Iſaaci Caſauboni Notis in Epiſtolas.* This edition was reprinted at Geneva in 1599, 1605, and 1611 in 12mo.

[*M*] *His edition of* Theophraſtus's Characters.] It was publiſhed at Lyons 1592 in 12mo, under this title; *Theophraſti Characteres Ethici Græcè & Latinè ex verſione & cum Commentario Iſaaci Caſauboni.* The third edition was printed at Lyons in 1612 in 12mo. This third edition is more correct than the former, Caſaubon having reviſed his Tranſlation, being excited to it by a Greek, whoſe name was Furlanus, who had laboured upon the ſame Author, and whoſe work was very contemptible. Caſaubon's edition of Theophraſtus is highly eſteemed ſtill, and it is one of the works, which have procured him the moſt reputation. Joſeph Scaliger in his Letter to him dated at Leyden May 1594 (6) tells him, that when he read this edition of Theophraſtus, he was ſo highly pleaſed with it, that he was even tranſported with joy, and could not refrain from ſpeaking of him all that Caſaubon's merits and his own regard for him required; tho' whatever he could ſay, would be below his deſert. *Quum primum mihi ſalivam moviſſent Theophraſtei Characteres tui, dicam ſerio, de poteſtate mei exivi, neque me continere potui, quin ea de te prædicarem, quæ & meritum tuum & amor meus poſtulabant; quanquam quicquid de te dixero, omne infrà virtutes ingenii tui fuerit.* And the ſame Writer in the *Scaligerana, ſive excerpta ex ore Joſephi Scaligeri per F. F. P. P.* tells us (7), that our Author's edition of Theophraſtus and Athenæus are excellent ones.

(6) *See* Scaliger's *Epiſtol.* 35. lib. 1. pag. 131. edit. Francofurti 1628 in 8vo.

(7) Pag. 64. edit. Genevæ 1666.

[*N*] *And* Apuleius's Apology *in* 1594.] It was printed by Commeline in 4to under this title: *L. Apuleii Apologia, cum Iſaaci Caſauboni Caſtigationibus.* Father Niceron tells us (8), that he ſhews by this edition, that he was no leſs an able Critic in Latin, than he had before ſhewn himſelf in Greek. He dedicated it to Joſeph Scaliger, who had then contracted a ſtrict friendſhip with him, and highly approved his works, tho' he was uſed to commend but a very few perſons.

(8) Pag. 137.

[*O*] *And his* Commentary on Suetonius *in* 1596.] It was printed at Geneva 1596 in 4to, under the following title: *C. Suetonii Tranquilli Opera, cum Iſaaci Caſauboni Animadverſionibus.* This work was ſo well received, that it was reprinted the year following with ſome additions by him. Another edition enlarged and corrected was printed at Paris 1610 in fol.

[*P*] *He therefore accepted the place of Profeſſor of the Greek Tongue and polite Learning, which was offered him at Montpellier.*] A greater ſalary was promiſed him than he enjoyed at Geneva. He was a long while in ſuſpenſe whether he ſhould accept this offer, but at laſt was prevailed upon by the ſollicitations of Philip de Canaye, Lord of Freſne, and of William Ranchin, a famous Profeſſor of Civil Law at Montpellier (9). He removed thither in the latter end of the year 1596, and entered upon the exerciſe of his Profeſſorſhip in Feb. the year following (10). About the ſame time the city of Niſmes gave him an invitation to reſtore their Univerſity, but he refuſed it. It is ſaid likewiſe, that the Univerſity of Franeker had then alſo ſome thoughts of ſending for him; but this is not certain (11).

(9) Bernard, *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, July 1710, Art. 1. pag. 9.

(10) Niceron, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 122.

(11) Bernard, *ubi ſupra, and* Niceron, *ubi ſupra.*

[*Q*] *His edition of* Athenæus.] It was printed at Lyons 1600 in two volumes in fol. under the following

conſiderable fortune, who being a great favourer of men of learning, carried him with him to Paris, where he was introduced into the acquaintance of the firſt Preſident du Harlay, the Preſident de Thou, Monſieur Gillot, and Nicholas le Fevre. Henry IV of France being informed of his merit would have him leave Montpellier for a Profeſſorſhip at Paris. He was for ſome time in ſuſpence what courſe to take, and returned to Montpellier, where he received a letter from the King dated January the 3d 1599, by which he was ſent for to Paris, and ſet out for that city February the 26th the ſame year. Being come to Lyons, his friend Monſieur de Vicque obliged him to ſtay there, at leaſt till the King ſhould come thither, eſpecially becauſe his edition of *Athenæus*, which went on but very ſlowly, ſtood in need of his preſence. Some domeſtic affairs obliged him to go to Geneva, where he complains that juſtice was not done him with regard to the eſtate of his father-in-law. Upon his return to Lyons, having tarried a long time in vain for the King's arrival there, after a ſecond journey to Geneva, he went at laſt to Paris, though he foreſaw, as de Vicque and Joſeph Scaliger foretold him, that he would not have all the ſatisfaction there, which at firſt he expected; not that Henry IV did not receive him with great civility, but the jealouſy of ſome other Profeſſors, and eſpecially his being a Proteſtant, occaſioned him great trouble (*g*). Some time after he was appointed one of the Judges in the Conference between James-Davy du Perron, Biſhop of Evreux, afterwards Cardinal, and the famous Philip du Pleſſis-Mornay [*R*]. Upon his return to Paris he met with ſome chicanry, with reſpect to his ſalary and the expences which he was at in removing with his family to Paris, becauſe the Marquis de Roſny, the King's Treaſurer, was not his friend; ſo that he was obliged to procure an expreſs order from Henry IV for the payment of three hundred crowns (*h*). He returned May the 30th 1600 to Lyons to haſten the impreſſion of his *Athenæus* (*i*), and had there a quarrel with his friend de Vicque, becauſe he would not go with him to Swiſſerland [*S*], whither the latter was ſent by the King. He returned to Paris with his wife and children in September following, and was very well received by the King and by a great many perſons of diſtinction (*k*). He read no public Lectures, but only private ones, and at the ſame time publiſhed ſeveral works of the Antients [*T*]. He ſtudied Arabic, and made ſuch a progreſs in it, that he undertook the compiling a Dictionary, and tranſlated ſome books of that Language into Latin. He tells us himſelf, that in 1601 he was obliged againſt his will to write to James VI King of Scotland, afterwards King of England, but he does not mention the reaſons of it. That Prince anſwered him with great civility, which obliged our Author to write to him a ſecond time (*l*). Henry IV augmented his ſalary, and appointed

(*g*) Bernard, pag. 10, 11. *and* Niceron, pag. 122, 123, 124.

(*h*) Bernard, pag. 13. *and* Niceron, pag. 125.

(*i*) Mr. Bernard pag. 13. erroneouſly ſays his *Polybius*.

(*k*) Bernard, pag. 13. *and* Niceron, pag. 126.

(*l*) Bernard, pag. 14.

lowing title; *Athenæi Deipnoſophiſtarum Libri XV. Græcè & Latinè, Interprete Jacobo Dalechampio; cum Iſaaci Caſauboni Animadverſionum Libris XV.* It was reprinted likewiſe in the ſame city in 1612 in two volumes in fol. Caſaubon's Notes are contained in the ſecond volume.

[*R*] *Appointed one of the Judges in the conference between James Davy du Perron, Biſhop of Evreux, afterwards Cardinal, and the famous Philip du Pleſſis-Mornay.*] The conference was held at Fontainebleau May the 4th 1600. It was deſigned, that there ſhould have been ſeveral ſittings; but the indiſpoſition of du Pleſſis-Mornay put an end to it at one (12). As our Author was not favourable to the latter, who, if we may believe the Hiſtorians of that time, did not acquit himſelf to great advantage in that conference, it was reported, that Caſaubon would ſoon change his Religion. Mr. Bernard tells us (13), that there were two things, which increaſed this ſuſpicion; one was, that Philip de Canaye, his great friend, went over to the Roman Catholics; the other was, that his own ſon John did the like. But we may obſerve with regard to the latter inſtance, that his ſon did not change his religion till about ten years afterwards, as appears from Mr. Bernard's own account (14); and conſequently this could not poſſibly encreaſe the ſuſpicion of our Author's diſpoſition to turn Roman Catholic then. Mr. Bernard remarks (15), that he cleared himſelf of theſe accuſations in ſeveral of his Letters; and the conſequences ſhewed, that either theſe ſuſpicions were falſe, or that if he was under any temptation to change his Religion, he had ſtrength enough to reſiſt it. However it is certain, that he was not in all points of the opinion of the Reformed Church; and he declared, that with reſpect to the Sacraments the Fathers of the Church believed ſomething more than the Reformers, as appears by his 670th letter addreſſed to Utenbogard, and by his 1043d to Tilenus (16). But however that matter was, Mr. Almeloveen in his life of him gives a large account of what paſſed at the conference of Fontainbleau, in order to ſhew, that thoſe were in the wrong, who accuſed Caſaubon of favouring du Perron on that occaſion.

(12) Niceron, pag. 124, 125.

(13) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 12.

(14) Pag. 17. *See likewiſe* Niceron, pag. 129.

(15) Pag. 12.

(16) Idem, ibid.

[*S*] *Had there a quarrel with his friend de Vicque, becauſe he would not go with him to Swiſſerland.*] The reaſon of this refuſal was, that he was under ſome apprehenſions leſt he might loſe the place of Library-keeper to the King, which had been promiſed him, and which it was probable would be ſoon vacant, the perſon, who enjoyed it, being greatly indiſpoſed. Nor was he diſappointed in his expectations of it (17).

(17) Niceron, pag. 126.

[*T*] *At the ſame time he publiſhed ſeveral works of the Antients.*] We ſhall give ſome account of them. *Hiſtoriæ Auguſtæ Scriptores cum Commentario Iſaaci Caſauboni.* Paris 1603 in 4to; and likewiſe with the Commentaries of Salmaſius upon the ſame Authors at Paris 1620 in fol. and Leyden 1670 in two volumes in 8vo. *Diatriba ad Dionis Chryſoſtomi Orationes*, publiſhed in the Edition of that Author by Frederic Morel at Paris 1604 in fol. *Perſii Satyræ ex recenſione & cum Commentariis Iſaaci Caſauboni.* Paris 1605 in 8vo. and London 1647 in 8vo. The notes, which accompany the text of Perſius, were the lectures, which he had formerly read at Geneva. They were enlarged in the edition of 1647. Joſeph Scaliger ſays, that in this edition of Perſius the ſauce is worth more than the fiſh. *Au Perſe de Caſaubon la ſaulce vaut mieux que le poiſſon* (18). *De Satyricâ Græcorum Poeſi, & Romanorum Satyrâ Libri duo.* Paris 1605 in 8vo. Our Author aſſerts in this work, that the Satyrical Poetry of the Latins was very different from that of the Greeks. This opinion was attacked by Daniel Heinſius in his two books *De Satyrâ Horatianâ*, printed at Leyden 1629 in 12mo. Ezechiel Spanheim in the *Preface* to his tranſlation of the Emperor *Julian's Cæſars*, having examined the arguments of theſe two learned men, declares for Caſaubon's opinion. Crenius has inſerted our Author's treatiſe in his *Muſæum Philologicum & Hiſtoricum*, printed at Leyden 1699 in 8vo, together with the following piece, *Cyclops Euripidis Latinitate donata a Q. Septimio Florente.* Caſaubon, who publiſhed this tranſlation, ſubjoined it to his treatiſe *de Satyricâ Poeſi*, &c. *Gregorii Nyſſeni Epiſtola ad Euſtathiam, Ambroſiam, & Baſiliſſam, Græcè & Latinè cum Notis Is. Caſauboni.* Paris 1606 in 8vo. and Hanaw 1611 in 8vo. He was the firſt, who publiſhed this letter.

(18) *Scaligeriana*, pag. 64. edit. Genevæ 1666.

pointed him his Library-Keeper in the latter end of the year 1603 [*U*]. The ſame year he took a journey to Dauphiné to ſee his mother, and to Geneva about his private affairs. He was frequently and ſtrongly ſollicited by his friends of the Roman Catholic Religion to abandon the Proteſtant Faith; but in vain [*W*]. The Magiſtrates of Niſmes gave him a ſecond invitation to their City, offering him an houſe and a ſalary of 600 crowns of gold *per ann.* but he durſt not accept it for fear of diſpleaſing the King (*m*). The famous diſputes between Pope Paul V and the Republic of Venice occaſioned him to write a Treatiſe on *Eccleſiaſtical Liberty* [*X*]. In 1609 he publiſhed at Paris his edition of Polybius in fol. [*Y*]. The year following there happened two things, which proved a great affliction to him; the death of Henry IV, which deſtroyed all his hopes of keeping his place, and his ſon John's changing his Religion; and this latter circumſtance gave him the greater uneaſineſs, becauſe a report was ſpread that he himſelf had charged George Stranchan, an Engliſhman, who taught his ſon the Mathematics, to inſtruct him at the ſame time in the Popiſh Religion (*n*). Mr. Almeloveen in his Life of our Author, clears him of all theſe imputations, and ſhews that Caſaubon lamented a long while his ſon's change. The ſame year having obtained leave of the Queen of France, he went over to England with Sir Henry Wotton, Embaſſador Extraordinary from James I (*o*), where he was extremely well received [*Z*], and engaged in writing a confutation of Baronius's

(*m*) Bernard, pag. 15. *and* Niceron, pag. 128.

(*n*) Bernard, pag. 17, 18. *and* Niceron, pag. 129.

(*o*) Bernard, pag. 18. *and* Niceron, pag. 129.

[*V*] *Augmented his ſalary, and appointed him his Library-Keeper in the latter end of the year* 1603.] The King added two hundred crowns to his ſalary, and nominated him to ſucceed John Goſſelin his Library-Keeper, a great Mathematician, but a man of a very odd temper, who would not let Caſaubon have the uſe of the Books in the King's Library as often as he deſired. Our Author entered upon this new office in the latter end of the year 1603, when Goſſelin, who was very old, having been left near a fire by his ſervant, fell into it, and was burnt (19).

(19) Bernard, pag. 14. *and* Niceron, pag. 127.

[*W*] *He was frequently and ſtrongly ſollicited by his friends of the Roman Catholic Religion to abandon the Proteſtant Faith; but in vain.*] About the year 1604 he was obliged to ſuſtain ſome attacks from the Jeſuits and Cardinal du Perron, concerning Religion. It happened that he had a diſpute with the latter at a feaſt, to which he had been invited. This occaſioned a report, that he promiſed there to turn Papiſt; which obliged him to write a letter to the Cardinal, which the Miniſters of Charenton thought fit to publiſh, in order to confute thoſe falſe rumours (20). It appears from his 348th letter of Mr. Almeloveen's edition, that Monſr. du Freſne, after he had embraced the Roman Catholic Religion, ſollicited Caſaubon to do the like; to which he anſwered, that he would always remember their antient friendſhip and the obligations, which he had to him, but could not do what he deſired of him, and far leſs follow his example. He deſired him earneſtly not to impute his refuſal to obſtinacy, but rather to ſincerity, and to the reſolution, which he had of maintaining thoſe opinions, which he knew to be true, and of which he was fully perſuaded. And in his 319th letter directed to Mr. du Pleſſis he clears himſelf of the ſuſpicions, which were ſpread abroad concerning him, that he was about to change his Religion. In 1609 he had a conference with Cardinal du Perron concerning Religion by the King's Order, in order to prevail upon him to embrace the Popiſh Religion. And it was then given out that he wavered on that head (21).

(20) Bernard, pag. 15. *and* Niceron, pag. 128.

(21) Bernard, pag. 16. *and* Niceron, pag. 128, 129.

[*X*] *Occaſioned him to write a Treatiſe on* Eccleſiaſtical Liberty.] It was entitled, *De Libertate Eccleſiaſticâ Liber.* 1607 in 8vo. pagg. 264. In this treatiſe he defended the rights of God and Sovereigns againſt the pretenſions *of Rome.* But when the differences between the Pope and the Venetians were determined, the King ordered it to be ſuppreſſed before it was printed, or perhaps before it was finiſhed†. But becauſe the Author had ſent ſome ſheets of it to ſeveral of his friends, as they were printed, the work could not be entirely ſuppreſſed. It is ſaid likewiſe, that there are two or three editions of that fragment. It is certain that Melchior Goldaſt inſerted it in his *Collectanea de Monarchia S. Imperii, tom.* 1. *pag.* 674. and Almeloveen reprinted this fragment in his edition of Caſaubon's Letters (22).

† Bernard, pag. 16. *and* Guil. Camdeni & *illuſt. Viror. ad* G. Camden. *Epiſtol.* pag. 99.

(22) Bernard, pag. 15, 16. *and* Niceron, pag. 140, 141.

[*Y*] *In* 1609 *he publiſhed at Paris his edition of Polybius in fol.*] It was publiſhed under the following title: *Polybii Opera Græcè & Latinè ex Verſione Iſaaci Caſauboni. Accedit Æneas Tacticus de tolerandâ Obſidione. Græcè & Latinè.* It was reprinted at Hanaw from the Paris Edition in 1609 in fol. It is dedicated to King Henry IV, and the dedication is eſteemed a maſter-piece of the kind. Our Author had a talent for pieces of that nature as well as for Prefaces. In the former he praiſes without any low ſervility, and in a manner, which appears very remote from flattery; and in the latter he ſhews the deſign and merit of his works without oſtentation, and with an air of modeſty. He may ſerve as a model for pieces of this kind, which ought ſo much the leſs to be neglected, as they firſt offer themſelves to the Reader's view, and are deſigned to prejudice him in favour of the book itſelf (23). Caſaubon made the tranſlation of Polybius and Æneas Tacticus; and had a deſign to have added a Commentary upon the whole; but his death prevented him from executing it, and we have only a ſmall part of that work, printed after his death at Paris in 1617 in 8vo, under this title, *Ad Polybii Hiſtoriarum Librum primum Commentarius.* Our Author expected to have received a conſiderable preſent from the King for the dedication of his Polybius; but his Religion, as he informs us himſelf, prevented him from receiving any thing, to which Mr. Bernard adds (24), that Henry IV, who was no great ſcholar, did not know the value of the preſent. Huetius, afterwards Biſhop of Avranches, in his Treatiſe *de optimo interpretandi genere* (25) tells us, that Thuanus and Fronto-Ducæus the Jeſuit highly extolled our Author's induſtry in his Edition of Polybius; and that both of them were ſo pleaſed with his manner of tranſlating that writer, that they believed it was not eaſy to determine whether Caſaubon had tranſlated Polybius, or Polybius Caſaubon. *Caſauboni in excolendo Polybio induſtriam Auguſtus Thuanus & Fronto-Ducæus ſummoperè extulerunt: ea verò utrique potiſſimum placuit interpretandi ratio, quam hoc opere tranſferendo tenuiſſet, ut non facile dici poſſe crederent, Polybiumne Caſaubonus, an Caſaubonum Polybius convertiſſet.*

(23) Niceron, pag. 142.

(24) Pag. 17.

(25) *Apud* Blount, *Cenſur. Celebrior. Authorum*, pag. 884. edit. Genevæ in 4to, 1694.

[*Z*] *Where he was extremely well received.*] He met with the utmoſt civilities from all the men of learning and diſtinction there. He ſaw the King, and had the honour of eating with him ſeveral times. He received a preſent from him of 1000 French livres, becauſe the King knew, that he was to viſit the Univerſities of Oxford and Cambridge. He afterwards gave him two Prebends, one at Canterbury, and the other at Weſtminſter, with a ſalary of 2000 French livres. That Prince wrote at the ſame time to the Queen of France to give Caſaubon leave to ſtay longer in England than was at firſt allowed him (26). However in his 1056th letter of Mr. Almeloveen's Edition he complains, that he was more inſulted at London than he had ever been at Paris in the midſt of the Papiſts; that ſtones were thrown at his windows night and day; that he received a great wound as he went to Court; that his children were affronted in the ſtreets; and that he and his family were ſometimes purſued with ſtones. Mr. Bernard (27) tells us, that this was perhaps occaſioned by the hatred, which the common people bear to ſtrangers, and by ſeeing them dreſſed in a manner different from

(26) Bernard, pag. 18. *and* Niceron, pag. 130.

(27) Pag. 27.

ronius's Annals [*AA*]. His *Exercitations* upon them were finiſhed in eighteen months in the beginning of the year 1614 (*p*). He did not live long after this, for he died the firſt of July the ſame year in the fifty fifth year of his age. It was found after his death that he had a double bladder (*q*). He was interred in Weſtminſter-Abbey, where a monument was erected to him [*BB*]. He had ſeveral children by his wife Florence, the daughter of Henry Stephens [*CC*]. We ſhall give an account of the reſt of his works in the note [*DD*]. He received the higheſt elogiums from all the Men of Letters, who were

(*p*) Bernard, pag. 20.

(*q*) Idem, ibid. *and* Niceron, pag. 130. *See* Dr. Raphael Thorius's *Epiſtola de Iſaaci Caſauboni Morbi Mortiſque Cauſâ*. Printed with our Author's Letters.

from that of the country. But the writers of *the Hiſtory of the works of the Learned* for September 1710 (28) obſerve, that this never ordinarily happens in London, where there is always a great concourſe of ſtrangers; ſo that it muſt have proceeded from ſome other cauſe.

(28) Pag. 599. edit. London in 4to.

[*AA*] *Engaged in writing a confutation of* Baronius's Annals.] A little time after he went to England, Peter du Moulin wrote to Dr. James Montague, Biſhop of Bath and Wells, to inform him, that Caſaubon had a great inclination to Popery; that there were only a very few Articles, which kept him among the Proteſtants; and that if he returned to France he would change his Religion, as he had promiſed; which would be the occaſion of great ſcandal and prejudice to the Proteſtants. He therefore deſired him to endeavour to keep him in England, and to engage him in writing againſt the Annals of Baronius, ſince he knew that he had materials ready for that ſubject. Mr. Bernard tells us (29), that he does not know whether this letter did the buſineſs; but that it is certain, that King James I engaged him to write the book, which he publiſhed againſt the Annals of Baronius, and which was entitled, *Exercitationes contra Baronium*, London 1614 in fol. Francfort 1615 in 4to. Geneva 1655 and 1663 in 4to. Some learned men are of opinion, ſays Mr. Bernard (30), that he has pulled down the pinnacles of that great building of Baronius; but that it is certain, that Caſaubon would have done more ſervice to the Commonwealth of learning, if he had been allowed to continue his labours upon profane Authors. And Father Niceron obſerves (31), that he was not equal to ſuch a work, becauſe he had not ſufficiently ſtudied Divinity, Chronology, or Hiſtory, and was not converſant enough in the Fathers; ſo that he is ſaid to have committed more errors than Baronius in a leſs compaſs. Our Author in his 1059 Letter directed to Dr. Richard Montague, afterwards Biſhop of Norwich (32), complains extremely that this Divine had undertaken to write againſt Baronius at the ſame time with himſelf; and threatens to complain of him to the King, who had commanded him to write againſt that Cardinal. He tells him, that he had been engaged a long time upon that ſubject; and that as he was the firſt, Dr. Montague ought not to interfere with him. *This*, ſay the Authors of the *Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned* (33), *ſhews* Caſaubon *to have been a ſelfiſh, peeviſh man, and might occaſion his being hated by the people.*

(29) Pag. 19.

(30) Ibid.

(31) Pag. 145.

(32) Mr. Bernard, pag. 27. erroneouſly ſays, *Bath and Wells.*

(33) September 1710, pag. 599.

[*BB*] *Interred in Weſtminſter-Abbey, where a monument was erected to him.*] The Epitaph upon it is as follows:

Iſaacus Caſaubonus:
(O Doctiorum quicquid eſt aſſurgite
Huic tam colendo Nomini,)

Quem Gallia Reip. Litterariæ bono peperit; Henricus IV Francorum Rex invictiſſimus Lutetiam litteris ſuis evocatum Bibliothecæ ſuæ præfecit; charumque deinceps dum vixit habuit; eoque terris erepto Jacobus Magn. Britan. Monarcha, Regum Doctiſſimus, doctis indulgentiſſimus, in Angliam accivit, munificè fovit, poſteritaſque ob doctrinam mirabitur. H. S. E. invidiâ major. Obiit æternam in Chriſto vitam anhelans Cal. Julii 1614. *Ætat.* 55. *Viro opt. immortalitate digniſs. Thom. Mortonus Epiſcopus Dunelmenſis jucundiſſimæ quoad frui licuit conſuetudinis memor. Pr. S. P. Cu.* 1631.

Qui noſſe vult Caſaubonum,
Non ſaxa, ſed Chartas legat,
Superfuturas Marmori,
Et profuturas poſteris.

[*CC*] *He had ſeveral children by his wife, Florence, the daughter of Henry Stephens.*] His eldeſt ſon John embraced the Roman Catholic Religion, as we have obſerved. We ſhall give an account of Meric in the next article. Another of his ſons, whoſe name was Auguſtin, having turned Papiſt, enter'd himſelf into the Order of the Capuchins, and was poiſoned with eleven others of his Order at Calais by one of the inhabitants of that city, as Mr. Ogier relates in the account of his journey. Mr. Du Pin informs us upon the teſtimony of Mr. Cotelier, that when this ſon of Caſaubon was determined to become a Capuchin, he went by the order of his Superiors to deſire his father's bleſſing before he took upon him the vow; and that Caſaubon gave it him very readily with theſe words: *My ſon, I do not condemn thee; nor do thou condemn me; we ſhall both appear before the Tribunal of Jeſus Chriſt.* There is no mention of this Auguſtin in Caſaubon's Letters (34).

(34) Niceron, pag. 132.

[*DD*] *We ſhall give an account of the reſt of his works in the Note.*] *Publii Syri Mimi, ſive ſententiæ ſelectæ Latinè, Græcè verſæ, & Notis illuſtratæ per Joſephum Scaligerum, cum Præfatione Iſaaci Caſauboni.* Leyden 1598 in 8vo. *Inſcriptio vetus dedicationem fundi continens, ab Herode rege facta, cum Notis Iſaaci Caſauboni.* This little piece, which was publiſh'd about the year 1607, is inſerted by Thomas Crenius in his *Muſæum Philologicum.* Caſaubon's Notes are ſhort, but very learned; however it appears, that he was miſtaken in aſcribing the Inſcription to Herod, King of Judæa, inſtead of Herodes the Athenian (35). He publiſh'd Joſeph Scaliger's *Opuſcula Varia*, at Paris 1610 in 4to, and Francfort 1612 in 8vo, with a Preface of his own writing. *Ad Frontonem Ducæum Epiſtola, de Apologiâ Jeſuitarum nomine Pariſiis edita.* London 1611 in 4to. The chief deſign of this Letter was to confute the *Réponſe Apologetique à l'Anti-Coton, par François Benald. Au Pont.* 1611 in 8vo, and to oppoſe the doctrine of the Jeſuits about the Authority of Kings. Mr. Bernard tells us (36), that this Letter was publiſhed almoſt againſt his will, and that he received a conſiderable preſent for it from King James. *Epiſtola ad Georgium Michaelem Lingelſhemium de quodam libello Scioppii*, 1612 in 4to. This Letter, which is dated Auguſt 9th 1612, is the 828th of Mr. Almeloveen's Collection. *Epiſtola ad Cardinalem Perronium.* London 1612 in 4to. This Letter, which is the 838th of Mr. Almeloveen's Collection, is dated November 9th, 1612. It is not ſo much a compoſition of our Author, as an exact account of the ſentiments of King James I, whoſe and the Church of England's Secretary, he tells us, he was, with regard to ſome points of Religion. It was therefore printed among the works of that King in the edition of them publiſhed by Dr. James Montague Biſhop of Wincheſter, in 1619. It is written with great moderation; and Cardinal du Perron wrote an Anſwer to it, which was left unfiniſh'd at his death. Valentine Smalcius, a famous Socinian, has endeavoured likewiſe to confute ſome paſſages of it in a little piece publiſhed under the name of Anthony Reuchlin, and intitled, *Ad Iſaacum Caſaubonum Paræneſis*, Racoviæ 1614 in 4to (37). *Iſaaci Caſauboni Epiſtolæ.* Hague 1638 in 4to. This edition was publiſhed by John Frederick Gronovius. A ſecond edition, 82 *Epiſtolis auctior, & juxta ſeriem temporum digeſta, per Joannem Georgium Grævium*, was printed at Magdeburg and Helmſtad 1656 in 4to. Theſe two editions are eclipſed by the following one, printed at Rotterdam 1709 in fol. and intitled, *Iſaaci Caſauboni Epiſtolæ, inſertis ad eaſdem reſponſionibus, quotquot hactenus reperiri potuerunt, ſecundum ſeriem temporis accuratè digeſtæ. Accedunt huic editioni præter trecentas ineditas Epiſtolas Iſaaci Caſauboni Vita, ejuſdem Dedicationes, Præfationes, Prolegomena, Poemata, Fragmentum de Libertate Eccleſiaſticâ. Item Merici Caſauboni Epiſtolæ, Dedicationes, Præfationes, Prolegomena, & Tractatus quidam rariores. Curante Theodoro Janſon ab Almeloveen.* i. e. "Iſaac Caſaubon's Letters, with all

(35) Idem, pag. 141.

(36) Pag. 19.

(37) Idem, pag. 144.

were his contemporaries, not only on account of his profound learning, but likewiſe of his modeſty, ſincerity and probity.

" all the Anſwers which could hitherto be found, " diſpoſed in a chronological order. To which are " added in this edition, beſides three hundred Letters " never before printed, Iſaac Caſaubon's Life, his " Dedications, Prefaces, Prolegomena, Poems, and " his Fragment concerning Eccleſiaſtical Liberty; and " alſo the Letter of Meric Caſaubon with his Dedica- " tions, Prefaces, Prolegomena, and ſome ſcarce " Treatiſes, publiſhed by Theodore Janſon ab Alme- " loveen." Sorbiere in the *Sorberiana* (38) ſays, that theſe Letters contain the hiſtory of a man of probity and learning, but have nothing very remarkable in them except the purity of the language, and the marks of a frank and ſincere mind. The Author of the *Melanges d'Hiſtoire & de Literature*, publiſh'd under the name of *Vigneul-Marville*, aſſures us, that they are all perfectly beautiful; and he makes no ſcruple to compare them with thoſe of Grotius and Scaliger with regard to learning, and to aſſert, that they exceed them for the eaſineſs and purity of ſtyle, which is entirely epiſtolary, and not at all affected. Caſaubon is blamed for mixing too much Greek in his Latin Letters; and tho', ſays Mr. Bernard (39), he excuſes himſelf from the example of Cicero and others, yet it is certainly a fault. Father Vavaſſor in his Treatiſe *de Epigrammate* (40) charges him likewiſe with Galliciſms; but theſe defects, and perhaps ſome others, do not hinder theſe Letters from being worth reading (41). In 1710 Mr. John Chriſtopher Wolfius publiſhed at Hamburg in 4to, *Caſauboniana, ſive Iſaaci Caſauboni varia de Scriptoribus Libriſque Judicia, Obſervationes ſacræ in utriuſque Fœderis loca, Philologicæ item & Eccleſiaſticæ, ut & Animadverſiones in Annales Baronii Eccleſiaſticos ineditæ, ex variis Caſauboni MSS. in Bibliothecâ Bodleianâ reconditis nunc primum erutæ à Joan. Chriſtoph. Wolfio. Accedunt duæ Caſauboni Epiſtolæ ineditæ, & Præfatio ad Librum de Libertate Eccleſiaſticâ, cum Notis Editoris in Caſauboniana, ac Præfatio, quâ de hujus generis Literis diſſeritur.* Father Niceron ſays (42), that there is nothing very conſiderable in this Collection. T.

(38) Pag. 50.

(39) Pag. 23, 24.

(40) Cap. 22.

(41) Bernard, pag. 24.

(42) Pag. 147.

☞CASAUBON (MERIC), ſon of the preceding, was born at Geneva Auguſt the 14th 1599 (*a*), and not in September, as Mr. Wood aſſerts in his *Athenæ Oxonienſes* (*b*). He began his firſt ſtudies at Sedan, and continued them in England, whither he came with his father in 1610 [*A*]. He was inſtructed by a private maſter till 1614, according to Mr. Wood (*c*), or 1616, according to Father Niceron (*d*), when he was ſent to Chriſt Church College in Oxford, where being put under a moſt careful tutor, Dr. Edward Meetkirk (*e*), afterwards the King's Profeſſor of Hebrew, he was ſoon elected a Student of that College, and made ſo great a progreſs in Logic and Philoſophy (*e*), that he took the Degree of Maſter of Arts June the 14th 1621 (*f*), being at that time very eminent for his extenſive learning (*g*). The ſame year he publiſhed a book in defence of his father againſt the calumnies of certain Roman Catholicks [*B*]. This book gained him the favour of King James I, and procured him a conſiderable reputation abroad, eſpecially in France, whence he had ſeveral offers of promotion there; his godfather Meric de Vicque, being then or ſoon after Keeper of the Great Seal of that Kingdom (*h*). The next book, which he publiſhed, was a *Vindication of his Father*, in Latin [*C*], written by

(*a*) Niceron, *Mémoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſt. des Hommes Illuſtres*, tom. 18. pag. 148. edit. de Paris 1732.

(*b*) Vol. 2. col. 485. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) *Ubi ſupra.*

(*e*) *See* Dr. Meric Caſaubon of *Credulity and Incredulity*, pag. 16. edit. London 1668.

(*f*) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 218.

(*g*) Idem, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 485.

(*h*) Idem, ibid.

[*A*] *In England, whither he came with his father in* 1610.] We obſerved in the preceding article that Iſaac Caſaubon came to England October 1610; and therefore as his ſon Meric was born in Auguſt 1599, Mr. Wood muſt certainly be miſtaken in his *Athenæ Oxonienſes* (1), where he tells us, that the latter was but *nine* years of age, when he was brought into England by his father.

(1) Vol. 2. col. 485. 2d edit. London 1721.

[*B*] *He publiſhed a Defence of his father againſt the calumnies of certain Roman-Catholics.*] It was printed at London 1621 in 8vo under the following title, *Pietas contra maledicos Patrii nominis & Religionis hoſtes.* In this Book he mentions ſeveral particulars relating to the Life of his father, and defends him againſt the reproaches of Caſpar Scioppius, Julius Cæſar Boulanger, Eudæmon-Joannes, and ſome others, who had caſt odious imputations upon his morals and religion (2).

(2) Niceron, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire des Hommes Illuſtres*, tom. 18. pag. 150, 151.

[*C*] *A Vindication of his father in Latin.*] It was printed at London 1624 in eight ſheets in 4to, and intitled, *Vindicatio Patris adverſus Impoſtorem, qui Librum ineptum & impium* de Origine Idololatriæ *nuper ſub Iſaaci Caſauboni nomine publicavit.* The occaſion of this book was as follows. In 1624 there was publiſh'd at London a Treatiſe, intitled, *The Original of Idolatries, or the Birth of Hereſies. Firſt faithfully gathered out of ſundry Greek and Latin Authors, as alſo out of divers learned Fathers, by that famous and learned Iſaac Caſaubon, and by him publiſhed in French for the good of God's Church, and was tranſlated into Engliſh for the benefit of this Monarchy. By Abraham Darcie.* It was dedicated to Prince Charles, afterwards King Charles I, and preſented to King James I, and all the Lords of the Council. Meric Caſaubon in his *Neceſſity of Reformation in and before Luther's time, and what viſibly hath moſt hindred the progreſs of it*, printed at London 1664 in 4to tells us (3), that " the chief end " and ſubject of the Book was to prove, that the " *Maſs*, (a word of great extent and antiquity, which " made the Authors of the *Auguſtane Confeſſion*, ſub- " ſcribed by Calvin, ſay, *Falſè accuſantur Eccleſiæ no-* " *ſtræ, quod Miſſam aboleant, retinetur enim Miſſa apud* " *nos, & ſummâ reverentiâ celebratur*,) or rather in- " deed the whole *Liturgy*, antient and late, and every " part of it, was derived from antient Heathens, Nu- " ma Pompilius, and I know not whom; ſome part " alſo of it is taken out of the Alcoran; which to " prove, his Authors for the moſt part are ſome late " collectors of Roman Antiquities, as Blondus, Alex- " ander ab Alexandro, and the like, who ſay no ſuch " thing; but from what they ſay of the Romans, he " makes his inferences and applications, as he liſts " himſelf, more like the dreams of a diſtemper'd man " than the words of a man endowed with ordinary " ſenſe and reaſon." Our Author therefore, at that time a young Student in Chriſt-Church, addreſſed himſelf to one of the Biſhops, who uſually waited on the King, who was then at Theobalds; and by the Biſhop's means a Letter of his was ſhewn to the King, who diſcovering the fraud, ordered Nathaniel Butter the Bookſeller, and Abraham Darcie to be committed to priſon (4); and it was with great difficulty, that Dr. Montague Biſhop of London made his Chaplain's peace on account of his licenſing of it (5). Soon after a French book, the original of the Engliſh Tranſlation, being produced, it was found, continues our Author (6), *that an old title-page had been by art and cunning tranſformed, the years altered, and the name of* Iſaac Caſaubon *inſerted; and thus the world for mere gain and lucre, (for I do not believe, that there was any further myſtery in it at firſt) ſhamefully abuſed. Other editions or copies of the ſame book were found, and ſhewed to the King; yea tranſlations of it, that had been made, when my father was yet ſcarce born.* Upon this our Author publiſhed his *Vindicatio Patris*, which by the King's command was tranſlated into French and Engliſh (7). And yet ſome years after the Book abovemention'd or Engliſh Tranſlation was reprinted at Amſterdam, as our Author ſuppoſes, with this title, *The Original of Popiſh Idolatry; or the Birth of Hereſies. Publiſhed under the name of* Caſaubon, *and called in the ſame*

(3) Pag. 157, 158.

(4) Ibid. pag. 158.

(5) Fuller's *Church Hiſtory*, Book 10. Sect. 7. num. 18. pag. 112.

(6) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 159.

(7) Ibid.

by the command of King James (*i*). This was printed at London in 1624. And about the ſame time he was preſented by Dr. Lancelot Andrews, Biſhop of Wincheſter to the Living of Bledon in Somerſetſhire (*k*), and took the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity (*l*), and deſigned to have proceeded where his father had left off in the confutation of Cardinal *Baronius's Annals*, but was diverted from the execution of that deſign [*D*]. Some years after the publication of his two former books, he was made Prebendary of Canterbury by Archbiſhop Laud, and Rector of Ickham near that City (*m*). In 1631 he publiſhed at London in 8vo, *Optati Libri VII de Schiſmate Donatiſtarum, cum Merici Caſauboni Notis & Emendationibus*, and in 1634 a Tranſlation out of Greek into Engliſh of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus's *Meditations concerning himſelf* †, London in 4to, a ſecond edition of which reviſed and corrected was publiſhed the year following at London in 4to, and in 1664 in 8vo. Auguſt the 31ſt 1636 he was created Doctor of Divinity at Oxford, by command from King Charles I, when his Majeſty and the Queen were entertained in that Univerſity (*n*). In 1638 he publiſhed at London in 4to, a *Treatiſe of Uſe and Cuſtom* [*E*]. In the beginning of the civil war he loſt all his ſpiritual promotions, and lived retiredly with that little which he had left; though he ſtill continued to publiſh ſeveral excellent works [*F*]. In 1649 Mr. Greaves of Gray's Inn, an intimate friend

(*i*) Idem, ibid.

(*k*) Idem, ibid, *See likewiſe* Dr. M. Caſaubon's *Treatiſe of Credulity and Incredulity in things natural, civil, and divine*, pag. 115, 116, edit. London 1668.

(*l*) Wood, *ubi ſupra*.

(*m*) Idem, ibid.

† See the Article of MARCUS ANTONINUS *Philoſophus*, vol. 2. note [*U*], pag. 45, 46.

(*n*) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 272.

ſame year upon misformation. But now upon better conſideration reprinted with Allowance; being a true and exact Deſcription &c. Printed . . . 1630. A Preface alſo was added in juſtification of the book and the firſt editors of it, where among other things it is ſaid, "that they, that did ſuppreſs it, were either Papiſts "in their hearts, or ſuch as hold with Papiſts, that "ignorance is the mother of devotion, that the Goſ"pel of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt was departing from the "land &c." And ſince that a Pamphlet came out, without mentioning where it was printed, much to the ſame purpoſe, in the very front of which are theſe words by way of approbation: *D. Caſaubonus ille eruditiſſimus Ceremoniarum Ethnicarum & Diabolicarum in Pontificias & Epiſcopales mutationem terris demonſtrare promittebat. Quod ego Caſauboni promiſſum judico digniſſimum, quod typographiæ beneficio ad manus plurium perveniat.* This piece is but ſhort, as our Author obſerves (8), but all of the ſame ſtrain and ſpirit as the former book, to which it refers.

(8) Ibid. pag. 160.

[*D*] *Deſigned to have proceeded where his father had left off in the confutation of Cardinal* Baronius's Annals; *but was diverted from the execution of that deſign.*] Mr. Wood tells us (9), that about the time, that he was beneficed in Somerſetſhire, and took the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity, he reſolved upon that deſign, but was *diverted by ſome accidental occaſions or provocations*; and that at length, when he came to maturity of years for ſuch a work, and had acquainted Archbiſhop Laud, his great friend and patron, with his deſign, who was very ready to place him conveniently in Oxford or London, according to his deſire, that he might be furniſhed with books neceſſary for ſuch a purpoſe, the troubles and diviſions began in England; ſo that he had no certain place of habitation, and was obliged to ſell a good part of his books (10); and in concluſion after about twenty years ſuffering he was grown ſo old and infirm of body, that he could not expect to live many years, and thereupon was forced to give over that project.

(9) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 485.

(10) See his *Diſcourſe of Credulity and Incredulity*, pag. 260. edit. London 1668.

[*E*] *His* Treatiſe of Uſe and Cuſtom.] He mentions this in the following paſſage in his Diſcourſe of *Credulity and Incredulity* (11). *It is poſſible, the reader may light upon a book, intitled,* A Treatiſe of Uſe and Cuſtom. *It is not in the title, but might have been added* (*as here*), in things natural, civil, and divine. *That which gave occaſion to it,* (*for I muſt own it as mine, though ſet out without my name*) *was, I was at that time much troubled, and as I thought injured by what in the Law of this Realm goes under the name of Cuſtom, to me before little known. And as the buſineſs run often in my mind,* (*riding eſpecially, when I had nothing elſe to buſy my thoughts*) *it brought in time many things into my mind, which I read and obſerved concerning* cuſtom *in general, till at laſt it came to this, that was printed.* "I needed not have owned it, ſome "may think, and better ſo perchance; yet the thanks "I have had for it from ſome, to whoſe judgment I "could not but aſcribe much, becauſe I knew them "very converſant in the ſtudy of Nature, whereof "alſo they have given good proof to the Public, hath "made me to adventure upon this acknowledgment. "However were it now to be reprinted, ſuch is the "largeneſs of the ſubject, it might be fitted for pub"lic uſe much more than ever it was. Now thoſe "things, that are atchieved only by art and ſtudy, "though they may ſeem not ſo properly *natural* in "that ſenſe we take natural here; yet as they are "referred to the *power of uſe and cuſtom* (a great my"ſtery of nature in our ſenſe, and the ſubject of much "*admiration*, as that Treatiſe will ſhew them, who "deſire further ſatisfaction about it) ſo they properly "belong to this account."

(11) Pag. 15. edit. London 1668, in 8vo.

[*F*] *He ſtill continued to publiſh ſeveral excellent works.*] *The uſe of daily public Prayers in three poſitions.* London 1641 in 4to. This is omitted in Father Niceron's Catalogue of our Author's works. *Notæ & Emendationes in Marci Antonini Imperatoris de ſeipſo & ad ſeipſum libros XII.* London 1643 in 8vo. In Monſr. Baillet's *Jugemens des Savans* (11), this edition is erroneouſly ſaid to be printed in 1621. The Latin tranſlation, which is publiſhed here with the Greek text of Antoninus, was done by William Xylander, but corrected in a variety of places by our Author, who has likewiſe added the notes of Xylander. *The original cauſe of temporal evils: The opinions of the moſt antient Heathens concerning it examined by the Sacred Scriptures, and referred unto them, as to the ſource and fountain, from whence they ſprang.* London 1645. in 4to, and not in 8vo, as Father Niceron tells us (12). *A Diſcourſe concerning Chriſt his Incarnation and Exinanition*, with an Introduction *concerning the principles of Chriſtianity and Divinity.* London 1646 in 4to, and not 8vo, as Father Niceron ſays. *De Verborum uſu, & accuratæ eorum cognitionis utilitate Diatriba.* London 1647 in 12mo. The ſame year he publiſhed at London in 8vo, a more compleat Edition of his Father's Notes on Perſius's ſatyrs, under the following title, *Perſii Satyræ, cum Notis Iſaaci Caſauboni.* In 1650 our Author publiſhed, *De quatuor Linguis Commentationis Pars prior, quæ de Lingua Hebraicâ & de Lingua Saxoniâ. Acceſſerunt Guilielmi Somneri ad verba vetera Germanica Lipſiana Notæ.* London in 8vo. He had not opportunity of finiſhing the other two languages, Greek and Latin (13). *Terentius cum Notis Thomæ Farnabii in quatuor priores Comœdias, Merici Caſauboni in Phormionem & Hecyram.* London 1651 in 12mo. Farnaby dying before he had finiſhed his Notes upon Terence, our Author was engaged by the Bookſeller to write Notes upon the *Phormio* and *Hecyra*, which the former had not written upon. *Some Annotations in the Pſalms and Proverbs.* He tells us in his diſcourſe *of Credulity and Incredulity in things* Natural &c. (14), that theſe *Obſervations* were extorted from him by the importunity of the Printers, "when "he was not well furniſhed either with books or lei"ſure, but worſt of all, of will, when nothing could "be expected to be acceptable and welcome, but what "reliſhed of ſchiſm and rebellion." Theſe Annotations were inſerted in one of the latter Editions of the *Aſſembly's Annotations on the Bible*, reprinted with ſome additions (15). *Hierocles de Providentia & Fato, & Fragmenta ejuſdem, Græcè & Latinè, cum Lilii Gyraldi Interpretatione Symbolorum Pythagoræ. Accedunt aurea Pythagoreorum Carmina, & in ea Hieroclis Commentarius, Græcè & Latinè, interprete Joanne Carterio, cum*

(11) Tom. 2. num. 539. pag. 248. edit. Amſterd. 1725 in 4to.

(12) *Ubi ſupra*; pag. 152.

(13) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 487.

(14) Pag. 106, 107. edit. London 1668.

(15) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

friend of our Author, brought him a meſſage from Oliver Cromwell, then Lieutenant General of the Parliament Forces, to bring him to Whitehall to confer with him about matters of moment; but his wife being then lately dead [G], and not, as he ſaid, buried, he deſired to be excuſed. Mr. Greaves afterwards came again; and our Author fearing ſome bad conſequence of the affair, deſired to know the meaning of it, which Mr. Greaves refuſed to acquaint him with. But at laſt returning he told him, that the Lieutenant General intended to promote him, and to employ his pen in writing the Hiſtory of the late war, deſiring at the ſame time, that the matters of fact might be impartially repreſented. Dr. Caſaubon returned his hearty thanks for the honour intended him, but declared that he was incapable in ſeveral reſpects for ſuch an employment, and could not ſo impartially engage in it, but that his ſubject would oblige him to make ſuch reflections as would be ungrateful, if not injurious to his Lordſhip. Notwithſtanding this anſwer Cromwell ſeemed ſo ſenſible of his worth, that he ordered, that upon the firſt demand there ſhould be delivered to him three or four hundred pounds by a Bookſeller in London, whoſe name was Cromwell, whenever his occaſions ſhould require, without acknowledging any benefactor at the receipt of it. But this offer he rejected, though his circumſtances were then mean. At the ſame time it was propoſed by Mr. Greaves, who belonged to the Library at St. James's, that if our Author would gratify Cromwell in the requeſt abovementioned, he would reſtore to him all his father's books, which were then in the Royal Library there, being given by King James, and give him a patent for three hundred pounds *per annum* to be paid to the family as long as the youngeſt ſon of Dr. Caſaubon ſhould live; but this was likewiſe refuſed. Not long after this there was a propoſal made to him by the Embaſſador of Chriſtina Queen of Sweden, to invite him to that Kingdom, where he was to have the government of one, or the inſpection of all the Univerſities, with a conſiderable ſalary for himſelf, and a ſettlement of three hundred pounds *per ann.* upon his eldeſt ſon during life. But this he alſo waved, being determined to ſpend the remainder of his life in England (*o*). At the Reſtoration he recovered all his ſpiritual preferments, and continued writing books to his death [*H*], which happened July the 14th

(*o*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 485, 486.

tum Notis Merici Caſauboni. London 1655 in 8vo, and London 1673 in two volumes in 8vo. Caſaubon had at firſt a deſign to correct the Latin tranſlation of Hierocles, which appeared to have great occaſion for it; but not knowing that the work was printing till it was almoſt entirely finiſhed, he contented himſelf with adding only ſome Grammatical Notes (16). *A Treatiſe concerning* Enthuſiaſm, *as it is an effect of nature, but is miſtaken by many for either Divine Inſpiration, or Diabolical Poſſeſſion.* London 1655 in 8vo. This Treatiſe contains ſix Chapters, the firſt of which treats of Enthuſiaſm in general; the ſecond of Divinatory Enthuſiaſm; the third of Contemplative and Philoſophical Enthuſiaſm; the fourth of Rhetorical Enthuſiaſm; the fifth of Poetical Enthuſiaſm; and the laſt of Precatory Enthuſiaſm. *De nuperâ Homeri Editione Lugduno-Batavicâ Hackianâ, cum Latinâ verſione & Didymi Scholiis: ſed & Euſtathio & locis aliquot inſignioribus ad Odyſſeam pertinentibus. Item ſuper loco Homerico dubiæ apud antiquos Interpretationis, quo Dei in hominum tam mentes quam fortunas imperium aſſeritur, binæ Diſſertationes.* London 1659 in 8vo; and reprinted at the end of Almeloveen's edition of *Iſaac Caſaubon's* Letters. *Epicteti Enchiridion, Græcè & Latinè, cum Notis Merici Caſauboni, & Cebetis Tabulâ.* London 1659 in 8vo. The tranſlation is done by Jerom Wolfius. A tranſlation into Engliſh of *Lucius Florus's Hiſtory of the Romans*, with Notes. London 1659 in 8vo. He publiſhed likewiſe at London 1659 in fol. *A true and faithful relation of what paſſed for many years between Dr.* John Dee *and ſome ſpirits &c.* with a long Preface by our Author, in order to confirm the truth of the relation with regard to ſpirits. Mr. Leibnitz (17) ſtiles this *Preface a very excellent one*, and tells us that it deſerves to be tranſlated as well as the book itſelf.

(16) Niceron, pag. 153.

(17) *Miſcellanea Leibnitiana*, pag. 221. edit. Lipſiæ 1718, in 8vo.

[*G*] *His wife being then lately dead.*] Father Niceron informs us (18), that ſhe died in the year 1651; which is inconſiſtent with what Mr. Wood aſſerts, where he tells us in the paſſage quoted in the text of this Article, that it was in 1649 that Mr. Greaves came from Cromwel to our Author, who deſired then to be excuſed on account of his wife's death, juſt before.

(18) Pag. 149.

[*H*] *Continued writing books to his death.*] We ſhall give an account of them as follows. I. *A Vindication of the Lord's Prayer as a formal Prayer, and by Chriſt's Inſtitution to be uſed by Chriſtians as a Prayer &c.* London 1660. The firſt occaſion of writing this Treatiſe was upon the report, that Dr. John Owen, who had the chief management of the Univerſity of Oxford from 1652 to 1657, had put on his hat, when the *Lord's Prayer* was repeated by the Preacher in the chief Church of Oxford; for which fact the reader may conſult Mr. Thomas Long's Book, intitled, *No Proteſtant but Diſſenters Plot diſcovered and defeated; being an anſwer to the late writings of ſeveral eminent Diſſenters &c.* (19); and the *Apologia pro Miniſtris in Angliâ ejectis*, ſaid to be written by Mr. Henry Hickman, who alſo blames Dr. Owen for it. But the fact was denied by the Doctor in a letter to Dr. Lewis du Moulin (20); *but therein*, ſays Mr. Wood (21), *he doth err much, for ſeveral now living in Oxon know it well enough.* II. *A King and his ſubjects unhappily fallen out, and happily reconciled, in a Sermon at Canterbury on Hoſea* 3. *verſ.* 4, 5. London 1660 in 4to. III. *The queſtion, to whom it belonged antiently to preach, and whether all Prieſts might or did; diſcuſſed out of antiquity, as alſo what preaching is properly.* London 1663 in 4to. IV. *Notæ & Emendationes in Diogenem Laertium de Vitis &c. Philoſophorum.* Theſe Notes were added to thoſe of his father in the editions of Laertius printed at London 1664 in fol. and Amſterdam 1692 in 4to. V. *Of the neceſſity of Reformation in and before* Luther's *time, and what viſibly hath moſt hindred the progreſs of it. Occaſioned by ſome late virulent books written by Papiſts, but eſpecially by that intitled,* Labyrinthus Cantuarienſis. *Here beſides ſome other points, the grand buſineſs of theſe times,* Infallibility, *is fully diſcuſſed.* By Meric Caſaubon, *D. D. and one of the Prebends of Canterbury.* London 1664 in 4to. This Book is chiefly deſigned as an anſwer to one printed at Paris in 1658, and intitled, *Labyrinthus Cantuarienſis, being an anſwer to the late Archbiſhop of Canterburie's* Relation of a conference; and intended to ſhew the neceſſity of a reformation, and that the ſeparation of our Church from that of Rome, upon that account, cannot be charged with ſchiſm; in oppoſition to what the Author of the Labyrinth maintains in the 11th, 13th, and 14th Chapter of his Labyrinth, that *Proteſtants are Schiſmatics, and no part of the Catholic Church.* VI. *An Anſwer concerning the new way of Infallibility lately deviſed to uphold the Roman cauſe; the Holy Scriptures, the antient Fathers and Councils laid aſide; againſt* J. S. *(the Author of* Sure-footing*) his Letter lately publiſhed.* London 1665 in 4to. The Letter by

(19) Pag. 167, 168. edit. London 1682, in 8vo.

(20) *See* Dr. John Durell's *Vindiciæ Eccleſ. Angl.* cap. 3. pag. 33.

(21) Col. 487.

14th 1671, in the seventy second year of his age, and not in the seventy fifth, as is mentioned in his epitaph [*I*], and he was interred in the Cathedral of Canterbury, where he had a monument erected to him. He had a design in the latter part of his days of writing his own Life [*K*]. Mr. Wood in his *Historia & Antiquitates Universitatis Oxonienſis* (*p*) tells us, that he was skilled in various parts of Literature, tho' not very accurately, but that his chief talent lay in critical Learning, in which he seems to have been greatly assisted by his father's papers. He was eminent for his piety, charity to the poor, and his courteous and affable disposition. Monsieur Bernard in his *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* (*q*) observes, that though he was inferior to his father, yet he was a man of considerable learning; and that he ascribed to the Philosophy of Des Cartes the little inclination which people had in his time for the study of polite Literature. He left a great number of manuscripts to the University of Oxford (*r*). By his wife, whom he married in 1651, and with whom he had a considerable fortune, he had several children (*s*), and particularly a son whose name was John, and who was a Chirurgeon in Canterbury (*t*).

(*p*) Lib. 2. pag 282.

(*q*) Tom. 35. *Mois de Juillet* 1710, Art. 1. pag. 28.

(*r*) Wood, *Hiſt. & Antiq.* lib. 2. pag. 282.

(*s*) Niceron, pag. 149.

(*t*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 486.

by J. S. that is, *John Sarjeant*, contained some exceptions against some passages in Dr. Casaubon's former Book *Of the necessity of Reformation*, &c. and this Letter was printed at the end of *Sure-footing in Christianity*, and follows the four Appendixes relating to Dr. Thomas Pierce, Dr. Daniel Whitby, Dr. J. Stillingfleet, and Dr. Jeremy Taylor, printed in 1664 in a large 8vo. VII. *A Letter of* Meric Casaubon *D. D. &c. to* Peter du Moulin, *D. D. and Prebendary of the same Church, concerning Natural Experimental Philosophy, and some Books lately set out about it.* Cambridge 1669 in 4to. pagg 36. VIII. *Of Credulity and Incredulity in things Natural, Civil, and Divine; wherein, among other things, the Sadducism of these times, in denying spirits, witches, and supernatural operations, by pregnant instances and evidences is fully confuted; Epicurus his cause discussed, and the jugling and false dealing lately used to bring him and Atheism into credit, clearly discovered; the use and necessity of ancient learning against the innovating humour all along proved and asserted.* London 1668 in 8vo. The second part was printed at London 1670 in 8vo, under the following title; *Credulity and Incredulity in things Divine and Spiritual; wherein (among other things) a true and faithful account is given of the* Platonic Philosophy, *as it hath reference to Christianity; as also the business of witches and witchcraft, against a late writer fully argued and disputed.* The *late Writer*, whom our Author attacks in this part, is John Wagstaff, who published at London 1669 in 8vo, *The Question of Witchcraft debated, or a discourse against their opinion, that affirm Witches.* Mr. Wood informs us (29), that the two parts of Dr. Casaubon's Book lying dead on the Bookseller's hands, they printed after his death a new title to them as follows; *A Treatise proving Spirits, Witches, and Supernatural Operations by pregnant instances and evidences*, &c. London 1672 in 8vo. IX. *Notæ in Polybium*, printed for the first time in the Edition of that Author published by James Gronovius at Amsterdam in 1670 in 8vo. X. *Epistolæ, Dedicationes, Præfationes, Prolegomena, & Tractatus quidam rariores*; published by Theodore Janson ab Almeloveen at the end of Isaac Casaubon's Epistles, at Rotterdam 1709 in fol. XI. *De Jure Concionandi apud Antiquos*, Mr. Wood, who mentions this piece in his *Historia & Antiquitates Universitatis Oxonienſis* (30), only tells us, that it was written in Latin. But perhaps he is mistaken; and it was only the English Tract mention'd above, N° 3.

(29) Col. 488.

(30) Lib. 2. pag. 282.

[*I*] *His Epitaph*] It is as follows (31): *Sta & venerare Viator. Hic mortales immortalis ſpiritûs Exuvias depoſuit Mericus Caſaubonus, magni nominis eruditique generis par hæres; quippe qui patrem Iſaacum Caſaubonum, Avum Henricum Stephanum, Proavum Robertum Stephanum habuit. Hui quos Viros! Quæ Literarum Lumina! Quæ ævi ſui decora! Ipſe eruditionem per tot erudita capita traducem excepit, excoluit, & ad pietatis (quæ in ejus pectore Regina ſedebat) ornamentum & incrementum fæliciter conſecravit; Rempublicam Litterariam multiplici Rerum & Linguarum ſupellectile locupletavit. Vir, incertum doctior an melior, in pauperes liberalitate, in amicos utilitate, in omnes humanitate, in acutiſſimis longiſſimi morbi tormentis Chriſtianâ patientiâ inſigniſſimus. Gaudeat primaria hæc Eccleſia primariis Canonicis Caſaubonis ambobus, qui eundem in Eruditorum, quem ipſa in Eccleſiarum ſerie, ordinem obtinent. Obiit noſter pridie Idus Julii an.* 1671. *ætatis ſuæ* 75, *Canonicatûs ſui* 46.

(31) *See* Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

[*K*] *He had a design in the latter part of his days of writing his own Life.*] He mentions this design in his *Treatiſe concerning Enthuſiaſm*, c. 3. p. 85; and he often declared (32), that he esteem'd himself obliged to write an account of it out of gratitude to divine Providence, which had preserved and deliver'd him from more hazardous occurrences than ever any man, as he thought, besides himself had encounter'd with; particularly in his escape from a fire in the night-time, which happened in the house where he lived while he was a boy, at Geneva in his recovery from a sickness at Christ-Church in Oxford, when he was given over for dead, by a chymical medicine given him by a young Physician (33); in his wonderful preservation from drowning, when overset in a boat on the Thames near London, the two watermen being drowned, and himself buoyed up by his Priest's coat; and in his bearing several abuses, fines, imprisonments, &c. "laid upon him, *says Mr. Wood* "(34), by the fanatical Reformers in the time of his "Sequestration, and other memorables. But these "things being by him deferred from time to time, "were at length hinder'd by death, which seized on "him sooner than he expected. T.

(32) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 488.

(33) See his *Discourse of Credulity and Incredulity*, pag. 16, 17. edit. London 1668.

(34) *Ubi ſupra.*

CASSANDRA, daughter of Priam and Hecuba, was tempted by Apollo, and deceived him. He promised to bestow upon her the gift of Prophecy, provided she would give him her maidenhead [*A*]. Cassandra seemingly consented to this exchange; but no sooner had she obtained the gift of Prophecy, but she laughed at the tempter, and broke her word with him. Apollo did not revenge himself, by bereaving her of the gift he had indulged her, but by causing no credit to be given, by any persons, to her predictions (*a*). She was considered as mad, before the things she foretold were come to pass;

(*a*) Apollodor. lib. 3. pag. m. 227.

[*A*] *Apollo . . . promis'd to bestow upon her the gift of Prophecy, provided she would give him her maidenhead.*] I have already observed several times, that nothing can be more ill contrived and connected than the system of the antient Heathens, of which we have a proof here. It was a tenet of the Pagan Doctrine, that the Priestess of Apollo at Delphi should always be a virgin, for that otherwise she could not be inspired (1). This being laid down, it ought not to have been supposed, that Apollo promised the gift of Prophecy to a virgin, upon condition that she would surrender up her maidenhead to him. Some writers imagine that this was owing to the artifices of the Devil, and his deep malice (2). But this supposes that the story of Cassandra's temptation is real fact, whereas it is no more than a poetical fiction. The Author whom I have here in view has committed another error. He supposes that the Sybil of *Cumæ* was tempted by Apollo, in the same manner as Cassandra had been; and to prove this (3), he cites some verses of Ovid (4), which make no mention of any promise of the gift of Prophecy. In order to find an exact conformity between these two temptations, it should have been said that Apollo offered, in general, to give Cassandra any thing she should ask of him, for so he promis'd the Sybil (5). A modern Writer supposes,

(1) *See* Petit. *de Sybillâ*, pag. 114.

(2) Ibid. pag. 121.

(3) Ibid. pag. 122.

(4) See lib. 14. Metam. Ovid.

(5) *Elige, ait, virgo Cumæa quid optes, Optatis potiere tuis.* Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 14. ver. 140. That is, "Wish, my "Cumæan maid, "whatever you "will, "It shall be "granted.——

paſs; and was not owned to be in her ſenſes, till after they were accompliſhed (b). Servius relates the manner how theſe were rendered ineffectual [B]. Some relate another ſtory [C]. However this be, when the Greeks took the City of Troy, this Propheteſs fled for ſhelter into the Temple of Minerva, and there ſaved her life, but not her honour [D]; for Ajax ſon of Oileus forced her in the midſt of the Temple. We have declared elſewhere (c), in what manner Minerva reſented this injury; and we ſhall here make ſome mention concerning the puniſhment of this obſcene impiety [E]. It is remarkable

(b) Plutarch. *de præc. Reipubl.* pag. 281.

(c) In the Remarks [B] and [C] of the article AJAX OILEUS, above.

poſes, that the promiſes made to Caſſandra were in reality confined to nothing; and that it was Caſſandra who made choice of the gift of Prophecy (6); but the authority of Apollodorus and that of Servius will not allow us to agree to this ſuppoſition. One of theſe Authors ſays, that Apollo promiſed Caſſandra that he would make her a Propheteſs (7); and the other, that he made her no promiſe; but that Caſſandra having deſired to be endued with the gift of Prophecy, as a reward for her laſt favour, was taken at her word (8). The Sybil being permitted to ſue for whatever bleſſings ſhe pleaſed, deſired long life; and having forgot to deſire perpetual youth, it was in her power to have obtained that alſo; it would have coſt Caſſandra only her maidenhead.

(6) Vigenere, in the Argument to the *Caſſandra of Philoſtratus*, tom. 1. pag. m. 630. edit. in 4to; and tom. 2. pag. 77.
(7) Apollodor. lib. 3. pag. m. 227.
(8) Servius, in Æn. lib. 2. ver. 247.

Excidit, ut peterem juvenes quoque protinus annos,
Hos tamen ille mihi dabat, æternamque juventam,
Si venerem paterer (9).

That is,

" I aſk'd long life, and my requeſt obtain'd.
" The precious bleſſing of unfading youth
" Would have been mine, had I my virtue yielded."

(9) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 14. ver. 344.

But Caſſandra thought that eternal youth would be purchaſed too dear at that price; and conſequently ſhe ſet a high price upon her wares.

[B] *Servius relates the manner how theſe* Prophecies *were rendred ineffectual.*] Apollo's ſpittle produc'd this effect, which was ſo ſtrong, that Caſſandra's predictions could never obtain credit. The God was exaſperated at the fair-one, for refuſing what ſhe had promis'd him; however, he concealed his reſentment, and deſired her to grant him a kiſs at leaſt. She indulged his requeſt, upon which he ſpit in Caſſandra's mouth, and by that means the gift he had beſtowed upon her became of no uſe. *Apollo cum amâſſet Caſſandram, petit ab ea ejus concubitus copiam; illa hac conditione promiſit, ſi ſibi ab eo futurorum ſcientia præſtaretur; quam cum Apollo tribuiſſet, ab illa promiſſus coitus denegatus eſt; ſed Apollo diſſimulata pauliſper ira, petiit ab ea, ut ſibi oſculum ſaltem præſtaret, quod cum illa feciſſet, Apollo os ejus inſpuit; & quia eripere Deo ſemel tributum munus non conveniebat, effecit ut illa quidem vera vaticinaretur, ſed fides non haberetur* (10). Servius relates theſe particulars, in his Commentary on the following lines of Virgil.

(10) Servius, in Æn. lib. 2. ver. 247.

Tunc etiam fatis aperit Caſſandra futuris
Ora, Dei juſſu non unquam credita Teucris (11).

That is,

" Caſſandra . .
" Foretold our fate, but by the God's decree,
" All heard, but none believ'd the Prophecy."

(11) Virg. Æn. lib. 2. ver. 246.

[C] *Some relate another ſtory.*] It is this: Helenus and Caſſandra, who were twins, were carried in their infancy to the Temple of Apollo, and were left there a whole night, either out of forgetfulneſs, or becauſe it was the cuſtom. The next day, when the infants where ſought for, they were found with ſerpents twiſted round their bodies, and licking their ears. This action of the ſerpents endued both with the gift of Prophecy (12). This calls to my memory what is related of Melampus. One day, whilſt he was ſleeping, two ſerpents came and lick'd his ears; and waking afterwards, he was aſtoniſhed at his underſtanding the language of birds, whereby he was enabled to foretel a great many things (13).

(12) Tzetzes *in Lycophron.* Euſtathius *in Iliad* 6. Scholiaſtes Euripidis *in Hecub. apud* Meziriac. *in Epiſt. Ovidii*, pag. 479.
(13) Apollodorus, lib. 2. Scholiaſtes *Homeri in Odyſſ.* 11. Scholiaſtes Apollonii in lib. 1. *apud* Meziriac. ibid. pag. 480.

[D] *She fled for ſhelter into the Temple of Minerva, and there ſaved her life, but not her honour.*] Virgil did not think proper to ſay that ſhe had been raviſhed (14); and only repreſents the condition to which ſhe was reduced, when ſhe was dragged out of the Temple.

(14) *Bene diſſimulavit de ſtupro Caſſandræ.* Servius *in Æneid.* lib. 2. ver. 403.

Ecce trahebatur paſſis Priameïa virgo
Crinibus a templo Caſſandra adytiſque Minervæ;
Ad cœlum tendens ardentia lumina fruſtra;
Lumina, nam teneras arcebant vincula palmas.

That is,

" Behold the royal Propheteſs, the fair
" Caſſandra, dragg'd by her diſhevell'd hair;
" Whom not Minerva's ſhrine, nor ſacred bands,
" In ſafety could protect from ſacrilegious hands.
" On Heav'n ſhe caſt her eyes, ſhe ſigh'd, ſhe cry'd,
" ('Twas all ſhe cou'd;) her tender arms were ty'd."

Dryden.

But Quintus Calaber the Poet was not ſo ſcrupulous, he declaring expreſly, that Ajax the ſon of Oileus, raviſhed Caſſandra in the very Temple of Minerva (15). This is the general tradition (16); which was proved by public monuments in ſeveral cities of Greece (17). See the article of that AJAX. According to ſome Authors, Caſſandra was the Prieſteſs of Pallas (18); whilſt others relate, that ſhe was in that character with regard to Apollo (19); nevertheleſs, if Virgil may be credited, ſhe had been betrothed or promis'd to Corœbus.

(15) Quint. Calab. 13. ver. 421.
(16) *See* Servius in Æneid 1. ver. 41.
(17) Pauſanias, lib. 1. pag. 14; lib. 5. pag. 167; lib. 10. pag. 343.
(18) Servius, in Æn. 2. ver. 404.
(19) *Tractata comis antiſtita Phœbi*
Non profecturas tendebat ad æthera palmas.
Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 13. ver. 411. i. e. " Caſſandra " being dragged " by the hair, " lifted up her " unavailing " hands to hea- " ven." *See alſo* Euripides, *in Troadibus*, ver. 253.

——— ——— *Juveniſque Corœbus*
Mygdonides. Illis ad Trojam ſorte diebus
Venerat, inſano Caſſandræ incenſus amore,
Et GENER *auxilium Priamo Phrygibuſque ferebat:*
Infelix qui non SPONSÆ *præcepta furentis*
Audierat (20).

That is,

——— " Young Corœbus, who by love was led
" To win renown, and fair Caſſandra's bed:
" And lately brought his troops to Priam's aid:
" Forewarn'd in vain by the prophetic maid."

Dryden.

(20) Virgil. Æneid. lib. 3. ver. 341.

Homer mentions a Prince, who was come to ſue for Caſſandra in marriage; and promiſed at the ſame time to oblige the Greeks to raiſe the ſiege of Troy. This Prince was ſo inflamed with Caſſandra's beauty, that he did not require any dowry.

Ἦτοι δὲ Πριάμοιο θυγατρῶν εἶδος ἀρίστην
Κασσάνδρην, ἀνάεδνον· ὑπέσχετο δὲ μέγα ἔργον
Ἐκ Τροίης ἀέκοντας ἀπωσέμεν υἷας Ἀχαιῶν.

(21) Homer. Iliad. ver. 365.

That is,

" Caſſandra's love he ſought with boaſts of power,
" And promis'd conqueſt was the proffer'd dower."

Pope.

Priam conſented to this marriage. Homer calls this future ſon-in-law of Priam, Othryoneus, and makes him die in battle. Virgil alſo relates that Corœbus was killed the night that Troy was taken. Pauſanias mentions this Corœbus, as a man who was to marry Caſſandra (22).

(22) Pauſan. lib. 10. pag. 344.

[E] *We ſhall take ſome notice, concerning the puniſhment of this obſcene impiety.*] Plutarch obſerves, that it was not long ſince the Locri had diſcontinued the ſending virgins to Troy, to expiate the looſe action of Ajax (23). Theſe virgins ſpent their whole lives in a very melancholy manner, in ſweeping the Temple of the Goddeſs Minerva. I make uſe of Amyot's tranſlation, to ſhew their dreſs and employment.

(23) Plut. *de ſera Numinis Vindicta*, pag. 557.

Où les pieds nuds, ſans aucune veſture,
Sans voile aucun, ni honneſte coiffure,
Ne plus ne moiens qu' eſclaves, tout le jour
Des le matin elles ſont ſans ſejour
A balſier de Pallas la Déeſſe
Le temple ſaint juſques en leur vieilleſſe.

Thus tranſlated,

" Barefooted here, without or veil or gown,

" Or,

remarkable that the puniſhment fell on the ſex which had been injured; for the Locri were obliged to ſend, annually, young maids to Troy, where they paſſed their days in a very ſevere condition. They ſent maidens in this manner for ſeveral Centuries, and 'twas never known, that any one of them loſt their virginity (*d*). Theon the Sophiſt made an obſervation

(*d*) See in the remark [*E*], citation (31), St. Jerom's words.

" Or head-dreſs to confine their flowing hair,
" Like ſlaves they work; from morn to ſhadowing
" Eve,
" For ever they are ſweeping Pallas' Temple;
" Nor ceaſe, till frozen age benumbs their limbs.

After giving theſe verſes of Amiot, I ſhall make uſe of Vigenere's proſe, to explain more particularly the puniſhment, which Ajax's crime brought on the Locri. *Timæus the Sicilian and Callimachus relate this more particularly, they declaring, that ſome three years after the death of Ajax, the Locri being afflicted with a grievous peſtilence, becauſe of the crime committed by their deceaſed Prince, the people were admoniſhed by the oracle, that they would be a thouſand years (from that time) appeaſing the Minerva of Troy; during which they muſt ſend to it, annually, two virgins, on whom the lot ſhould fall. Theſe poor creatures were obliged to ſet out privately in the night, by the moſt ſecret, ſolitary ways, in diſguiſe, in order to enter ſecretly into the temple of the Goddeſs; where if they arrived ſafe, they remained for her Miniſtry and ſervice, to ſweep and water the place; and whence they never dared to come out, nor approach the holy image, except in the night-time; being moreover ſhaved, cloathed in a wretched garment, and barefooted. But few among them could arrive there, becauſe the moment the Trojans were informed of their departure from Locris, (which was at certain ſtated ſeaſons) they uſed to lay in wait for them; and there, without the leaſt mercy, if any of them fell into their hands, they either were inhumanly ſtoned to death or killed with ſwords; then burnt upon the ſpot with the wood of trees, that do not bear fruit; and thrown their aſhes from mount Tracon* (24) *into the ſea. So ſeverely could the Gods of the Heathens take vengeance of thoſe who offended them* (25).

(24) It ſhould have been *Traron*.

(25) Vigenere on Ajax the Locrian of Philoſtratus, tom. 1. pag. m. 711.

Vigenere cites Timæus the Hiſtorian, and Callimachus the Poet, as tho' the Books in which they related thoſe particulars were ſtill extant, which is an impoſition. That writer would have been more ſincere, as well as more exact, had he cited the Scholiaſt on Lycophron; for it is he who relates this incident, and produces the teſtimony of thoſe two Authors. He obſerves (26), that Peribœa and Cleopatra were the two firſt virgins whom the Locri ſent; and that there was ſome little variation in the method; for, at firſt, two virgins who were come to years of maturity were ſent; and afterwards children of but a year old, with their nurſes. In caſe the Trojans killed them before they arrived at the Temple, the Locri were obliged to proceed to a new choice. This cuſtom expired a thouſand years after the war of Troy. Χιλίων δ' ἐτῶν παρελθόντων μετὰ τὸν Τρωικὸν πόλεμον ἐπαύσαντο τῆς τοιαύτης θυσίας. We muſt read Τρωικὸν and not Φωκικὸν, as it is printed. The learned Caſaubon would have done better to correct the text in this manner, than to criticiſe Timæus, upon pretence, that there was only about 840 years, between the Trojan war, and the concluſion of the war of Phocœa (27). I am to obſerve, that he makes this remark, in commenting an Author who takes notice, that it is extremely difficult to guard ſufficiently againſt thoſe, who endeavour to introduce any thing in a clandeſtine manner. This Author mentions the Trojans as an inſtance, who though they employed the utmoſt precautions to prevent the Locrian Virgins from coming into Troy, they yet found all their endeavours fruitleſs. We ſee he ſpeaks of this cuſtom in the preſent tenſe, which is a proof that it ſtill exiſted (28). Μαρτύριον δὲ ὅτι τὰ εἰσειωπώμενα μετ' ἐπιβουλῆς χαλεπὸν φυλάξαι. Οἱ γὲν περὶ Ἴλιον ἄνθρωποι ἐκ τοσούτου χρόνου καὶ οὕτω διατεταγμένοι, οὔτω δύανται φυλάξαι μὴ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοῖς τὰς Λοκρίδας. Καίτοι τοσοῦτον αὐτοῖς ἔσιν ἡ σπουδὴ καὶ ἡ φυλακή. ἀλλ' ὀλίγοι προσίχοντες τῷ λαθεῖν λανθάνουσι, πολλὰ εἰσάγοντες σώματα. i. e. " The great difficulty " there is of introducing a thing by ſtealth, may be " proved by an example. For the Trojans, tho' they " employed ſo much time, ſo much care and circumſpection, to prevent the Locri from entring the city " of Troy, they yet could not hinder it. But the few " who are to enter, deceived thoſe who watched for " them, and by that means many Locrian women are " brought into the city." Were this Author now living, he might confirm his aphoriſm by the example of a great multitude of Proteſtants, who eſcaped out of France, in ſpite of the well contrived meaſures which had been taken to prevent their leaving the Kingdom. I do not take notice of the ſucceſs of the ſtratagems by which contraband goods are brought in, in ſpite of the great number of Cuſtom-houſes and Officers,

(26) Tzetzes *in Lycophron.* ver. 1141.

(27) Caſaub. *in Æneæ Poliorc.* cap. 31. pag. m. 1784.

(28) Æneas *in Poliorc.* cap. 31. pag. m. 1704.

Et trompant de Colbert la prudence importune (29).
That is,
" Spite of ſage Colbert's well-concerted ſchemes.

(29) Deſpreaux, Sat. 8. ver. 195.

Caſaubon has committed a conſiderable error, tranſlating the paſſage where Polybius ſays, that there were, among the Locri, an hundred noble families, who were honoured with ſeveral prerogatives; and that the virgins who were ſent annually to Troy, were always to belong to theſe hundred families: Ἐξ ὧν ἔμελλον οἱ Λοκροὶ κατὰ τὸν χρησμὸν κληροῦν τὰς ἀποσταλησομένας παρθένους εἰς Ἴλιον (30). *E quibus*, according to Caſaubon's verſion, *Locrenſes illas centum virgines ſorte legere ex oraculi reſponſo tenebantur, quæ erant quotannis ad Ilium mittendæ.* This Latin ſignifies manifeſtly, that the Locri had ſent an hundred maidens annually to Troy; but this is not the tranſlation of Polybius's words, he not making any mention of the number of maidens who were ſent. I will here introduce a paſſage of St. Jerom. *Juſtum eſt & Locras virgines non tacere, quæ cum Ilium mitterentur ex more, per annos circiter mille, nulla obſcœni rumoris & pollutæ virginitatis ullam fabulam dedit* (31). i. e. " I muſt not omit the Locrian virgins, " who being ſent annually to Troy, according to a " cuſtom which prevailed about a thouſand years, ne- " ver gave occaſion to the leaſt evil report concerning " the violation of their chaſtity." He does not pretend to applaud theſe Locrian maidens, becauſe none of them had been raviſhed, but that none of them ſuffered her chaſtity to be violated; which certainly is a remarkable circumſtance, conſidering the length of the voyage, and the long duration of this cuſtom. We are not to wonder that the Trojans, who laid in wait for them, did not once attempt to enjoy them; for they conſidered them as ſo many victims who were loaded with curſes; they looked upon them as unclean animals, who deſerved only to be ſlaughtered and burnt, and their aſhes to be ſcattered in the air (32) by way of expiation. Tzetzes (33) obſerves, that one of them died on mount Traron near Troy; that the Locri buried her, ſaid nothing of it; but that they diſcontinued the ſending of any more maidens, becauſe they believed they had fulfilled the time preſcribed by the oracle. However, they were miſtaken; and their country began again to be afflicted with a famine, which made them reſume the cuſtom they had laid aſide; but now, inſtead of ſending two maidens, they ſent but one to Troy, imagining that this would be ſufficient to expiate for the future, the crime of Ajax. The Scholiaſt pretends, that they gave a wrong interpretation to the oracle, ſince Apollo, (without limitting any time) had commanded them to ſend two maidens, to expiate the injury which had been done to Caſſandra. But this is a bad remark; for he himſelf had juſt before ſaid, that the oracle had appointed a thouſand years (34); and this term of years is mentioned by ſeveral Authors (35). Ælian indeed ſuppoſes, that the oracle injoyned this puniſhment in general, till ſuch time as the Trojan Minerva ſhould be appeaſed (36). I muſt not omit what Strabo aſſerts, viz. that, in his time, it was generally ſaid by the Trojans, that the Greeks had never entirely ruined their city (37), which was proved in this manner, viz. that the Locri began to ſend maidens thither a very little after. To this Strabo anſwers two things. I, That Homer makes no mention of the raviſhing of Caſſandra: II, That the Locri did not begin to ſend

(30) Polyb. lib. 12. cap. 3. pag. 914. edit. Amſtel. 1670.

(31) Hieron. *contra Jovinian.* lib. 1. cap. 26.

(32) They uſed to be caſt in the Sea. Lycophr. ver. 1158.

(33) Tzetzes *in Lycophron.* ver. 1159.

(34) Idem, ibid. ver. 1141.

(35) Lycophron. ver. 1153. Scholiaſt. Homeri in lib. 13. ver. 66. *ex* Callimacho.

(36) Ælian. *apud* Suidam, pag. 623. *in* Ποινή.

(37) Strabo, lib. 13. pag. 413.

obſervation I ſhall here take notice of [F]. Caſſandra, in the diviſion of the plunder, fell to Agamemnon's lot. She was not diſpleaſing to this Prince [G]; and it is ſaid that Clytemneſtra was jealous of it, and that this was one of the motives which prompted her to murder her huſband (e) [H]. Caſſandra was not ſpared, ſhe being butchered at the ſame time; and two boys, (twins) whom ſhe had had by Agamemnon, met with the ſame fate (f). She was vaſtly beautiful, and had been ſought for in marriage by powerful Princes (g). A conteſt aroſe between the cities of Mycenè and Amicles about her tomb (h); each of them pretending to have it. A temple was built to her honour in Leuctra, where her ſtatue was honoured by the name of Alexandra (i) [I].

(e) Homer. Odyſſ. lib. 11. Hygin. cap. 17. Philoſtrat. *in Caſſandra.*

(f) Pauſan. lib. 2. pag. 147. edit. Lipſ. 1696.
(g) See the remark [D].
(h) Pauſan. lib. 2. pag. 147.
(i) Idem, lib. 3. pag. 277.

Lycophron ſpeaks of a temple of Caſſandra built by the Daunians, and by the inhabitants of the city of Dardanus. The ſtatue of this Lady was there an aſylum to ſuch maidens as were determined not to marry; and who grounded their refuſal on the uglineſs or mean extraction of thoſe who courted them. The remedy they employed on this occaſion was, to embrace the ſtatue of Caſſandra; but then they were obliged to put on the dreſs of furies, and change the colour of their complections, by dawbing their faces with certain drugs. They devoted themſelves in a particular manner to the worſhip of Caſſandra, and honoured her as a Goddeſs (k). There is not any paſſage in Lycophron expreſſed

(k) Extracted from Lycophron, ver. 1128, & *ſeq.*

maidens, till the Monarchy of the Perſians. A conſiderable error is committed in the tranſlation of theſe words of Strabo: Αἱ γοῦν Δοκρίδες παρθένοι μικρὸν ὕστερον ἀρξάμεναι ἐπέμποντο κατ' ἔτος (38); for inſtead of *Locrenſes quidem virgines paulò poſt cæperunt Ilium mitti quotannis*, i. e. "A little after the Locrian virgins "uſed to be ſent to Troy every year," the tranſlator ſays *Locrenſes*, &c. *mitti more uſitato:* which ſignifies that this cuſtom was more antient than the war of Troy. In a word, this is a blunder of the tranſlator.

(38) Idem, ibid. edit. Genev. 1587.

[F] *Theon the Sophiſt made an obſervation which I ſhall here take notice of.*] It is a precept in Rhetoric, concerning the manner of refuting a narration. The Rhetorician, ſays he, muſt deny the fact, either by aſſerting that it is not poſſible, or that it is repugnant to probability; but, in caſe it be manifeſtly true, he muſt attack the narration on ſome other ſides; he muſt examine whether any thing be wanting; whether any uſeleſs particulars are introduced into it, or whether one part may be inconſiſtent or contradictory to the reſt. For, if the Rhetorician finds nothing amiſs in theſe reſpects, he then muſt oppoſe decency and utility; for, in the ſame manner as certain actions ought not to be committed, ſo they ought not to be related after they have been committed. It is better to bury them in everlaſting oblivion. It would therefore be very unſeemly, if, after repreſenting Ajax as impious as is related, the writer ſhould add, that he did not meet with any misfortune either at ſea or in his own houſe, and died in a happy old age. One may eaſily ſuppoſe, that Theon's meaning is, that if ſome Orators had related the actions of Ajax, without ever deviating from the rules but in that ſingle point, viz. their not ſuppreſſing the good fortune which followed his impiety; there would have been no other way of refuting their narration, but by ſhewing that they had not been ſilent in that place where they ought to have been ſo. The only engine that could be levelled at them, would be the *common place* of utility and decorum; they could be cenſured for nothing, but for exhibiting to public view an impious man made fortunate, an object that claſhes with decorum, and may be of prejudice to good manners. It will be neceſſary for me to quote the words of the Greek Sophiſt; for they contain I know not what, that is ſurprizing, and which does not agree very well either with the laws of hiſtory or with truth; but the Rhetoricians have ſome rules which are peculiar to their art only (39). Εἰ ὃ ταῦτα πάντα κατὰ τρόπον εἴη διατεθειμένα, ἀλλ' ὡς ἁπλῶς τι, καὶ ἀσύμφορον διωκτέον. Εἰ δὲ τῶν πραγμάτων, ἃ πραχθῆναι μὲν οὐκ ἐχρῆν, φθάσαντα δὲ πραχθῆναι, σωτῆρός συμφέρει, οἷον, εἴ τις τὸν Λοκρὸν Αἴαντα τοιαῦτα εἰπὼν εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἀσεβῆσαι, οἷα λέγεται, ἔπειτα ὑπόθοιτο, μήτε ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ, μήτε οἴκοι, κακόν τι αὐτὸν πιπονθότα, ἐν γήρᾳ μὲν εὐδαιμονίας τετελευτηκέναι (40). However it be, this makes for the tradition, concerning the puniſhment of Caſſandra's raviſher.

(39) See the Remark [A] of the Article CASTRITIUS (TITUS). See alſo the concluſion of the remark [B] of the Article CASSIAN Family.
(40) Theoph. *in Progymnaſm.* cap. 6. pag. 87, 88. edit. Lugd. Batav. 1626.

[G] *Caſſandra . . . was not diſpleaſing to this Prince.*] Agamemnon fell in love with her, if we may believe Euripides (41), and obtained her from the Greeks as a kind of gift. She was not diſpoſed by way of lot, but was ſet apart, in order to be preſented to that Monarch (42), who made her his concubine (43). I have ſpoke of Horace's wrong argumentation in the article BRESEIS (44). This Poet would prove, that his friend ought not to be aſhamed at loving his maid ſervant, ſince Agamemnon did not bluſh to love King Priam's daughter:

(44) Remark [E].

Arſit Atreides medio in triumpho
Virgine rapta (45).
Thus engliſhed,
"Fam'd Agamemnon, midſt his glorious triumphs,
"Sigh'd for the raviſhed virgin——

(45) Horat. Od. 4. lib. 2. ver. 7.

By the way, Hyginus ſhould not have aſſerted that Oeax, to revenge the death of his brother Palamedes, told Clytemneſtra a falſhood, by informing her, (in oppoſition to truth) that her huſband was bringing her a rival, or rather a concubine, viz. Caſſandra (46). This was not telling her a falſhood. Pauſanias informs us that Caſſandra, being got with child by Agamemnon, was delivered of twins, whom Ægiſtheus murthered on their father's grave (47).

(46) Hygin. cap. 117.

(47) Pauſan. lib. 2. pag. 59.

[H] . . . . *Clytemneſtra was jealous of it; and this was one of the motives which prompted her to murder her huſband.*] Hyginus, in the place before cited, relates, that the words of Palamedes's brother had a deſired effect. Clytemneſtra being informed that her huſband was bringing Caſſandra, reſolved to get rid of them both, and accordingly did ſo. She owns in Euripides, that the injury her huſband had done her, in ſacrificing Iphigenia, would not have prompted her to murther him; but he was returned, ſaid ſhe, with an enthuſiaſtic, frantic wench; he had put her into my bed, and we were two brides under one roof.

Ἀλλ' ἦλθ' ἔχων μοι Μαινάδ' ἔνθεον κόρην
Λέκτροις τ' ἐπεισέφρησε, κἀνόμφα δυοῖν
Ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖσι δώμασι κατεύχομαι (48).

(48) Euripides *in Electra*, ver. 1032. pag. m. 627.

Meziriac pretends, that Pindar mentions theſe very two cauſes for Clytemneſtra's attempt, but he is miſtaken; Pindar's two cauſes are, the remembrance of Iphigenia's ſacrifice, and the fear of Agamemnon's anger. His wife had led ſo diſſolute a life (49), that ſhe did not think it poſſible, either that her crime could be concealed, or that her huſband would ſuffer her to go unpuniſhed. It is plain this is Pindar's thought, and I am ſurprized Meziriac did not perceive it. See his Commentary on Ovid's Epiſtles, pag. 891.

(49) Ἡ ἐτέρῳ λέχει δαμαλιζομένην Ἐννύχιοι παράγον κοῖται. Pindar. *Pyth.* Od. 11. pag. m. 470.

[I] *She was honoured by the name of Alexandra.*] She was very near as much known by this name, as by that of Caſſandra; witneſs the Poem ſtill extant of Lycophron, which is entitled *Alexandra*, becauſe it is a Prophecy made, as the Poet ſuppoſes, by Caſſandra. It is whimſical in Tzetzes to ſuppoſe, that ſhe was called Alexandra, παρὰ τὸ ἀλύξαι τὴν ἀνδρὸς συνουσίαν, (becauſe ſhe fled the amorous embrace) or, to uſe the expreſſion of Mr. de Meziriac of the French Academy, *becauſe ſhe ſhunned all carnal copulation with men.* I am of opinion that ſhe ſhunned full as much, fire, water and precipices. He therefore had as much reaſon to draw the etymology of her name from thence.

(41) Ἔρως ἐτόξευσ' αὐτὸν ἐν Διὸς κύρει. Euripid. *in Troad.* ver. 255.
(42) Ἐξαίρετόν νιν ἔλαβεν Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ. Ibid. ver. 249.
(43) Ibid. ver. 44. and 252.

expreſſed more clearly than this [K]; nevertheleſs, it is impoſſible to find the proofs of it in the Authors which have been handed down to us; and indeed we find the notes of our Commentators very dry and barren on this occaſion. Plutarch informs us, that there was in Thalamæ (l) an Oracle of Paſiphae; and that, according to ſome writers, Caſſandra died in that place, and was called Paſiphae, becauſe ſhe gave Oracles to all who came and conſulted her (m).

(l) A City of Peloponneſus.

(m) *Ex* Plut. *in Agide & Cleom.* pag. 799.

[K] *Lycophron ſpeaks of a Temple of Caſſandra... There is not any paſſage in this Poet expreſſed more clearly.*] Notwithſtanding this, the conſtruction of his words are ſuch, as may admit of many doubts. For the reader is not certain, whether the Poet means, that the ſtatue of Caſſandra will be as a preſervative to thoſe young maidens from marriage; or whether it aſcribes this virtue to the dreſs they ſhould wear, and to the ointments which would change their complections. This laſt ſenſe is not abſurd; for we may naturally ſuppoſe, that this new geer they appeared in, was a remedy for love. Conſider the words of this Poet.

Ἐμὼν περιπτύξουσιν ὠλένας βρίτας
Ἄλκαρ μίγιστον κλᾴμασι τυρφιμώτων
Ἐρινύων ἰσθῆτα καὶ ῥίπτας βαφὰς
Πεπαρμένας θρόνοισι φαρμακτηρίοις (50).

(50) Lycophron, ver. 1135.

Imitated,

" Their out-ſtretch'd arms ſhall wind around my
" ſtatue,
" And find the ſureſt remedy 'gainſt marriage;
" Having aſſumed the hideous dreſs of furies,
" And ſmear'd their faces with black odious oint-
" ments.

Such kind of aſylums were very rare; they doubtleſs were not found neceſſary. This perhaps is the only one that has been ſpoke of; and yet it was unknown to Hiſtorians and Geographers.

CASSIUS, a Roman Family. Thoſe Writers who only obſerve it to have been Patrician, are as much miſtaken as they who affirm it, ſimply and abſolutely, to have been Plebeian (a) [A]. Antonius Auguſtinus (b), and Corradus (c) ſay, with more foundation, that there were two families of this name, the one Patrician, the other Plebeian; for we meet with one Caſſius who was Conſul, a few years after the expulſion of the Kings, and a long time before the Plebeians had obtained, anno 387 of Rome, a right of enjoying the Conſular Dignity. We alſo find a Caſſius Tribune of the People, to which employment none but Plebeians could be raiſed; we ſee him, I ſay, inveſted with it, a little after the beginning of the ſeventh Century of the Commonwealth. There conſequently muſt have been either two families named Caſſius, the one a Patrician and the other a Plebeian, as Suetonius obſerves with regard to the Claudians (d); or that the ſame family Caſſia, being Patrician at firſt, afterwards became Plebeian, as was the caſe with ſome others. I believe it will not be very eaſy to decide this matter [B]. The antient Writers do not give us lights ſufficient for that purpoſe. Tacitus ſeems not to have known any other Caſſian family but that which was Plebeian [C]; or elſe that he was ſenſible, that the Plebeian family Caſſia did not deſcend from the Patrician Caſſius's.

(a) Glandorp. *Onomaſtic.* pag. 202.

(b) *In Famil. Romanis.*

(c) *In Brutum Ciceron.* pag. 178, but he is miſtaken, when he aſſerts, that ſeveral of the firſt Conſuls were named Caſſius; there being but one.

(d) *In Tiberio, init.*

CASSIUS

[A] *Thoſe writers who content themſelves with declaring it to have been Patrician, are as much miſtaken as they who affirm it ſimply and abſolutely to have been Plebeian.*] Richard Streinnius (1) ſhould not have ranked this family among the Patricians, without obſerving ſome diſtinction; ſince among the ſeveral Caſſius's mentioned by him, there is but one who was indiſputably a Patrician; and that all the reſt are probably of the ſame family with L. Caſſius Longinus, whom he declares to have been Tribune of the People, the year of Rome 616. He did not forget to cenſure Valerius Maximus, for making a Caſſius, who was a Patrician and of conſular dignity Tribune of the people (2); and, in the ſame page, he falls into much ſuch an error. Glandorp commits one of an oppoſite kind; for after ſaying at firſt that the Caſſii were Plebeians; he begins the liſt of the perſons ſo called, by the Caſſius who was ſentenced to die for treaſon, the year of Rome 269, after having been thrice Conſul (3). We muſt not rank Conſuls, in Plebeian families, till after the year of Rome 387; and we muſt never rank Tribunes of the people among Patricians, as being Patricians.

(1) *In Stemmat. Gent. & Familiar. Romanar.*

(2) Val. Maxim. lib. 5. cap. 8.

(3) Glandorp. *Onomaſtic.* pag. 202.

[B] *There... either muſt have been two families, named Caſſius,... or that the ſame family Caſſia, being Patrician at firſt, afterwards became Plebeian.... I believe it will not be very eaſy to decide this matter.*] Nevertheleſs Cicero ſeems to remove this uncertainty, when he aſſerts, that Caſſius the murtherer of Julius Cæſar ſprung from a family, which would not ſubmit to ſovereign Power, nor indeed to that of any one (4). It is very plain that he hinted at Spurius Caſſius, who was ſaid to have been condemned by his own father, for aſpiring to the regal Dignity, the year of Rome 269. Now it is very certain, that the Caſſius Longinus's, of whom he that conſpired againſt Cæſar was one, were of a Plebeian family; ſince therefore he was of the family, *(natus in familia)* which could not bear the ambition of Spurius Caſſius, may we not aſſert that the Plebeian Houſe *Caſſia* deſcended from that which was Patrician? But it may be anſwered, that Cicero's teſtimony is not to be very much depended upon on this occaſion; for, not to mention that he ſpeaks ſuccinctly and briefly of the affair of Spurius Caſſius, (which he would not have done had he been very certain of what he aſſerted) we find he ſuppoſes, in the ſame place, that Brutus, the aſſaſſin of Julius Cæſar, deſcended from him who drove out Tarquin. Nevertheleſs this is a very doubtful fact (5). We then muſt imagine, that Cicero acted on that occaſion like an able Pleader, who makes a merit of every thing that may ſerve his cauſe. See Corradus in his Commentary on the following words of the *Brutus of Cicero: Conceſſum eſt Rhetoribus mentiri in Hiſtoriis, ut aliquid dicere poſſint argutius.* i. e. " Rhetoricians " are allowed to advance ſome untruths in hiſtory, " that they may have an opportunity of ſaying ſome " ſmart things." Brutus and Caſſius were not diſpleaſed to have it ſuppoſed, that they ſprung from thoſe of the ſame name with themſelves, who had diſtinguiſh'd themſelves ſo much antiently; and there is no doubt but their friends ſpread ſuch a report as occaſion offered. A rumour was alſo ſpread, (tho' leſs probable) that Spurius Caſſius had been puniſhed by his own father. Cicero finding that all this made for his purpoſe, took advantage of it. It was not neceſſary, in an oratorical piece, that all theſe particulars ſhould be undoubted fact. Conſequently we ſhall ſtill be in as much uncertainty, notwithſtanding this authority.

(4) *Quid? C. Caſſius in ea familia natus quæ non modo dominatum, ſed ne potentiam quidem cujusquam ferre potuit, me auctorem, credo, deſideravit?* Cicero, Philipp. 2.

(5) See the Remark [K] of the Article BRUTUS (Marcus Junius.)

[C] *Tacitus ſeems not to have known any other family* (the Caſſian) *but that which was Plebeian.*] When he ſpeaks of L. Caſſius, who was married to Druſilla daughter of Germanicus, he declares him to be of a Plebeian Family, which however was antient, and illuſtrious by the public employments the individuals of it had exerciſed (6). *Plebei Romæ generis, verum antiqui honoratique* (7). Had Streinnius conſider'd this paſſage, he either would have changed the ſtate of this family, or have explained it better. All the Caſſius Longinus's were doubtleſs Plebeians. William Grotius (8) therefore committed a miſtake, in declaring that C. Caſſius Longinus was of a Patrician Family.

(6) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 6. cap. 15.

(7) See the preceding remark.

(8) *In Vitis Jurisconſultorum*, pag. 198.

CASSIUS VISCELLINUS (SPURIUS) after having thrice enjoyed the Conſular Dignity; been once General of the Horſe (*a*) under the firſt Dictator that was created in Rome; and twice received the honour of a triumph; was condemned to die in the year of Rome 269, for aſpiring to the Regal Dignity (*b*). Moreri gives two articles inſtead of one on this occaſion [*A*]; and, beſides this, is guilty of four miſtakes [*B*]. He was not able to rectify the blunders of Valerius Maximus; and the Commentators on the laſt mentioned Author have rectified them but little better [*C*].

Hofman

(*a*) In Calepin, the General of the Horſe is not rightly diſtinguiſhed from Spurius Caſſius who was thrice Conſul, &c.

(*b*) See the Remark [*A*].

VALERIUS MAXIMUS, who is not very exact, is miſunderſtood by Moreri.

[*A*] *Moreri gives two articles inſtead of one on this occaſion.*] He has fallen into the worſt method poſſible with regard to our Spurius Caſſius, whom he makes a different perſon from him mentioned in Chapt. VIII, Book V of Valerius Maximus. One very eaſily perceives, by examining the originals carefully, that the Caſſius mentioned by Valerius Maximus in this place, is not different from him whoſe puniſhment he relates elſewhere (1), and whoſe hiſtory Livy and Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus have preſerved. There we meet with the puniſhment of but one man; but becauſe the circumſtances of it were variouſly related; and that Valerius Maximus, who is a very inaccurate compiler, has ſpoke in a different manner, at different times, (and never completely and fully) of this particular; Moreri choſe rather to multiply perſons without any neceſſity, rather than adhere to the moſt reaſonable, or rather, (if I dare ſay it,) the only reaſonable ſuppoſition, which is, to reduce (as I have done) the whole to the ſingle fact related by me in the text of this article. I will now lay open the grounds of this confuſion.

(1) Lib. 6. cap. 3.

DIFFERENT accounts of the condemnation of this Caſſius.

(2) *Antiq. Rom.* lib. 8.

(3) Lib. 2.

Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus (2) and Livy (3) allow, that the moſt probable ſuppoſition is, that the two Queſtors accuſed Spurius Caſſius before the people; and that having obtained ſentence of death to be pronounced againſt him, they cauſed him to be executed. Livy, however, informs us, (as a leſs probable tradition) that Caſſius had no other judge but his own father, who having brought his ſon to a trial in his own houſe, cauſed him to be ſcourged and put to death; which done, he conſecrated the *peculium* (eſtate) of this ſon, to the Goddeſs Ceres. Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus gives us likewiſe a ſecond tradition, (as leſs probable indeed) but nevertheleſs related by Authors worthy of credit: 'tis this, that Caſſius's father, being the firſt who entertained a ſuſpicion of his ſon, enquired very exactly into the whole affair; afterwards informed the Senate of it, and furniſhed proofs on which that Aſſembly condemn'd him; and that in conſequence of this, the father brought the criminal home, and put him to death. Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus argues againſt this; and, among other reaſons, employs the following; that, in his time, there was ſeen near the temple of *Tellus* or the Earth, the place where Caſſius's houſe had ſtood, which had been raz'd after his execution. He adds that, in proceſs of time, part of this ground was taken, in order to build the temple of *Tellus* upon it; and that the reſt of the ground was left empty and void. The only reaſon of my giving theſe circumſtances, is to ſhew the more evidently, that Moreri miſtook in ſuppoſing that he found two Caſſius's who were puniſhed with death, in the Authors he has given us as his authorities. For, had he carefully compared Valerius Maximus (the chief ſource of his error) with the two Hiſtorians above cited, he would have found, that this Author mentions only the Spurius Caſſius Viſcellinus of the other two. And indeed what does Valerius Maximus ſay in Chapter VIII of Book V? That Caſſius, imitating the example of Brutus, and knowing that his ſon, who was Tribune of the people, had propoſed a law which till then had been never heard of, (this was the *Agrarian Law*); and that he gained himſelf a ſtrong party by his many popular intrigues; condemn'd him (in conjunction with his friends and relations) in his own houſe, for having aſpired to the regal dignity; cauſed him to be ſcourged and put to death, and conſecrated his *Peculium* to Ceres. In the IIId Chapter of Book V, he ſpeaks of the indignation with which the people were fired againſt Spurius Caſſius; and obſerves, that they had leſs regard to his two Triumphs and three Conſulſhips, than to the ſuſpicions they entertained of his ambition; and that the Senate and people, not being ſatisfied with putting him to death, pull'd down his houſe, and built, on the place where it had ſtood, the temple of *Tellus*.

'Tis manifeſt, that all he ſays in theſe two places, (the groſs error excepted of making one of the family of Caſſius Tribune of the people at that time) (4) agrees with Spurius Caſſius Viſcellinus according to the various circumſtances of his trial, related by Livy and Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus. I will confeſs that he ſeems to be miſtaken in it; and that it is better, (ſince he cannot be altogether excuſed) to allow, that he has made two facts or incidents of one; than to ſay, that he falſified the circumſtances of a ſentence or trial, in order to make a double uſe of it; in the one, to give an inſtance of the ſeverity of a father, and in the other, an example of the ſeverity of the people. But Moreri ought to have rectified this Writer by the teſtimony of good Hiſtorians.

(4) He has alſo committed a miſtake, which will be mentioned below.

[*B*] .. *Moreri ... beſides this, is guilty of four miſtakes.*] I. He had been very much puzzled, had he been call'd upon to prove, that the father of our Caſſius had the *prænomen* Spurius. II. This pretended Spurius Caſſius ought not to have been placed in the 230th year of Rome; for as he is known to us only by the ſeverity he exerciſed towards his ſon, the time, when that ſeverity was put in execution, ought to agree pretty near with that time. But if it did agree with it, then Caſſius muſt neceſſarily have puniſhed his ſon under Tarquin's reign; and that there were Tribunes of the people before the expulſion of the Tarquins, which is falſe and abſurd; and conſequently the fixing it to the year 230 of Rome, is not a juſt date. III. I obſerve, that it ſerves to no other uſe but to confound the Author who employs it; for, if Spurius Caſſius lived at that time, then his ſon muſt have been Tribune of the people, much about the time that Livy and Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus fix the puniſhment of Spurius Caſſius Viſcellinus, that is, to the year of Rome 269; which ſhews that we muſt not ſuppoſe (with Moreri) two Caſſius's who were puniſhed much about the ſame time, the one by his own father, and the other by the people, for having a deſign to ſeat himſelf on the throne, by means of the Agrarian Law. For in caſe here had been, much about the ſame time, two perſons of the ſame name put to death for the ſame treaſon, moſt Hiſtorians would have taken notice of it; whereas not one of them ſays a word on that head. IV. Let us add, that Moreri ſhould not have barely ſaid, that Caſſius had a ſon *who was Tribune*; but Tribune of the people; and have refuted this pretended office which Valerius Maximus beſtows upon him. The learned Manutius was led into a miſtake by Valerius Maximus (5).

(5) *Fuit in ea familia* (Caſſia) *qui necari filium voluerit, quod Agrariam legem Tribunus plebis tuliſſet, quaſi de regno cogitaret.* Paulus Manut. *in Cicer. Philipp. II.*

(6) *Ex nova recenſione A. Thyſii.* Lugd. Batav. 1655, in 8vo.

[*C*] *The Commentators of Valerius Maximus . . have rectified them but very little.*] There is nothing in *the Valerius Maximus Variorum* (6), that may induce us to believe, that the Commentators of it had perceived the errors of their Author; no enquiry is made, whether the Caſſius in his Vth book, is the ſame with him in his VIth. No one thinks it ſtrange, that, in Valerius Maximus's Vth book, the ſentence and execution of Caſſius ſhould be a domeſtic affair; and in his VIth, an affair of the Senate and people. One of the Commentators makes the Caſſius of the VIth book live anno 668 of Rome; only four hundred years lower than it ought to be. Father Cantel, who publiſhed Valerius Maximus *in uſum Delphini*, obſerves no farther on the paſſage in queſtion of Book V, but that the Author does not agree either with Livy or Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus; but he ſhould alſo have declared, either in that place, or on the ſixth book, that he does not agree with himſelf. We are referred, with regard to the laſt paſſage, to places which take no manner of notice of what had been promiſed. Writers ought to be more careful in the numerical figures of ſuch books, as are deſigned for the inſtruction of youth.

ERROR of Valerius Maximus, with regard to the temple of Tellus.

The Commentators in queſtion have been ſo indulgent, as not to reproach their Author, with having written too negligently of this Temple of *Tellus*. He has

Hofman, all things conſidered, is at leaſt as faulty as Moreri [*D*].

has ranged the words of his relation in ſuch a manner, as plainly ſhews that he intended to make his readers ſuppoſe, that the building of this Temple was one of the articles of the ſentence pronounced againſt Caſſius, and one of the principal reaſons of his puniſhment. *Senatus populuſque Romanus*, ſays he (7), *non contentus capitali eum ſupplicio afficere, interempto domum ſuperjecit, ut penatium quoque ſtrage puniretur, in ſolo autem ædem Telluris fecit. Itaque quod prius domicilium impotentis viri fuerat, nunc religioſæ* SEVERITATIS *monumentum eſt.* i. e. "The Senate and people of Rome, not "contented with executing him, pulled down his "houſe, that he might be puniſh'd in the ruin of his "houſhold-gods, and built on the ſame ſpot the Tem-"ple of *Tellus*. Thus that which was formerly the "houſe of an ambitious man, is now a monument of "religious SEVERITY." 'Tis plain he conſiders the building of this Temple, as part of the puniſhment inflicted on Caſſius by the Judges. Now, this is the very article for which a Commentator ought to have cenſur'd him; ſince he had obſerved on this occaſion (8), that the Temple of *Tellus*, devoted by T. Sempronius, ſtood, according to Servius, in the diſtrict or diviſion of the city called *Carinæ*; for it appears by Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, that the Temple of *Tellus*, built on part of the ſpot on which Caſſius's houſe ſtood before, was near that part of the city. This Temple was therefore not built till upwards of two hundred years after Caſſius's execution (9); conſequently it was not built with a deſign to aggravate his puniſhment; and in that caſe they would have ſet about it very late. And indeed, we don't find that Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus makes any relation between the puniſhment of this criminal and the Temple of *Tellus*; and denotes ſufficiently, that theſe two incidents happened at ſome diſtance one from the other.

(7) Lib. 6. cap. 3.

(8) In pag. 534. of *Valerius Maximus Variorum*, by Thyſius.

(9) Sempronius devoted it during the war with the Picentini; the year of Rome 485.

TEMPLE of Tellus in Pliny.

The Temple of Tellus, in Rome, mentioned ſomewhere by Pliny (10), was built long before that which was devoted by T. Sempronius. But this is of no uſe to juſtify Valerius Maximus, ſince (were we to ſtand to the deciſion of this paſſage, we then muſt ſuppoſe that this Temple of Tellus had preceded Caſſius's execution. And indeed, Pliny's words imply, that in the year 596, the cenſors cauſed ſeveral ſtatues to be removed; and even melted down that which Sp. Caſſius, who aſpired to the regal dignity, had raiſed in his own honour in the Temple of Tellus. Perhaps that, inſtead of the Temple of Tellus, it ought to have been, the Temple of Ceres; for as it was Spurius Caſſius, who, during his ſecond Conſulate, dedicated the Temple of Ceres (11), which Poſthumius the Dictator had devoted three years before; he very probably choſe to ſet his ſtatue there, preferably to any other place. However, I dare not affirm any thing on this head. I will only add, that neither the Dictionaries of Charles Stephens, Calepin, Lloyd, or Hofman, who all quote Valerius Maximus's words, take the leaſt notice of his error.

(10) Lib. 34. cap. 6.

(11) Dion. Halicarn. lib. 6.

REMARK on Pliny and Father Hardouin.

By the way I will obſerve, that Pliny has followed the tradition, which declared that the father judged and puniſhed his ſon in his own houſe (12); and Father Hardouin ſeems to endeavour to ſave Pliny's honour (with regard to his diſcernment) in that place; for after citing the words of Livy, which obſerve that ſome perſons had related the incident in this manner; he adds, that Valerius Maximus and Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus affirm it; whilſt others aſſert that Caſſius was thrown headlong from a rock. No reader would be able to gueſs from this the real opinion of Livy and of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, which is far from coinciding with that of Pliny. If this paſſage be not quite ſo accurate as it ſhould be, we may very eaſily excuſe it in a writer, whoſe learned Commentary coſt him the utmoſt pains, and is the reſult of an application that is very rarely met with.

(12) Plinius, lib. 34. cap. 4. Florus alſo follows that tradition, lib. 1. cap. 26.

[*D*] *Hofman, all things conſidered, is at leaſt as faulty as Moreri.*] For if, on one ſide, Moreri is in an error, in making Spurius Caſſius's father live in the 230th year of Rome; Hofman commits a particular miſtake, in declaring that Valerius Maximus aſſerts, that after that the ſon had been ſcourged and put to death by his father's order, the plunder was applied to the building a Temple to Ceres. *Templo dein Cereris ex præda extructo.* We have already obſerved (13) that Caſſius dedicated this Temple, and conſequently it was not built after his death. Beſides, the confiſcated poſſeſſions of a rebel, are not called booty or plunder. In fine, if any would ſtill raiſe objections, from the multiplicity of Temples built in honour of Ceres, ought he not at leaſt to pay ſome regard to theſe words of an antient Author, *Verberibus affectum necari juſſit, ac peculium ejus Cereri conſecravit* (14)? i. e. "After "cauſing him to be ſcourged, he commanded him to "be put to death, and dedicated his eſtate to Ceres?" Does this ſignify a Temple built to Ceres? and if he were deſirous of ſpecifying the uſe to which the *peculium* conſecrated to this Goddeſs was employed, why did he not conſult Livy (15), Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus (16) and Pliny (17), who all affirm, that a brazen ſtatue was made out of it?

(13) The Citation (11) above.

(14) Val. Max. lib. 5. cap. 8.

(15) Lib. 2.
(16) *Antiq. Rom.* lib. 8.
(17) Lib. 34. cap. 4.

CASSIUS LONGINUS (LUCIUS) flouriſhed in the ſeventh Century of Rome. He was a Judge, and ſo famous for his inflexible ſeverity, that his tribunal was called the *Rock of the Impeached* [*A*]. I believe he is not the ſame LUCIUS CASSIUS whom Cicero mentions in his Treatiſe *de claris Oratoribus*, and in his third book *de Legibus* [*B*]; but

[*A*] *His tribunal was called the Rock of the Impeached.*] 'Tis not Cicero who informs us of this particular, as Julian Brodeau ſuppoſed, who was very juſtly and modeſtly cenſured by Menage (1) on that account: 'tis Valerius Maximus (2), who relates it, to do the greater honour to Mark Anthony, grandfather of the Triumvir. This Mark Anthony was one of the ableſt Orators of his age. He was going into Aſia as Quæſtor, when news was brought him, that he was ſummoned (upon an accuſation of committing inceſt) before the dreadful Tribunal of L. Caſſius the Prætor, that Tribunal which was called *Scopulum reorum.* He did not fail making his appearance, and would not take advantage of the Law, which forbid the receiving of any accuſations, againſt thoſe who were abſent *reipublicæ cauſa* (upon affairs of the Commonwealth), and was acquitted (3). A modern Author thinks, that Caius Aquilius the Prætor is he whoſe Tribunal was called, *the Rock of the Accuſed* (4). This Aquilius was Prætor at the ſame time with Cicero (5).

(1) Amœnitat. *Jurif.* cap. 43. pag. 420. edit. Francofurt. 1680.
(2) Lib. 3. cap. 7. *von* 9. *ut apud* Menagium, ibid.

(3) See the article of MARK ANTHONY the Orator above, citation (*a*).
(4) See the *Biblioth. Univerſ.* tom. 13. pag. 121.
(5) Bertrand. *in Vitis Juriſcon.* pag. 223. citing the Topicks of Cicero.

[*B*] *I believe he is not the ſame Lucius Caſſius, whom Cicero mentions in his Treatiſe of illuſtrious Orators, and in his third Book of Laws.*] Cicero deſcribes him in ſuch a manner, as plainly ſhews that he ſpeaks of L. Caſſius Tribune of the people, anno 1616; for he aſcribes to him the *Lex Tabellaria* (6), enacted under the Conſulate of M. Lepidus, and C. Mancinus. There is no room to doubt, but that L. Caſſius, who was Conſul the year of Rome 626, and Cenſor anno 628, was the ſame with the Caſſius who was Tribune of the people anno 616. In my opinion therefore, it was not he, whoſe Tribunal was called the *Rock of the Accuſed*; for then we muſt ſuppoſe, that after having attained the higheſt employment in the Commonwealth, anno 628, he deſcended back to the Prætorſhip twelve or thirteen years after; ſince the Prætor mentioned by Valerius Maximus on occaſion of Mark Anthony's proſecution, muſt have been in office about the year of Rome 640; or elſe we muſt ſuppoſe, that this Author does not expreſs with a requiſite exactneſs the qualities of L. Caſſius.

(6) A Law enacted, by which the People were not allowed to give their votes by word of mouth, but in writing. *See* Mercerus *on Alexander ab Alexandro*, lib. 4. chap. 3. num. 894.

A FALSE citation of Father Cantel.

Father Cantel, in his Commentaries on Valerius Maximus *in uſum Delphini* (7), ſays a thing that removes the whole difficulty, viz. that L. Caſſius, by an extraordinary creation made Prætor, after his Conſulate and Cenſorſhip, becauſe of the reputation he had acquired of being very ſevere, obtained, by order of the people, the authority of taking cognizance of inceſtuous crimes, at the time that complaint was made, that the Prieſts had acted with too much indolence, againſt the Veſtals who were accuſed of incontinence.

(7) In Lib. 3. cap. 7. pag. 179 and 180.

but I take him not to differ from the Caſſius who gave vogue to the famous maxim cui 642

The misfortune is, that neither the epitome of Livy, nor Aſconius Pedianus, cited by Father Cantel, ſay any ſuch thing. The Abridgment of Livy (8) obſerves only, that Æmilia, Licinia and Martia, all Veſtals, were condemned for committing inceſt; and that it was related in what manner this inceſt had been committed, diſcover'd and puniſhed. What a noble piece of hiſtory is here loſt! What pity it is, that we have not this related by Livy's grave and majeſtick pen! It is pity too, we don't know all that Dion had related concerning the proſecution of theſe Veſtals. Some account is given of this in the *Excerpta* publiſhed by Valeſius in 1636 (9). But let us examine the words of Aſconius Pedianus; he deſcends pretty much to particulars, eſpecially with regard to L. Caſſius. *At the time*, ſays he (10), *that Sextus Peduceus, Tribune of the people, accuſed L. Metellus the Pontifex Maximus, and the whole college of Pontiffs, of having judged unjuſtly the inceſtuous crime of the Veſtals, of whom Æmilia only had been condemned; the two others, viz. Marcia and Licinia, having been cleared; the people appointed L. Caſſius, a Judge of extraordinary ſeverity, to bring thoſe Veſtals to a new trial; which being done, Caſſius not only condemned them both, but ſeveral others; and it is likewiſe thought that he acted with too great ſeverity.*

(8) Epiſt. 63.

(9) Pag. 628.

(10) Aſcon. Pedian. *in Orat. Cicer. pro Milone.*

It does not appear from this paſſage, that Lucius Caſſius had been Conſul and Cenſor before this; nor that the dignity of extraordinary Prætor was conferred on him. Nevertheleſs, we may gather from hence, by giving a little more latitude to the expreſſions, that the people inveſted him at that time, with an extraordinary and ſpecial Commiſſion, ſuch as the *Grand Jours* (Seſſions); or that iſſued to Mr. Boucherat (11) in 1680, to preſide in trials of poyſoning and witchcraft. Thus, provided we ſuppoſe that Valerius Maximus expreſſed himſelf wrong, in repreſenting to us ſimply as a Prætor, a man who had already filled the higheſt employments in the Commonwealth; and who was inveſted at that time with an extraordinary authority, in order for him to preſide over important cauſes; we then may believe, that L. Caſſius, Tribune of the people in 616, Conſul in 626, and Cenſor in 628, preſided in the trials for inceſt, about the year 640; and that he judged Mark Anthony the Orator. By the character Cicero has given of him (12), we ſhall conclude, that the talents he poſſeſſed were ſuch, as might naturally acquire him the character of being the Rock of the impeached or accuſed; but, on the other ſide, ſeverity was ſo common to his family, that it is impoſſible to determine from thence, whether the perſon who enjoyed that dreadful reputation, was the Tribune of anno 616, or his ſon, or brother, or nephew, or couſin. *L. Caſſius, ex familia tum ad cæteras res tum ad judicandum ſeveriſſima* (13). i. e. "Lucius Caſſius, ſprung from a family, famous for its "ſeverity in all things, and eſpecially in pronouncing "judgment." Add to this a paſſage from Tacitus. *Ita dignum majoribus ſuis & familiæ Caſſiæ per illas quoque gentes celebrata* (14). i. e. "Thus he was "worthy of his anceſtors, and of the Caſſian family, "and famous likewiſe among thoſe Nations."

(11) He was made Chancellor of France in 1685, and he had already filled ſeveral of the higheſt employments of the long Robe. He died in September 1699.

(12) *Tum L. Caſſius multum potuit non eloquentiâ, ſed dicendo tamen; homo non liberalitate ut alii, ſed ipsâ triſtitiâ & ſeveritate popularis.* Cicero *in Brut.* cap. 25. i. e. "Caſſius was at "that time very "powerful, not "by his elo-"quence, but "his manner of "delivering "himſelf; a "man who "made himſelf "popular, not "as others do, "by liberality, "but by his ſo-"lemnity and "ſeverity."

(13) Cicer. Verr. II. ſpeaking of a Caſſius who was made a military Tribune, at the time of Verres's proſecution.

(14) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 12. cap. 12. ſpeaking of a Caſſius, Governor of Syria, who even in times of peace, maintained the ſtricteſt military diſcipline.

WHETHER we know to which Caſſius the maxim *Cui bono* belongs.

Nor can we determine the queſtion from this remark, viz. that Cicero, who has often mentioned the maxim *Cui bono* introduced by a very ſevere Judge, L. Caſſius by name, (doubtleſs the ſame perſon whoſe Tribunal was called *Populus Reorum*) does not ſay, on any occaſion, that he had been Conſul and Cenſor; for it may be anſwered, that when a perſon is only to exhibit the qualities of a good Judge, it is unneceſſary to mention his other employments; and that otherwiſe, it might be pretended that L. Caſſius Tribune of the people anno 616, him whom Cicero mentions in his treatiſe *de claris Oratoribus*, had not been either Conſul or Cenſor, ſince Cicero does not make any mention of this. If it ſhould be aſked, from what authority I pretend to aſſert, that L. Caſſius, the Rock of the Impeached, is the author of the maxim *Cui bono*, I ſhall refer them to the following beautiful paſſage of the Oration for Roſcius Amerinus. *Luc. Caſſius ille, quem populus Romanus veriſſimum & ſapientiſſimum judicem putabat, identidem in cauſis quærere ſolebat* CUI BONO FUISSET (15). *Sic vita hominum eſt, ut ad maleficium nemo conetur ſine ſpe atque emolumento accedere. Hunc quæſtorem ac judicem fugiebant atque horrebant ii quibus periculum creabatur; ideo quod tametſi veritatis erat amicus, tamen naturâ non tam propenſus ad miſericordiam, quam implicatus ad ſeveritatem videbatur. Ego . . facile me paterer vel illo acerrimo judice quærente, vel apud Caſſianos judices, quorum etiam nunc illi quibus cauſa dicenda eſt, nomen ipſum reformidant, pro Sex. Roſcio dicere.* i. e. "Lucius Caſſius, he whom the "Roman people conſider'd as the moſt upright and "wiſe Judge, uſed to enquire, from time to time, "when he ſet upon cauſes, *whoſe is the profit?* Such "is the nature of mankind, that no one will attempt "a wicked action but in the view of intereſt. All "who were in any danger, fled away and dreaded the "ſight of this inquiſitive Judge; for notwithſtanding "he was a friend to truth, he yet ſeemed, by his na-"ture, more inclined to ſeverity than to mercy. With "regard to myſelf . . . I ſhould not be any way afraid "to plead for Sex. Roſcius before that ſevere Judge "himſelf, or any of the *Caſſian* Judges, whoſe name "is now dreaded by thoſe whoſe cauſe is to be plead-"ed."

(15) Cicero makes the ſame remark *in Orat. pro Milone.* cap. 12. *and* Philipp. II. c. 14.

WHETHER a Conſul deſcended to the office of Prætor.

I obſerved one particular that merits a digreſſion. I ſuppoſed that they who had filled the higheſt employments in the State, did not deſcend back to the Prætorſhip; and yet we have examples of a perſon's returning to this employment, after having been Conſul: But our Lucius Caſſius is not in the caſe. A perſon returned to it, in order to requalify himſelf, after he had been diſgraced on ſome account. Plutarch informs us of this circumſtance (16), in the affair of Cornelius Lentulus Sura, who was diveſted of his quality of Senator after having been Conſul; and who was not reſtored to his firſt dignity, till after being Prætor a ſecond time. Dion obſerves the ſame of this Lentulus (17), and in another place (18), he obſerves, that Saluſt was made Prætor, the year of Rome 706, in order to requalify him for a ſeat in the Senate-houſe. It was doubtleſs from the ſame motive that the Triumvirs appointed Prætor a ſecond time, Ventidius (19), who had been declared an enemy to the commonwealth, together with Mark Anthony. Were there not this reaſon, this office might perhaps be beſtowed twice upon the ſame perſon; ſince we read in Aſconius Pedianus (20), that Marius Gratidianus was ſince Prætor, becauſe of the great love the people had for him; but it is very probable that there was no interpoſition of the Conſulate and the Cenſorſhip between the two Prætorſhips; conſequently this is not a proper example, to clear up the affair relating to our Caſſius. Nor is the example of Mancinus, who was Prætor after the diſgrace he ſuffered before Numantia, during his Conſulſhip (21), any more to the purpoſe; the caſe is of the ſame nature with that of Lentulus Sura; but Metellus Pius's gaining the offices of Prætor and Pontifex Maximus from his competitors who were of conſular dignity, would puzzle us a little, were we not to ſuppoſe that the following words of Aurelius Victor, *Adoleſcens in petitione Prætoræ & Pontificatus, Conſularibus viris prælatus eſt* (22), ſignify only this, that he was oppoſed in the Pontificate, by ſome perſons of conſular degree. We muſt not imagine that Aurelius Victor, nor thoſe who are ſuperior to him, obſerve the following rule of the Logicians, viz. that a propoſition compoſed of ſeveral ſubjects is falſe, unleſs the Attribute agrees ſeparately with each ſubject. With regard to the Quæſtorſhip, an office inferior to the Prætorſhip, I cannot deny but that it has been exerciſed by perſons who had been Conſuls; and here follows what a learned man has obſerved on this occaſion. "Altho' the Quæſtors had "no right of prediction; nor of ſummoning perſons "to appear before them, any more than of impriſon-"ing their perſons, *neque vocationem neque prehenſionem haberent*; yet perſons of conſular dignity did "not refuſe that employment. T. Quintus Capitolinus was Quæſtor with M. Valerius, after having "been thrice Conſul. Cato the elder was the ſame, "after having triumphed three times, and paſſed thro' "all the employments. And it was even enacted by "the *Lex Pompeia*, that none but perſons of conſular "dignity ſhould fill that employment (23). But ſince "there is no example of the like kind, with regard "to the Prætorſhip; I have reaſon to ſuppoſe, that a "difference was made, in that reſpect, between thoſe "two employments."

(16) *In Vita Ciceronis.*

(17) Dion. lib. 37.

(18) Lib. 42.

(19) Idem, lib. 47.

(20) *In Oration. Ciceron. contra C. Anton. &c.*

(21) Aurel. Victor.

(22) This paſſage puzzles the Commentator very much.

(23) Du Boulay, *Thréſor des Antiquitez Romaines*, pag. 825.

BONO [C]; nor from him, who, according to Saluſt, was Prætor the year of Rome 642 [D]. It is from the judicial ſeverity of this Caſſius, that very rigid Judges have been called *Caſſiani* [E]. The Preſident Bertrand miſtook, when he gives this honour to another Caſſius Longinus [F]. I will not omit an error of Corradus [G].

CASSIUS

[C] *I take him not to differ from the Caſſius, who gave vogue to the famous maxim* Cui bono.] The paſſage of the oration *pro Roſcio Amerino*, which I cited in the preceding remark, ſhews what was meant by this maxim, and the uſe which Lucius Caſſius the Prætor made of it. I add here, that this is a very judicious maxim, and grounded on a principle which admits of but very few exceptions in life, viz. *that no one perpetrates crimes, but in the view of reaping advantage of it*; and that, *in criminal matters, the preſumption is very ſtrong againſt thoſe who reap ſome benefit from them.* I ſpeak of ſuch crimes as are puniſhable by earthly judges. This it was made Caſſius the Prætor preſume very naturally in trials for crimes, that many things might be brought to light, in caſe it could be diſcovered, what benefit the perſon accuſed would have gained by the crime with which he was charged. Not but that ſome perſons are incapable of committing a crime, what advantage ſoever might accrue to them from it (24); and others, who are capable of ruſhing upon guilt, for a very trifling profit; or even from the bare deſire of continuing in the wickedneſs to which they have accuſtomed themſelves (25). However, this does not deſtroy Caſſius's maxim; it is well enough known, that in matters of this kind, rules ought not to be of a metaphyſical, or even phyſical Univerſality. See in what manner this maxim has been applied by Hobbes in his Leviathan, Chap. LVII; la Mothe le Vayer, in his diſcourſe of Hiſtory, pag. 201 of Tom. II, of the 12mo Edition; and the Author of *Various Thoughts on Comets*, page 683.

(24) This remark is of Cicero *pro Milone*, in the ſame place where he ſpeaks of the maxim of Caſſius, *Illud Caſſianum* CUI BONO FUERIT, *in his perſonis valeat, etſi boni nullo emolumento impelluntur in fraudem, improbi ſæpe parvo.*

(25) *Si cauſa peccandi in præſens minus ſuppetebat, nihilominus inſontes ſicuti ſontes circumvenire, jugulare. Scilicet ne per otium torpeſcerent manus aut animus, gratuitò potius atque crudelis erat.* Salluſt. *in Bell. Catil.* ſpeaking of the horrid crimes Catiline made his Partizans perpetrate. *See* Cicero, *de Officiis*, lib. 51. cap. 24.

(26) Salluſt. *in Bello Jugurthino*, cap. 32, *fin.*

[D] *Nor from him, who according to Saluſt, was Prætor the year of Rome* 642.] This Prætor may very probably be Author of the maxim *cui bono*, and the rock of the impeached; for Saluſt repreſents him as ſo very famous for his probity, that as much confidence was reposed in his private promiſes, as in the public faith, a circumſtance which prevailed with Jugurtha, to ſurrender himſelf to the mercy of the Romans; Caſſius, who had been deputed to Jugurtha, to perſuade him to come to Rome, having not only given him a ſafe conduct from the commonwealth, but alſo his private word. *Privatim præterea*, ſays Saluſt, *fidem ſuam interponit, quam ille* (Jugurtha) *non minoris quam publicam ducebat. Talis ea tempeſtate fama de Caſſio erat* (26). If this were the ſame with him whom Valerius Maximus mentions with reſpect to Mark Anthony the Orator, he would be different from the tribune of the people of anno 616; for what probability is there, that a man who had been Cenſor in 628, had been no more than Prætor in 642?

The *Variorum* Commentary on Saluſt, publiſhed at Leyden by Thyſius in 1656, ſets before us two very different opinions. Some aſſert, that Caſſius the Prætor, who was deputed to Jugurtha, is he who, during his Tribuneſhip, cauſed the *Lex Tabellaria* to be enacted; and others declare it was he, who being Conſul a little after the expedition of Numidia (27), and commanding an army in Gaul, was cut to pieces by the Tigurini (28). This laſt opinion, which is likewiſe that of Sigonius (29), and of Glandorp, is much preferable to the other; for if L. Caſſius, defeated by the Tigurini the year of Rome 646, was Tribune of the people anno 616; he muſt have been Conſul a ſecond time in 646, of which no mention is made in the conſular tables. It is rather the ſon of this Tribune, as Sigonius believes, than the Tribune himſelf. A circumſtance which I look upon as very certain is, that L. Caſſius, Author of the maxim *cui bono*, and the rock accuſed, is either he who was Tribune of the people in 616; or the Caſſius, who being Prætor in 642, was deputed to Jugurtha. The Dauphin Scholiaſt on Tully's Oration, is of the laſt opinion. Valeſius (30) had already joined in it; but without criticizing Lindenbrog, who had followed the other opinion, and whom he criticizes upon another affair in the ſame note. Corradus, in his Commentary on the *Brutus* of Cicero, and the Dauphin Scholiaſt on the ſame Book; Glandorp and ſeveral others join in opinion with Lindenbrog. I hope this will excite the learned, to enquire more exactly into this matter.

(27) Glandorp, pag. 203. declares there were ſix years between the Prætorſhip of this Caſſius, and his defeat, when there were but four.

(28) The Swiſs of Zurich.

(29) *In Faſtis Conſul.*

(30) *In Amm. Marcell.* lib. 22. pag. 321. edit. in folio 1681.

[E] *It is from the judicial ſeverity of this Caſſius, that very rigid judges have been called* Caſſiani.] We have already ſeen this in a paſſage of Cicero (31), and here follows another from the ſame Author (32). *Non quæro judices* CASSIANOS, *veterem judiciorum ſeveritatem non requiro.* i. e. "I do not ſtand in need of "CASSIAN Judges; I do not require the ſeverity of an- "tient Judges." Cicero had ſaid a little before, in an ironical way. *Etiam illum ipſum quem tu in Cohorte tua* CASSIANUM *judicem habebas.* i. e. "That "very CASSIAN Judge whom you had in your Co- "hort." To this the following paſſage from Book XXVI of Ammianus Marcellinus is relative: *Jura quidem prætenduntur & leges, & Catonianæ* vel CASSIANÆ *ſententiæ, fuco perliti reſident judices.* i. e. "The laws and privileges ſubſiſt indeed in appearance, "as well as the Catonian and CASSIAN deciſions; "and there is ſtill the ſhadow or reſemblance of "Judges:" and this other of Marcus Aurelius (33); *Puto me non erraſſe, ſiquidem & tu notum habes Caſſium, hominem* CASSIANÆ *ſeveritatis & diſciplinæ.* i. e. "I think I was not in an error, ſince even you are "acquainted with Caſſius, a man of *Caſſian* ſeverity "and diſcipline." To which we may alſo add theſe words from the XXXth Book of Ammianus Marcellinus, concerning the Emperor Valentinian. *Judices nunquam conſulto malignos elegit: ſed ſi ſemel promotos agere didicit immaniter, Lycurgos inveniſſe ſe prædicabat &* CASSIOS, *columnia juſtitiæ priſcæ, ſcribenſque hortabatur aſſidue ut noxas vel leves acerbius vindicarent.* i. e. "He never purpoſely made choice of ſevere "Judges; but if, when once they were raiſed to the "bench, he heard that they acted with cruelty, he "then would ſay that he had met with Lycurgus's and "Caſſius's, the pillars of antient Juſtice, and uſed to "exhort them daily by letters, to be very ſevere even "on the ſlighteſt offences." I am to obſerve that Lindenbrog refers the firſt paſſage of Ammianus Marcellinus, not to Lucius Caſſius, but to Caius Caſſius, who lived under Tiberius, and after him; and who was the chief of the Caſſian Sect among the Civilians. He ſhould have called to mind, that on theſe words of Book XXII of that Hiſtorian, *Judicibus Caſſiis triſtior & Lycurgis*, he had ſaid that the *Judices Caſſiani* were ſo called from L. Caſſius, whom Cicero mentions *in Bruto*, and of whom he pretends Marcellinus ſpeaks in that place.

(31) At the end of the third paragraph of the remark [B].

(32) In the fifth Oration againſt Verres, which is alſo called the 3d *in Verrem*; becauſe among the Orations which relate to Verres's cauſe, two are only in a preliminary way. Valeſius the younger *in Amm. Marcell.* pag. 471. applies one of theſe paſſages to the 1ſt *in Verrem*, cited by his brother; this probably is an error of the Preſs, as *veterem* which is there for *Verrem*; for pag. 321. the elder Valeſius cites 3 *in Verrem.*

(33) *Epiſt. ad Præf. Prætor.*

[F] *The Preſident Bertrand miſtook, when he transferred this honour to another Caſſius Longinus.*] The paſſages we juſt now cited form the greateſt elogium that poſterity could employ, to do juſtice to the integrity of L. Caſſius; and to immortalize the ſtrong endeavours he had uſed, to have the laws ſtrictly executed in his time. Preſident Bertrand is very much miſtaken on this occaſion (34). He remarks after Suetonius, that Caius Caſſius Longinus who lived under Nero, was blind; and he pretends that this is a ſignal mark of an extreme ſeverity, which he proves from the examples of Caſcellius, of Appius, and of Catulus Meſſalinus. He adds, that this Caſſius was a judge of ſo extraordinary a ſeverity, that his tribunal was called *ſcopulum reorum.* This however is a blunder, for the Caſſius whoſe tribunal was ſo entitled, was contemporary with Mark Anthony the Orator, about the year of Rome 640, that is, upwards of 150 years before Nero's reign. Menage has obſerved this (35); William Grotius, brother to the famous Hugo Grotius, had remarked it long before (36). It is true indeed he makes Bertrand ſay, that Caſſius got himſelf that character by his too great cruelty, *propter nimiam Sævitiam*; whereas Bertrand employs only the word *Severitas*; but perhaps the leaſt criticiſm on this would be renewing the Caſſian ſeverity.

(34) Lib. 2. *de Juriſper.* pag. m. 274.

(35) Amœnitat. *Juris*, cap. 43.

(36) *In Vitis Juriſconſultorum quorum in Pandectis extant Nomina*: A work, which lay a long time among the papers of the Deceaſed; and deſerved to be more correctly printed. It was printed at Leyden in 1690.

[G] *I will not omit an error of Corradus.*] I have cited a paſſage of Cicero, where mention is made of one L. Caſſius, who having been elected Military Tribune, could not have judged Verres, had the cauſe been

CASSIUS LONGINUS (CAIUS) one of the murtherers of Julius Cæsar, and he who said to one of the accomplices, *Strike, tho' the dagger should go through my body* (a), was one of the greatest men in his time. It must indeed be confessed that he was a little hot; and that to him are imputed the Counsels which sometimes prompted Brutus to carry matters too far (b). He was a great Epicurean; and yet he practised better the duties of a worthy man, and was infinitely more regular in his morals, than most of the Idolaters. He never drunk wine (c). It is universally known that the elogium was given him, of being the last of the Romans (d). He married Junia sister to Brutus, and seems not to have had great reason to believe that she was very chaste [A]. He was a great soldier, of which he gave a signal proof after the defeat of Crassus. The Parthians, to take advantage of their victory, entered Syria, and besieged Antioch. Cassius repulsed them with so much vigour, that he forced them to raise the siege; and took such excellent measures, in order to defeat their parties, and draw their army into a disadvantageous spot of ground, that he defeated it; killed Osaces their General; and forced Pacorus, the King's son, to abandon Syria (e). When we consider these transactions attentively, we may easily invalidate most of Glandorpi's criticisms on Rutilius [B], as the reader will see in the remarks. Mark Anthony did not doubt any longer of the victory, when news was brought him that Cassius was dead.

(a) *In cæde dubitanti cuidam, vel per me, inquit, feri,* Aurel. Victor, *de Viris illust.* pag. m. 104.

(b) Plutarch, *in Bruto*, pag. 1006.

(c) Seneca, *Epist.* 83.

(d) See the remark [B] of the Article BRUTUS (Marcus Junius.)

(e) Dio, lib. 40. See the remark [A].

been put off to the year following. Corradus (37) imagined either that the Commentary of Asconius Pedianus has been corrupted in that passage, or that this Commentator mistook, in pretending that Cicero speaks of the same Lucius Cassius, who enacted the *Lex Tabellaria* the year of Rome 617 (38). If Asconius had such a thought, he must have committed a very childish error; for there being, according to Corradus's calculation, an interval of sixty seven years at least between that law, to the time of Verres's trial; how strange a blunder would it be, to suppose, that a man sixty seven years after his having been Tribune of the people, was elected, (at about an hundred years of age,) Tribune of the soldiers? But there does not appear the least error in Asconius, and it is Corradus who did not rightly understand him. Asconius (39), in order to shew that Cicero had reason to say, that the Cassian family was very severe, as well in jucidiary, as in other matters, observes, that it gave rise to the *Leges Tabellariæ*, and that the Cassius who asked the question *cui bono* sprung from it.

(37) *In Brutum Ciceronis*, pag. 179.

(58) Corradus fixes it to this year, and not, as others do, to 616.

(39) *In Proœm. Act. in Verrem.*

[A] *He married Junia, sister to Brutus; and seems not to have had great reason to believe, that she was very chaste.*] In case he thought her so, he was ignorant of the common reports, at least of the suspicions and raillery of the most eloquent Orator in Rome. Here follows a passage wherein Cicero supposes that Servilia, not contented with prostituting herself to Cæsar, abandoned to him her daughter Junia, Cassius's wife. *Mater M. Bruti Servilia, cum preciosum ære parvo fundum abstulisset à Cæsare subjiciente hastæ bona civium, non effugit dictum tale Ciceronis: Equidem quo melius emptum sciatis, comparavit Servilia hunc fundum Tertia deducta. Filia autem Serviliæ erat Junia Tertia. Eademque C. Cassii uxor, lasciviente dictatore tam in matrem quam in puellam, tunc luxuriam senis adulteri civitas subinde rumoribus jocisque carpebat, ut mala non tantum seria ferrent* (1). i. e. "Servilia, mother to Marcus Brutus, having bought, "for a small sum of money, a noble farm of Cæsar, "who was exposing the effects of the Citizens to public sale, could not escape this taunt of Cicero. "That you may be the more sensible of the cheapness "of this farm, know that Servilia bought it *Tertiâ* "*deducta*. Now Junia Tertia was Servilia's daughter "and wife to Cassius. As the Dictator had an affair both with the mother and daughter, his lechery was the subject of the conversation and jest "of the whole City." Glandorp refers us to this passage of Macrobius, and yet does not know against which of Servilia's two daughters Cicero's taunt was levelled. He is in doubt whether it related to Junia wife of Lepidus the Triumvir, or to Junia Cassius's wife: *Utra Tertia fuerit in quam jocatus est Cicero (locus est apud Macrobium Lib. 2. Saturn. capite 2.) non facile dixerim* (2). Was it possible for one who had read this whole passage to be in any doubt which it was? I am to observe, that Cassius's wife survived her husband threescore and four years (3).

(1) Macrob. Saturn. lib. 2. cap. 2. *See also* Suet. *in Cæsare*, cap. 50. I shall cite his words in the remark [A] of the article SERVILIA.

(2) Glandorp. *Onomast.* pag. 498.

(3) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 3. *sub fin.*

[B] *When we consider . . . that he defeated the Parthians, killed their General . . . we may easily invalidate most of Glandorp's criticisms on Rutilius.*] The greatest part of his critique (4) on a passage of Bernardin Rutilius (5), in which it is related that Cassius, Pompey's Lieutenant and Governor of Syria, made war upon the Parthians, is ill grounded. The error there may be entirely removed, by only suppressing these two words *Pompey's Lieutenant*; for, we may allow all Rutilius says there, that circumstance excepted. And indeed Dion declares, that altho' Cassius had not accepted the command of the army which the soldiers offered him, and Crassus permitted him to accept; he yet was afterwards Governor of Syria (6), when Crassus's defeat, and the invasion of the Parthians necessarily required it. I have already taken notice of the success with which he carried on the war; and he obliged the Parthians to abandon the Province where he commanded. Glandorp was not ignorant of this circumstance, in page 205 (7); whence it is scarce possible to understand the reason employed by him against the Rutilius, in page 470. It is true, says he, that after Crassus had been defeated, Cassius the Quæstor, seeing himself block'd up in Antioch, made some very successful sallies upon the Parthians; but this was without an express declaration of war against them, *bellum nullum justum aut indictum cum illis gessit.* Was it not enough that this was the continuation of the war, which Crassus had carried into their country? And can there be a more express war, than for the person who commands in a Province, to fight against those who entered it in a hostile way, in consequence of a victory even over the aggressors? Had not Glandorp employed this reason which quite spoiled his criticism, and had he contented himself with supposing that Rutilius had a view to the time in which Cæsar and Pompey were waging war one against the other, his remark would have been to purpose. Here follows the manner in which Cicero speaks of Cassius, Commander in Syria, after Crassus's defeat. *Neque verò classes deerunt: tanti Tyrii Cassium faciunt, tantum ejus in Syria nomen atque Phœnice est. Paratum habet Imperatorem C. Cassium P. C. Respublica contra Dolabellam, nec paratum solum sed peritum, atque fortem. Magnas ille res gessit ante Bibuli summi viri adventum, cum Parthorum nobilissimos duces maximasque copias fudit, Syriamque immani Parthorum impetu liberavit* (8). i. e. "Nor will Fleets be wanting, so highly do the Tyrians esteem Cassius, and so great is his fame in Syria "and Phœnicia. . . Fathers, the Commonwealth has "a General, C. Cassius, prepared against Dolabella; "and not only prepared, but skilful and brave. This "Cassius atchieved mighty actions before the arrival "of Bibulus that great man; he having defeated the "ablest Generals and the choicest forces of the Parthians, and deliver'd Syria, when invaded by a "numberless multitude of Parthians." Read also the same Cicero in Letter XX of Book V to Atticus, in which he declares, that he had intimidated the Parthians, and encouraged Cassius by his march. *Rumore adventus nostri, & Cassio qui Antiochia tenebatur, animus accessit, & Parthis timor injectus est. Itaque cedentes ab oppido Cassius insequutus rem bene gessit, quâ in fugâ magnâ auctoritate Osaces Dux Parthorum vulnus accepit, eoque interiit paucis post diebus.* i. e. "Upon the report of my advancing, Cassius, who "was hemmed up in Antioch, was animated; and the "Parthians were terrified. And now these drawing "off

(4) *Onomastic.* pag. 470.

(5) An Italian Civilian who wrote the *Lives of the Civilians*, printed at Basil in 1537 and 1557.

(6) Τῆς Συρίας ἐν τε τῷ παρόντι καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἦρξεν. "He then "commanded over Syria, and "even afterwards." Dio, lib. 40.

(7) *Syriam adversus Parthos defendit, Osace duce cum magnâ copiarum parte interempto.* Glandorp. *Onom.* pag. 205. i. e. "He "defended Syria "against the "Parthians; "Osaces the General, and a "great part of "the troops, being slain."

(8) Cicero, Philipp. XI. cap. 12.

(f) *Cujus morte inaudita, Antonius exclamaſſe dicitur, Vici,* Aurel. Victor. *de Viris illuſtr.* pag. 104.

dead (*f*). Moreri has not many errors in this Article [*C*]. Furetiere has publiſhed a notorious falſity concerning Caſſius [*D*]. Plutarch ſeems to have contradicted himſelf, where he ſpeaks of the death of this illuſtrious Roman [*E*], and Dion has not argued very juſtly [*F*]. The Chronicle of Euſebius is incorrect on this occaſion [*G*]. I am ſurpriſed that Plutarch and the reſt of the Hiſtorians, did not take notice of Julius Cæſar's ghoſt appearing to Caſſius [*H*].

Here

" off from the city, Caſſius followed them with ſuc-
" ceſs; and in their flight, Oſaces General of the
" Parthians, and a man of great authority received a
" wound, of which he died a few days after." The reader may alſo ſee Joſephus, Chapter XII of Book XIV of his *Antiquities of the Jews*.

[*C*] *Moreri has not many errors in this article.*] His aſſertion, viz. that Caſſius was vanquiſhed by Cæſar, is a miſtake; for Caſſius, after Pompey's defeat, ſubmitted to the Conqueror, and delivered up to him the Fleet he commanded, without ſtriking a blow; and harbour'd from that time a deſign upon Cæſar's life (9). Nor is it true, that *when Auguſtus, Mark Anthony, and Lepidus, made a league in order to revenge the death of Cæſar, Caſſius went into Syria*; for both he and Brutus had before ſecured to themſelves ſuch countries as they thought moſt convenient for their affairs. The inſtant they perceived that Mark Anthony and young Octavius were more powerful in Italy than the aſſaſſins of Cæſar; they left that country, and did not retire to thoſe provinces which the Senate had allotted them, but to poſſeſs themſelves of ſuch as were more powerful; and for this purpoſe, Caſſius who was very well known and greatly eſteemed by the Syrians, made choice of Syria, whilſt Brutus ſecured Macedonia; as appears from Dion, Plutarch and ſeveral other Hiſtorians. Moreri ſhould have cited Florus, Book 4. Chap. 7; and not Book 3. Chap. 6. He has alſo cited Book I of Epicurus's Life by Gaſſendi, inſtead of Book II; and has given the name of *Dandorus* to the Freedman whom Plutarch and Dion call Pindarus (10).

(9) C. *Caſſius . . me auctorem credo deſideravit: qui etiam ſine his clariſſimis viris hanc rem in Cilicia ad oſtium fluminis Cydni confeciſſet, ſi ille ad eam ripam quam conſtituerat, non ad contrariam navim appuliſſet.* Cicero, *Philipp.* 2. cap. 11.

(10) It was by this man that Caſſius cauſed himſelf to be ſlain.

[*D*] *Furetiere has publiſhed a notorious falſity concerning Caſſius.*] I fancy it will not be an error to aſſert, that the following words of Aulus Gellius were at leaſt the remote cauſe of it: *Eum Caſſium poſtea ſatis notum eſt victis Parthis fuſoque exercitu ſuo miſeram mortem oppetiiſſe* (11). Aulus ſpeaks of a certain fatality which was ſaid to be inſeparable from the horſe Sejanus, which brought all who were poſſeſſed of him to an untimely end; and in enumerating the examples that were pretended to be given of this, he mentions that of Caius Caſſius, who had that horſe after Dolabella's untimely end. He then adds, that it is generally known, *that Caſſius periſhed miſerably, after having defeated the Parthians* (12), *and after the loſs of his own army.* Nothing could have been more improper, than to relate, on ſuch an occaſion, the advantages which Caſſius had gained over the Parthians ſo long before. Either the paſſage muſt be corrupted, and *Parthis* muſt have been put for *Partibus* (13), or Aulus Gellius did not think of what he was about. Beſides, either Furetiere, who ſays that Caſſius, poſſeſſor of the horſe Sejanus, after Dolabella, *died in a war againſt the Parthians* (14), took it upon truſt; or gave no attention to Aulus Gellius's words; for in giving ever ſo little, we ſhall find that he ſpeaks of Caſſius, the aſſaſſin of Julius Cæſar; and it is univerſally known, that this Caſſius died in the battle of Philippi, in which he was overcome by Mark Anthony, as is ſeen in Moreri, and not in a war againſt the Parthians.

(11) Aulus Gell. lib. 3. cap. 9.

(12) Or after that the Parthians had been defeated.

(13) *See* Glandorp. *Onomaſt.* pag. 470. It is *partibus* in the beſt editions of Aulus Gellius.

(14) *Dictionaire Univerſel.* under the word *Cheval.*

[*E*] *Plutarch ſeems to have contradicted himſelf, where he ſpeaks of the death of this illuſtrious Roman.*] In one place he informs us, that Caſſius killed himſelf with the ſame dagger, with which he had ſtabbed Cæſar; and admires this as a very myſterious circumſtance (15); but, in another place, he only ſays, that Caſſius made Pindar his Freedman kill him (16); and even obſerves, that this Freedman ſtruck the blow, by cutting off his head (17). Velleius Paterculus enforces this circumſtance. *Lacerna caput circumdedit*, ſays he, *extentamque cervicem interritus liberto præbuit. Deciderat Caſſii caput cum &c* (18). i. e. "Wrapping up
" his head with his cloak, he undauntedly ſtretched
" out his neck to his Freedman. Caſſius's head was
" ſtruck off, when &c." Now a dagger is not a very proper inſtrument for this purpoſe; and it is certain, that moſt of Cæſar's murtherers employed daggers (19). The only way left Plutarch to be conſiſtent with himſelf, was to ſay, either that Caſſius deſired his Freedman to make uſe only of the dagger with which he (Caſſius) had ſtabbed Julius Cæſar, or that the Freedman had then no other (20).

(15) Plut. *in Vita Cæſaris*, pag. 740.

(16) Idem, *in Vita M. Antonii*, pag. 924. and in *Vita Bruti*, pag. 1004.

(17) Idem, *in Vita Bruti*, ibid.

(18) Patercul. lib. 2. cap. 70.

(19) Sueton. *in Cæſare*, cap. 72, & *ibi* Pitiſcus.

[*F*] *. . . Dion has not argued very juſtly.*] Having related, about the end of Book XLVII, that Caſſius cauſed Pindarus one of his Freedmen to kill him; and that Brutus cauſed himſelf alſo to be ſlain by one of thoſe who accompanied him; he begins the XLVIIIth book with ſaying, *Thus died Brutus and Caſſius, ſtabbed with the ſame ſwords with which they had killed Cæſar* (21). But with all the reſpect that is due to the antient Hiſtorians, we may venture to aſſert, that this relation is not perfect in every part; and that no attentive and judicious reader will perceive one good conſequence in it. Brutus and Caſſius cauſed themſelves to be killed by one of their retinue; and therefore they fell by the very ſwords with which they had murthered Julius Cæſar. This would ſooner be believed, did it appear that they had killed themſelves. Suetonius indeed tells us, that ſome of the aſſaſſins killed themſelves with the ſame dagger; but then he does not name any one. *Nonnulli ſemet eodem illo pugione, quo Cæſarem violaverant, interemerunt* (22).

(20) There is the figure of Brutus and Caſſius's dagger in a medal of Brutus, given by Spanheim, pag. 270. of his Commentary on the Cæſars of Julian.

(21) Ὁ μὲν δὴ Βροῦτος ὅτι Κάσσιος αὐτὸς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ξιφισίου διὰ τῶν Καίσαρα ἀπειργασμένων σφαγέντες. Dion. lib. 48. *init.*

(22) Sueton. *in Julio, ſub fin.*

[*G*] *The Chronicle of Euſebius is incorrect on this occaſion.*] We therein are told, that Caſſius conquered Judæa, and plundered the Temple of Jeruſalem, before Julius Cæſar's death (23). Now theſe are all falſities. There was no occaſion to conquer Judæa, ſince it obeyed peaceably the Romans at that time. Caſſius never plundered the city of Jeruſalem; for had this been true, Joſephus would not have omitted it; nor have contented himſelf with barely ſaying, that Caſſius demanded a large ſum of money from the Jews. This was done by him after Cæſar's death, when he went to ſecure the Province of Syria (24). Had Euſebius ſaid, Caſſius plunder'd the Temples of the Rhodians, this would have been more juſt; but then he ought not to have fixed this incident, as he does in his Chronicle, two years after the death of Julius Cæſar. Scaliger declares that he miſtook two years (25), but I am of opinion it was but one. However this be, Caſſius having conquered the Rhodian Fleet, carried off their ſhips and treaſure, and plundered their Temples. He left them nothing but the chariot of the Sun; and would have treated them ſtill more rigorouſly, had he not called to mind, his having ſtudied among them. The Rhodians imagined they were infallibly ſure of victory, ſince they ſhewed him the chains they had prepared for ſuch Romans as they ſhould take priſoners (26). See in what manner Valerius Maximus, to give the better ſcope to his myſterious conceits, has related the particulars concerning the Chariot of the Sun (27).

(23) Euſeb. *In Chron.* num. 1973.

(24) *See* Scaliger, *Animadverſ. in hunc locum. Chron. Euſeb.* pag. 158. where he obſerves that Jornandes, according to his uſual cuſtom, tranſcribed thoſe errors of St. Jerom.

(25) Ibid. pag. 160.

(26) Dio, lib. 47. pag. 395.

(27) Val. Max. lib. 1. cap. 5. num. 8.

[*H*] *Plutarch, and the reſt of the Hiſtorians . . . have not taken notice of Julius Cæſar's ghoſt appearing to Caſſius.*] I am ſurprized that Plutarch ſhould take no notice of Cæſar's appearing to Caſſius, at the battle of Philippi. How could ſuch an incident eſcape this Hiſtorian, who collected ſo carefully the prodigies concerning the war againſt Brutus and Caſſius; and who related ſo great a number of them, that he thought himſelf obliged to inform us, that Caſſius began at laſt to waver a little in his Epicurean Principles (28)? Dion, who is as induſtrious on this article as Plutarch, is alſo ſilent with regard to this memorable apparition; and I don't remember any one who has mentioned it except Valerius Maximus. At the battle of Philippi, ſays he (29), Caſſius driving forward with extreme fury, ſaw Cæſar, who, under a more auguſt form than is ſeen among mortals, was riding full ſpeed to attack him. But Caſſius was ſo aſtoniſhed at what he ſaw, that he turn'd his back, after ſaying: *It is high time to give over: If the killing of him was doing little or nothing, what can be done more? C. Caſſius . . . cum acie Philippenſi ardentiſſimo animo perſtaret, vidit . . Julium . .*

(28) Plut. *in Vita Bruti.*

(29) Valerius Maximus, lib. 1. cap. *ult.*

Here follows a very remarkable circumſtance. Caſſius believed, according to the doctrine of Epicurus, the mortality of the ſoul; and nevertheleſs he offered up prayers to the Manes of Pompey the Great, the day that Julius Cæſar was aſſaſſinated [*I*]. He had forgot his Philoſophy on this occaſion: Nature was more powerful than Art. He did not behave in this manner, when Brutus told him that he had ſeen an apparition; for notwithſtanding that he ſhould naturally have been uneaſy, with regard to futurity, in the preſent ſtate of their affairs, he nevertheleſs argued very calmly; endeavoured to refute this apparition philoſophically; and concluded with ſaying, that he wiſhed the common belief, with regard to the exiſtence of Genii, were true [*K*]. The reaſons he gave to corroborate it, were very well adapted to fill his friend with hopes; and, at the ſame time, ſhew us, that Infidels are not always inclined to unbelief from motives of ſelf-love (*g*). I ſhall examine the religious expreſſions which it is ſaid he employed in haranguing his ſoldiers [*L*].

(*g*) See the *Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes*, num. 187. pag. 586.

CASSIUS.

humano habitu auguſtiorem, purpureo paludamento amictum, minaci vultu, & concitato equo in ſe impetum facientem: quo aſpectu perterritus, tergum hoſti dedit, voce illa prius emiſſa, quid enim amplius agas, ſi occidiſſe parum eſt? I ſhould be more ſurprized that ſuch an incident ſhould be found but in one Author, did I not know that there are very many ſingular ones, that have tranſmitted to poſterity by one writer only. And it ſometimes happens, that this ſingle Author ſpeaks of it only occaſionally, and a long time after the incident happened. Several examples of this are ſcatter'd up and down in different parts of this work, and here follows one. Ammianus Marcellinus is the only writer who informs us of the expedient Alexander employed, in order to drive ſleep from him (30); and we probably ſhould not have known this circumſtance, had not that Author been deſirous of giving Julian the apoſtate ſome ſuperiority over Alexander.

A REMARKABLE incident concerning Alexander, that is found only in Ammianus Marcellinus.

(30) Ammian. Marcell. lib. 16. cap. 5.

[*I*] *He believed . . the Mortality of the Soul; and nevertheleſs offered up prayers to the manes of Pompey the Great, the day that Julius Cæſar was aſſaſſinated.*] Plutarch does not relate this without joining a reflection to it; he obſerving, that the greatneſs of the enterprize, and the dangers with which it was ſurrounded, inſpired ſuch an enthuſiaſm as made Caſſius forget his principles of Philoſophy. Καὶ γὰρ ἂν λέγεται Κάσσιον εἰς τὸν ἀνδριάντα τὸν Πομπηΐου περὶ τῆς ἐγχειρήσεως ἀποδιδόναι, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι σιωπῇ, καίπερ οὐκ ἀλλοτρίων ὢν τῶν Ἐπικούρου λόγων, ἀλλ' ὁ καιρὸς (ὡς ἔοικεν) ἤδη τῷ θυμῷ παρεσῶντος, ἐνθουσιασμὸν ἐποίει καὶ πάθος, ἀντὶ τῶν προτέρων λογισμῶν (31).

(31) Plutarch. *in Julio Cæſare*, pag. 739. A. See alſo in *Bruto*, pag. 991, *D.*

[*K*] *When Brutus told him that he had ſeen an apparition . . . he nevertheleſs argued very calmly; endeavoured to refute this . . philoſophically, and concluded with ſaying, that he wiſhed the Roman Belief, with regard to the Exiſtence of Genii, were true.*] 'Tis Plutarch informs us of all theſe particulars. Δαίμονας δ' οὔτ' εἶναι πιθανὸν, οὔτ' ὄντας ἀνθρώπων ἔχειν εἶδος, ἢ φωνὴν, ἢ δύναμιν εἰς ἡμᾶς δηλήσασαν. ὡς ἐγὼν' ἂν ἐβουλόμην ἵνα μὴ μόνον ὅπλοις καὶ ἵπποις καὶ ναυσὶ τοσαύταις, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεῶν ἀρωγαῖς ἐπιθαῤῥοῦμεν, ὁσιωτάτων ἔργων καὶ καλλίστων ἡγεμόνες ὄντες (32). i. e. "Neither is it credible that there are "Genii, nor, if there be ſuch beings, that they wear "a human ſhape, and are endued with a voice and "ſtrength ſuitable to us. I indeed wiſh it were ſo, "for then, we ſhould not rely ſo much on our horſe "and foot, and ſo mighty a fleet; but confiding in the "aid of the Gods, we ſhould atchieve the moſt holy "and moſt illuſtrious exploits." Theſe words of Caſſius appeared ſo beautiful to de Balzac, that he made a paraphraſe on them, purpoſely to give the idea of the converſaion of the Romans. "In the "following light, *ſays he* (33), Caſſius ſet a ſubject ſo "unpleaſant in itſelf; and ſo highly does he improve it "for the uſe of converſation: and without appearing "to be either a ſilly admirer or an obſtinate unbe-"liever, he ſays thus pleaſantly to his friend." *That "the cares of the Soul, the ſtruggles of the mind, the happineſs of the body, the gloom of the night, might have "created the viſion, and raiſed that ſtrange image before "him. That with regard to himſelf by the principles of "the Philoſophy he profeſſed, he did not believe there were "ſuch beings as Dæmons, much leſs that they were viſible; "however, that he could wiſh they did exiſt, and that his "Philoſophy were falſe; becauſe that probably thoſe incorporeal ſpirits, being ſo juſt and virtuous, and the action "committed on the ides of March, ſo beautiful and "heroic, and their cauſe ſo juſt, they doubtleſs would "come and ſhare in it: That thus they would be as ſoma "ny unexpected friends and allies of the Commonwealth, "who would come to their aid; and as ſo many* corps de "reſerve, *who would fight for them whenever their aſ-"ſiſtance would be wanted. That this being the real "fact, they then need not to compute merely in their "party, ſo many companies of foot, ſo many troops of horſe, "ſo many legions, and ſo many ſhips; but that there was, "over and above, an army of immortals, who would "not require any pay, but would declare for the cauſe of "virtue, and, above all, would never join with Mark "Anthony againſt Brutus, nor prefer tyranny to liberty.* "Theſe, Madam, are the dying words of the Com-"monwealth, after which it expired. This was the "characteriſtic of the ſpirit of Rome, and was the "language natural to Majeſty. Don't you think "Caſſius greatly eloquent in that language? Should "you not be glad to become better acquainted with "this excellent man; to ſee him engaged on other "ſubjects; and to hear him argue on leſs diſagreea-"ble topicks; and at another time than on the even-"ing before the battle of Philippi (34)?"

(32) Idem, in *Bruto*, pag. 1001, *B.*

(33) Balzac, *Oeuvres diverſes*, Diſcourſ. 2. pag. m. 51, 52.

(34) Balzac is miſtaken, for Plutarch, *in Bruto*, pag. 1001, informs us, *that Brutus and Caſſius had this converſation the day after the apparition; and that they then were not come out of Aſia into Europe.*

Plutarch obſerves, that Caſſius's arguments were a great conſolation to his friend Brutus. They were ſpecious: but ſome will ſay, did not the phantom declare, that he was Brutus's evil Genius? Does not this imply, that all Genii do not favour the cauſe of virtue, as Caſſius ſuppoſed they did? Now, if we fear as much the evil offices of ſpirits as hope for good offices from them, is not this exactly the ſame as if no ſuch beings exiſted? To this I anſwer, that to follow only the light of nature, we are more inclined to believe that Genii are beneficent ſpirits, than to ſuppoſe them malicious; and hence Brutus might be more ſtrongly affected with the reflections of his friend, than with the words of the apparition.

[*L*] *I ſhall examine the religious expreſſions, which it is pretended he employed in haranguing his ſoldiers.*] Brutus and Caſſius reviewing their army near the Gulph Menas (35), did not forget to harangue them according to the uſual cuſtom. Caſſius being the oldeſt, ſpoke firſt; and expreſſed himſelf ſo happily, that the ſoldiers cried aloud, *Let us march; we'll follow wherever you lead.* Overjoyed at this exclamation, he harangued them again, and began with this wiſh: May the Gods who preſide over wars undertaken on a juſt account reward your fidelity (36). He then tells them, the good order the Generals had put every thing, they having employ'd the moſt prudent meaſures that the military ſcience could furniſh: Such, ſays he, are the precautions which human foreſight could ſuggeſt, the reſt depends on your valour and the divine bleſſing (37): whatever has been promiſed you ſhall be paid; and as we have already recompenſed your fidelity, we will not fail, with the aſſiſtance of the Gods (38), to reward you nobly when you ſhall have obtained the victory. Now does not a man who employs ſuch expreſſions, abandon the principles of Epicurus? Muſt we not conclude that Caſſius, at the ſight of the deciſive battle on which his whole fortune lay at ſtake, had recourſe to the ſame Deities whoſe providence he had been taught to deny? Was he not one of thoſe men who, when on the brink of danger, forgets all his free-thinking maxims? To this I anſwer two things: firſt, that we are not certain, that his ſpeech was inſerted in Appian's work, literally as he ſpoke it. The Hiſtorians diſpoſed theſe kind of

(35) In Thrace.

(36) Θεοὶ μὲν ὅσοι πολέμων δικαίων δυνάσται τῆς πίστεως ὑμᾶς, ὦ συστρατιῶται, καὶ προθυμίας ἀμείψοιντο. Appian, lib. 4. *Bell. Civil.* pag. 646.

(37) Τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ αὐτοῖς ἀνάλογον ἀναντίοιν παρὰ τε ὑμῶν καὶ παρὰ τῶν Θεῶν. Idem, ibid. pag. 647.

(38) Κατὰ γνώμην Θεῶν. Ibid.

CASSIUS LONGINUS (CAIUS) a great Lawyer in the reign of Nero. Some Criticks pretend, that Pomponius (*a*) confounded him with Lucius Caſſius Longinus, who married a daughter of Germanicus [*A*]. This would be leſs ſurpriſing than the little agreement that is found between the contemporary Authors, concerning the puniſhment which Nero inflicted on our Lawyer [*B*]. Some ſay he baniſhed him, and others that he

(*a*) *De Origine Juris*, leg. 2. § *ult.*

of harangues as they pleaſed: they alter'd them as they thought proper, and interwove their own thoughts. My ſecond anſwer is, that Caſſius, tho' he believed as ſtedfaſtly as ever the doctrine of Epicurus, nevertheleſs might have ſpoke the words related by the Hiſtorian. He was ſenſible that ſuch expreſſions would be very grateful to the ſoldiers; from this he conceived great hopes, and therefore it was his buſineſs to improve them. An able General, on ſuch an occaſion, does not accommodate his words to the philoſophical opinions he himſelf entertains, but to the prejudices of his ſoldiers.

[*A*] *Some Criticks pretend, that Pomponius confounded him with Lucius Caſſius Longinus, who married a daughter of Germanicus.*] I ſhall not diſpute either for or againſt him. It is pretended that he made but one perſon of two; having confounded together Lucius Caſſius Longinus, and Caius Caſſius Longinus; the former of whom was Conſul in the year of Rome 783, and afterwards married to Druſilla daughter of Germanicus, anno 785, and at laſt put to death by Caligula's order: the latter was Governor of Syria under the Emperor Claudius, and condemn'd to baniſhment under Nero. Lipſius, who after Glandorp has cenſured Pomponius upon that account, is himſelf criticiſed by the Preſident Bertrand, and by William Grotius. This affair may perhaps be examined on another occaſion.

I now ſhall only obſerve, that if it be true, as Lipſius aſſerts (1), that the Caſſius who married Druſilla the year of Rome 785, had been Conſul in 783; it is ſurprizing that Tacitus ſhould be quite ſilent on that head; ſince with reſpect to the marriage, he tells us who this Caſſius Longinus was, whom Tiberius had made choice of for a huſband to his adopted granddaughter; and that he deſcends ſo far for particulars, as to inform us, that this man was indeed of a Plebeian Family, but at the ſame time of conſiderable antiquity, and illuſtrious from the public employments it had filled: and that the Caſſius in queſtion had received a very ſevere education under his father, and was more commendable for the tractableneſs of his temper, than for the greatneſs of his underſtanding (2). Would any Writer, how exceſſively fond ſoever he might be of conciſeneſs, not (if he knew it) have added on ſuch an occaſion, that a man had been Conſul, and how he had behaved in his Conſulſhip? This Caſſius therefore was not Conſul in 783; or (which is very unlikely) Tacitus muſt not have known that he exerciſed that employment. On the other ſide, if Pomponius believed that his Caſſius Longinus was Conſul in 783, how could he poſſibly be ignorant of a circumſtance much more glorious than the Conſulſhip; how, I ſay, came he not to know that the Caſſius in queſtion had the honour two years after, to marry Tiberius's granddaughter? It is ſtrange and inconceivable, that this writer ſhould miſtake, in aſcribing to Caius Caſſius the Conſulſhip of Lucius Caſſius; and that after this, he ſhould not give him Lucius Caſſius's wife alſo.

But, in fine, it will be ſaid in favour of Lipſius, that Suetonius declares expreſly, that Druſilla was married to Lucius Caſſius Longinus, a man of conſular dignity. To this I anſwer, that Suetonius ſays only, that Caligula took Druſilla his ſiſter, from her huſband Caſſius, a man of Conſular Dignity. Now theſe two things differ widely. There was an interval of five years between Druſilla's marriage, and Caligula's acceſſion to the Throne. During this interval, L. Caſſius may have been another's proxy in the Conſulſhip; and in this manner Druſilla's huſband may have been of conſular dignity when his wife was taken from him, without his being ſuch at the time he married her. Such are the falſe reaſonings to which a Writer expoſes himſelf, when he does not examine with a Caſſian exactneſs all the circumſtances of the paſſages he intends to cite. Suetonius ſays, *Lucio Caſſio Longino Conſulari collocatam* (Druſillam) *abduxit* (Caligula) (3). Lipſius without ſpeaking either of Caligula, or the *abduxit*, aſcribes only the following words to Suetonius. *Druſillam collocatam L. Caſſio Longino Conſulari*, expreſſions which being laid down in this random manner, and as a proof of Lipſius's particular opinion, cannot be interpreted more juſtly than in the following manner. *Druſilla was married to L. Caſſius Longinus a man of conſular dignity.* Des Cartes has ſaid very juſtly, that the greateſt cauſe of our errors in Philoſophy, ariſes from our including more things in our judgments, than our diſtinct ideas preſent to us of them. It may alſo be aſſerted, that nothing occaſions greater falſities in criticiſm, than the liberty which Writers take to extend to an undue length, the authorities on which ſuch Writers ground their aſſertions.

(1) Lipſius, *in Tacit. Annal.* lib. 6. cap. 15.

(2) *Caſſius plebei Romæ generis, verum antiqui honoratique, & ſevera patris diſciplina eductus, facilitate ſæpius, quàm induſtria commendabatur.* Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 6. cap. 15.

(3) Suet. *in Calig.* cap. 24.

[*B*] *There is little agreement .... between the cotemporary Authors, concerning the puniſhment which Nero inflicted on our Lawyer.*] The ſplendor in which our Caius Caſſius Longinus lived, does not ſeem to allow the two quite oppoſite relations, which Authors have given of the treatment he met with from Nero. Some Writers aſſert, that this Emperor put him to death; and others, that he baniſhed him to Sardinia. Theſe are two contradictory aſſertions; it is declaring that Nero did and did not, put him to death. How could Writers relate the ſame incident in a direct oppoſite manner, grounded on the relation given by Authors who lived pretty near the time when the incident happened? It would not be leſs ſurprizing, ſhould people begin already to aſſert, that Barnevelt was only baniſhed, and that Mr. Fouquet was put to death. But whether there is occaſion here for our wonder or not, it is certain, that on one ſide ſeveral ingenious men, from the authorities of Suetonius and Juvenal; maintain, that Nero put Caius Caſſius to death; and on the other ſide, that ſeveral learned men from the authority of Tacitus and Pomponius, affirm in the moſt expreſs manner, that he only baniſhed him.

We will begin with the laſt teſtimonies; *Tunc Conſulto Senatus*, ſays Tacitus (4), *Caſſio & Silano exſilia decernuntur*,—DEPORTATUSQUE IN INSULAM SARDINIAM *Caſſius, & Senatus jus expectabant* (5). i. e. "Then Caſſius and Silanus, by a decree of the Senate, "were condemned to baniſhment. Caſſius was carried into exile &c." Caſſius is left there, and no notice taken of what became of him afterwards: but we are elſewhere informed, that having been reſtored by Veſpaſian, he died in peace. *Plurimum in civitate auctoritatis habuit, eo uſque donec eum Cæſar* CIVITATE PELLERET; PULSUS AB EO IN SARDINIAM *revocatus à Veſpaſiano, diem ſuum obiit* (6). i. e. "He had "great authority in the city, till Cæſar drove him "from it; and being baniſhed by that Monarch into "Sardinia, he was recalled by Veſpaſian, and died at "home." Let us now ſee, whether Suetonius and Juvenal declare as clearly, that Nero put him to death. Suetonius having ſaid, that this Emperor uſed to put to death whomſoever he pleaſed, for the moſt trifling fault; without obſerving the leaſt meaſure or diſtinction, adds, with regard to four perſons, the crimes with which they were charged (7), Caſſius Longinus the Lawyer, one of theſe four was accuſed (ſays he) of having left in the Genealogical Table of his family, the picture of Caſſius, one of Cæſar's murtherers: *Quod in vetere gentili ſtemmate C. Caſſii percuſſoris* Cæſaris *imagines retinuiſſet.* Now this is directly one of the articles of the impeachment, drawn up againſt this great man, according to Tacitus. *Objectavit Caſſio* (Nero) *quod inter imagines majorum etiam C. Caſſii effigiem coluiſſet, ita inſcriptam* DUCI PARTIUM (8), i. e. "It was objected to Caſſius by Nero, "that among the images of his anceſtors, he vene"rated that of C. Caſſius, on which was the follow"ing inſcription, TO THE LEADER OF THE PARTY." This ſhews that the two Hiſtorians in queſtion ſpeak of the ſame Caſſius; and nevertheleſs one of them declares expreſly, that he was only baniſhed; and the other, that he was put to death: for Suetonius muſt have been in a dream; had he ſpoke in the manner he has done, without intending to inform us thereby, that Nero cauſed this Lawyer to be put to death.

(4) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 16. cap. 9.

(5) Theſe laſt words which Lipſius looked upon as inexplicable, have been ingeniouſly corrected by Preſident Bertrand, and by William Grotius, very near in the ſame way. The firſt reads, *nec Senatus jus exſpectabatur*; the ſecond, *nec Senatus juſſus exſpectabatur.* The conjecture of Nicholas Heinſius, which appeared to Mr. Rijck, *Animadv. ad Tacit.* pag. 282. the moſt probable of all, is, that we are to read *& ſeneſtus ejus reſpectabatur.* But Don Nicholas Antonio, *de Juribus exulum*, lib. 1. pag. 72. pretends that we are to read, *ut ſenex tutius aſpectabatur*, or *deſpectabatur.*

(6) Pomponius, *in L. II. de Orig. Juris*, § *ult.*

(7) Suetonius *in Nerone*, cap. 37.

(8) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 16. cap. 7.

he put him to death. Commentators have not taken the leaſt pains to clear up theſe blunders [C]. In my opinion, they are miſtaken, who affirm, that Germanicus's ſon-in-law was a Lawyer (b) [D]. The omiſſion of a ſingle word has occaſioned the aſſertion of a great falſhood in de Chevreau's Hiſtory [E]; and it was not corrected in the Hague edition, printed anno 1698.

(b) Glandorp. *Onomaſt.* pag. 204 and 468.

(9) Juven. Sat. x. ver. 12, &c.

With reſpect to Juvenal (9), he ſeems to me to write in as poſitive terms. Not but that the baniſhment into the iſland of Sardinia, which paſſed for a very deſolate, unhealthy country, might have appeared to him ſo great a puniſhment as to make him ſay, that Caſſius Longinus whoſe great riches had occaſioned his exile to ſuch a place, would be an example of the calamities to which rich men, but not the poor are expoſed; and this is the common place he treats of on that occaſion. But laſtly, he had a little before confined himſelf to that ſpecies of misfortune or calamity, which he would aſcribe to riches: he had obſerved, that the too aſſiduous amaſſing of wealth had brought many to an ill end.

Sed plureis nimia congeſta pecunia cura
STRANGULAT.

That is,

" But more have been by avarice oppreſs'd
" And heaps of money crowded in the cheſt.
Dryden.

Therefore, the two examples which he gives immediately after, viz. Longinus and Seneca muſt be examples of perſons brought to an evil end.

Temporibus diris igitur, juſſuque Neronis
Longinum & magnos Senecæ prædivitis hortos
Clauſit, & egregias Lateranorum obſidet ædes
Tota cohors.

That is,

" For this, in Nero's arbitrary time,
" When virtue was a guilt, and wealth a crime,
" A troop of cut-throat guards were ſent to ſeize
" The rich men's goods, and gut their Palaces.
Dryden.

Tacitus obſerves alſo, that Caſſius's riches were one of the two cauſes of the perſecution he ſuffered; whence it is evident, that both he and Juvenal mean the ſame perſon. *Nullo crimine*, ſays he, in Chapter VII of the XVIth Book of Annals, *niſi quod Caſſius* OPIBUS *vetuſtis & gravitate morum præcellebat.* i. e. " Caſſius " had no crimes, but his great riches, and the fame " of the ſeverity of his manners." The other cauſe of this perſecution was, Caſſius's ſevere virtue, which was hereditary in his family, and of which he himſelf had given ſo many examples, either in maintaining the troops in Syria under the moſt ſevere military diſcipline, even in times of peace (10); or in voting for the continuing of that law, which condemned to death all the ſlaves belonging to a maſter, when one of them had killed him (11).

(10) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 12. cap. 12.
(11) Idem, *Annal.* lib. 14. cap. 43. *See alſo* chap. 48. of the 13th book, and chap. 41.

[C] . . . . *Commentators have taken no manner of pains to clear up theſe blunders.*] It cannot eaſily be conceived, why they did not take the pains to examine, either the error of Tacitus and Pomponius, or that of Juvenal and Suetonius. The Commentators on Juvenal (12), and of Suetonius (13) relate, that Nero put Caſſius Longinus to death, but at the ſame time take no notice of what is related by Tacitus, who gives a very different account. Neither do the Commentators on Tacitus (14) mention the opinion of the other two, and ſpeak only of his baniſhment. The Author of the lives of ancient Lawyers do the ſame (15). There are even ſome Writers, who cite Suetonius, with regard to the obſervation he made, viz. that Caſſius was blind (16); but they do not ſeem to have read in almoſt the ſame place, that Nero put him to death.

(12) *Britannicus, Autumnus, Farnabius, Prataeus &c.* This is not affirmed poſitively of all. The ſame is to be underſtood of what follows.
(13) Suetonius Variorum, Græevii, Pitiſci. Ch. Stephens, *and* Lloyd do the ſame
(14) Lipſius, Ryckius.
(15) Bertrand, Guil. Grotius.
(16) Glandorp, pag. 205. Bertrand, pag. 274.

[D] *In my opinion, thoſe are miſtaken, who affirm that Germanicus's ſon-in-law was a Lawyer.*] Had he been of that profeſſion, Tacitus would not have omitted it, where he mentions his good qualities, on occaſion of his marrying Tiberius's grand-daughter. Suetonius, who ſpeaks of him where he informs us that Caligula took away his wife, and afterwards put him to death (17), would certainly have taken notice of his being a Lawyer, had he been as Glandorp pretends (18), that celebrated Lawyer, who ſucceeded Maſurius Sabinus in that profeſſion, and whoſe mother, daughter of Tubero was grand-daughter of Sulpitius, the oracle of Civil Law. Suetonius has not omitted to call C. Caſſius Longinus, a Lawyer, he being really ſuch (19); but why ſhould he not have been equally accurate with regard to L. Caſſius Longinus? Tacitus has not forgot to obſerve, that Caius Caſſius was greatly ſkilled in the Civil Law. *Ea tempeſtate Caſſius cæteris præminebat peritia legum* (20).

(17) Sueton. *in Caligula*, cap. 24, 57.
(18) *Onomaſt.* pag. 204.
(19) Sueton. *in Nerone*, cap. 37.
(20) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 12. cap. 12.

ERROR of Hofman.

Mr. Hofman multiplies here the Lawyers in another manner. He makes one of theſe, he whom Nero put to death, according to Suetonius; and another, he who was only baniſhed into Sardinia, by the ſame Nero, according to Tacitus.

[E] *The omiſſion of a ſingle word, has occaſioned the aſſertion of a great falſhood, in de Chevreau's Hiſtory.*] It is I believe an error of the preſs. In chapter IX, of book III, of his Hiſtory of the world, we read, that *Nero put Caſſius Longinus to death, for having placed among the pictures of his anceſtors, that of Julius Cæſar.* The Printer had left out theſe words *of the murtherer*; the Corrector, not remembring the ſtory, and finding, notwithſtanding the omiſſion, a cauſe that was plauſible enough to induce Nero to put people to death, he therefore let the period ſtand as he found it; and in Holland they did not believe there was any occaſion to rectify this blunder. This conjecture is very probable; and would to God the error I have here taken notice of, was the only one which ſuch omiſſions of Copyiſts and Printers have occaſioned in Books.

Since the firſt impreſſion of this Dictionary, a new Edition has been publiſhed (21) of Mr. Chevreau's Hiſtory, agreeable to the alterations made by himſelf *in almoſt every page* of the preceding Editions (22). But I have not found any alteration in the paſſage relating to our Caſſius; ſo that I cannot any longer believe, that the Printers committed this error.

(21) At the Hague, in 1698.
(22) The Bookſeller's Preface.

CASSIUS HEMINA (LUCIUS) a Roman Hiſtorian, lived in the beginning of the ſeventh Century of Rome. He compoſed four books of Annals. By the particulars which are cited from it (a), we may ſuppoſe, that he traced the Roman Hiſtory to the times which preceded Romulus; and that he continued them thro' the ſeries of the ſucceſſors to that King, to his own times. He wrote the account of the ſecond Punic war in his laſt book (b). Theſe writers who make him live under Auguſtus, are very much miſtaken [A]; and

(a) *See* Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 27, 110.

(b) *Bellum Punicum poſterior.* Priſcianus, lib. 7. *apud* Voſſium, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 27. Antiently the nouns in *or*, were of the common gender. Voſſius, ibid.

[A] *Thoſe writers who make him live under Auguſtus, are very much miſtaken.*] Voſſius has diſcovered the cauſe of their miſtake. Priſcian, ſays he (1), cites at one time *Caſſius ad Mecænatem*; and at another, *Caſſius ad Tiberium*, upon which it has been pretended, that theſe related to Caſſius Hemina. Firſt, we have ſeen Simler aſſert in his Epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheca, that Caſſius Hemina had dedicated his Hiſtory and his Annals to Mecænas and to Tiberius. La Popeliniere afterwards aſſerted the ſame thing (2). Guilandin and Dalechamp have gone ſtill farther; in their opinion, Pliny ought not to have added the epithet of moſt ancient, *vetuſtiſſimum* to an Author who lived but ſeventy years before him, conſidering the perſons to whom he had dedicated his Books; for this reaſon they altered *vetuſtiſſimum* into *veriſſimum* (3). The truth is, Caſſius Hemina was living when the ſecular games were celebrated the fourth time, the year of Rome 608 or 607. As for Priſcian's Caſſius, he is Caſſius Severus the Orator, if Voſſius (4) and Father Hardouin (5) may be credited.

(1) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 27.
(2) *Caſſius Hemina* wrote Annals and ſome Hiſtories, which he ſent to the Emperor Tiberius and Mecænas. La Popeliniere, *Hiſt. des Hiſtoires*, pag. 318.
(3) *Caſſius Hemina vetuſtiſſimus Auctor Annalium* Plinius, lib. 13. cap. 13.
(4) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 27.
(5) *In Indice Autorum Plinii*, where an error has crept into the article of *Caſſius Hemina*, viz. they placing the beginning of Tiberius's reign under the year of Rome 780.

and confounded him with Caſſius Severus [*B*]. There is a wretched miſtake in Charles Stephens's Dictionary, concerning Caſſius Hemina [*C*].

[*B*] . . . . *and have confounded him with Caſſius Severus.*] Voſſius does not talk improbably, when he aſcribes this error to ſome of Tertullian's Copyiſts (6). It is doubtleſs much better to make this ſuppoſition, than to attack Tertullian himſelf: be this as it will, we ſee Caſſius Severus cited in Tertullian's apology, with Cornelius Nepos; and that to juſtify a particular which it is very certain Caſſius Hemina writ upon; whereas it is not very much ſo, that the other Caſſius wrote a Hiſtory properly ſo called. Voſſius is therefore of opinion, that Tertullian had barely cited Caſſius, but that he underſtood Hemina; and that the word Severus had at laſt crept into the text, by the ignorance of the Copyiſt. He confirms this conjecture by obſervation, viz. that Minutius Felix and Lactantius (repeating Tertullian's objection) cite Caſſius without adding Severus. They indeed rank him after Cornelius Nepos; but we muſt not infer from thence, that theſe meant as tho' his Hiſtory were poſterior to that of Cornelius Nepos; otherwiſe we ſhould be alſo obliged to conclude from hence, that Lactantius pretended, that Varro lived under Tiberius; for he places Varro after Caſſius, *Latini Nepos, & Caſſius, & Varro* (7). Thoſe who exclaimed ſo much againſt Calvin, for ſaying, ſoon after he had ſpoke of Arius, *ſurrexit poſtea Sabellius*, i. e. afterwards Sabellius appeared, have been ſhewn, that perſons extremely well ſkilled in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory and Chronology, have ſometimes placed Hereſiarchs in a very inaccurate manner, when the buſineſs was not to denote the exact time in which each of them had lived (8).

(6) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 110.

(7) Lactant. *Divinarum Inſtit.* lib. 1. cap. 13.

(8) See *Epiſtola Apologetica J. Sarravii, impreſſa Burdigalæ*, 1607, wherein is cited the following words of Nicholas Vignier, *Apud Alexandriam congregata fuit Synodus, conſtans probis & Catholicis Epiſcopis, per quos rurſus hæreſis utraque Arii & Sabellii damnata fuit*; and theſe of Carranza, *damnavit item Calixtum, Arium, Photinum, & Sabellium.*

[*C*] *There is a moſt wretched miſtake in Charles Stephen's Dictionary concerning Caſſius Hemina.*] We there find Caſſius Hemina a Surgeon in Rome, honoured with the freedom of that city, becauſe of his great ſkill in Surgery; and allowed to have a ſhop in the region or part of the city called Acilia. This is related, as from the authority of Pliny, Chap. VII, of Book XXV; and Chap. III, of Book XXX. But there is nothing like what is here aſſerted; either in the places cited, or in any other part of Pliny. The only circumſtance this Author tells us, which can have any relation to this, is in the firſt Chapter of the XXIXth Book: *Caſſius Hemina*, ſays he, *one of the moſt antient Authors affirms, that the firſt Phyſician who came to Rome, was Archagathus ſon of Lyſanias, who arrived thither from Peloponneſus, in the* 535*th year of Rome, where he was made free of the city, and allowed a ſhop which was bought for him at the public expence, in the region or diviſion called Acilia.* The Reader ſees evidently enough, the prodigious difference there is between what is aſcribed to Pliny, and what he really ſays; and it is vaſtly ſurprizing, that neither Frederic Morellus Regius Profeſſor, Lloyd, nor Hofman, ſhould have corrected this blunder of Charles Stephens. It is at full length in the edition of 1620, and in that of 1662. Lloyd has only changed the numerical figures of the citation from Pliny, which is far from rectifying the miſtake: he reducing them to the following. 7. 25. Hofman has tranſcribed word for word from Lloyd. Immediately after, they give us from Voſſius's Obſervations a good article of Caſſius Hemina the Annaliſt, the only one they ought to have mentioned, after expunging the chimerical Surgeon of that name.

CASSIUS SEVERUS (TITUS) a famous writer in the reign of Auguſtus, diſtinguiſhed himſelf chiefly by his ſatyrical humour, which at laſt occaſioned his baniſhment, and plunged him into miſeries, from which death only freed him (*a*). Moreri has confounded him with another CASSIUS ſirnamed *Parmenſis* [*A*] a great verſifier, and one of the aſſaſſins of Julius Cæſar. This made him fall into a great many errors [*B*], beſides

(*a*) See the remark [*G*].

[*A*] *Moreri has confounded him with another Caſſius ſurnamed Parmenſis.*] I have not found that they call him Severus; nevertheleſs Father Hardouin tells us (1), that he was called *Caſſius Severus Parmenſis*, and that the Orator Caſſius Severus, to prevent his being confounded with him, is ſurnamed Longulanus, from Longula the place of his birth (2). I wiſh he had given proofs of all this, and alſo whether the Poet is ſurnamed Parmenſis, becauſe he was a native of Parma. We may doubt the truth of this, becauſe Horace calls him *Hetruſcum*, a Tuſcan; and that Parma was then in Gallia Ciſalpina; but as it had belonged to the Tuſcans, who knows whether a native of Parma might not ſtill be called *Hetruſcus?* Father Hardouin obſerves, that the preceding editions of Pliny, expreſſed the name *Caſſius Severus, Longulanus*, as tho' two Authors were underſtood by theſe; and that it is certain Simler, in the Abridgment of Simler's *Bibliotheca*, ſpeaks of Longulanus ſingly, as an Author. He adds alſo, that we have an Epigram written by Caſſius Parmenſis on Orpheus; which Pitho inſerted in his Collection of ſmaller Poems of the Antients, publiſh'd at Paris in 1590. To this I add, that the Epigram in queſtion had been publiſh'd before Pithou's Collection. Achilles Statius was the firſt who publiſh'd it (4). Afterwards, N. Chytræus wrote a Commentary on it. Several perſons are of opinion that it is a ſuppoſititious piece, of which Achilles Statius is the true Author (5). There is no perſon but has heard, in what manner Muretus impoſed upon the greateſt critick of his time (6), in palming upon him as verſes of Trabeas (7), found in an old manuſcript, thoſe which Muretus had compoſed himſelf. Might not therefore Achilles Statius have had the like inclination, to try the judgment of the Public? Sigonius intended this, as appeared by the Book *de Conſolatione*, which he endeavoured to aſcribe to Cicero.

(1) *Comment. in Plin.* tom. 1. *in Indice Autorum.*

(2) A city of Italy in the country of the Volſci near Rome.

(3) Lib. 1. Sat. 10.

(4) In his Commentary upon Suetonius, *de claris Rhetoribus.*

(5) *See* Voſſius, *de Poet. Lat.* pag. 24. and the *Theſaurus Scholaſticæ Eruditionis.*

(6) Joſeph. Scaliger.

(7) An antient Comick Poet.

[*B*] . . . *This occaſioned his falling into a great many errors.*] 1. He obſerves in the firſt place, that the compoſitions of this Caſſius, *which were a little too much to the diſadvantage of Perſons of Quality, made Auguſtus reſolve to inſpect all famous pieces that ſhould be publiſh'd hereafter.* That is a very wrong interpretation of the following paſſage of Voſſius: *Scriptis ſuis procacibus procidiſſe viros fœminaſque illuſtres, eaque re occaſionem dediſſe Auguſto, ut* DE LIBELLIS FAMOSIS COGNITIONEM SUSCIPERET (8). Who would have believed, unleſs he ſaw it, that the Emperor Auguſtus could be found in this paſſage, deſirous of being informed of ſuch celebrated works as were publiſhing; and not fired with a juſt indignation againſt abuſive libels, and ordering the Judges to make ſearch for, and puniſh the Authors of them? I fancy Moreri would not have committed ſo many errors, had he trac'd back to the ſource which Voſſius directed him to, I mean, to the firſt Book of Tacitus's Annals; for he there would have found, that Auguſtus was the firſt, who, according to the Law *de Majeſtate*, took cognizance of ſuch Books as the Latins called *famoſos*; whence he would have concluded, that it was not out of the curioſity he had to peruſe celebrated pieces, but in order to cauſe enquiries to be made in a judiciary way, againſt works of the ſame kind with thoſe of Caſſius Severus, that the Emperor was induced to eſtabliſh this new Tribunal. Now, of what ſpecies were thoſe compoſitions of Caſſius? Satyrs, in which the reputation of ſeveral illuſtrious perſons of both ſexes had been furiouſly attacked. Tacitus ſpeaks in the following manner: *Primus Auguſtus cognitionem de famoſis libellis ſpecie legis ejus* (Majeſtatis) *tractavit, commotus Caſſii Severi libidine, qua viros fœminaſque illuſtres procacibus ſcriptis diffamaverat* (9). i. e. "The Monarch "who firſt took cognizance of defamatory libels was "Auguſtus, by virtue of the law *de Majeſtate*; ex"cited thereto by the outrage of Caſſius Severus, "who had aſperſed many perſons of diſtinction of "both Sexes in his writings." II. Moreri ſays ſecondly, that Caſſius Severus *was one of the conſpirators againſt Cæſar; that after the defeat of Brutus and Caſſius, in the year of Rome* 712, *he followed young Pom-*

(8) Voſſius, *de Hiſtoric. Lat.* pag. 109.

(9) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 1. cap. 72.

fides those he committed abstractedly from this. I shall take notice of them below, and the mistake committed by a learned Advocate for Cardinal Mazarine [C]. Vossius has also confounded the Orator with the Poet [D]; and was censured for it by remarks, all which however are not just. Other writers, on the contrary, have made two men of this Cassius [E]. He is not the Cassius to whom Ovid wrote [F]. Scaliger knew very well who he was, but employed bad reasons to refute this error [G]. Some difficulties

pey and afterwards Anthony; and that at last, Augustus ordered Varus to kill him; and that the latter finding Cassius in his study, set fire to it, and burnt him together with his books. All this is false, and relates to another Cassius, who is a very different person from him in question, as will be observed hereafter (10). III. *Tacitus nevertheless says,* adds he, *that he was banished into the Island of Crete, by the command of Tiberius.* This is not so erroneous, since the abovementioned banishment belongs properly to our Cassius. But Moreri does not long continue in the right path, without stumbling. Tacitus does not inform us, that Tiberius banished Cassius into the Island of Crete; he observes only, that in the year 777, which was the 10th of Tiberius's reign, Cassius's punishment was increased; since instead of leaving him in his banishment in the Island of Crete, he was confined to the little Island of Seriphus, and prohibited the use of fire and water (11). This passage does not inform us, whether it was under Augustus, or since his death that Cassius was banished into the Island of Crete; and though this had happened under that Emperor, Moreri would have nevertheless been mistaken, in ascribing to Tacitus, what really was not asserted by him. What then will the reader say, when he shall find that Cassius was banished under Augustus? which circumstance is verified in the following manner. Cassius, according to St. Jerom, died the year of our Lord 33 (12), and the 25th of his banishment. He therefore must have been banished into the Island of Crete in the 8th year of Christ, and in the 50th of Augustus's reign; now, since Augustus died but in the 56th year of his Empire, Cassius's exile must consequently have preceded, five or six years, the accession of Tiberius to the Imperial Throne. And accordingly we find, that Scaliger fixes the banishment of Ovid, and of Cassius to pretty near the same time (13). IV. This plainly shews another error of Moreri, viz. his saying that St. Jerom affirms, that Cassius died, *after fifteen years banishment, the 4th year of the CC Olympiad, i. e. about the 24th year of the Christian Æra.* A slight inspection into St. Jerom's Chronicle will shew, that Cassius died in the 25th year of his exile, the 4th of the CCIId Olympiad, the 33d of our Lord, and the 19th of Tiberius. This cannot be said to be an error of the Printer, from his mistaking one figure for another; for besides that in the abovementioned article of Moreri, some numbers are expressed at length in words; is it possible for a Printer to mistake three times in the figures, with the symmetry which is here seen between the errors? V. The last blunder is the following: Moreri ascribes to Cassius Severus, what Horace says only of Cassius Parmensis, viz. that his poetic genius flowed with greater rapidity than a violent stream &c. I do not reckon as errors, the Authors which are cited at the foot of the article, tho' they make no mention of our Cassius Severus.

(10) In the note [L].

(11) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 4. cap. 21.

(12) Andrew Schottus was in an error when he wrote 39 in his Treatise, *De claris apud Senecam Rhetoribus.*

(13) Scaligeri, *Animadv. in Euseb.* pag. 187. *ad numerum* 2048.

[C] *I shall take notice below, of a mistake committed by a . . . Advocate for Cardinal Mazarine.*] I mean Gabriel Naudæus. *Cassius Parmensis,* says he (14), *having wrote against Augustus, Albius Tibullus promis'd indeed to write in his defence;*

Scribere quod Cassî Parmensis opuscula vincat? *

But for the Emperor, he did not shew any resentment at it. Never was a passage placed more improperly than those verses of Horace; for that Poet does not assert, that Tibullus composed verses which related in any manner to Cassius Parmensis; he speaks of this only in a doubtful way; and he also supposes, that in case Tibullus wrote upon this subject, it was not to refute a Satyr written against Augustus; but only by way of attempting to excel Cassius Parmensis. Read attentively the following Verses, and consult Dacier's Notes on them!

(14) Naudæus, *Dialog. de Mascurat,* pag. 642.

* Horat. lib. 1. Epist. 4. ver. 3.

Albi nostrorum sermonum candide Judex!
Quid nunc te dicam facere in regione Pedana?
Scribere quod Cassi Parmensis opuscula vincat?
An tacitum sylvas inter reptare salubres,
Curantem quicquid dignum sapiente bonoque est (15)?

(15) Idem, ibid.

That is,

"Albius, the fairest Critick that I know,
"What shall I say, that you are doing now?
"In Pedan fields do you design to write
"More great than Cassius, and with higher flight?
"Or do'st thou gravely walk the healthy wood,
"Considering what befits the wise and good?"

Creech.

[D] *Vossius has also confounded the Orator with the Poet.*] Dacier has censured this error in his excellent Commentary on Horace (16). If it were true, that the Poet was called Severus (17), I should find but one proof of Vossius's having confounded him with the Orator; for in that case, he might have called the Poet *Cassius Severus Parmensis,* without confounding him with the Orator. And as for the passage of Quintilian, wherein Cassius the Orator is mentioned; and which Dacier produces to shew, that Vossius had confounded together the two Cassius's; this cannot prove the matter in hand, since Vossius had not the abovementioned passage in view, but cites another from Quintilian, which does not relate to Cassius Severus the Orator, but to Cornelius Severus the Poet (18). Dacier has therefore but the following proof left, viz. that Vossius ascribes to Cassius Parmensis what the old Scholiast on Horace says of Cassius Severus, in Ode VI of the Vth Book. Dacier might therefore have said, that Vossius ascribes to the Poet Cassius, not only what relates to no one but to the Orator; but also, what is relative only to Cornelius Severus the Poet. Vossius had not committed those errors, in his work on the Latin Historians; for he ascribes to Cassius Severus the Orator, the Ode of Horace in question; he also distinguishes him from Cornelius Severus, and censures la Popeliniere for having confounded them (19).

Dacier's Criticism of Vossius examin'd.

(16) Tom. 5. pag. 147. *sive in VI Ode Epod. aut Libri V.*

(17) Father Hardouin *in Indice Autorum Plinii,* affirms it.

(18) Vossius, *de Poetis Lat.* pag. 24.

(19) *See* Vossium, *de Hist. Lat.* pag. 109.

[E] *Others on the contrary have made two men of this Cassius.*] We shall see presently, that if on one side Cassius Severus and Cassius Parmensis, have been made one person; on the other side, Cassius has been made two persons. And indeed, Glandorp having mentioned most of the particulars which are related of him, speaks immediately after of another Cassius Severus, flourishing under Vespasian, and spoken of by Pliny in chapter XI, of Book XXXV (20); but this is the individual person who was banished for his calumnies. This appears at first sight, when we consider on what occasion Pliny speaks of this Cassius, viz. after having taken notice of certain Dishes of so prodigious a size, that luxury had perhaps never displayed itself more than on this occasion; he says, that Vitellius's Dish was not more infamous than that of Asprenas, which had poisoned 130 guests, as Cassius Severus, the accuser of Asprenas, objected to him. Now we find by Suetonius (21), that it was under Augustus Asprenas was prosecuted by Cassius Severus, for being a poisoner.

(20) Glandorp, *Onomastic.* pag. 209.

(21) In Aug. cap. 56.

[F] *He is not the Cassius to whom Ovid wrote.*] Glandorp had committed another error a little before, viz. in being of opinion, that T. Cassius Severus was the person to whom Ovid wrote the VIIIth Epistle of the first Book *de Ponto.* Father Andrew Schottus committed the like mistake (22), as also Vossius (23); tho' Scaliger had refuted him, upon L. Giraldi's doubting, whether the Orator Cassius Severus, and the Severus to whom Ovid wrote, were the same person.

(22) *De claris apud Senecam Rhetoribus.*

(23) Vossius, *de Hist. Lat.* pag. 109.

[G] *Scaliger . . . had employed bad reasons to refute this error.*] There is as much difference, says he (24), between the one and the other, as between the family of the Cassii, and that of the Cornelii: for he to whom Ovid wrote, was Cornelius Severus the Poet; and the other

(24) Scalig. *Animadv. in Chron. Euseb.* pag. 187. edit. Amstel. 1658.

culties may be ſtarted with regard to the time in which Caſſius was puniſhed for his Satyrs [*H*]; for Authors do not agree with regard to the Laws, which Auguſtus cauſed to

other was Caſſius Severus the Orator. 'Tis plain from theſe words, that Scaliger was perſuaded, that the Caſſius in queſtion was of the family *Caſſia*, one of the moſt illuſtrious in Rome; but that is not true, ſince, according to Tacitus, this Orator was of mean extraction (25). With regard to Scaliger's other reaſon, I don't know what to make on't: and I have read over the following paſſage ſeveral times, without being able to underſtand it. Cornelius Severus, ſays he, was ſtill living after the death of Auguſtus; but Caſſius Severus had been baniſh'd five years before the death of that Emperor, almoſt at the ſame time that Ovid was ſent into exile. The Printers muſt certainly have omitted a word, *Romæ* for inſtance; otherwiſe Scaliger would argue wretchedly; and if we ſuppoſe he aſſerted, that Cornelius Severus lived at Rome after Auguſtus's death, this manifeſtly ſhews, that the Cornelius in queſtion was not Caſſius Severus, who having been ſent into baniſhment before the death of Auguſtus, never returned from it. This is certainly the true way to remove Giraldi's doubt, and to refute the opinion of Glandorp and Voſſius. We will but refer them to the Epiſtle of Ovid in queſtion, which they will find dated the fourteenth year of his baniſhment; and directed to a man who enjoyed all the pleaſures of Rome, and all the delights of his country-ſeat. But theſe circumſtances did not any way ſuit the Orator Caſſius, baniſh'd into the Iſland of Crete. If Giraldi's doubt related to the ſecond Epiſtle of the fourth Book *de Ponto*, this may likewiſe be removed, by the Epiſtle itſelf, ſince it is directed to a Poet who was at that time in proſperity.

I muſt here inform the reader, that beſides the VIIIth Epiſtle of the firſt Book *de Ponto*, there is another (26) in the Vth Book written to a Severus who was profeſſedly a Poet, as one may eaſily ſuppoſe, from the manner in which Ovid writes to him. This very probably was Cornelius Severus, as Voſſius (27), and Briet (28) ſuppoſed. In this manner, the VIIIth Epiſtle of the 1ſt Book *de Ponto*, and the IId of the 4th Book, were written, according to Voſſius, to the ſame friend. If this be true, we are not to ſuppoſe, that thoſe Epiſtles are placed in the true order of time; the IId Epiſtle of the 4th book, is of an older date than the VIII of the firſt Book; ſince in the former, Ovid makes an apology to his friend, for not having wrote to him before. Beſides, conſidering his friend as engaged in ſeveral employments, in the VIIIth Epiſtle of the firſt Book; he ſays nothing which intimates, that he was writing to a Poet. Such a circumſtance would be very ſingular, with regard to perſons who ſet up for Poets; and applied themſelves ſo much to that art as Ovid and Cornelius Severus did. For this reaſon, there is ſome little room to doubt, whether theſe two Epiſtles were written to Caſſius Severus.

[*H*] *Some difficulties may be ſtarted, with regard to the time in which Caſſius was furniſhed for his Satyrs.*] St. Jerom's calculation, with regard to the baniſhment of this ſatyrical Writer, is enough to perplex very much other calculations. Caſſius juſtly deſerves the name of a ſatyrical Writer; he might even be look'd upon as a martyr to ſlander; ſince having brought a ſevere baniſhment upon himſelf, by the very ſeverity of his Satyr, and not ſoftening his pen, after that calamity, he made himſelf new foes, without having pacify'd thoſe he had before exaſperated (29). This brought a more ſevere puniſhment upon him, and reduced him to ſuch an extreme poverty, that he had ſcarce money wherewithal to purchaſe even rags, to cover his nakedneſs (30). He died in this miſerable condition in the 25th year of his baniſhment, according to St. Jerom; now as this happened in the 19th year of Tiberius's reign, Caſſius's exile muſt have begun five or ſix years before Auguſtus's death. But in what manner ſhall we reconcile this with Dion, who relates, that Auguſtus did not puniſh ſome libellers; nor gave orders to reſtrain the licentiouſneſs of Satyriſts till the year of Rome 765, i. e. two years before the death of that Emperor? We are not to doubt but that theſe proſecutions and regulations occaſioned Tacitus to ſay, that Auguſtus, exaſperated at the libels of Caſſius Severus, was the firſt who gave orders for proſecuting on the law *de Majeſtate*, the Authors of ſuch pieces. Neither are we to doubt, but that this Writer was baniſhed from Rome, about the ſame time that the Emperor made theſe new laws; conſequently, either St. Jerom's Chronology or that of Dion, are not accurate. Suetonius will not clear this doubt. He indeed tells us, that Auguſtus made ſuch laws; but he does not inform us in what year of his reign this happened. Nor does Tacitus mention the time; but only tells us the occaſion on which they were enacted.

If it be difficult to fix the Æra of Auguſtus's Edict againſt Libels, 'tis not, I believe, difficult to find in general, that he publiſh'd it in the latter part of his life. Whence it appears, that thoſe are miſtaken who pretend, that Horace had this Statute in his eye, where he introduces a friend telling him, that there were laws in force againſt ſatyrical Poets (31). On this occaſion Chabot the Commentator ſays, that Suetonius ſpeaks of the ſame law hinted at in theſe words of Horace; and cites Suetonius very improperly, firſt, by entirely diſguiſing the paſſage; and ſecondly by his adding notes, and explications to it; the whole in Italic, ſo that it is impoſſible for the reader to diſtinguiſh the words of Suetonius, from thoſe which are not ſo. But the greateſt blunder is, his aſſerting that Horace had in view the law which Suetonius ſpeaks of; a law that was not enacted till long time after the death of this Poet, which happened the 36th year of Auguſtus's reign; twenty years before the death of that Emperor. Torrentius has committed the like error, in his Commentary on Suetonius: *Ad novum Auguſti*, ſays he, *hæc de re edictum reſpexit haud dubie Horat. L. II. ad Trebatium.* Si mala condiderit, &c. i. e. "Horace doubtleſs had an eye to Auguſtus's new E-"dict, concerning this matter, in Book II, *ad Trebatium*, &c. The Author of the new Commentary Variorum on Suetonius, in 8vo, is of the ſame opinion with Torrentius. The Dauphin Scholiaſt (32) goes ſtill farther; for he aſſerts, that Horace had alſo in view the Edict of Auguſtus in the firſt Epiſtle of the ſecond Book; where it is more evident, that he ſpeaks of an antient law, enacted on account of the unbounded licentiouſneſs of Farce-players;

——— ——— *Quin etiam Lex*
Pœnaque lata, malo quæ nollet carmine quemquam
Deſcribi. Vertere modum formidine fuſtis,
Ad bene dicendum delectandumque redacti (33).

That is,

"Till laws commanded to regard men's fame,
"Severely laſh the vice, but ſpare the name.
"Fear made 'em civil, and deſign to write
"With modeſty, ſpeak well, and to delight.
CREECH.

It is generally thought, that the Poet ſpeaks there only of a Decree made by the laws of the twelve Tables, to prevent defamation of any kind. Forſterus has committed a more egregious blunder than any of thoſe I have yet mentioned; he aſcribes (34 to the Edict of Auguſtus, not only the above cited verſes of Horace, but alſo the following words from his Art of Poetry.

——— ——— *Lex eſt accepta, chorusque*
Turpiter obticuit, ſublato jure nocendi.

That is,

"Thus was the chorus loſt; their railing Muſe
"Grew ſilent, when forbidden to abuſe. Creech.

Now could the Æra of Auguſtus's Edict, mentioned by Dion, and pointed out by Tacitus, be criticized with any ſhadow of reaſon, were the affair of Labienus quoted, whoſe books were condemned to the flames, before Caſſius Severus had been proſecuted for his ſatyrical writings? This, at firſt ſight, ſeems an objection; ſince it cannot be aſſerted with truth, that Auguſtus's proſecution of Libels began by thoſe of Caſſius Severus; or two years before this Emperor's death, if it be true that the Senate burnt Labienus's Books, at a time when Caſſius was unmoleſted in his houſe. Now it appears from Seneca, that this happened about ſuch

a time,

HORACE miſunderſtood with regard to the Laws enacted againſt Satyrs.

(25) *Relatum de Caſſio Severo exſule, qui* SORDIDÆ ORIGINIS, *maleficæ vitæ, ſed vrandi validus, &c.* Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 4. cap. 21.

(26) The ſecond.

(27) *De Poetis Lat.* pag. 34.

(28) Ibid. pag. 28.

(29) *Per immodicas inimicitias et judicio jurati Senatus in Cretam amoveretur, effecerat. Atque illic eadem actitando, recentia veteraque odia advertit, exitiſque exutus, interdicto igni atque aqua, ſaxo Scribonio conſenuit.* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. 4. cap. 21.

(30) *XXV exilii ſui anno in ſumma inopia moritur, vix panno verenda contectus.* Chr. Euſebii.

(31) *Si mala condiderit in quem quis carmina jus eſt Judiciumque.* Horat. Sat. 1. lib. 2. ver. 82.

(32) *In Sueton. Aug.* cap. 55. pag. 176.

(33) Horat. Epiſt. 1. lib. 2. ver. 152.

(34) Forſterus, *Hiſtor. Juris Civil.* lib. 1. cap. 31. pag. m. 222.

THE works of Labienus condemned to the flames.

to be enacted againſt Libels. Plutarch was far from being exact in Chronology, where he ſpeaks of our Caſſius [*I*]. The ſatyrical diſpoſition of Caſſius prompted him to ſet up for an Accuſer or Informer; and though he was very unſucceſsful in his proſecutions, he yet would never leave off that infamous practice [*K*]. The manner in which he tormented Ceſtius the pleader (*b*), who had made an anſwer to Cicero's ſpeech *pro Milone*, is

(*b*) See the article CESTIUS, and Seneca, *Præf.* lib. 3. *Declam.* pag. m. 337.

a time, ſince, when he regrets the loſs of thoſe Writings of Labienus, and the reſolution which the Author of them had formed of ſhutting himſelf up in the monument of his anceſtors, in order that he might not ſurvive the loſs of his compoſitions, he obſerves, that whilſt theſe books were burning, Caſſius Severus ſaid: *they muſt now burn me alive; ſince I know them by heart* (35). "Caſſi Severi hominis Labieno junctiſſimi "bellè dictares ferebatur; ILLO TEMPORE QUO LIBRI "LABIENI EX SENATUS-CONSULTO UREBANTUR, "*nunc me, inquit, vivum uri oportet, qui illos edidici* (36)."

(35) Some Authors relate this, as tho' Caſſius had ſaid it of his own books. Eraſmus, *Apophthegm.* lib. 8. pag. m. 659. Jeremie de Pours, pag. 667. of *La divine Melodie*, wherein he calls him *Caſſianus*; Chriſtianus Liberius, pag. 3. *Exercitation. de ſcribendis & æſtimandis Libris*; and others.

(36) Seneca, *Præfat.* lib. 5. *Controverſiarum.*

It may be anſwered, that Labienus's Writings were not properly defamatory Libels, or Satyrs directed at random againſt every one: but that they were Hiſtories wherein he had ſpoke, as being a Republican, very much in favour of Pompey, and of thoſe who had endeavoured to reanimate his party; that indeed ſuch ſort of pieces give as much offence as ſlanderous Libels; and that Auguſtus thought himſelf obliged to proſecute the Authors of them; but that it might be on a quite different foot, than when he came to enact the decrees ſpoken of by the Hiſtorians above cited.

Whatever may be ſaid on this ſubject, I can never be perſuaded, that Labienus's Works were condemned, merely becauſe the Author ſpoke well of Cæſar's enemies. It is true indeed, that under the cruel and bloody Tiberius, an Author loſt his life (37), for praiſing Brutus, and for ſaying that Caſſius was the laſt Roman; but at the ſame time the Hiſtory obſerves, that this was the firſt proſecution ever commenced on ſuch an account; and we find by the oration of the perſon impeached, that Auguſtus did not diſcontinue his eſteem for Livy, nor remove Aſinius Pollio, and Meſſala Corvinus, though they had ſpoken very handſomely of Cæſar's enemies. We find even there, that ſeveral pieces had been ſuffered to go uncenſured, tho' highly injurious to that Emperor, or to Auguſtus. Whence it may eaſily be inferred, that in caſe the Books of Labienus were condemned to the flames, it was becauſe they were filled with invectives againſt a numberleſs multitude of perſons. It is indiſputably manifeſt from Seneca, that they were of this caſt, he ſpeaking of them as follows: *Libertas tanta ut libertatis nomen excederet, ut quia paſſim ordines hominesque laniabat Rabienus vocaretur. Animus per vitia ingens, & ad ſimilitudinem ingenii ſui violentus, & qui Pompeianos ſpiritus nondum in tanta pace poſſuiſſet. . . . Memini aliquando cum recitaret hiſtoriam, magnam partem convolviſſe & dixiſſe*, Hæc quæ tranſeo poſt mortem meam legentur. *Quanta in illis libertas fuit, quam etiam Labienus extimuit* (38). i. e. "The liberty he "aſſumed was ſo great, that it exceeded the name "of liberty; ſo that by tearing to pieces whole orders "of men, and all without diſtinction, he was called "* *Rabienus*. He was a very wicked man and ſavage, "as he muſt naturally be; and ſtill preſerv'd the ſpirit of "the Pompeian party, even in ſo profound a peace. . I "remember once, when he was reciting his Hiſtory, "and had read a great part of it, he ſaid; *the inci-* "*dents which I paſs over will be read after my death.* "What a prodigious liberty was taken in them, a li- "berty which Labienus himſelf dreaded?" Had he writ in as general terms as Livy, he would have met with the ſame indulgence; and not have found in Caſſius Severus an intimate friend, and a great admirer of his works. Farther, Seneca declares, that till Labienus's books were condemned to the flames, no ſuch proſecutions had been ever heard of; and he congratulates the public, that this kind of puniſhment was not thought of, when Cicero was put to death; but at a time when there were no writers of genius: *Res nova & inſueta ſupplicia de ſtudiis ſumi: bono hercle publico iſta in pœnas ingenioſa crudelitas poſt Ciceronem inventa eſt. Quid enim futurum fuit ſi Triumviris ingenium libuiſſet Ciceronis proſcribere? Dii melius quod eo ſeculo iſta ingeniorum ſupplicia cœperunt quo & deſierunt* (39).

(37) Cremutius Cordus. *See* Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. 4. cap. 34.

(38) Seneca, *Præf.* lib. 5. *Controverſiarum.*

* As tho' we ſhould ſay, *a mad, outragious creature.* Addit. by the Tranſlator.

(39) Idem, ibid. DISAGREEMENT between Tacitus and Dion.

The reſult of theſe authorities is, I, that the works of Labienus were not committed to the flames, on account of the partiality which appeared in general, in them, with regard to Pompey's friends; and of this Cremutius Cordus's ſpeech is a proof. II, That theſe writings were very ſatyrical, Seneca plainly hints. III, That theſe were the firſt works of this kind that were ever burnt. IV, That this was done, either before Caſſius Severus was proſecuted either in his perſon or his writings. But this will never be reconciled either with Dion or with Tacitus: the latter ſays, that Caſſius's libels occaſioned Auguſtus to enact the law *de Majeſtate* againſt ſatyrs; whilſt the other affirms, that the decree which ordained that informations ſhould be taken out againſt libels, and burnt, and the puniſhing of ſome ſatyrical Authors, preceded the death of Auguſtus but two years. As St. Jerom computes Caſſius Severus to have been twenty five years in baniſhment, which Caſſius died the 19th year of Tiberius; he therefore would not be very well qualified to reconcile this matter. Some of theſe writers muſt neceſſarily have been very inaccurate. Now could this be Seneca; and is it poſſible for us to ſuppoſe that he had confounded the periods? The words which Caſſius ſays only in his baniſhment, could Seneca have aſcribed to him, as a ſmart ſaying ſpoke in Rome before his exile? But if Seneca miſtook in a circumſtance that happened in his time, and which related to two Orators of his acquaintance; how can we depend on any thing he affirms? But in caſe he has told us the truth, we have there a convincing proof, of a circumſtance which Voſſius conſiders as doubtful, or at moſt but as likely, viz, that Labienus died under Auguſtus (40).

(40) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 117.

[*I*] *Plutarch was far from being exact in Chronology, when he ſpeaks of our Caſſius.*] He affirms that Tiberius being one day in the Senate, a Senator repreſented to the Aſſembly, that it would be proper for every perſon to deliver his ſentiments with freedom; and declare, without the leaſt diſguiſe, whatever concerned the public welfare. This preamble having raiſed the attention of the whole aſſembly, the Senator directed himſelf to Tiberius; to inform him, that great complaints were made concerning him; and at the ſame time that no perſon dared to diſcover his uneaſineſs to him, viz. of his undergoing too much toil for the ſake of the Commonwealth; he ſacrificing his diverſions and health to its welfare. As he was going on with great volubility in the ſame ſtrain, we are told, adds Plutarch, that Caſſius Severus the Orator ſaid, *the liberty this man takes, will occaſion his death* (41). It is impoſſible, that Caſſius would have ſaid this, the very day that the Senator threw out theſe flattering expreſſions; ſince Caſſius, who was ſent into exile before the death of Auguſtus, was never recalled from it. I am ſurprized that as Theophilus Raynaud had ſo prodigious a memory, he did not call to mind this inſtance of the puniſhment of defamatory libels, where he ſpeaks of what was done by the Romans on thoſe occaſions (42).

(41) Plutarch, in his method how to diſtinguiſh the flatterer from the friend.

(42) Theoph. Rayn. Erotemat. *de malis ac bonis Libris*, pag. 72. BAD character of this Caſſius. He took a pleaſure in informing againſt others.

[*K*] *The ſatyrical diſpoſition of Caſſius prompted him to ſet himſelf up as an accuſer; and tho' he was very unſucceſsful in his proſecutions, he yet would never leave off that infamous practice* (43).] If ever man did not deſerve to be pitied for the calamities he ſuffered in his baniſhment, it was certainly Caſſius Severus; for, beſides the character or caſt of his ſlander, which was an immoderate and incorrigible ill nature; he took ſuch pleaſure in impeaching perſons, that one would have thought, he had ſet up for a common accuſer. This black diſpoſition engaged him to undertake the defence of the moſt groundleſs cauſes; and not to be diſheartened at the ill ſucceſs of his proſecutions. It was ſo uſual to ſee people acquitted in thoſe proſecutions, that this wiſh has been ranked among the ſmart ſayings of Auguſtus, viz. that the Architect of the Forum he was building, and which was carried on too ſlowly, might be accuſed by Caſſius (44). Auguſtus's thought is founded only on the ambiguous ſignification of the word *abſolvere*; it ſignifying, both to *finiſh* and *acquit*.

(43) This gave riſe to the following banter of Auguſtus; *Cum multi Severo Caſſio accuſante abſolverentur, & Architectus Fori Auguſti exſpectationem operis diu traheret, ita jocatus eſt*, Vellem Caſſius & meum Forum accuſet. Macrob. *Saturn.* lib. 2. cap. 4.

(44) See the preceding citation.

is ſufficient to ſhew, that no man in the world ever carried chicane and wrangling to a more extravagant height: and it is a very odd circumſtance, that Caſſius never undertook the defence of perſons impeached or accuſed (*c*), except when he was forced to plead his own cauſe, when he himſelf was impeached. Hofman has miſtook in certain things [*L*]. Writers are not agreed with regard to the country of

(*c*) Seneca, *Epiſtom. Diclamat.* lib. 3. pag. 336.

Caſſius

acquit. This ſaying is therefore a mere pun or ſilly banter, according to the taſte of this time; I ſay of this time, becauſe it is not fifty years ſince, that ſuch equivocating expreſſions paſſed for the brighteſt wit (45). Be this as it will, this pun is no leſs a proof of Caſſius's inclination to impeach, than the exclamation he made in opening his plea againſt Aſprenas, whom he accuſed. *By the favour of the Gods, I am ſtill alive; and have wherewithal to make life agreeable, ſince I ſee Aſprenas proſecuted.* Nothing can be more judicious than Quintilian's reflection on this exordium. *Sine dubio in omnibus ſtatim accuſationibus hoc agendum eſt, ne ad eas libenter deſcendiſſe videamur; ideoque mihi illud Caſſii Severi non mediocriter diſplicet*; Dii boni, vivo; & quo me vivere juvet Aſprenatem reum video. *Non enim juſta ex cauſa, vel neceſſaria, videri poteſt poſtulaſſe eum, ſed quadam accuſandi voluptate* (46). i. e. "Doubtleſs in all impeachments this is firſt to be "taken care of, that we do not ſeem to undertake "them with pleaſure; and for this reaſon I am not a "little diſguſted at the following expreſſions of Caſſius "Severus; *Ye Gods! I live; and live with pleaſure, "becauſe I ſee Aſprenas impeached*. For he does not "ſeem to have impeached him for any juſt cauſe, or "out of neceſſity, but merely from a certain delight "he took in impeaching others." This Caſſius was certainly a moſt deteſtable villain; and thoſe who reſemble him, in every age, deſerve to die as miſerably as he did; and to have the following words ſpoke of him, according to Amyot's tranſlation

(45) As is manifeſt from the verſes above of St. Amant, in the article BAUTRU (WILLIAM), citation (1).

(46) Quintil. *Inſtit. Orator.* lib. 11. cap. 1.

Que deſormais autant en puiſſe-il prendre
A qui voudra telle choſe entrependre (47).

That is,

"Henceforward, may ſuch fate attend the wretch,
"Who ſhall engage in vile attempts like Theſe.

(47) This is a tranſlation of a verſe from Homer, applied by Scipio Africanus to the death of Tiberius Gracchus. *See* Plutarch, *in Vita Gracchor.* pag. 834.

For, if under the Roman Republic, at which time impeachments were conſidered as a ſtep for young Lawyers of quality to riſe in the world (48), and as a noble career for Orators to improve themſelves in (49), and at the ſame time a terror to wicked men (50); nevertheleſs thoſe who ſet up for accuſers were deſpiſed and hated; what expreſſions are there odious enough to employ under the Chriſtian diſpenſation, and in States which are governed in a different manner from the Commonwealth of antient Rome; what terms, I ſay, can one find to expreſs ſufficiently our indignation, againſt thoſe who ſet up for ſuch? I will again cite Quintilian; who declares, that there is but very little difference between a highwayman and a profeſſed informer. *Accuſatoriam vitam vivere & ad deferendos reos præmio duci proximum latrocinio eſt* (51). Cicero conſiders, as an indelible ſtain on the family *Junia*, its having given birth to an Orator, who exerciſed the horrid profeſſion here ſpoke of. *Iiſdem temporibus M. Brutus, in quo magnum fuit, Brute, dedecus generi veſtro, qui cum tanto nomine eſſet patremque optimum virum habuiſſet & juris peritiſſimum, accuſationem facitaverit, ut Athenis Lycurgus. Is magiſtratus non petivit, ſed fuit accuſator vehemens & moleſtus, ut facile cerneres naturale quoddam ſtirpis bonum degeneraviſſe vitio depravatæ voluntatis* (52). i. e. "At that time lived M. Brutus, "who, O Brutus! was a great diſgrace to your family. "This man, tho' he had acquired ſo exalted a repu"tation, and had ſo excellent a perſon for his father, "and a moſt able Lawyer, he yet made a trade of "impeaching others, as Lycurgus did at Athens. "This Brutus did not aſpire to the moſt exalted em"ployments in the State, but was a furious and vex"atious accuſer; ſo that it was manifeſt that the good "diſpoſition inherent in his family had been corrupt"ed by the depravity of his inclinations." He obſerves in another place, that that perſon muſt have almoſt renounced the name and nature of man, who could make it his conſtant practice to endanger the lives of many; and that whenever ſuch a one profeſſes himſelf an informer, he brands his reputation with the blackeſt infamy. *Duri hominis vel potius vix hominis videtur periculum capitis inferre multis; id cum periculoſum ipſi eſt, tum etiam ſordidum ad famam committere, ut accuſator nominetur, quod contigit M. Bruto ſummo genere nato, illius filio, qui juris civilis in primis peritus fuit* (53). What would he ſay in this age were he a Chriſtian, and ſaw perſons whoſe character in life required a quite different behaviour, ſet up for Knights of the Poſt, and perpetual Informers; one while by printed Libels, at other times by anonymous letters, include affairs of all kinds in their informations; as high-treaſon and hereſy; to ſet themſelves at the head of all Spies and News Mongers; and be no more diſheartened than Caſſius Severus was, to ſee thoſe they impeach for ever cleared &c. what would he ſay? This we may eaſily gueſs. We meet in Balzac's converſations, with a very beautiful chapter (54). Here follows the latter part of of it. "There is ſtill extant a "fragment of the plea of Calvus the Orator, againſt "that man ſo univerſally deteſted, I mean the infa"mous Vatinius; and this fragment is inſerted in the "collection of antient Orators, in the following words, "if my memory does not fail me. *Hominem noſtræ "civitatis audaciſſimum, factioſum, ſordidum, accuſa"torem*; i. e. "a man of our city, very bold, fac"tious, ſordid, and an accuſer:" wherein I find he does not omit, among Vatinius's other ill qualities, that of his being an accuſer or informer. Once again, it was infinitely more excuſable in that age, to ſet up for an informer, than at this time; for what arts are not employed in a Commonwealth, to win the favour of the people? Now thoſe of Rome were greatly pleaſed, to ſee informations brought againſt ſuch as had exerciſed any employment in the State; they conſidered informers as ſo many maſtiffs who ruſhed upon wolves. Ἐδόκει δ' ἡ ἄλλως αὐτοῖς (Ῥωμαίοις) ἀνὴρ προφάσεως οὐκ ἀγαπὴς εἶναι, τὸ τῆς κατηγορίας ἔργον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάνυ τοὺς νέους ἐσπουδάζετο ποιεῖν ἀδίκων ἐπιφυομένους ἐρᾶν, ὥσπερ θηρίους εὐγενεῖς σκύλακας. *Et quidem videbatur alioqui vel non ſuppetente cauſa res non pudenda accuſatio, ſe delectabantur juvenibus improbos ut generoſis canibus feras conſectantibus* (55). Thus in Republicks, there is no ſurer way of gaining the applauſe of the common people, than by railing heartily from the pulpit againſt the Magiſtrates.

(48) Quintil. lib. 12. cap. 7. Apuleius *in Apologia*. See his words above, in citation (11) of the article ALLUTIUS (TITUS).

(49) Cicero, *de Officiis*, lib. 2. cap. 14.

(50) Quintil. lib. 12. cap. 7.

(51) Idem, ibid.

(52) Cicero, *in Bruto*, cap. 34.

(53) Idem, *de Officiis*, lib. 2. cap. 14.

(54) It is the 5th of the *Entret.* 34. pag. m. 329.

(55) Plutarch. *in Lucullo, init.* See above the note [*D*] of the article S. BERNARD, at the break.

[*L*] *Hofman has miſtook in certain things.*] He is a little more accurate on this occaſion than Moreri, and yet he is not ſo exact as he might have been; *quiſque ſuos patitur manes.*

I. In the firſt place, Hofman gives a ſeparate article of Caſſius Severus the Orator, with the judgment which Quintilian forms of him; to which Hofman adds, that Caſſius's Writings were ſuppreſſed by a decree of the Senate; he cites Suetonius for this purpoſe, and at laſt refers us to Voſſius. This Article is inſerted at full length in the Dictionary of Lloyd, who tranſcribed it without the leaſt amendments from Charles Stephens, excepting that he refers to Voſſius, which he added to it. We may cenſure all three, with regard to the quotation from Suetonius (56); for as he only mentions the ſuppreſſing of Caſſius's Writings, merely to inform us, that they were again ſuffered to be publiſhed by Caligula, with thoſe of Cremutius Cordus and of Labienus; they ſhould not have taken notice of the decree which prohibited the peruſal of them, or elſe they ſhould have told us, that this prohibition was taken off ſome time after. Ildly, After this Article, Hofman gives us another, viz. that of Caſſius Severus Parmenſis the Orator, of whom he relates ſeveral particulars which relate only to the Caſſius Severus of the preceding Article. He cites ſeveral Authors, as Horace in Satyr 19 (57), of the firſt Books, Velleius Paterculus, Appian, Oroſius, all who make not the leaſt mention of this Caſſius. So that, not ſatisfied with having drawn up two Articles for one and the ſame perſon; he falſly gives the ſurname *Parmenſis*, to Caſſius Severus the Orator; and aſcribes to him what was ſaid of another Caſſius. The worſt

(56) One of them at leaſt ſhould have given it us in a more preciſe manner, by citing the 16th chapter of Caligula's *Life*.

(57) It ſhould be 10 and not 19; the 1ſt book of Horace's Satyrs containing but 10, and the 2d only 8.

Caſſius Severus [*M*]. We ſhall give in the remarks the miſtakes of Petrus Crinitus [*N*].

I am obliged in juſtice to Caſſius, to conſider him alſo on his favourable ſide. So great was his eloquence, that it made him triumph over his Auditors, he moulding their paſſions, and diſpoſing of their anger as he pleaſed. They were ſo delighted with hearing him, that they were always vexed at his leaving off. He had two perfections in his voice which are ſeldom found together; I mean that it was ſtrong and very ſweet at the ſame time; and being of a majeſtic ſtature, it might be affirmed, that his body correſponded very well with his mind. The gravity which he did not aſſume in his ordinary behaviour, diſplayed itſelf with the utmoſt ſtrength and beauty in his words; for when he waved his raillery, his expreſſions had all the dignity of a Cenſor's harangue (*d*). His preſence of mind was ſo great, that he ſucceeded much better in ſuch things as he ſpoke unprepared, than in thoſe he got by heart. His *extempore* ſpeeches at the bar charmed much more than thoſe he had meditated upon. They who pleaded againſt Caſſius, never interrupted him; knowing, that to provoke him, was adding freſh ſtrength to his eloquence, and that it was of advantage to Caſſius to have the thread of his diſcourſe broken. He ſucceeded better in unexpected caſes, than in thoſe he had meditated upon in his ſtudy (*e*). Nevertheleſs, no man ever took more pains in preparing himſelf. His ſpeeches were prodigiouſly laboured; he did not ſuffer any thing to ſlip him that had the air of negligence; they were filled with noble thoughts; every expreſſion was of ſome import; and when an Auditor happened to be ever ſo little abſent in mind, he certainly loſt ſome valuable particular (*f*). Though Caſſius was always ſo ſucceſsful in his extempore ſpeeches, this did not make him leſs careful of preparing himſelf; for he was not ſatisfied with meditating ſtrongly on

(*d*) *Quamdiu citra joces ſe continebat, cenſoria oratio erat.* Seneca, *Præf.* lib. *Declamat.* pag. 336.

(*e*) *Melius ſemper fortuna quam cura de illo merebat.* Idem, ibid.

(*f*) *Nulla pars erat quæ non ſua virtute ſtaret: nihil in quo auditor ſine damno aliud ageret: omnia intenta aliquò petentia.* Idem, ibid.

circumſtance is, that he finiſhes his Article with the doubtful interrogation following, with regard to a particular which does not admit the leaſt difficulty, *an idem cum Caſſio Poëta?* whether he be the ſame with Caſſius the Poet? Caſſius the Orator, baniſhed by Auguſtus into the iſland of Crete and by Tiberius into that of Seriphus, where he died in the 25th year of his exile, is he the ſame perſon with Caſſius Parmenſis the Poet, whom Auguſtus cauſed to be put to death at Athens a little after the battle of Actium; upwards of forty years before Tiberius's acceſſion to the Imperial Throne? IIIdly, Hofman is condemned by his own words; for he had given us, in the preceding page, the Article of Caſſius Parmenſis the Poet; wherein he had ſaid, that after the defeat of Brutus and Caſſius, this Poet retired to Athens; and that Varus, whom Auguſtus ſent to kill him, found him ſtudying; and having killed him, carried off all his books and his ſtrong box. This Article has been copied *verbatim* by Lloyd, who had tranſcribed it in like manner from Charles Stephens, whom he ſhould rather have corrected, in as much as he has ſuppreſſed all the actions of that Caſſius, from the time of the battle of Philippi to that of Actium; for it is not true, as all three aſſert, that after the defeat of Brutus and Caſſius, he retired to Athens: for he joined with Pompey's ſon, and afterwards with Mark Anthony; and had employments under both; and did not retire to Athens till after the battle of Actium, in the year of Rome 722. He was the only one who ſurvived of all Cæſar's aſſaſſins (58): but he did not live long after his retreat (59); and it is not thought, that he lived quite fourteen years after Cæſar's murther (60). Be this as it will, Hofman who fixes his death ſooner than it ſhould be, by making him retire to Athens ſoon after the battle of Philippi, the year of Rome 712, makes him the more improper to be confounded with Caſſius Severus, confined in the iſland of Seriphus, under the reign of Tiberius.

(58) Vell. Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 87.
(59) Valerius Maximus, lib. 1. cap. 7. num. 7.
(60) *See* Caſaubon. *ad Suet. in Jul. cap. ult.*
(61) Sueton. ibid.
(62) Petav. *Rationar. Temp.* Part 1. lib. 4. cap. 20.
(63) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 110.
(64) Lib. 4. Epiſt. 28.
(65) Catanæus calls this Severus by the name of *Julius*, without giving any reaſon for it; and conſequently makes him different from the other to whom the 6th Epiſtle of the 3d book is written, whom he declares to be of the ſame country with Pliny.

Obſerve by the way, that according to Suetonius, hardly any one of Cæſar's murtherers ſurvived him above three years (61). It is nevertheleſs certain, that a conſiderable number of them out-lived that term. Petavius has made Suetonius ſpeak without exception: *nullus triennio amplius ſuperſtes fuit .... ut ait Suetonius* (62). Chevreau, in the IVth Chapter of the IIId Book of his Hiſtory of the world ſays, that none of them could have ſurvived Cæſar above three years.

[*M*] *Writers are not agreed, with regard to the Country of Caſſius Severus.*] Father Hardouin's opinion, on the Country of this Caſſius, is very different from that of Voſſius. For the latter (63) aſſerts, that when the younger Pliny (64) deſires for Herennius Severus the pictures of Cornelius Nepos and of Titus Caſſius, countrymen of the Severus (65) to whom he writes, he hints at our Caſſius Severus. If this be true, the latter was not a native of Longula, as Father Hardouin pretends (66), ſince Cornelius Nepos was born in the neighbourhood of the Po (67); which circumſtance the inhabitants of Verona interpret to their advantage (68), in order that their City may have the honour of having given birth to Cornelius Nepos. But Catanæus diſputes this honour with them very warmly; and affirms that Parma is nearer the Po than Verona; and that ſince Titus Caſſius was a native of Parma, Cornelius Nepos muſt have been ſo too (69). Let them take the diſpute to themſelves. It is certain, that Catanæus ſeems not to be acquainted with the difference which is between Caſſius Parmenſis the Poet, and Caſſius Severus the Orator. Perhaps Voſſius miſtook after Glandorp (70), by taking the Titus Caſſius of the younger Pliny, for Caſſius Severus the Orator; for one would imagine, that had Pliny aſked for the picture of Caſſius Severus, from a perſon named Severus, and for another who alſo was called by that name, he would have taken ſome notice of this conformity of names. But I own, that this is not a convincing proof. Be this as it will, Pliny ſays nothing that denotes, whether he ſpeaks of a learned man ſurnamed Severus, or that the perſon he mentions is rather Caſſius the Orator, than Caſſius the Poet: they both might have had Titus for their prænomen. Beſides, the *Readings* of old Manuſcripts are extremely various (71); ſome have it *Titi Catii*, others *Titi Atii*, and in the margin *Attici* or *Catili*.

(66) In *Indice Autorum Plinii.* I am of opinion that he founds his opinion on the Catalogue of Authors, of the 35th book of Pliny.
(67) *Padi accola.* Plin. lib. 3. cap. 18.
(68) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 69.
(69) Catan. *Comment. in Plinii Epiſtolam* 28. lib. 4.
(70) *Onomaſtic. Roman.* pag. 209.
(71) *See* Gruteri *Notas in Plin. Variorum*, edit. Lugd. Bat. 1669.

[*N*] *We ſhall give in the remarks, the miſtakes of Peter Crinitus.*] He ſays (72), in the firſt place, that Caſſius Severus, a native of Parma as Authors relate, was rank'd by Ovid among the Poets his cotemporaries, ſuch as Sabinus, Montanus, Meliſſus, Propertius. II, That it was he who after having ſignalized himſelf in the war of Brutus and Caſſius, retired to Athens, and there was put to death by Auguſtus's command. III. That Horace owed him a ſtrong grudge, as appears from ſeveral paſſages in his works, and eſpecially from ſome iambicks imitated from Archilochus. IV. That he muſt not be confounded either with Cornelius Severus, nor with Caſſius Severus the Orator. 'Tis evident that he commits the ſame error for which he cenſures others, I mean, that he confounds Caſſius Parmenſis with Cornelius Severus, and with Caſſius Severus; for ſince he owns, that the firſt was put to death in his retirement at Athens; he ſhould have conſider'd him as dead, ever ſince about the year of Rome 723. Now, as Ovid was at that time but twelve or thirteen years of age, we muſt not imagine, that he rank'd him in the Catalogue of the Poets his cotemporaries; that Catalogue I mean which he gave in his old age. This does not admit of any difficulty, when we examine the Catalogue in queſtion (73), where Ovid oppoſes to the cenſures of a Critick, the reputation he enjoyed in Rome, at a time when he lived there with ſuch and ſuch perſons; thoſe whom Crinitus mentions, viz. one Severus and ſome others. Let the reader judge, whether this Severus is not Cornelius Severus, whom Crinitus

(72) *De Poet. Lat.* cap. 47.
(73) It is in the 16th Letter of the 4th book *de Ponto*.

on ſubjects, but wrote down the greateſt part of what he was to ſpeak. This is the ſubſtance of Seneca's judgment on this Orator (*g*); and which he has introduced by way of preface, to a curious narrative [*O*]. Quintilian's judgment does not agree in all reſpects with that of Seneca. I am to obſerve, that our Caſſius reſembled ſo exactly one of the ſword-players who uſed to divert the Roman people, that it was very difficult to diſtinguiſh them [*P*].

(*g*) Idem, ibid.

nitus is diſpleaſed to ſee confounded with Caſſius Parmenſis. Beſides, it is certain, that the verſes imitated from Archilochus, are only the ſixth Ode of the fifth Book of Horace (74), which is levelled only at Caſſius Severus the Orator. The reader will obſerve, without my telling him, that Crinitus falls into the errors above hinted at, concerning the ſuppreſſion of Caſſius Parmenſis's warlike exploits, between the battles of Philippi and Actium.

(74) This *Ode* ſhews, that at firſt Caſſius Severus dared to exerciſe his Satyr on ſuch ſubjects only as were ſafe; but that he grew bolder afterwards. *See* Tacitus, *Ann.* lib. 1. cap. 72.

[*O*] *Seneca gives a judgment of this Orator which he has made as a Preface to a pretty curious narrative.*] This Relation contains the anſwer which Caſſius made, when he was aſked, why he ſucceeded infinitely better in ſuch cauſes as he really pleaded, than in thoſe harangues which he ſpoke on imaginary ſubjects, which was very much the cuſtom at that time. Seneca, who had put this queſtion to Caſſius, relates the anſwer which was made him. Caſſius made excellent Obſervations on this ſubject, which I would adviſe my readers to peruſe in the original. I have only copied ſome part of Seneca's preamble. We find therein, that many Orators who were admired at the Bar, would often miſcarry in their imaginary ſpeeches; and that no one was more remarkable for this than Caſſius Severus. *In nullo hoc fiebat notabilius* (75). On the preſent occaſion Seneca makes an Elogium on this Orator's Eloquence, and gives the characteriſticks of it. He poſſeſſed all the qualities, adds Seneca, requiſite to declamation. His expreſſions were well choſen, his ſtyle was full and nervous, and contained more ſentiments than words; and yet Caſſius, in his Declamations, uſed to fall ſhort of himſelf, and of many others: ſo that he never would declaim unleſs deſired by his friends. *Omnia habebat, quæ illum ut bene declamaret, inſtruerent: phraſim nec vulgarem, nec ſordidum, ſed lectum: genus dicendi non remiſſum aut languidum, ſed ardens & cogitatum: nec lentas, nec vacuas explicationes, ſed plus ſenſus quam verborum habentes: diligentiam, maximum etiam mediocris ingenii ſubſidium, tamen non tantum infra ſe cum declamaret, ſed etiam infra multos erat. Itaque raro declamabat, & non niſi ab amicis coactus* (76). I am to obſerve, that his eloquence was more beautiful to hear than to read; the pieces he publiſhed, did not anſwer to the fame he had acquired: there generally was a greater diſproportion between them, than is commonly found between an harangue when ſpoke, and the fame when printed. *Non eſt quod illum ex his quæ edidit æſtimetis. Sunt quidem & hæc quibuſdam grata. Verum eloquentia ejus longe major erat quam lectio. Non hoc ea portione illi accidit qua omnibus fere, quibus majori commendationi eſt audiri quàm legi, ſed in illo longe majus diſcrimen eſt* (77).

(75) Seneca *in Præf.* lib. 3. *Epitomes Declamat.* pag. m. 335.

(76) Idem, ibid. pag. 336.

(77) Idem, ibid.

[*P*] *Our Caſſius reſembled another man ſo exactly, .. that it was very difficult to diſtinguiſh them.*] Pliny and Solinus take notice of this particular. *Caſſio celebri Oratori Armentarii Mirmilloni* (78) *objecta ſimilitudo eſt* (79). *Armentarius Mirmillo & Caſſius Severus Orator ità ſe mutuò reddiderunt, ut ſi quando pariter viderentur dignoſci non poſſent, niſi diſcrepantiam habitus indicaret* (80). i. e. "It was objected to the famous Orator Caſſius, that he reſembled Armentarius the Gladiator. Armentarius the Gladiator, and Caſſius Severus the Orator were ſo very like, that when ſeen together, they could not be diſtinguiſhed except there was ſome difference in their dreſs." I am ſurprized, that Solinus did not expatiate on the circumſtance which Pliny had hinted at, viz. that this reſemblance was objected to Caſſius. Had he commented this, he perhaps would have informed us, that the wags uſed to ſay, the reſemblance of theſe two men was owing perhaps to ſome private gallantries. How do we know, whether it was not ſaid, that they were alike in temper and diſpoſition; and that the one was as much a Gladiator at the Bar, as the other in the Amphitheatre?

(78) Father Hardouin pretends that *Armentarius* ſignifies in this place a Shepherd, and that *Mirmillo* is here a proper name, Salmaſius *in Solin.* pag. 30. is of a quite different opinion.

(79) Plin. lib. 7. cap. 12.

(80) Solin, cap. 1. pag. m. 8.

CASSIUS (CHÆREA) the ringleader of the Conſpirators who murthered Caligula, was Captain of the Guards [*A*]. He had been Captain in the Legions which mutinied in Germany, a little before the death of Auguſtus (*a*). He cut himſelf a way with his ſword through ſuch ſoldiers as abuſed the Captains. He was a brave, worthy man (*b*); and it was with reluctance he executed the ſevere command of Caligula. The compaſſion he had for the oppreſſed people, made him levy, with leſs diſpatch than the Emperor required, the monies ariſing from the taxes and tributes (*c*); he was at the head of this commiſſion. Caligula looked upon the humanity he exerciſed on this occaſion, as a mark of cowardice, and thereupon this cruel tyrant inſulted and reproached very outragiouſly this Captain of his Guards. In giving out the *Word* to him, he ever made uſe of ſuch a ſatyrical term as was expreſſive of indolence and effeminacy [*B*]; which was ſure to ſet the officers and ſoldiers a laughing, to whom Caſſius was obliged to give out the word (*d*). Exaſperated to find himſelf made the Emperor's laughing-ſtock, and the ſport of the regiment

(*a*) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 1. cap. 32.

(*b*) *Tum adoleſcens & animi ferox inter obſtantes & armatos ferro viam patefecit.* Idem, ibid. Ἄλλως τε γὰρ ἐρχαιότροπός τις ἀνὴρ ὁ Χαιρέας ἦν. Dio, lib. 59. pag. m. 762.

(*c*) Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. 29. cap. 1.

(*d*) Idem, ibid.

[*A*] *He was Captain of the Guards.*] Seneca calls him General *Tribunus Militum* (1), but Suetonius is more accurate: *Primas ſibi partes*, ſays he (2), *Caſſius Chærea Tribunus cohortis prætoriæ depopoſcit.* The learned Mr. Bentley, pag. 81 of his Notes on the Chronicle of Malala, calls our Caſſius a Tribune of the People. This is a ſlight error, which is far from any way reflecting on the aſtoniſhing erudition of this Author.

(1) Seneca, *de Conſtantia Sapientis*, cap. 18.

(2) Suet. *in Calig.* cap. 56.

[*B*] *Caligula .. in giving out the word to him, ever made uſe of ſuch a ſatyrical term, as was expreſſive of indolence and effeminacy.*] See Joſephus, who expatiates very largely on this ſubject (3). Suetonius expreſſes himſelf as follows: *Quem* (Caſſium Chæream) *Caius ſeniorem jam ut mollem & effeminatum denotare omni probro conſuerat, & modo ſignum petenti Priapum aut Venerem dare, modo ex aliqua cauſſa agenti gratias oſculandam manum offerre formatam commotamque in obſcænum modum* (4). i. e. "Whom (*Caſſius Chærea*) now advanced in years, he uſed to treat very ſhamefully, as tho' he were a ſoft effeminate man; and ſometimes, when he aſked for the word, he would anſwer *Priapus* or *Venus*; ſometimes when he thank'd the Emperor for ſome favour, he would give him his hand to kiſs, moving it about obſcenely." Seneca ſpeaks to pretty near the ſame purpoſe; but adds, that Chærea's ſhrill and effeminate voice, gave ſome occaſion to theſe railleries; and that he did not ſeem to be the man he ſhewed himſelf afterwards, in ſtriking Caligula with ſo much vigour. *Chæreæ tribuno militum ſermo non pro manu erat, languidior ſono & infracta voce ſuſpectior. Huic Caius ſignum petenti modo* Veneris, *modo* Priapi *dabat, aliter atque aliter exprobans armato mollitiam. Hæc ipſe perlucidus, crepidatus, armillatus. Coegit itaque illum uti ferro, ne ſæpius ſignum peteret. Ille primus inter conjuratos ſuſtulit: ille cervicem mediam uno ictu decidit, plurimum deinde undique publicas ac privatas injurias ulciſcentium gladiorum ingeſtum eſt; ſed primus vir fuit qui minimè viſus eſt* (5). i. e. "Chærea, the military Tribune, had a ſhrill, effeminate

(3) Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. 19. cap. 1.

(4) Sueton. in *Calig.* cap. 56.

(5) Seneca, *de Conſtantia Sapientis*, cap. 18.

regiment he commanded, he formed a conſpiracy. He made choice of accomplices, and animated them whenever it was neceſſary; in a word, he conducted his plot with ſo much art, that Caligula was murthered (*e*). However, he reſerved to himſelf the advantage of ſtriking the firſt blow [*C*]. Some Authors ſay, that he gave him a deep wound in the nape of the neck; and others, that after ſtaring him in the face, he beat out his jaw-bone (*f*). Caligula being killed (*g*), Caſſius fled to the houſe of Germanicus (*h*), and hearing that the Senate were pleaſed with what he had done, he ſhewed himſelf to the people. One of the Conſuls made a long Oration in praiſe of Liberty; and concluded with declaring, that all the conſpirators, eſpecially Chærea, ought to be raiſed to the greateſt honours. Chærea went to the Conſul's to know the *Word*, who gave him the word *Liberty*. This he gave out to the Cohorts, who obeyed the Senate; and as he was the ſoul of this party, he ſent one Lupus a Tribune to kill Ceſonia, wife of Caligula, with their daughter (*i*). Nevertheleſs Claudius was ſaluted Emperor in the Prætorian Cohorts; and the Senate was forced to approve of this election. The new Empetor did not fail to puniſh Chærea [*D*], who ſuffered death with great reſolution (*k*).

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

(*f*) Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 58.

(*g*) It was in the year of our Lord 41, the 24th of January.

(*h*) Joſeph. *Antiquit.* lib. 19. cap. 1.

(*i*) Ibid. cap. 2.

(*k*) Ibid. cap. 3.

" minate voice which no ways anſwered his bravery. " Whenever he aſked the word, Caligula would anſwer " either *Venus* or *Priapus*; reproaching him a variety " of ways, as a ſoldier, with effeminacy, tho' no one " could be more luxurious and effeminate than the " Emperor himſelf. He therefore forc'd Chærea to " employ the ſword, in order that he might not be " often forced to aſk the word. He was the princi- " pal conſpirator. It was he who ſtruck off the Em- " peror's head at one blow: a multitude of ſwords " ruſhed in upon him, to revenge public and private " injuries; but Chærea was the firſt who ſhewed him- " ſelf a man; he who had been thought the leaſt ſo."

[*C*] *He reſerved to himſelf the advantage of ſtriking the firſt blow.*] See Suetonius in the remark [*A*]. Tillemont (6) did not ſufficiently weigh the expreſſions of Seneca. According to him, Seneca tells us, that Chærea cleaved Caligula's head in two with one blow. But this is not the ſenſe of the following words, *cervicem mediam uno ictu decidit*; or, as ſome read, *diſcidit*. Tillemont is miſtaken in another thing (7): He ſays that Cornelius Sabinus, *according to ſome Authors, forced away Caligula's jaw-bone, by a cut with his ſword:* Suetonius, whom he cites, aſcribes this blow to Chærea, according to ſome people.

(6) *Hiſt. des Empereurs*, tom. 1. pag. m. 302.

(7) Idem, ibid.

[*D*] *Claudius . . . the new Emperor, did not fail to puniſh Chærea.*] 'Twas confeſſed that Chærea had ſhewn great bravery; but that 'twas at the ſame time a treacherous action, and ought to be puniſh'd, as a terror to thoſe who ſhould afterwards attempt to murther an Emperor (8). According to Suetonius, the conſpirators who were put to death were puniſhed, partly to ſerve as an example; and partly becauſe they had intended alſo to kill Claudius, Caligula's ſucceſſor. *Exempli ſimul cauſſa, & quod ſuam quoque cædem depoſciſſe cognoverat* (9). Dion deſerves to be heard. *Claudius*, ſays he (10), *was overjoyed at Caligula's murther, and yet he put to death Chærea. He did not think himſelf under any obligations to thoſe perſons whoſe conſpiracy had paved his way to Empire; but was exaſperated againſt the man, who had dared to kill an Emperor; and he provided, at a diſtance, for his own ſafety.* There is ſomething unaccountable in the Politicks of Princes. They do all that lies in their power to ſeduce and corrupt the ſubjects of each other. They give an aſylum to conſpirators, they protect rebels; and at the ſame time they don't conſider, that this is ſetting an example to their own ſubjects for them to rebel; and to hope for aſſiſtance in their rebellion. This extravagant conduct is owing to their thinking only on the time preſent: for did Princes conſider the ill conſequences which would flow from it, not one of them would contribute either money or exhortations in favour of inſurrections.

(8) Joſeph. lib. 19. cap. 3.

(9) Sueton. *in Claud.* cap. 11.

(10) Dio, lib. 60. pag. 765.

CASTALIO (SEBASTIAN) born in the country of the Allobroges [*A*], in the year 1515, deſerves an honourable place among Authors [*B*]. His principal Work is a Latin

[*A*] *He was born in the country of the Allobroges.*] I have been forced to make uſe of this general expreſſion, becauſe I have not been able to diſcover any thing more particular. In his Epitaph they have given him the epithet of *Allobrox*. This may equally ſignify, either that he was of Dauphiné, or that he was of Savoy. Mr. Allard has preferred the former ſignification (1): but he grounds his opinion on an Author who has not ſaid what he makes him ſay; for theſe words of Sammarthanus, *Ex aſperis & ſalebroſis Allobrogum montibus humili ortus fortuna* (2), do not ſignify that a man was born *in the mountains of Dauphiné*. La Croix du Maine makes Caſtalio *a native of the country of Savoy* (3). Dr. Spon (4), and Signor Leti (5), make him a native *of Chatillon en Breſſe*.

(1) Allard, *Biblioth. de Dauphiné*, pag. 68.

(2) Sammarthanus, *Elog.* lib. 2. pag. m. 126.

(3) La Croix du Maine, *Biblioth. Franc.* pag. 453.

(4) Spon, *Hiſtoire de Geneve*, liv. 3. pag. m. 257, at the year 1544.

(5) Leti, *Iſtoria Genevrina*, tom. 3. pag. 79.

[*B*] *He deſerves an honourable place among Authors.*] His works would be very conſiderable on account of their quality and number, even tho' it were not known that he lived but forty eight years. He ſhewed himſelf ſkilful in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. He publiſhed at Baſil, in 1545, four Books of Dialogues which contain the principal Hiſtories of the Bible in elegant Latin, ſo that youth might thereby at the ſame time make a proficiency in piety and in the Latin tongue. They were reprinted in the year 1548, and afterwards with corrections and additions in the year 1551 (6). Theſe three Editions have been followed by ſeveral others (7). He publiſhed in 1546, with notes, the Tranſlation which he had made of the Sibylline Verſes (8) and of the Books of Moſes (9). This was followed in 1547 by his Latin Verſion of the Pſalms of David, and all the other Songs found in Scripture. In 1548 he printed a Greek Poem on the life of John the Baptiſt, and a Latin Poem which is a Paraphraſe of the Prophet Jonas. I ſay nothing of his Tranſlation of ſome paſſages of Homer, and ſome Books of Xenophon and St. Cyril (10); and as to the moſt important of his labours, I ſhall ſpeak of them in the ſubſequent remark. Let us only add here, that he tranſlated into Latin ſeveral Italian Treatiſes of the famous Ochinus, and particularly the XXX Dialogues, ſome of which ſeem to favour Polygamy. Martin Ruarus is in the wrong to find fault with Calovius for having attributed the tranſlation of thoſe Dialogues to Caſtalio. *Scribis Caſtellionem XXX Ochini Dialogos in Latinam linguam tranſtuliſſe. Id ego ut ut mihi dubium, cum nonniſi à Caſtellionis inimicis mera ſuſpicione ductis affirmatum videam, in medio tamen relinquam* (11). i. e. " You " write that Caſtalio turned the XXX Dialogues of " Ochinus into Latin. This, however doubtful it be with " me, ſince I find it affirmed by none but the enemies of " Caſtalio who were led by meer ſuſpicion, I ſhall " not determine." But he is not in the wrong to cenſure him for having ſaid that Lælius Socinus publiſhed it under the name of Felix Turpio. It is certain that this fictitious name appears not in the work, and that the true name of Ochinus is put to it. Let it not be inſiſted that Bullinger has obſerved that Ochinus cauſed it to be printed by a friend of his, an Italian (12); for this Italian is no other than Peter Perna a Printer at Baſil, who ſet his name according to cuſtom at the end of the Book. How could Lælius Socinus, who died in the year 1562, have cauſed a Book to be printed which was not put to the preſs till 1563? Calovius's miſtake was occaſioned by their being certain Dialogues of Caſtalio to which Fauſtus Socinus

(6) *Epitome Bibliothec. Geſneri*, pag. 745.

(7) I make uſe of that of Leyden, 1620, in 8vo.

(8) In Latin Heroic Verſe.

(9) In Latin Proſe.

(10) Extracted from Geſner's *Epitome*, pag. 745.

(11) Mart. Ruarus, *Epiſtolâ* 47, *Centur.* 1. pag. 226, 227.

(12) Bullinger. *in Præf.* Simleri *Libris præfixâ, apud* Ruar. ibid. pag. 227.

Latin and French Verſion of the Scripture. It is ſpoken of in a very different manner; ſome find great fault with it, and others commend it highly [C]. He gained the eſteem and friendſhip of Calvin during the ſtay he made at Straſburgh in 1540, and 1541, and he even lodged ſome days at his houſe (a). It was Calvin who procured him a Schoolmaſter's place in the College of Geneva, or rather earneſtly perſuaded him to accept

(a) See the Remark [G].

cinus, who publiſhed them, prefixed a preface under the name of *Felix Turpio Urbevetanus* (13). Caſtalio is the Author, not the Tranſlator of thoſe Dialogues: they treat *de Prædeſtinatione, de Electione, de libero Arbitrio, de Fide*, i. e. "Of Predeſtination, Election, "Free-will, and Faith," and were printed with ſome other pieces of the ſame Author (14), in the year 1578. Ruarus aſſures us it was at Baſil: if ſo, the title was falſified; for it is *Areſdorffii, per Theophil. Philadelph.*

I ſhall make mention here and there of ſome other Writings of Caſtalio in the Remarks of this Article. I propoſe it as a queſtion to be examined by the curious whether he be not the Author of the Latin Tranſlation of ſome Treatiſes of St. Chryſoſtom and St. Cyril, of which Geſner's Epitome ſpeaks under the word *Johannes Theophilus* (15). It is a fictitious name which our Author gave himſelf in the title of a Tranſlation (16): it is thought that in another work he put on the maſk of *Martinus Bellius*. I have ſpoken of it more than once (17); but without ſaying that he denied before the Miniſters of Baſil, who cited him before them, that he was the Author of that compilation. *Appellatus coram Baſilienſis Eccleſiæ Miniſtris Bellii farraginem . . . . falſo ejuraſti* (18). It is Beza who thus reproaches him with having falſly denied it on oath, and who adds that it was tranſlated into French, and printed in that tongue at Lyons, whither it was carried in manuſcript by Caſtalio's brother. Our Author publiſhed very ſingular opinions in the Work which he intitled *Moſes Latinus* (19), as for inſtance, that the bodies of malefactors ought not to be left on the gibbet, that thieves ought not to be puniſhed with death, and that it would be better to revive the ancient cuſtom of reducing them to ſlavery. His foundation was that the political laws of Moſes are obligatory on all nations (20). His notes on the Epiſtle to the Romans were condemned by the Church of Baſil, becauſe they oppoſed the doctrine of Predeſtination, and of effectual Grace (21). However he got them ſold in the ſame city, after they had been tranſlated into French (22).

[C] *Some find great fault with* his Verſions of the Scripture, *and others commend them highly.*] Thuanus ſays ſeveral perſons judged that Caſtalio put his unclean hands to this work with an inſolent raſhneſs. *Impuras manus multorum judicio ad ſacra tractanda attulit, cum à rebus ad tantum opus neceſſariis homo imparatiſſimus novam Bibliorum interpretationem inſolenti temeritate molitus eſt* (23). The fault which has been the moſt generally condemned in his Latin Tranſlation, is the affectation of making uſe of none but claſſical Latin terms. This is the reaſon why he has ſaid *Genius* inſtead of *Angelus*, *lotio* inſtead of *baptiſmus*, *Reſpublica* inſtead of *Eccleſia*, and *Collegium* inſtead of *Synagoga*. Voſſius (24) and ſeveral other learned men juſtly cenſure him for it. He is accuſed of having run into the other extreme in his French Tranſlation (25), that is, of having made uſe of low and vulgar terms. Here follow the examples which a Jeſuit gives of this, after having criticiſed ſome effeminate expreſſions, and the frequent diminutives in the Latin Tranſlation of the Canticles. "In his French Tranſlation he is "yet more ſhameleſs; for he makes open mockery "of the Holy Spirit in ſix or ſeven places, as when "inſtead of ſaying a Jew, he ſays *un Rongné* *, that "is *Circumciſus:* as when he tranſlates theſe words of "St. James in the IId Chapter, *Superexaltat miſeri-* "*cordia judicium*, that is, ſays this ſcoundrel, *La mi-* "*ſericorde* FAICT LA FIGUE *au jugement* †: as when "he ſpeaks of David in the ‡ LXXVIIth Pſalm, and "tranſlates his own words *De poſt fœtantes accepit* "*eum*, that is, ſays this mere ſwineherd, *Il le tira* "*du cul d'une charrue* ‡. In fine, tranſlating theſe "words of David in the VIIIth Pſalm, *Ex ore in-* "*fantium & lactantium perfeciſti laudem*, he turns "them very badly, tho' a Turner by trade, *Des petits* "MORVEUX *qui ſont à la mammelle* ⁂ (26)." Take notice that in the two laſt examples the Tranſlation is not ſuch as is repreſented (27). Henry Stephens has exclaimed no leſs than the Jeſuit againſt Sebaſtian Caſtalio, who *has ſtudied*, ſays he (28), *to find out beggarly words, or ſuch at leaſt as ſhould make the readers laugh, rather than engage them to conſider the ſenſe of the paſſage.* He quotes *for example* miſéricorde fait la figue au jugement. This manner of tranſlating appears to him the ſtrangeſt kind of blaſphemy ſpoken of by him in that Chapter. and he adds: *He has not only taken a pleaſure in the cant words of beggars, and their ways of ſpeaking, but has taken liberties of all ſorts; calling her whom a huſband entertains beſides his wife, and whom the Latins called* Pellex, *(by a word borrowed from the Greeks, who had likewiſe borrowed it from the Hebrews,)* arriere femme, *i. e.* a backwife, *(as we ſay* arriere boutique *i. e.* a back-ſhop,*) and making uſe of the word* Avantpeau *inſtead of* Prepuce, *i. e.* foreſkin; *ſaying* Rongné *inſtead of* Circoncis, *i. e.* circumciſed, *aud* Empellé *inſtead of* Incirconcis, *i. e.* Uncircumciſed. *He alſo transforms God into a* Monſieur de Rochefort. *In a word, even the expreſſion* faire carous, *i. e.* to carouſe, *has found a place in this Tranſlation. Behold the new invention which the Devil has found out in our days, to infringe the authority of the Holy and Sacred Word of God; who in his mercy, provided againſt it in good time, by permitting the Author of the ſaid Tranſlation (of whom a very good opinion had been entertained for a while) to condemn himſelf out of his own mouth, and to make known by what ſpirit he was led* (29). Theodore Beza was not ſilent on this occaſion: he maintained that the jargon of Poictou, the coarſeſt of all the jargons of France, may ſeem leſs barbarous than the ſtyle of Caſtalio (30). Obſerve that Father Simon aſſerts, that *there appears* in Caſtalio's French Tranſlation *the ſame affectation of writing in an elegant and polite ſtyle*, as does in his Latin Verſion (31). He gives a judgment of the latter which, all things conſidered, is glorious for Caſtalio (32). You will find ſome paſſages of it in the Additions of Mr. Teiſſier (33). You will alſo find there that three learned perſons (34) have ſpoken of that Verſion with elogy. One of them was ſo charmed with it, that as he praiſed it he felt a poetical Enthuſiaſm riſe, which obliged him to join the language of the Muſes to his proſe, to expreſs his admiration (35). Sir Thomas Pope-Blount has collected a great many paſſages, ſome diſadvantageous to Caſtalio, and others advantageous (36): I refer you to them, and add only that he has forgotten the commendations which Epiſcopius has given to this Tranſlator of the Scripture (37), and the invective which is to be ſeen in a Preface to the New Teſtament printed at Geneva in the year 1560 (38). Let us not forget that Caſtalio began his Latin Verſion at Geneva in 1542, and that he finiſhed it at Baſil in 1550. It was printed at Baſil in 1551, and dedicated by the Author to Edward King of England. He gave a ſecond Edition of it in 1554, and another in 1556. The Edition of 1573 is more eſteemed than any of the other (39). The French Verſion was dedicated to Henry II, and printed at Baſil *for John Hervagius*, in the year 1555. As to the diſputes which aroſe between Caſtalio and Theodore Beza concerning the Tranſlation of the Scripture, conſult the Author whom I cite (40). It muſt not be forgotten that he complained that having been the firſt who had made an exact deſcription of Solomon's Temple, he had no thanks for it; but that on the contrary, he received ill language from thoſe who made advantage of his labour. *Nonnihil mirari ſe dicebat tuorum ingenuitatem, qui cùm ſubtilem effigiem Templi apud Ezechielem, in qua una exprimenda primus potiſſimum elaboraverat, ſurripuiſſent, non modo in ſuis Bibliis quibus eam inſerebant non laudarunt auctorem, cujus labore ſuas merces ornabant, ſed etiam eum infinitis convitiis onerarunt* (41). It is Baudouin who ſpeaks thus to Theodore Beza.

Caſtalio's Latin Bible has been lately reprinted in Germany (42), and they have joined to it *ejuſdem* (Caſtellionis) *Delineatio Reipublicæ Judaicæ ex Joſepho*;

(13) This anſwers to *Fauſtus Sozinus Senenſis.*

(14) *Quæſtio an perfectè Legi Dei obediri poſſit. Reſponſio ad Borrhaum de Prædeſtinatione. Defenſio adverſus Calvinum de Calumnia.*

(15) *Epit. Geſneri*, pag. 503.

(16) See the Remark [F].

(17) Above, in the Article BEZA, Remark [F]; and in the Article SOCINUS (Marianus) grandſon &c. Remark [B], in the firſt paragraph where I ſpeak of Lælius.

(18) Beza, *ad Defenſ. & Repreb. Caſtell.* pag. 451.

(19) It is the Tranſlation of the Books of *Moſes*, of which I have ſpoken above, Citation (9).

(20) Extracted from Theodor. Beza, *ad Defenſ. & Repreb. Caſtellion.* num. 6. *in Lucam*, pag. 451. Oper. tom. 1.

(21) Beza, *de Prædeſtin. adv. Caſtellion.* pag. 384. tom. 1. Oper.

(22) Idem, *ad Defenſ. & Repreb.* pag. 431.

(23) Thuan. lib. 35. *in fine.*

(24) Voſſius, *Inſtitut. Oratoriar.* lib. 4. cap. 1.

(25) *See* Sammarthan. *Elog.* lib. 2. pag. 126.

* *One that has been clipped.*
† *Mercy makes mows at judgment.*
‡ *The LXXVIII according to our Tranſlation.*
‡ *He took him from the ploughtail.*
⁂ *Snotty-noſed children at the breaſt.*

(26) Garaſſe, *Doctrine curieuſe*, pag. 202, 203.

(27) See the end of this Remark.

(28) Henri Etienne, *Apol. d'Herodote*, liv. 1. chap. 14. pag. m. 96.

(29) Idem, ibid. pag. 97.

(30) Beza, *ad Defenſ. & Repreb. Sebaſt. Caſtell. init.* pag. m. 430, 431, *Oper.* tom. 1.

(31) Simon, *Hiſt. Critique du Vieux Teſt.* liv. 2. chap. 25. pag. m. 349. They have added a Marginal Note in the Rotterdam Edition, which acquaints us that *Henry Stephens* reproaches this Tranſlator *with ſpeaking Beggars Gibberiſh.*

(32) Ibid. chap. 21. pag. 324, &c.

(33) To the Elogies taken from Thuanus, tom. 1. pag. m. 223, 224.

(34) Hiperius, Humfred. & Furius Ceriolanus.

(35) You will find theſe Verſes in Simon's *Critical Hiſtory of the Verſions of the New Teſtament*, chap. 24. pag. 274.

(36) Pope Blount, *Cenſur. Autor.* pag. 493, *& ſeq.*

(37) Epiſcopius, *Inſtitut.* pag. 277.

(38) Father Simon produces it, *Hiſt. Crit. des Verſions du Nouv. Teſtam.* pag. 275.

(39) Simon, *Hiſt. Critiq. du Vieux Teſtam.* pag. 324.

(40) Simon, *Hiſt. Crit. du Nouv. Teſtam.* chap. 24. pag. 273, &c.

(41) *Reſp. ad Calvin. & Betzam pro Franc. Balduino.*

(42) In 1697, at Leipſic, by Thomas Fritſch, in folio.

accept it (*b*). Caſtalio having exerciſed it near three years, was forced to quit it in the year 1544, and to ſeek out another abode, for having maintained ſome peculiar opinions [*D*]. He retired to Baſil, and had there the employment of Greek Profeſſor conferred on him (*c*). He paſſed all the reſt of his life in that place, and died there the 29th of December 1563 (*d*). He was interred in the Great Church of Baſil, by the care of three Poliſh Gentlemen, who had been his ſcholars (*e*) [*E*], and cauſed an honourable Epitaph to be put on his tomb. He had the misfortune to expoſe himſelf to the indignation of Calvin and Theodore Beza, who loaded him with ill language. They were perſuaded he deſerved it, for having followed a method not quite ſo ſtrict in matters of Predeſtination, and for having diſapproved of the puniſhing of Heretics (*f*), The Latin Tranſlation which he made of ſome Works of Ochinus brought on him great ſuſpicions of Heterodoxy. He was alſo accuſed of favouring Enthuſiaſts [*F*]. To judge of

(*b*) See the ſame Remark [*G*].

(*c*) See his Epitaph at the end of his *Dialogi Sacri*.

(*d*) See the ſame Epitaph.

(*e*) Their names are in the Epitaph.

(*f*) See the Remark [*F*] of the Article BEZA, and the Remark [*B*] of the Article SOCINUS (Marianus) grandſon &c.

Nota prolixior in Caput IX Epiſtolæ ad Romanos, nec non Defenſio Verſionis novi Fœderis contra Th. Bezam.

I cannot forbear imparting to you a ſmall diſtruſt which I have had, and the effect it has produced. What Theodore Beza, Henry Stephens, and Garaſſe, ſay of Caſtalio's French, made me conclude at firſt that Writer had treated the Scripture as Scarron did Virgil: but afterwards I thought their word was not to be taken, and that poſſibly paſſion had induced them to amplify. In this uncertainty, I took Caſtalio's French Bible, and opened it in ſeveral places. I ſought very carefully for thoſe burleſque phraſes with which he has been ſo much reproached, but could find none of them, except only that of *faire la figue*. I found neither the *cul de la charrue*, nor the *petits morveux*, quoted by Father Garaſſe; and I cannot ſufficiently admire at the impudence of that Calumniator. It muſt be confeſſed here that ſome people are unfortunate; they can never avoid the ſtrokes of ſlander. If any other than Caſtalio had made this Tranſlation of the Scripture, his language would not have been greatly exclaimed againſt. As to the words *avant peau, rogné*, &c. they are not low or vulgar, but full as noble as *prepuce*, and *circoncis*. He who made uſe of them is only to be blamed for a needleſs innovation: his good intention (43) does not juſtify him.

(43) See his Preface.

[*D*] *He was forced to quit his Schoolmaſter's place . . for having maintained ſome peculiar opinions.*] He was ſo angry that he could not get Calvin to approve the impertinencies of his French Tranſlation of the New Teſtament, that he began to broach ſome errors, and to maintain that the Song of Solomon was a ſmutty compoſition which ought to be ſtruck out of the Canon of Scripture. He abuſed the Miniſters who oppoſed his deſign. He was ſummoned to appear before the Senate, where he was heard, and declared convicted of calumny, and was ordered to retire elſewhere. It is thus that Theodore Beza relates the matter. *Indignatus quòd ſuas ineptias in Gallica Novi Teſtamenti verſione Calvino non probaſſet, eouſque efferbuit, ut exotica quædam docere non contentus, palam etiam Canticum Salomonis tanquam impuram & obſcœnam cantionem ex Canone expungi juberet, & repugnantes Miniſtros atrociſſimis convitiis proſcinderet. Id illi verò ſibi non ferendum meritò rati, hominem ad Senatum vocant: ubi pridie Calend. Junii patientiſſimè auditus, cognitâque cauſâ calumniæ damnatus, ex urbe excedere juſſus eſt* (44). See the margin (45). This relation ſeems to be ſtrained too far, if compared with an Atteſtation which Calvin gave this Schoolmaſter of Geneva. It imports that he voluntarily reſigned his place; that he had behaved himſelf in it in ſuch a manner that he was judged worthy to be a Paſtor; and that nothing had hindred his being promoted to that office, but the peculiar opinion which he held concerning the Canticles, and the article of Chriſt's deſcending into Hell; and in fine, that this was the only reaſon why he quitted Geneva. *In eo teſtimonio tu teſtaris*, thus Caſtalio ſpeaks to Calvin (46), *mihi à vobis diſcedendi unam cauſam fuiſſe, diſcordiam illam de Cantico Canticorum, & de interpretatione tua capitis fidei de Chriſti deſcenſu ad inferos. Tua verba ſunt hæc:* Hoc breviter teſtamur, talem fuiſſe à nobis habitum, ut noſtro omnium conſenſu jam ad munus paſtorale deſtinatus eſſet. *Et in fine verba ſunt hæc:* Ne quis ergo aliud quippiam cauſa eſſe ſuſpicetur, cur à nobis diſcedat Sebaſtianus, hoc quocunque venerit teſtatum eſſe volumus. Scholæ miniſterio ſponte ſe abdicavit. In eo ita ſe geſſerat, ut ſacro hoc miniſterio dignum judicaremus. Quominus autem receptus fuerit, non aliqua vitæ macula, non impium aliquod in fidei noſtræ capitibus dogma, ſed hæc una, quam expoſuimus, cauſa obſtitit. He declares that he had ſhewn this Atteſtation to ſeveral perſons, and even to ſome Miniſters. Conſult Dr. Spon, who does not ſay he was turned out of the city, but only that he was depoſed (47). See below the Remarks againſt Mr. Teiſſier.

(44) Beza, *in Vita Calvini, ad ann.* 1544, pag. 372. *Op.* tom. 5.

(45) *Hoc eodem anno per Sebaſtianum Caſtellionem fictæ pietatis hominem Satan vos fidemque veſtram impellere & levi primùm, ut videbatur, ictu ſed periculoſiſſimo quatere voluit: quo tamen malo & occulto veneno civitas veſtra anno XLV homine ipſo tanquam ſpuma expulſo purgata eſt.* i. e. "The "ſame year Satan by means of "Sebaſtian Caſtalio, a man of "feigned piety, "deſigned to puſh "at you and "your faith, "and to ſhake "you firſt by a "light blow, as "it ſeemed, but "really a moſt "dangerous one: "of which viru-"lent and latent "poiſon how-"ever your city "was purged in "the year 45, "by ſpewing out "the man him-"ſelf."

Danæus, *Epiſt. Dedic. Libr.* de Hæreſ. *ad Senatum Genevenſem.*

(46) Caſtellio, *in Defenſ. ad Author. Libelli cui Titulus eſt Calumnia Nebulonis*, pag. m. 19.

(47) Spon, *Hiſt. de Genève*, liv. 3. pag. 257.

[*E*] *He was interred in the great Church of Baſil, by the care of three Poliſh Gentlemen . . . his Scholars.*] I have learned this particular from the Inſcription of an Epigram, which is at the end of his ſacred Dialogues (48). A very memorable particular is to be found in the Scaligerana: Caſtalio had been laid in the tomb of the family of the Grynæus's; but a Profeſſor of that family cauſed him to be taken up again. This perhaps was what induced the three Poliſh Gentlemen to take care of Caſtalio's funeral. Scaliger's judgment follows. *Si non cum affectu vel ignominia Simon Grynæus juſſit Caſtalionem ex ſuo ſepulchro educi & alibi ſepeliri, nihil mali. Sunt qui nolunt alios in ſuo ſepulchro ſepeliri; ſed in noſtra religione non deberet fieri* (49). He excuſes the action of Grynæus, and blames it at the ſame time. He excuſes it, in caſe it was not produced by paſſion, and was attended with a moderation which caſt no ignominy on the memory of the deceaſed; and he blames it, becauſe he ſuppoſes thoſe of the Proteſtant Religion ſhould not be ſubject to the infirmity of not ſuffering another to be interred in their ſepulchre. It is difficult to imagine that Simon Grynæus was free from paſſion in this affair, and that ſeveral conſiderations of human intereſt did not induce him to behave in the manner he did. We ſhall ſee preſently that they had made Caſtalio as black as a Devil.

(48) *Aliud* (Epitaphium) *de monumento quod ei tres Poloni . . . locarunt in ſummi Templi Baſil. periſtylio in pavimento.*

(49) Scaligerana, *Voce* Grynæus, pag. m. 101.

[*F*] *He was accuſed of having favoured Enthuſiaſts.*] This is what Beza means by cenſuring him for having attempted to enervate the authority of the Scripture, as if it contained not that ſublime Divinity which St. Paul taught by word of mouth to ſuch of his diſciples who were the greateſt proficients. *Ut qui ſua quadam in Sacrorum Bibliorum perverſionem præfatione palàm verbi divini ſatis perſpicuam auctoritatem convellere ſtuduiſſet, ſuiſque in priorem ad Corinth. Epiſtolam adnotationibus, ut à verbo ſcripto tanquam imperfecto nos abduceret, diſertè ſcripſiſſet, Paulum quandam Theologiam ea quam ſcriptis tradidiſſet reconditiorem, perfectos neſcio quos ſuos diſcipulos docuiſſe* (50). i. e. "As one who "had openly endeavoured, in a certain preface of his "to a perverſion of the Holy Bible, to derogate from "the ſufficiently evident authority of the Divine "Word, and in his Annotations on the firſt Epiſtle "to the Corinthians, had, with a deſign to draw us "away from the written word as imperfect, expreſly "written, that Paul taught certain of his diſciples a "more recondite Theology than what he had delivered "in writing." Scaliger ſaid that Caſtalio was tainted with ſeveral doctrines of the Anabaptiſts (51). Nothing has contributed more to his being ranked among the Enthuſiaſts, than his Latin Tranſlation of the *Theologia Germanica*: it is a Book full of fanaticiſm, and was the ſpoiling of a great many people in the Low Counries. Here is what Sainte Aldegonde wrote to Theodore Beza in the year 1567. *Eſt genus novum ἐνθουσιαζῶν qui tum ex illa, quam noſti, Theologia Germanica dudum à Caſtellione Latine reddita, tum ex Taulero deliro ſanè Monacho, tum porrò ex aliorum quorundam & veterum & recentiorum hæreticorum furoribus, eas conſuunt rhapſodias, quæ non jam ſuperſtitioſæ ac rudi plebeculæ, ſed ipſis etiam viris, & mediocri eruditione, & non contemnenda pietatis ſpecie præſtantibus, ita vehementer arrident, ut certatim omnes ad eorum libros quaſi ad reconditum aliquem theſaurum accurrant. Omnia eorum deliramenta percenſere, nimis foret longum, & ipſe non potes pleraque ignorare, cui fuerit cum hujuſmodi*

(50) Beza, *in Vita Calvini, ad ann.* 1553, pag. 377.

(51) Scaligerana I. pag. m. 28.

of him by the Picture which his Adverſaries drew of him, we muſt take him not only for a very ill man, but even for a profligate wretch [G]. I ſhall ſet down (g) ſeveral Fragments of the Apology which he publiſhed; but I would not have them conſidered as the

(g) In the Remark [G].

juſmodi monſtris (in quibus Caſtellionem ego non infimo loco poſuerim) perſæpe conflictandum (52). i. e. "There "is a new ſort of Enthuſiaſts who from the German "Theology which you are acquainted with, and was "ſometime ago tranſlated into Latin by Caſtalio, "from Taulerus a crack-brained Monk, and alſo from "the ravings of certain other heretics both ancient "and modern, patch up thoſe Rhapſodies which ſo "violently pleaſe not only the ſuperſtitious and ignorant multitude, but even men who have a moderate "ſhare of learning, and no contemptible appearance "of devotion, that all flock with eagerneſs to their "books, as to a hidden treaſure. It would be tedious to enumerate all their wild notions, nor can you "be ignorant of the greater part of them, having "been frequently obliged to encounter ſuch monſters, "among whom I rank Caſtalio not in the loweſt "place." Beza was perſuaded that Caſtalio had tranſlated that Book into Latin; however, he durſt not aſſert it in a public work, before he had informed himſelf whether it was poſſible to produce ſufficient proofs of it, in caſe Caſtalio ſhould deny it. A wiſe precaution, and which ought not to be neglected ſo often as it is. Let us ſee what he wrote to a Phyſician at Baſil. *Hoc amabò reſcribo, ſi quam fecero in mea reſponſione mentionem Bellii, & Theologiæ Germanicæ, & ille ſe eorum librorum authorem inficietur, num id poſſim ità ſecurè affirmare, ut ſi neceſſe fuerit, teſtibus etiam aut idoneis argumentis convinci poſſit. Nam de re ipſa, id eſt, quin revera libros illos ac præſertim præfationem Bellianam ediderit, non dubito: ſed videndum nobis eſt, ut non tantùm detegatur iſte, verum etiam convincatur, ut tandem omnes norint quæ ſit ſancti iſtius viri conſcientia* (53). i. e. "Write me word, I entreat you, whether "if I ſhould make mention in my anſwer of Bellius, "and the *Theologia Germanica*, and he ſhould deny "himſelf to be the Author of thoſe Books, I may "affirm it with ſafety, ſo that, if occaſion be, he may "be convicted by witneſſes or proper arguments. For "of the thing itſelf, that is, that he really publiſhed "thoſe Books and eſpecially Bellius's preface, I make "no doubt: but it is our buſineſs to ſee, not only "that he be detected, but convicted likewiſe, that all "the world may at length be acquainted with this "ſanctified perſon's conſcience." Hoornbeeck did not underſtand the whole ſenſe of theſe words (54); he did not perceive that Beza intended to ſpeak of Caſtalio as the Author of the Latin Tranſlation, and not as the Author of the work itſelf intitled *Theologia Germanica*. He adds that this work was alſo tranſlated into Latin, and printed at Antwerp in the year 1558, under the name of John Theophilus. He had already ſaid that the Dutch Tranſlation had been very imprudently commended by Martin Luther. He did not know that the firſt edition of the Latin Tranſlation is of Baſil, 1557. The Epitome of Geſner's *Bibliotheca*, acquainting us with this, obſerves that Caſtalio is the man who tranſlated that work under the name of *Joannes Theophilus* (55). Dr. Spon makes him the Author of the work itſelf, and is miſtaken: *He wrote*, ſays he (56), *another Book intitled* Theologia Germanica, *and a Treatiſe of the old and new man.* Mr. Jurieu has made almoſt the ſame miſtake, ſince he ſays that *John Theophilus is the Author of a Book intitled* Theologia Germanica (57). Here is another fault of Dr. Spon's: he did not know that the Treatiſe of the old and new man, is no more than the French Tranſlation which Caſtalio made of the *Theologia Germanica*. This is what we find in la Croix du Maine (58), who was ignorant on the other hand that the Latin Work is only a Tranſlation. Take notice that Caſtalio denied before the Miniſters of Baſil that he had any hand in that Book (59).

(52) Philippus Marnixius, *Epiſt. ad Bezam.* It is the 6th among *Beza's Letters*, pag. m. 206. tom. 3. *Operum.*

(53) Beza, *Epiſt. ad Gulielmum Gratarolum.* It is the 46th *Oper.* tom. 3. pag. 257. See the 451ſt page of the 1ſt vol. of his Works.

(54) Hoornbeeck, *Summa Controverſ.* lib. 6. pag. m. 409.

(55) *Epitome* Geſneri, pag. m. 745.

(56) Spon, *Hiſt. de Geneve*, pag. 252.

(57) Jurieu, *Apolog. pour les Reformat.* tom. 1. pag. 106.

(58) La Croix du Maine, *Bibliot. Franc.* pag. 453.

(59) Beza, *ad Defenſ. & Reprch. Caſtell. init.* pag. 431. *Oper.* tom. 1. See alſo pag. 451.

[G] *To judge of him by the picture which his adverſaries drew of him, we muſt take him . . . . for a profligate wretch.*] He wrote an Apology in the year 1558, wherein he complains particularly of two Pieces of Calvin's (60): one was intitled *Anſwers to certain calumnies and blaſphemies, &c.* and appeared in the year 1557; the title of the other was *Calumniæ Nebulonis cujuſdam, &c.* which was printed in year following. He maintains that he never ſaw the two Works which Calvin attributed to him (61). *Vocas me ſub-inde*, ſays he (62), *in Gallico libello, blaſphemum calumniatorem, malignum, canem latrantem, plenum ignorantiæ & beſtialitatis, plenum impudentiæ, impoſtorem, ſacrarum literarum impurum corruptorem, Dei prorſus deriſorem, omnis religionis contemptorem, impudentem, impurum canem, impium, obſcœnum, torti perverſique ingenii, vagum, balatronem. Nebulonem verò (ſic enim interpretor* Brouillon) *appellas octies, & hæc omnia longè copioſius, quàm à me recenſentur, facis in libello duorum foliorum, & quidem perparvorum. De Latino verò, quid multis opus eſt? Tituluseſt:* Calumniæ Nebulonis. *Finis eſt:* Compeſcat te Deus, Satan: *media ſunt ejuſdem coloris.* i. e. "You frequently call "me, in the French pamphlet, blaſphemous ſlanderer, "malignant, barking dog, full of ignorance and be"ſtiality, full of impudence, an impoſtor, an impure "corrupter of the holy Scriptures, a very mocker of "God, a contemner of all religion, impudent, im"pure dog, impious, obſcene, of a crooked and per"verſe mind, a vagabond, and a worthleſs fellow. "You call me a pragmatical knave (for ſo I interpret "*Brouillon*) eight times; and all theſe you beſtow on "me much more plentifully than I have enumerated, "in a pamphlet of two ſheets, and thoſe very ſmall "ones. As to your Latin piece, what need many "words? The title is; *The Calumnies of a Knave.* "It ends with; *The Lord rebuke thee, Satan*: the inter"mediate contents are in the ſame ſtrain." He repreſents to him not only what the Goſpel denounces againſt him who injures his brother, but alſo what Calvin himſelf had written in the Life of a Chriſtian. *Nihil ne te movet (ut cætera taceam,) tui ipſius libellus ille, quem ſcripſiſti de Vita hominis Chriſtiani? Qui libellus ita ſancta, ita pia præcepta continet, ut nuper præſente me dixerat quidam, operæ precium eſſe, ut tibi ſcribat aliquis epiſtolam, in qua te interroget, utrum fieri poſſit, ut horum duorum libellorum, videlicet,* Vita hominis Chriſtiani, & Calumniæ Nebulonis &c, *idem ſit author* (63). i. e. "Are you nothing moved (to omit other things) "by your own Book of the Life of a Chriſtian man? "a Book which contains ſuch holy, ſuch pious pre"cepts, that a certain perſon lately ſaid in my pre"ſence, that it would be worth while for ſomebody to "write you a Letter, and therein aſk you, whether "it be poſſible that the ſame man could be the author "of theſe two books, viz. *The Life of a Chriſtian man*, "and *The Calumnies of a Knave.*" He juſtifies himſelf in particular from the crime of theft, as will be ſeen below, and from thoſe of treachery, cruelty, and blaſphemy. *Hæc accuſationis tuæ ſumma eſt*, ſays he (64), after having quoted Calvin's own words, *in qua me infimulas ſuperbiæ, perfidiæ, inhumanitatis, ingratitudinis, fraudulentiæ, impudentiæ, ſcurrilitatis, blaſphemiæ, denique impietatis.* i. e. "This is the ſum "of your accuſation, wherein you charge me with "pride, perfidiouſneſs, inhumanity, ingratitude, de"ceit, impudence, ſcurrility, blaſphemy, and impiety." If you know me to be ſuch a man while I abode with you, proceeds he to aſk him, why did you almoſt conſtrain me to teach in the College of Geneva? Can one in conſcience commit the education of children to ſuch a perſon? *Si jam tum talem cognoviſti, quæro ex te, qua conſcientia me poſtea iſtic ludo literario præfeceritis, & multum recuſantem pertraxeritis, tu & unà duo tui ſummi amici, & ſummæ in Sabaudia authoritatis viri concionatores. Quæſo te, quorum hominum eſt pueris inſtituendis præficere hominem, quem tu ſceleratum eſſe ſcires, idque in ea urbe, quam vos ſanctam etiam impreſſis libris appellatis* (65)? Why did you give me a Teſtimonial of my leading a good life, after I had taught in that College about three years? Thereupon he lays before him the words which you have read in the Remark (D) (66). You cannot ſay, continues he (67), that you did not know me to be ſuch a perſon till after that time; for, beſides that you manifeſtly intimate quite the contrary, you would be the moſt ſtupid man alive, if I had been ſuch a man as you ſet me forth, while I lodged with you, and taught in the College of Geneva, and yet you had not diſcovered it. He confeſſes he had not been exempt from vanity (68), and he relates an effect of it which I ſhall ſpeak of below (69); he owns alſo that he loved merry conceits, but not in matters of Religion. I have always cenſured thoſe, ſays he (70), who were guilty of drollery

(60) Caſtellio, *Defenſ.* pag. 2.

(61) Idem, ibid. pag. 3.

(62) Idem, ibid. pag. 5.

(63) Idem, ibid. pag. 7.

(64) Idem, ibid. pag. 17. See the 267th Letter of the Collection intitled, *Epiſtol. Eccleſiaſtic. & Theolog.* of the Amſterdam Edition, 1684, in folio.

(65) Idem, ibid. pag. 18.

(66) Citation (46).

(67) Caſtellio, *Defenſ.* pag. 19, 20.

(68) Idem, ibid. pag. 22.

(69) In the Remark [M].

(70) Caſtellio, *Defenſ.* pag. 24.

the faithful portraiture of his enemies: it will be ſufficient for my purpoſe if they be taken for a general image of the corruption of nature, and for a ſubject of reflections. An infinite number of other people agree in commending him as having led a good life [*H*].

What

drollery in ſuch matters; two of your beſt friends know it well. One of them having publiſhed a jocoſe book intitled *Zoographia*, I went to his houſe to give him my advice, and not finding him, I ſent it him by a third perſon. Far from making a good uſe of it, he publiſhed a ſecond piece of the ſame nature, intitled *Paſſavantius*, and has mortally hated me ever ſince. The other is a man to whom I have great obligations, he has entertained me in his houſe, and I ſaw he was a perſon of ſome piety: I wrote to him that he would do well to publiſh no more facetious Books on ſacred ſubjects; and he did not take the caution I gave him amiſs, as the other had done. Take notice that he obſerves (71) Calvin had prefixed a Preface to a Piece of this nature, written by one of thoſe two Authors.

(71) Idem, ibid.

As to Calvin's reproaching him with having entertained him in his houſe (72), his Anſwer is this. He owns that he lodged with him at Straſburgh, but that he went away at the week's end, to make room for *Madamoyſelle du Verger*, who would have lodgings in Calvin's houſe as well for herſelf as for her ſon, and her ſon's ſervant (73). You deſired me civilly to quit my room to that ſervant: I did ſo, and paid you for my board. Some time after I was deſired by your people to come and attend your ſervant, a countryman of mine, who was ſick. I went thither, I aſſiſted him till his death, that is to ſay, for ſeven days, and I lived on your bread; but ſince that time I have not lodged with you (74). He mentions ſome ſervices which he did to Calvin's family while the latter was gone to the Diet of Ratiſbon, and concludes that he could not be reproached either with ingratitude or treachery.

(72) *Cum te domi meæ aluerim.*

(73) Caſtellio, *Defenſ.* pag. 26.

(74) Idem, ibid. pag. 27.

The Appendix to his Apology is remarkable. He there upbraids Calvin and Theodore Beza with too greedily picking up the flying reports concerning their enemies, and inſerting them immediately in the firſt Book they publiſhed. You hate me, ſays he to them; and that is the reaſon why you eaſily give credit to all the ill which is ſaid of me, and why you believe not, or turn to a bad ſenſe, the good which you hear of me. *Accedit in vobis ad levitatem illam capitale odium mei: quo fit, ut de me quicquid mali dicitur, id quia vultis, facillimè credatis: facilè enim (inquit idem Cæſar) credunt homines quæ volunt. Rurſumque ſi quid boni dicitur, id vel non credatis, vel maligna interpretatione depravetis* (75). Your emiſſaries report, or write to you, all the ſtories which may hit your taſte; you take your meaſures according to their news, and thereby expoſe yourſelves, ſooner or later, to confuſion. *Talia de me jactant leviſſimi homines, & ea vobis veluti conducti, vel referunt, vel ſcribunt, quia vos talia libentur audire ſciunt. Atque ita ineunt à vobis certè non honeſta mercede gratiam. Vos hiſce rumoribus, atque auditionibus permoti de re non levi, leve conſilium initis, auditiones illas etiam monimentis literarum mandatis: quorum vos ſi non e veſtigio, at certè aliquando pœnitere neceſſe erit, cum incertis rumoribus ſerviatis, & plerique ad voluntatem veſtram ficta reſpondeant* (76). If your emiſſaries deceive you, you alſo deceive them in your turn: they hear from you a hundred falſe reports, which they ſpread up and down on every ſide (77). You have endeavoured to render me odious to all the world, and to that end have repreſented me as a dangerous caballer, who had people in pay, in town and country, at the city gates and in the taverns. Some Frenchmen, who come hither (78) from Straſburgh with this formidable idea which you give of my perſon, were greatly ſurprized to find me poor and quiet, and teſtified an extreme indignation againſt the Authors of ſo many fables. *Pateſcunt artes, conatuſque veſtri, ſicuti nuper patuere quibuſdam juvenibus Gallis, qui huc ab Argentina profecti ſic habebant aures imbutas iſtis de me rumoribus, ut me putarent paſſim emiſſarios habere non ſolum in diverſoriis, verum etiam ruri, & in portis urbis. Denique eam de me opinionem imaginemque animo conceperant, ut me arbitrarentur magnum aliquem, & opibus, atque authoritate pollentem virum, quaſique ſatellitum caterva ſtipatum cujus inſidias eſſet effugere difficile. Ubi deinde nihil tale deprehenderunt, contraque homuncionem viderunt, pauperem, vilem, abjectum, quietum, nihil molientem, nullius nec ſplendoris, nec authoritatis, mirati ſunt, non abſque ſtomacho, illa mendacia, mecumque tandem congreſſi, tam ab illis abhorruerunt, mihique adhæſerunt, quàm ante cognitam veritatem à me abhorrentes illis adhæſerant* (79). You excite the Magiſtrates againſt me, and not being able to perſuade them to ſatisfy your paſſion, you practiſe all ſorts of artifices to ruin my reputation, and to prevent my writings being read. You publiſh works againſt me, and endeavour to prevail that I may not be permitted to anſwer you (80). You forbid your people to ſpeak to me, and if any of them venture to do it, they become ſuſpected to you, and you become their enemies. This is the reaſon why ſeveral, who would come to viſit me, dare not do it. *Quoniam illi* (Magiſtratus) *veſtræ cupiditati, vel non obſequuntur, vel nondum obſequuntur, vos (quod proximum eſt) me toto orbe, quibuſcunque modis fieri poteſt, certatim infamatis; mea ſcripta (ut papam poſſis agnoſcere) ne legantur pro virili prohibetis: ipſi contrà ſcribitis, mihi ne reſpondere permittatur, quoad ejus fieri poteſt, cavetur. Veſtris ne me conveniant vetatis, ſi qui convenerint plerumque ſuſpectos habetis, & abhorretis. Quo metu fit, ut multi me, quamvis cupientes, convenire non audeant, id quod nonnulli, & mihi, & aliis confeſſi ſunt* (81). You conceal your hatred under the ſpecious pretence of the love of truth, and you make an ill uſe of your eloquence and wit to make your accuſations appear probable to the people; which is not difficult, there being nothing ſo wholeſome which may not be poiſoned, nor any thing ſo ugly which may not be covered with paint. *Interea nomine ſtudii tuendæ veritatis odium veſtrum prætexitis: veram ejus cauſam (quippe vobis parum honeſtam) diſſimulatis, cauſamque veſtram apud imperitos probabilem redditis ea arte, quæ docet de quavis re propoſita probabiliter diſputare in utramque partem. Qua quidem arte ſic inſtructi eſtis, (atque utinam tam præclaris ingeniis, vobiſque divinitus longè alios ad uſus conceſſis non abuteremini) ut vix quicquam vel tam benè dici, aut fieri poſſit, quin id interpretando deformare, vel tam malè quin fucare poſſitis, præſertim judice mundo, apud quem valere maledicta quid mirum, cum nullum ſit ipſi ſuavius pabulum* (82)? The remainder of this Appendix contains excellent admonitions; and it muſt be agreed that Caſtalio, let him be as much a heretic as you pleaſe, has given more ſignal examples of moderation in his Writings, than the Orthodox who attacked him.

(75) Idem, ibid. pag. 36.

(76) Idem, ibid. pag. 38, 39.

(77) *Neque verò plus illi vobis, quàm vos illis nocetis. Nam & à vobis illi viciſſim multa falſa audiunt, quæ deinde diſſeminant, quo fit ut utrique cæteros decipiendo, ſcandalis Eccleſiam repleatis.* Caſtellio, *Defenſ.* pag. 39.

(78) That is, to Baſil.

(79) Caſtellio, *Defenſ.* pag. 40.

(80) Here are the words which Baudouin, *Reſponſ. III.* folio 168 *verſo*, ſuppoſes Caſtalio made uſe of ſpeaking of Beza: *De ſingulari æquitate tua quam admirabatur neſcio quid narrabat, cum te diceret miris artibus efficere ut illi quem impotentiſſime laceſſebas, non liceret aut reſpondere aut reſponſionem edere, propterea quæ tuæ clementiæ gratias ageret, qua eum hoc labore liberabas.*

(81) Caſtellio, *Defenſ.* pag. 41.

Father Garaſſe tells us, that *Calvin teſtifies of Caſtalio, that when he drank, he uſed to ſay before he taſted the wine*, Tu quis es? *i. e.* "Who art thou?" *and when he had taſted it, if it was paſſable, or tolerably good, he anſwered*; Ego ſum qui ſum, *i. e.* "I am that I am:" *but if it was excellent, he anſwered*; Hic eſt filius Dei vivi, *i. e.* "This is the "ſon of the living God (83)." I do not believe that Calvin ever ſaid this.

[*H*] *An infinite number of . . . . people agree in commending him as having led a good life.*] There appeared in him great ſimplicity, and an extreme averſion to oſtentation (84). Theodore Beza acknowledges this to be fact, tho' he gives it the worſt turn he poſſibly could (85); but we muſt conſider that he ſpoke as an enemy. During the diſputes concerning Arminianiſm, they reprinted in Holland *Conſilium ad vaſtatam Galliam anno* 1567 *datum per Sebaſtianum Caſtalionem, ubi cauſæ præſentis tum belli ſimulque medicina ejus indigitantur, ac præſertim diligenter examinatur ac perpenditur an conſcientiis vis ſit adhibenda.* i. e. "Advice to France laid deſolate, given in the year "1567 by Sebaſtian Caſtalio, wherein the cauſes of "the preſent war, and alſo the remedy thereof, are "pointed out, and the queſtion whether conſciences "may be forced is particularly and carefully examined "and weighed." Theodore Bomius, who procured this new Edition was cenſured for it by the Anti-Remonſtrants. They blamed him for having taken up the ſtinking bones of Caſtalio out of the grave (86). He anſwered, that that man deſerved all manner of commendation; he alledged the fair Teſtimonial which the Univerſity of Baſil gave him, he quoted the letters of Melanchthon, &c. (87). *Bomius* (in Veredario

(82) Idem, ibid. pag. 42.

(83) *Doctrine curieuſe*, pag. 201.

(84) *Homo ſimplex, & ab omni faſtu alienus.* Sammarth. *Elogior.* lib. 2. pag. 126.

(85) *Erat quadam ταπεινοφροσύνης ſpecie ineptiſſime ambitioſus. Ac plane ex eorum genere quos Græci ἰδιογνώμονας appellant.* i. e. "Under a "certain appearance of humility, he was "moſt fooliſhly "ambitious: "and perfectly "one of thoſe "whom the "Greeks call "ἰδιογνώμονας, "men fond of "their own opinion." Beza, *in Vitâ Calvini, ad ann.* 1544, pag. m. 372.

(86) *Quod fœtentia Caſtalionis oſſa è ſepulchro produxerit.* Salomon Theodotus, *in Pacificatorio diſſecti Belgii*, pag. 103.

(87) Idem, ibid. pag. 103, 104.

What he anſwered, when he was accuſed of theft, will ſhew us that he was poor [*I*]. Sentiments are not divided as to his poverty; no body denies but that he had a great deal of difficulty to get bread for himſelf and his children which were not few, for he left four ſons and as many daughters (*b*). Montagne laments the hard fate of this Author [*K*]. There are ſeveral people who ſay he was a Miniſter; but there is ſome reaſon

(*b*) See the Latin Verſes on his Death, at the end of his *Dialogi Sacri*.

ſuo edito anno 1617, pag. 20.) *adverſario huic reſpondens, mirifice Caſtalionem commendat; honorificum de eo citat teſtimonium Univerſitatis Baſileenſis in qua Theologiæ* (88) *Profeſſorem egit. Ex Philippi quoque Melanchthonis & Chriſtophori Carleili ad ipſum datis literis laudes ejus exaggerat.* Let us confirm this by a paſſage taken from the letter of an Arminian Miniſter: "The Divines of Baſil give S. Caſtalio a great teſti- "mony of excellent piety; and even Polanus, a great "Predeſtinarian, confeſſes that Caſtalio was *of holy* "*life and exemplary converſation*. . . . I do not find "that their adverſaries (89) have ever given them a "good teſtimony, as Polanus has done to Caſtalio, "even in the place where he diſputes againſt him "concerning Predeſtination (90)." One may make, methinks, a general reflection, which will be a ſtrong proof of the good morals, and of the learning of this man. His enemies cried him down as the peſt of Orthodoxy, and a diſturber of the Reformed Church. They endeavoured to prevail with the Magiſtrates of Baſil to expel him. The Conſiſtory of Baſil did not ſpare him; he was cited before them with relation to ſome Books which were imputed to him: and one of his works was condemned by them (91). Some Profeſſors of the Univerſity wrote againſt him (92). It is ſaid, that having been confounded in a public diſputation concerning Predeſtination, the Curators of the Univerſity ordered him not to tranſgreſs the bounds of his profeſſion, and not to meddle with Divinity. *Omnes norunt, quum in diſputatione publica de prædeſtinatione tibi os occluſum eſſet, adeò ut quod hiſceres non haberes, niſi illud unum tui ſimilibus ſolenne, te ſcilicet iſta myſteria non capere, tibi (inquam) tum, & aliàs aliquoties, ab Academiæ præfectis edictum fuiſſe ut in tuæ profeſſionis finibus maneus, à theologicis rebus abſtineres* (93). All this teſtifies that no indulgence was ſhewn him. It is therefore very plain, that if he was not expelled, he was beholden to his learning for it, and to the edification which he afforded to the whole city by his piety and virtue. *Caſtàlioni fecerunt injuriam cum doctus eſſet, faſtum objecerunt*, ſaid Scaliger (94); i. e. "They wronged Caſtalio, taxing him with pride, "becauſe he was a learned man."

(88) It ſhould be *Linguæ Græcæ*.

(89) That is, the Adverſaries of *Calvin* and *Beza*.

(90) *Letter of Charles de Nielles.* It is the 634th among the *Epiſt. Eccleſ. & Theolog.* Ed. Amſtel. 1648, pag. 951.

(91) See the Remark [*B*], Citation (21).

(92) *See* Theod. Beza, *ad Defenſ. & Repreh. Caſtell. init.* pag. 43. tom. 1. *Operum.*

(93) Idem, ibid. *init.* pag. 431.

(94) Scaligerana, pag. m. 46.

Let us take notice, by the way, of the fault which has ſlipped into the title of the Work which Bomius cauſed to be reprinted. The year 1567 is wrongly inſerted therein. I think it ſhould have been the year 1562: for this Writer dying in the year 1563, could not have given that advice to France made deſolate, on any other occaſion than that of the firſt religious civil war. La Croix du Maine obſerves that he is ſaid to be the Author of a Book intitled *Le Conſeil à la France deſolée* (95). The firſt Edition is not of the year 1578, as the Author whom I cite (96) aſſerts: it was precedent to the peace of 1563. Baudouin, in his anſwer to Beza (97), ſpeaks of this Advice, as of a Book printed about the time that Anthony King of Navarre died.

(95) La Croix du Maine, *Biblioth. Franc.* pag. 453.

(96) Salom. Theodotus, *in Pacificatorio diſſecti Belgii*, pag. 103.

(97) *Fol.* 68 *verſo.*

[*I*] *What he anſwered, when accuſed of theft, will ſhew us that he was poor.*] Calvin reproaches him with having ſtolen ſome wood. *Quæro ex te dum proximis annis tibi harpago in manu erat ad rapienda ligna, quibus domum tuam calefaceres, an non te propria voluntas ad furandum impulerit? tibi ſi ad juſtam damnationem hoc unum ſufficit, quod ſciens, & volens, turpe, & ſceleratum lucrum, ex damno alieno captas, quicquid de neceſſitate obſtrepis minime te abſolvet* (98). i. e. "Pray tell me, when of late years you had a drag- "hook in your hand to ſteal wood with to burn at "home, did not your own will induce you to commit "theft? If this alone be ſufficient to condemn you, "that knowingly and voluntarily you ſeek a ſordid "and wicked gain by your neighbour's loſs, all the "noiſe you make about neceſſity will never acquit you." How do you know this? anſwered Caſtalio (99). You did not ſee it, and you ought not to have believed it on a hearſay: why did you not examine your informers? why did you not aſk them whether they had been eye-witneſſes, and whether the circumſtances of the action do not exempt it from the charge of theft? The chit-chat of your Clients, and your credulity which foments it, have deceived you here, as they have on a hundred other occaſions. *Decipit hic te profectò, ut & in multis aliis rebus, & tuorum linguacitas, & ejuſdem allectrix tua credulitas. Scis illud,* Facile credunt homines quæ volunt (100). He then relates the fact. He ſays that being in extreme want, and unwilling notwithſtanding to quit his Tranſlation of the Scripture, he took a drag-hook at his hours of leiſure, to pull out the pieces of wood which floated on the river: this wood belonged to nobody, but to the firſt who laid hold of it; I might therefore, adds he, appropriate it to myſelf without fraud, to ſerve me for fewel at home. The fiſhermen and many others exerciſed their hooks as well as I, and this was done in ſight of the whole city. *In eo ſtudio cum ità totus eſſem, ut vel mendicare mallem quam deſiſtere, & in ripa Rheni habitarem, capiebam interdum ſuccidivis horis harpagone ligna, quæ ſolet, dum exundat Rhenus, ſecum rapta devehere, quibus domum meam calefacerem. Hoc tu furtum interpretaris. Certè non bonus, neque candidus interpres. Publica ſunt illa ligna, & primi occupantis* (101). He adds, that during the overflowing of a river which diſcharges itſelf into the Rhine above Baſil, there were above two hundred perſons who employed themſelves in ſtopping the pieces of wood which were driving down towards the city, and that himſelf and four of his friends ſtopped a great deal of it, as a recompenſe for which the Magiſtrates ordered them to be paid four pence a piece, and left them the wood. He takes the city of Baſil, and divers men of learning in particular, to witneſs, that his pretended theft conſiſted only in this (102). He proteſts before God and men, that he had from his youth up a ſingular averſion to lying and ſtealing (103). He concludes with ſaying that he knew the fable of his thieving had been told about in Geneva; but that he had imagined it to be only the diſcourſe of John Calvin's friends, people accuſtomed to ſpread abroad without judgment whatever might defame their patron's enemies. I did not believe, continues he, that you who knew me would give credit to this ſtory, and I could not eaſily have believed you would have publiſhed it, tho' I knew you ſo well. *Putabam ſermones eſſe tuorum, qui de iis à quibus te abhorrere ſciunt, quælibet ſpargere ſolent nullo judicio. Sed te, te (inquam) qui me noſſes, hæc credere non putabam. Ut verò etiam publicato libro in totum orbem, & ad poſteritatem ſpargeres, ita me Deus amet, quamvis te noſſem, non facilè credidiſſem* (104).

(98) Calvin. *in Calumniis Nebulonis*, pag. m. 748. *Tractat. Theolog.*

(99) Caſtalio, *in Defenſ.* pag. 11.

(100) Idem, ibid. pag. 12.

(101) Idem, ibid.

(102) Idem, ibid. pag. 14.

(103) Idem, ibid. pag. 15.

(104) Idem, ibid.

[*K*] *He had a great deal of difficulty to get bread. . . . . Montagne laments the hard fate of this Author.*] They who ſay he employed himſelf by turns in digging the ground, and in inſtructing his ſcholars (105), intended without doubt to inſinuate to us that his fortune was very narrow. Mr. Varillas explains their words in this manner: *Caſtalio*, ſays he (106), *ſtruggled with ill fortune all his life long, and eſpecially after he had been driven from Geneva: his friends aſſiſted him but ſparingly in his extreme indigence; and he complains of it in an ingenious manner to one of them, to whom he dedicates his Moſts, telling him that the oil fell only drop by drop into his lamp. They ſay he was at laſt reduced, by the neceſſity of maintaining his numerous family, to divide his time, and to ſpend the morning in ſtudy, and the reſt of the day in tilling the ground; and that he nevertheleſs died for want, his misfortune having touched no Author with compaſſion except Montagne.*

(105) *Suburbanum prædium ſua ipſe quotidiè manu foderet, ſuſceptamque juventutis erudiendæ curam alterno telluris colendæ labore adæquaret.* Sammarth. *Elog.* lib. 2. pag. 126.

(106) Varillas, *Hiſt. de l'Herefie*, tom. 6. lib. 26. pag. 22.

Is it not a very deplorable thing, that a man ſo full of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, ſhould be ſo poor? He died for want, if we take Scaliger's word for it (107). Thoſe who would ſet the lives of the Ancients and of the Moderns in parallel, ſhould match this man with that Valerius Cato whoſe poverty ſerved Bibaculus for ſport (108): *Vixit ad extremam ſenectam, ſed in ſummâ pauperie, & pene inopiâ, abditus modico gurguſtio, poſtquam Tuſculana villa creditoribus ceſſerat, ut auctor eſt Bibaculus:*

(107) *Mortuus eſt ex pauperiate.* Scaligerana, pag. 46.

(108) Sueton. *de illuſt. Grammat.* cap. 11.

(i) See the Remark [L].

reaſon to believe they do not ſay true (i). I ſhall not have many things to ſay againſt Moreri, or againſt Mr. Varillas, or Mr. Teiſſier [L]. A Remark muſt be made on the

Si quis forte mei domum Catonis,
Depictas minio aſſulas, & illos
Cuſtodis videt hortulos Priapi;
Miratur quibus ille diſciplinis
Tantam ſit ſapientiam aſſecutus,
Quem tres cauliculi, & ſelibra farris,
Racemi duo, tegula ſub una
Ad ſummam prope nutriant ſenectam.

Et idem rurſus:

Catonis modo, Galle, Tuſculanum,
Tota creditor urbe venditabat.
Mirati ſumus unicum magiſtrum,
Summum grammaticum, optimum poëtam,
Omnes ſolvere poſſe quæſtiones,
Unum difficile expedire nomen.
En cor Zenodoti, en jecur Cratetis.

That is,

" He lived to extreme old age, but in the utmoſt " poverty, and almoſt in want of neceſſaries, ſhut " up in a little hut, after his farm at Tuſculum was " ſeized on by his creditors, as Bibaculus writes:

" *If any chance to ſee friend Cato's houſe,*
" *The boards red-painted, and ſmall garden plot,*
" *He needs muſt wonder by what diſcipline*
" *That man ſuch paſſing wiſdom could attain,*
" *Whom colworts three, and half a pound of meal,*
" *With a few grapes, have to old age ſupported,*
" *Under the ſhelter of a ſingle tile.*

" And again;

" *But juſt now, Gallus, Cato's creditors*
" *Put up to ſale his Tuſculan Eſtate.*
" *We wondred that this grand Philoſopher,*
" *This top Grammarian, and this beſt of Poets,*
" *Could ſolve all queſtions, yet ſhould be ſo puzzl'd*
" *To clear one ſingle debt. The quinteſſence*
" *Behold of Crates and Zenodotus!*

However, the words of Montagne deſerve tranſcribing. " I hear, to the great ſhame of our age," ſays he (109), " that in our ſight, two perſons of excellent " learning have died for want of having wherewith to " fill their bellies; Lilius Gregorius Giraldus in Italy, " and Sebaſtian Caſtalio in Germany: and I believe " there are a thouſand men who would have invited " them on advantageous terms, or have aſſiſted them " where they were, if they had known it. The world " is not ſo univerſally corrupted, but that I know a " man, who could wiſh with all his heart that the " means his friends have put into his hands were " employed, ſo long as fortune pleaſes that he ſhall " enjoy them, in ſheltering from neceſſity perſons re- " markable for any valuable qualifications, whom ill " fortune ſometimes perſecutes even to extremity, and " would put them at leaſt in ſuch a condition, that " it ſhould be entirely for want of a juſt way of think- " ing, if they were not contented." Two reaſons have engaged me to copy this paſſage: one is taken from the ſolidity of the reflection which accompanies this curious fact: the other, from the conſideration of the difficulty which the greater part of my Readers, who had a mind to know what Montagne has ſaid, muſt have been under to give themſelves that ſatisfaction; for the Alphabetical Table to his Eſſays would have been no help to them for the finding of this place, and he is not an Author who facilitates the ſearch of what one remembers to have read in his Eſſays, either by the titles of his Chapters, or by the connection of the ſubjects. Local memory knows not what to lay hold on in that Writer. For which reaſon the Table of matters ought to have been much better than it is. *Caſtalio* ſhould have appeared there under his name, or at leaſt under a *Poor Scholar, the Poverty of certain learned perſons*, &c. How ill is that Table made; and how many others are like it!

(109) Montagne, *Eſſais*, liv. 1. chap. 34. pag. m. 353.

[L] *I ſhall not have many things to ſay againſt Moreri, or againſt Mr. Varillas, or Mr. Teiſſier.*] The firſt aſſerts, without any proof, that Caſtalio was of the mountains of Dauphiné (110). Theſe words: *Beza himſelf, who was of his ſide, acknowledges it* (111) *was full of faults, and adds that Caſtillon thought it a matter indifferent to follow any Religion a man had a fancy to*; theſe words, I ſay, are very abſurd, for it is evident to the laſt degree that Theodore Beza was never of the ſame ſide with thoſe who held the indifference of Religions. Beſides, is it not viſible, that having made a Tranſlation of the New Teſtament, he was Caſtalio's rival, and that nobody therefore was ſo much diſpoſed as he to find faults in the Tranſlation of the latter? Add hereto, that he eſpouſed the quarrels of Calvin, the great enemy of Caſtalio, even before the Bible of the latter was publiſhed. Moreri perfectly reſembles thoſe who ſhould ſay, *The Verſion of the New Teſtament by Meſſieurs de Port-Roial is not a good one: Father Bouhours himſelf* (112), *who is of their ſide, acknowledges it to be full of faults.* In a word, it cannot be ſaid, without groſs ignorance, that Theodore Beza thought Caſtalio was of the Reformed Religion. I do not find in the Book cited by Moreri (113), that the indifference of Religions was the hereſy which Beza attributed to Caſtalio.

(110) See the Remark [A].

(111) That is, *Caſtalio's* Tranſlation of the *Bible*.

(112) He has likewiſe made a French Tranſlation of the *New Teſtament*.

(113) *The Life of Calvin*, by *Theod. Beza*.

I ſhall begin my Critique on Varillas with this, ſince he aſſerts that Beza ſays Caſtalio quitted Geneva *becauſe he held all Religions to be indifferent* (114). It is more probable, continues he, *that his ſtyle, which was incomparably more florid than that of Calvin, inſpired him with jealouſy.* Here are two faults; for, in the firſt place, it is not true that Caſtalio equalled Calvin in writing elegant Latin: all who are judges of ſtyle, will readily grant me this. In the ſecond place, Caſtalio had not yet ſhewn the ornamental graces of his pen, when he left Geneva. *He tranſlated* the Scripture *with ſo much delicacy, that the paint appears almoſt every where in his ſtyle, and in ſuch abundance, that it frequently gives diſguſt inſtead of pleaſure.* This propoſition of Varillas is not true; and though it were, yet the following would not be ſo: *It muſt however be owned, in requital, that no other Tranſlation comes near it, for beauty and clearneſs* (115). Is not a man who delivers theſe two judgments of the ſame Tranſlation, an excellent Critic? *He ſeems to ſay in his Argument on the Canticles, that the ſubject is not the myſtical love between Chriſt and his Church; but the ſcandalous amours of Solomon and one of his miſtreſſes* (116). I have fully verified theſe words to be falſe: I find no Argument on the Canticles, either in the French or in the Latin Bible of Caſtalio (117).

(114) Varillas, *Hiſt. de l'Hereſie*, liv. 26. pag. 21.

(115) Ibid. pag. 22.

(116) Ibid.

(117) I have conſulted five Editions.

Mr. Teiſſier (118) is in the wrong to ſay that our Author *always called himſelf* Caſtalio, after the adventure of which I ſhall ſpeak preſently. *He was*, continues he, *firſt a Miniſter at Geneva.* The Atteſtation of Calvin, mentioned above (119), invincibly refutes this, and convicts Theodore Beza of not having obſerved the Laws of Hiſtory, which require that no obſcurity be left in a Relation, with ſufficient exactneſs. He tells us that the city of Geneva being afflicted with the plague in the year 1542, thoſe who were infected wanted a Paſtor whoſe proper office it ſhould be to comfort them (120). Moſt of them were afraid of the contagion; but Calvin, Caſtalio, and Blanchet offered themſelves. The lot fell upon Caſtalio, who nevertheleſs impudently rejected that employment (121). It is natural to conclude from theſe words, that he was one of the Miniſters of Geneva; therefore they have not all the perſpicuity which is neceſſary. The term *Comforter* ſhould have been put inſtead of *Paſtor* which Beza makes uſe of, and in that caſe his readers would have had no room to imagine that Caſtalio was a Miniſter; for tho' a man be not one as yet, he may notwithſtanding offer himſelf to comfort the infected. We may ſee by the abovementioned Atteſtation, that he aſpired to the Miniſtry, and that he would have been admitted to it, had he not maintained certain opinions. I believe, with Dr. Spon, that *he had preached ſometimes* (122); but this only proves that he aſpired to the office of a Paſtor. I conclude that the Jeſuit Garaſſe is as many times miſtaken as he has called him Miniſter. He has done it frequently, and always with groſs

(118) Teiſſier, *Addit. aux Eloges*, tom. 1. pag. 222.

(119) In the Remark [D], Citation (46).

(120) *Paſtoris conſtantis ac ſedu li opera rtquireretur.* Beza, *in Vita Calvini, ad ann.* 1542, pag. m. 371.

(121) Dr. Spon, *Hiſt. de Geneve*, pag. 251. *and* Signor Leti, *Iſtor. Genevr.* tom. 3. pag. 76, do not ſay this.

(122) Spon. *Hiſt. de Geneve*, pag. 251. Note that Signor Leti, *Iſtor. Genevr.* tom. 3. pag. 79, 80, ſays expreſly that Caſtalio *was a Miniſter.*

the name *Caſtalio* [*M*]. I might make another, but I will not, on the imprudence of this learned man. If he had kept within the bounds of his profeſſion, he would have done more conſiderable ſervice to the Commonwealth of Learning than he has, as Peter Ramus has well obſerved [*N*], and would have ſecured himſelf from a thouſand vexations. Inſtead of that, he ſet up for godlineſs and devotion, and medled with the moſt nice and obſcure queſtions in Divinity. He ſhould have left them to thoſe they belonged to by virtue of their office, or if he muſt needs thruſt himſelf into ſuch ſort of buſineſs, he ſhould have applied Eſop's advice (*k*) to himſelf. I have heard people who paſſed for wiſe ſay, that not having regulated his conduct according to that advice, he did the ſame thing which is ſaid of the laſt Duke of Burgundy, with reſpect to his irruption into Germany (*l*).

(*l*) *While he ran his head againſt that potent Germanic body, which is all of iron.* Mezerai, *Abregé Chronol.* tom. 3. pag. m. 325. at the year 1475; add hereto the *fragilem truci commiſit pelago ratem* of Horace, Ode 3. Book 1.

(*k*) Ναι ευγε, ſaid he to Solon, either not to approach Kings, or elſe to ſay nothing to them but what may pleaſe. Plutarch. *in Solone.* Mr. Bayle quotes Mr. Dacier's Tranſlation, pag. 461, of the Dutch edition.

groſs abuſes. Here is an example of it: "We hear "that Sebaſtian Caſtalio, who was by trade a Carpen- "ter (113), has really *hewed the holy Scripture*, if his "daughters have ſpun it; this ſorry fellow, of a very "mechanical and ſervile turn of mind, and fit to be "a Miniſter, as indeed he was, beſides his vocation of "a Carpenter, has ſo planed the Scripture, and ſpoiled "it in ſo many important paſſages, that he makes us "juſtly apprehenſive of ſeeing the Bible reſigned and "given up into the hands of mechanics and idi- "ots (124)."

(123) This is a fact of which I am very uncertain.

(124) Garaſſe, *Doctrine Curieuſe*, pag. 506, 507.

Mr. Teiſſier ſuppoſes that Caſtalio was baniſhed: this is contrary to the Atteſtation of Calvin, and note that Sig. Leti relates that Caſtalio being threatened with baniſhment and depoſition, in caſe of a relapſe, waited not the effects of thoſe menaces, but retired to Baſil (125). Of the three cauſes of his exile aſſigned by Mr. Teiſſier, two are falſe ones: for his Preface to the Verſion of the Bible, and his Notes on the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, were not made till ſeveral years after his retreat from Geneva. All the Authors whom I have conſulted ſay, as Beza does, that he retired directly to Baſil. Mr. Teiſſier is the only one whom I have read, who ſays he retired to Bern, and that he was expelled thence on account of his errors.

(125) Leti, *Iſtor. Geneur.* pag. 80.

[*M*] *A remark muſt be made on the name* Caſtalio.] He owns that in his younger days he ſuffered himſelf to be drawn to vanity. *Inſoleſcebat animus ſtulta quadam & juvenili perſuaſione cognitionis earum ſcientiarum, & linguarum, quibus ſæpe ſolent earum ſtudioſi plus tribuere quàm ſpiritui* (126). i. e. "My mind "grew vain from a fooliſh and youthful perſuaſion of "my ſkill in thoſe ſciences and tongues, to which they "who are fond of them uſually attribute more than "to the ſpirit." He produces this proof of it. When I was at Lyons, before I went to you (127) at Straſburgh, ſomebody by miſtake called me Caſtalio, inſtead of Caſtellio. I was highly delighted with it, calling to remembrance the fountain Caſtalius which was conſecrated to the Muſes: thereupon I became in love with that falſe name, I preferred it to that of my family, and I adorned my ſelf with it at the head of a work. *Quod ego nomen audiens, à Muſarum fonte Caſtalio derivatum, adamavi, atque amplexus ſum, meque, omiſſo deinceps Caſtellionis nomine patrio, Caſtalionem appellavi. Quin etiam hoc idem nomen primis mei Prodromi literis primorum verſuum conſignavi, videlicet, ut eſſet inſignior etiam ad poſteros mea ſuperbia. Eram enim, ſi Muſis placet, Poëta, & Græcæ planè levitatis Muſopatagus* *. *Hæc ego confiteor, & execror, nec ſolum nunc confitens erubeſco, verùm etiam antea ſæpe ſolus cogitans, cùm me majorem veri cognitionem adeptum conſcientia pro mille teſtibus accuſaret, pudore ſuffuſus ſum. Itaque deinceps omiſſa illa gloriola Græca, nactus, quam ſæpe optavi, occaſionem mutandi, patrio me nomine Caſtellionem appellari cupio* (128). i. e. "Which name "when I heard, derived from the Caſtalian ſpring of "the Muſes, I grew in love with it, and embraced "it, and laying aſide my paternal name Caſtellio, "thenceforward called myſelf Caſtalio. I alſo ſet "this name at the beginning of the firſt verſes of my "*Prodromus*, that my pride might be the more con- "ſpicuous to poſterity. For I was a Poet, and pleaſe "the Muſes, and a moſt vain and obſtreperous Reciter "of my verſes. All this I acknowledge, and de- "teſt, nor is it the firſt time I have confeſſed and "bluſhed at it, having oftentimes before been covered "with confuſion, when I reflected thereon in private, "and conſcience, on a nearer acquaintance with truth, "accuſed me as ſtrongly as a thouſand witneſſes. "Wherefore laying aſide for the future this little Gre- "cian vanity, having met with an opportunity, which "I had often wiſhed for, of making the change, I de- "ſire to be called by my paternal name Caſtellio." The end of this paſſage ſhews us that he did not perſiſt in that little vanity, and that he returned to his true name. In the title of his French Bible he calls himſelf *Sebaſtian Chateillon*.

(126) Caſtell. *Defenſ.* pag. 21.

* Μυσοπάταγος Recitator clamoſus, vel perſonare omnia faciens, ſive verſificator obſtreperus.

(128) Caſtell. *Defenſ.* See the *Scaligerana prima*, pag. m. 41.

[*N*] *If he had kept within the bounds of his profeſſion, he would have done more conſiderable ſervice to the Commonwealth of Learning, as Peter Ramus has well obſerved.*] I ſet down his words, that they may ſerve for a Supplement to the Collections of Sir Tho. Pope Blount (129). *Utinam tanti ingenii tamque bonis artibus ac literis eruditi vis illa in hoc unico Græcæ profeſſionis argumento verſari maluiſſet, nihil mea quidem ſententia in iſto genere laudis Baſilea comparandum habuiſſet* (130). i. e. "I wiſh the force of ſo great a "genius, and ſo excellently learned, had choſen to "confine itſelf wholly to the profeſſion of the Greek "Tongue; Baſil, in my opinion, would have had "nothing comparable in that kind of merit." It is thus that Ramus ſpeaks, after having mentioned ſome Books which Caſtalio had tranſlated.

(127) He directs his diſcourſe to Calvin.

(129) He has not cited this paſſage of *Ramus* in his *Cenſura Authorum*, pag. 493, where he collects the Judgments on *Caſtalio*.

(130) Petrus Ramus, *in Baſilea*, pag. m. 52.

CASTELLANUS (*a*) (PETER) Great Almoner of France in the ſixteenth Century, was a very worthy and learned man. His father, who was a younger brother to a Walloon Gentleman, bore arms all his life-time, and ſettled at Archi in Burgundy [*A*]. He

(*a*) His true name was *Du Chaſtel.*

[*A*] *His father . . . younger brother to a Walloon Gentleman, ſettled at Archi in Burgundy* (*a*).] If Gallandius did not pay a mere compliment to his friend with regard to his extraction, the Author of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches, and Moreri have been very much in the wrong. According to Gallandius Caſtellanus (*Du Chatel*) was not only a Nobleman, but of a very ancient family (1), and the ſon of a brave Knight, *Eques Auratus magna ſcientiæ militaris & fortitudinis laude ſtipendia fecit* (2). That is, "He was a Knight, and ſerved in the Armies, with "great reputation as well for his ſkill in military af- "fairs, as for his courage." Beza ſpeaks of him quite in another manner. *This good Biſhop*, ſays he (3), *ſurnamed Chatelain, was of a very mean extraction.* And Moreri ſuppoſes, that Francis I having aſked Caſtellanus, *whether he was a Gentleman*, the latter replied, that *he did not well know from which of Noah's three ſons, who were in the Ark, he was deſcended.* This is inconſiſtent with Gallandius's account. Obſerve alſo that all thoſe, who mention Caſtellanus's native place, ſuppoſe that he was born at Langres, and yet Gallandius gives him a native place much more obſcure. It is a common thing for the learned, who are born in ſome village, to borrow a ſurname from the neareſt city. Thus a man was ſurnamed *Aurelianenſis* (from Orleans) tho' he was not born at Orleans, but in the neighbourhood. I imagine that for the like reaſon Caſtellanus was ſurnamed *Lingonenſis*,

(1) Petrus Gallandius, *in Vita Caſtell.* pag. 1.
(2) Ibid. pag. 2.
(3) Beze, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* liv. 2. pag. 80.

(*a*) Mr. de la Monoye has obſerved, in the fourth volume of the *Menagiana*, p. 124, of the Paris Edition 1729, that there is neither city nor town called *Archi* in Burgundy, and that theſe words in Gallandius *Archii in Burgundia*, ſhould be tranſlated *Arc in Barrois* or in the Dutchy of Bar; and the Abbot Papillon aſſerts, that this was really the native place of Caſtellanus, who was ſurnamed Lingonenſis, only becauſe he belonged to the Dioceſe of Langres (*a*). CRIT. REM.]

(*a*) From the Remarks printed at the end of Mr. Bayle's Dictionary, Paris edition.

He married there, and had two ſons, of whom our Peter Caſtellanus was the youngeſt; this child had the misfortune to loſe his father and mother before he came to years of diſcretion, and his guardians took very little care both of his eſtate and of his education; however in the eleventh year of his age he was ſent to Dijon, to ſtudy under a famous Tutor (*b*), and made ſuch a conſiderable progreſs as amazed his teachers. He learned the Greek Tongue without the aſſiſtance of any maſter; and he had not been above ſix years at Dijon, when he was choſen to teach a form there [*B*]. He diſcharged his duty in that ſtation in ſuch a manner as was very honourable to him, and he met very ſoon with a good opportunity to diſplay his wit and genius in a full audience [*C*]. He afterwards travelled in order to ſatisfy the deſire he had of being acquainted with the learned men, and eſpecially with Eraſmus. He went firſt into Germany, where he ſaw ſeveral men of letters, and ſtopt at laſt at Baſil to continue with Eraſmus [*D*], who having ſoon diſcovered that this young man had a great ſtock of learning, recommended him to

(*b*) His name was *Peter Turreau*, in Latin *Turrellus*. See the Remarks [*B*] and [*C*].

[*B*] *He had not been above ſix years at Dijon, when he was choſen to teach a form there.*] Beza was not ill informed with regard to this particular. *He was firſt*, ſays he (4), *a teacher at Dijon under Peter Turreau, who paſſed for one of the greateſt Soothſayers in his time.*

(4) Beze, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſtique*, liv. 2. pag. 80.

[*C*] *He met very ſoon with an opportunity to diſplay his wit and genius in a full Audience.*] We have ſeen juſt now that Peter Turreau paſſed for a great Soothſayer. He was proſecuted for it, and was in danger of being condemned as guilty of a crime committed both againſt the Laws of God, and thoſe of men. *Turellus præceptor impietatis accuſaretur, quod contra jura canonica & civilia, contraque ſacras literas ex Aſtris fata hominibus eventura prædicere diceretur* (5). That is, "Turreau was accuſed of impiety, becauſe it was ſaid, "that he told people their fortune by the Stars, againſt "the Canon and civil Laws, and againſt the holy "Scriptures." Caſtellanus full of gratitude for his Maſter, pleaded his cauſe with ſo much ſtrength, that he was acquitted. He diſcourſed with a great deal of learning and eloquence upon Aſtrology, and the divinations depending upon it; he ſhewed that ſome are very innocent, and ſome very criminal; but that Turreau did not meddle with the latter. This is the ſubſtance of his plea in Gallandius. Caſtellanus's youth rendred his diſcourſe more worthy of admiration, and no doubt but the Judges imagined, they ought to have a very great regard for the extraordinary merit of ſuch an Advocate. *Ipſe ſingulari pietate præditus, calore juvenili effervescens, veluti egregius ciconiæ parenti nutritia perſolvens pullus, defenſionem ſui præceptoris profeſſus ad Judicum ſubſellia laureatus acceſſit* (6). . . *Quem ita diſſerentem incomparabili quadam eloquentia & animi magna incitatione cum audiviſſent Judices, qui ad ſævitiam inflammati, ut ferè fit in rebus, quæ ad religionem ſpectant, ad damnandum reum ad tribunal venerant, ita ſtupentes & attoniti redditi ſunt, ut vix verbum ullum proloqui poſſent. . . Ita eo perorante & vultu & animo immutati ſunt, ut non modo de abſolutione Turrelli, ſed etiam de adoleſcente generoſo & diſerto laude & præmio ornando cogitarent. Inter quos cum ſederet Boudetus Lingonenſis antiſtes, homo doctus, advocatis aliquot Theologis, adoleſcentem non vulgariter laudavit, & honorario munere donatum dimiſit.* i. e. "He, who had a very great re- "gard for his Maſter, and was animated with a youth- "ful eagerneſs, as a noble young ſtork, which feeds "his dam, undertook to plead the cauſe of his Ma- "ſter, and came before the Bench of the Judges his "head crowned with laurels. . . . He pleaded with ſo "incomparable an eloquence and with ſo much zeal, "that they, who being inclined to ſeverity, as it ge- "nerally happens in ſuch affairs as relate to Religion, "were come to the Court with an intention to con- "demn the priſoner, were ſo ſurprized and aſtoniſhed, "that they could not ſpeak a word. . . His diſcourſe "changed their countenance and their reſolution to ſuch "a degree, that they not only reſolved to quit Tur- "reau, but alſo to honour the noble and eloquent "youth with praiſes and rewards. Amongſt the "Judges ſate Boudet Biſhop of Langres, a learned "man, who having adviſed with ſome Divines, not "only beſtowed uncommon praiſes on the young man, "but even made him an honourable preſent."

(5) Gallandus, *in Vita Caſtell.* pag. 13.

(6) Idem, ibid.

(7) Idem. pag. 18, 19.

[*D*] *He ſtopt at Baſil to continue with Eraſmus.*] Beza was not unacquainted with this journey of Caſtellanus, but it ſeems he has been miſtaken as to the time of it; he thought that Caſtellanus did not go to Baſil but after he had ſtudied the Law at Bourges under Andrew Alciat, whereas he ſhould have ſaid that he went to ſtudy the Law at Bourges after his journey to Baſil. *From Bourges he went to ſtudy at Baſil, where he made ſome progreſs in Philoſophy and in Divinity, living with Sebaſtian Munſter the Rector* (8). This is not at all mentioned in his Life; on the contrary, it is obſerved there, that he left Baſil, when the Catholic Religion was exploded thence, and after he had openly preached againſt a ſeditious Miniſter. *Secuta Baſileæ & aliis in Germaniæ locis tragica e templis imaginum exturbatione, & variis de Religione tumultibus exortis, cum Eraſmum, Baſilea relicta, Friburgum proficiſcentem animadverteret, ipſe quoque (poſtquam publicè concionatorem ſtudioſum confutaſſet) in quietiora paratioraque loca demigrare ſtatuit* (9). i. e. "The images hav- "ing afterwards been miſerably thrown out of the "Temples at Baſil, and in other places of Germany, "and ſeveral tumults having been raiſed on the ac- "count of Religion, Caſtellan finding that Eraſ- "mus was going to leave Baſil and to retire to Fri- "burg, he alſo (after he had publickly confuted a ſe- "ditious Preacher) reſolved to retire to a more quiet "place." If it could be ſaid, that Caſtellanus went twice to Baſil, it would reconcile the oppoſite accounts of Gallandius and Beza. There is a Letter from Eraſmus to Caſtellanus (10), which ſeems to favour the opinion of thoſe, who would think that the latter was twice at Baſil. He had been there before the Roman Catholic Religion was quite exploded thence, which happened in the year 1529. Gallandius aſſerts it; and he was there in the year 1531, as may be concluded, it ſeems, from the Letter, which Eraſmus wrote to him from Friburg September the 14th, after the printing of his Apophthegms. Now the Dedication of that Work is dated February the 26th 1531, and the Letter of Eraſmus, which I mentioned, contains the Author's thanks for the praiſes, which Caſtellanus had beſtowed upon him in a Letter on account of theſe Apophthegms: it follows therefore, that Eraſmus's Letter could not have been written before the month of September 1531. That letter ſhews, that Caſtellanus lived then, not far from Friburg; it mentions ſome partridges, which Caſtellanus had ſent to Eraſmus (11); it teſtifies that Caſtellanus would be very welcome whenever he would go and eat a fowl with Eraſmus. *Si tantus eſt amor in me tuus, ornatiſſime juvenis, ut juvet etiam cum umbra colloqui, iſtius quidem voluptatis ſcito tibi paratam fore copiam, quoties erit commodum. Quod ſi quando poſſis iſtam ſi non tragicam, certe ſplendidam perſonam, quam tibi fortuna impoſuit deponere, & uno Claudio Alberico velut Achate comitatus ad pullum ſimul lacerandum, venire familiariter, aut etiam invocatus, ſi libet, obrepere, quemadmodum Naſica ſolet Ennio, juvaret interdum tali contubernio repubeſcere.* i. e. "If you love me ſo much, moſt accompliſh'd youth, "that you delight to converſe even with a ſhadow, you "may have that pleaſure, whenever you will be at lei- "ſure. And if you can caſt off that, if not awful, yet ma- "jeſtic air, with which fortune endowed you, and "come freely with Claudius Albericus as with a faith- "ful Achates, to eat a chicken together, or even ſteal "upon us without being invited, as Naſica does in "Ennius, I ſhould be glad to grow young again by ſuch "a gueſt as you are." All this might very well intimate that Caſtellanus lived then at Baſil, in which caſe Beza was not miſtaken. Another Letter dated February the 7th 1532 (12) informs us, that Caſtellanus had met with a Biſhop, for his patron, and that he

(8) Beze, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* liv. 2. pag. 80.

(9) Gallandius, *in Vita Caſtellani.* pag. 21.

(10) It is the 23d of the 27th book.

(11) *De perdicibus jam iterum miſſis habeo gratiam.* Eraſm. *Epiſt.* 23. lib. 27. pag. 1516.

(12) *Septimo Idus Februarii, MDXXXI, juxta veſtram ſupputationem.* Eraſm. *Epiſt* 24. lib. 26. pag. 1437.

to Frobenius, who took him to correct the proof-ſheets of the Greek and Latin Authors, which he printed (*c*). This was alſo an advantage for Eraſmus, who by Caſtellanus's advice corrected ſeveral errors, which otherwiſe would have remained in his works [*E*]. They left Baſil together, when the Roman Religion was entirely aboliſhed there. Eraſmus retired to Friburg; and Caſtellanus returned into France; he deſigned to take a journey to Italy, when he was deſired by ſome perſons of Dijon, to be Tutor to ſome young ſcholars, whom their relations deſigned to ſend to Bourges, to ſtudy the Law under the famous Alciat. They, who begged this favour of Caſtellanus, were the chief Members of the Parliament of Burgundy; he granted their requeſt, but as the young men were not yet ready to be committed to his care, he employed himſelf in the mean time in two things of a very different nature; he read publick Lectures upon the Greek Text of St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Romans, and made love in private to his landlord's daughter; or to ſpeak more properly, that girl, who was very beautiful, courted and tempted him to ſuch a degree, that he could not reſiſt her dangerous allurement. When he perceived that ſhe was with child, he told it her mother, begged her pardon, and humbly deſired her to do her beſt endeavours, that her daughter might be delivered ſo ſecretly, that no body might hear of it. The kind mother complied with his requeſt, and managed the whole affair with ſo much diſcretion and prudence, that even her huſband heard nothing of it. A year after this girl was brought to bed, ſhe was married to a man of her own rank, and given for a pure virgin [*F*]. As for the boy of which ſhe was

(*c*) *Eum Frobenio commendavit, atque ut honeſto loco & ſtipendio ſibi in emendandis Græcis Latiniſque exemplaribus adjutor eſſet, effecit.* Gallandius, *in Vita Petri Caſtellani*, pag. 20.

he had wrote to Eraſmus, he would ſoon leave Paris. This Biſhop was no doubt the ſame with him whom Gallandius mentions; he was of the family of the *Tonnerre's*, and Biſhop elect of Poitiers. Caſtellanus had taught him polite Literature at Bourges, and accompanied him afterwards to Paris. *Utebatur familiariter Comite Tonorienſi, Epiſcopo Pictavienſi deſignato, qui tum in eodem legum ſtudio Alciato quoque operam dabat, quem etiam politioris doctrinæ literas Græcas & Latinas ſubceſivis horis docebat. . . Percurſo legum veluti ſtudio cum eo Epiſcopo Lutetiam reverſus* (13). i. e. "He was an "intimate friend of the Count de Tonnerres, Biſhop "elect of Poitiers, who ſtudied then alſo the Law "under Alciat. Caſtellanus taught him polite Lite-"rature at his leiſure hours . . and having gone thro' "his ſtudies of the Law, he returned with him to "Paris." The difficulty is, that we cannot meet in Peter Gallandius's account with any vacant time, in which this ſecond journey to Baſil can be placed, after Caſtellanus had finiſhed his ſtudies at Bourges. For from Bourges Gallandius ſends his friend to Paris with the Biſhop elect; then he makes him go to Rome with a Biſhop of Auxerre. Let us obſerve that we find, from two Letters of Eraſmus to Caſtellanus, that they both wrote a very bad hand. Eraſmus ſeems to be very ſorry, that he did not make a better uſe of Caſtellanus's aſſiſtance, whilſt they were together, but Caſtellanus was very well ſatisfied with Eraſmus's kindneſs and civility to him. *Quod mihi ſubinde occinis, comitatem, humanitatem, atque etiam merita neſcio quæ in te mea, uſque adeo nihil eorum agnoſco, ut me mei pudeat, quoties mecum reputo quam parvam habuerim, quum apud nos eſſes, tuæ dignitatis rationem. Sed ita eſt hominum ingenium, præſentem virtutem, ſi non odimus, ut ait Flaccus, certe negligimus, ſublatam ex oculis quærimus invidi, aut ſi minus invidi, certe incogitantes. Quo magis admiror ſingularem iſtius ingenii candorem, qui toties prædices humanitatem meam, cujus Scythicam inhumanitatem merito poſſes incuſare: neque gravabor hanc culpam ſarcire pro viribus, ſi vel ſeſe dederit occaſio, vel tu ſubmonueris quibus in rebus tibi poſſim commodare* (14). i. e. "You mention very often my civility and kindneſs "to you, and even my good offices; but all this is ſo "unknown to me, that I am aſhamed, when I think, "how little regard I had for your merit, when "you was at my houſe. But this is the genius of "men; virtue, when preſent, is, if not hated, yet "deſpiſed by us, as Horace ſays, and when abſent, "we enquire after it out of envy, or if not out of "envy, at leaſt without much reflection. Wherefore "I ſo much more wonder at your candor, for ſo much "commending my civility to you, whereas you might "juſtly upbraid me with a ſavage rudeneſs. I would "be glad to make amends for it, if any opportunity "offers, or if you would yourſelf hint to me in what "I can ſerve you."

(13) Galland. *in Vita Caſtell.* pag. 25.

(14) Eraſm. *Epiſt.* 24. lib. 26. pag. 1436.

[*E*] *By Caſtellanus's advice Eraſmus corrected ſeveral errors, which otherwiſe would have remained in his work.*] Eraſmus's railleries againſt the French raiſed ſuch an emulation in Peter Caſtellanus, that he ſtudied the Greek Tongue and Divinity and all parts of Literature, day and night. With ſuch an application, together with his genius and natural talents, he could not but acquire a great deal of learning, by which he ſoon diſcovered, that Eraſmus was not extremely well ſkilled in the Greek Tongue. Beſides Eraſmus ſpent ſo little time in the compoſing of his Books, that he could not but commit ſome blunders. It was a happineſs for him, that his works went thro' the hands of ſo learned a Corrector as Caſtellanus was. *Hic Juvenis Eraſmicæ Gloriæ emulatione, & ejus falſis in ingenia Gallica, quibus parum in literis tribuebat, cavillationibus incenſus, noctes & dies in Græcarum Literarum, Theologiæque atque omnis humanioris doctrinæ commentatione ita verſabatur, ut Eraſmum ſatis præcipitanter commentantem* (15), *& e Græco non probe intellecta in Latinum ſermonem male vertentem, frequenter ſuorum erratorum admoneret. Quæ ille, qui plurimum Caſtellani opera uteretur, cum agnoſcere, atque emendare ejus admonitu cogeretur, plurimum illi tribuebat atque deferebat. Memini Caſtellanum mihi frequenter dicere, Eraſmum in literis Græcis ſupra vulgus tum parum promoviſſe, in auctoribus, qui ab uſu communi remoti eſſent, inſigniter hæſitaſſe. Itaque quæ ex illis vertebat aut commentabatur, majore ex parte adjuvantibus doctis, qui ei hanc operam navabant, præſtitiſſe* (16).

(15) See above, the Article BUDEUS, Quotation (61).

(16) Gallandius, *in Vita Caſtell.* pag. 20.

[*F*] *His landlord's daughter . . . courted him, . . was with child, . . . was married, ... and given for a pure virgin.*] The queſtion is, whether the next day, the huſband agreed, that Agar was very much in the right to ſay, that *there are three things which are wonderful, yea four which I know not, the way of an Eagle in the air, the way of a ſerpent upon a rock, the way of a ſhip in the midſt of the ſea, and the way of a man with a maid* (17). Who knows, but in the enjoyment he repeated to himſelf the following lines of Lucretius?

(17) Proverb. 18, 19.

Avia Pieridum peragro loca nullius ante
Trita ſolo; juvat integros accedere fontes,
Atque haurire, juvatque novos decerpere flores,
Inſignemque meo capiti petere inde coronam,
Unde prius nulli velarint tempora Muſæ (18).

(18) Lucret. lib. 4. *init.* Compare this with the *Rem non novam*, of the Remark [*B*] in the Article BULGARUS.

Laſtly, who knows but ſome ſkilful Anatomiſt had forewarned him againſt all events, by ſome diſcourſe like this? *Gentlemen, if you meet with no obſtacle in your paſſage, if the victory be not bloody, yet you ought not to have the leaſt ſuſpicion to the advantage of your ſpouſes. Believe me, in ſuch an occaſion, as in many others, a pleaſing error is better than a diſagreeable truth.* This is what the Sieur Lami told his audience in a Lecture on Anatomy (19).

(19) Lami, *Diſcourſ. Anatom.* pag. m. 89.

Somebody may perhaps imagine, that it is not at all probable, Gallandius ſhould have ſaid, that Caſtellanus his friend got his landlord's own daughter with child; for it ſeems that this landlord was the father of Caſtellanus's diſciple, in which caſe the crime would have been ſo heinous, that the Hiſtorian would certainly have paſſed it over in ſilence, not to expoſe his friend's reputation. I ſhall therefore tranſcribe

was delivered, Caſtellanus's brother took it, and educated it as his own ſon. The time for conducting the young ſcholars to Bourges being come, Caſtellanus accompanied them thither, and ſtudied the Law, in which he made a conſiderable progreſs; yet he was not ſo much taken up with that kind of ſtudy, but he could ſpare time to apply himſelf alſo to the *Belles-Lettres*. His application and diligence were very ſurpriſing [G]. He ſtill deſired to ſee Italy, and had ſoon an opportunity to ſatisfy himſelf; for the Biſhop of Auxerre, who was going Embaſſador into Italy, would have him accompany him in the quality of a learned man belonging to him. He did not make a long ſtay at Rome, where nothing almoſt pleaſed him, but the remains of Antiquity [H]: he went to Venice, and found an employment fit for him in the capital City of the Iſland of Cyprus. The Biſhop and the inhabitants of that City were enquiring for a man who underſtood Greek and Latin, and could teach polite Literature: they offered Caſtellanus a penſion of two hundred crowns; he accepted it, and read Lectures in their City for two years with great ſucceſs; ſo that they were very ſorry when he left them to go into Egypt. He

here the words of the original, that I may not be thought to have put a falſe ſenſe upon them. *Verſabatur in ædibus honorati & primarii cujuſdam civis, cui puella erat forma admodum venuſta & eleganti, a qua frequenter multis illecebris ad amores & voluptatem invitabatur. Itaque etſi ea erat virtutis & continentiæ indole, ut . . . tantis tamen puellæ blandimentis, quibus non modo adoleſcentia lubrica, verum etiam ætas corroborata caperetur, captus, eam gravidam reddidit. Quod ubi cognovit, nihil antiquius ducens quàm ut cui juvenili cupiditate incenſus ſtuprum obtulerat, citra ignominiam, quantum fieri poſſet, conſuleret, ſenili quadam prudentia ad matrem acceſſit, culpam confeſſus, & veniam precatus, per omnia ſacra rogare cæpit honeſta aliqua occaſione, in eum locum filiam abduceret, ubi citra infamiæ notam clam parere, & citra turpitudinis ſuſpiciones in ædes paternas reduci poſſet. Quod ita matris prudentia adminiſtratum eſt, ut non modo alios, ſed & patrem ipſum flagitium latuerit, & anno poſtquam puella enixa eſt, in matrimonium honeſtiſſime collocata ſit* (20). You ſee that Gallandius very plainly hints, that Caſtellanus lodged at the girl's father's; for if he meant only, that Caſtellanus viſited her often, the expreſſion he makes uſe of (21), would have been at leaſt improper, becauſe it might be underſtood in a manner very diſhonourable to Caſtellanus. It is a phraſe, of which the moſt natural, moſt common and moſt reaſonable ſenſe, is that which I put upon it; it leads us directly to a notion, which aggravates Caſtellanus's crime, tho' his Hiſtorian has carefully avoided to make uſe of any expreſſion, which might intimate that Caſtellanus was a domeſtic tutor in the family of his miſtreſs. I own that on the other hand, it would be more difficult to excuſe him, if he had not lived under the ſame roof with her; for in that caſe, he would have ſought himſelf for the opportunities, which he ought to have avoided; but living in the ſame houſe with his fair tempter, the opportunities offered whether he would or not. The Author of his life thinks, that he acted very prudently, in the care he took to ſave the girl's reputation. *Quæ tanta in conſulendo honori puellæ prudentia, & tegendo flagitio induſtria me adduxit, ut ne hanc quidem adoleſcentiæ labem ſilentio prætereundam eſſe exiſtimaverim* (22). i. e. "His great prudence "in taking care of the girl's reputation, and his "pains in hiding the crime, made me think, "that I ought not to omit this fault of his younger "years." But there is nothing in all this, that deſerves the leaſt commendation. He ſhould have begun, with acquainting the mother not with her daughter's being with child, but with the girl's bad inclination; otherwiſe it was doing like thoſe, of whom it is truly ſaid, that *they act and then they think*. It happened luckily for Caſtellanus, that Beza, and the other writers on the Proteſtant ſide, knew nothing of this ſtory.

(20) Galland. *in Vita Caſtell.* pag. 21, 22.

(21) *Verſari in ædibus.*

(22) Galland. *in Vita Caſtell.* pag. 23.

[G] *His application and diligence were very ſurprizing.*] He ſlept ſcarce three hours a night; he uſed to lay himſelf down on the ground without any other pillow but his night-gown, in which he wrapped up his head; and as ſoon as he waked, he run with the utmoſt eagerneſs to his Books. In vain did his friends adviſe him not to apply himſelf ſo much; he would not hearken to ſuch advice (23). When he was made reader to the King, he again ſtudied with the ſame application, and that he might have more time to ſpare for his ſtudies, he never dined, but took a piece of bread at eight in the morning, and ſupped at five of the clock in the afternoon. He waited upon the King when he went to bed, and did not retire till the King was aſleep. Then he went to reſt four hours for the utmoſt, and then ſtudied without interruption till ten of the clock, when the King uſed to go to his Devotion. *Hanc perſonam ubi tanti Regis judicio & voluntate ſibi impoſitam eſſe vidit, noctes & dies, veluti Prometheus Caucaſo, ſe rurſum libris affixit, nullum non auctorum genus in omnibus linguis ita manibus pervolutavit, ut in ſingulis totam vitam contriviſſe quivis etiam exercitatiſſimus eum diceret* (24). i. e. "When he ſaw "this place conferred upon him by the judgment, and "good pleaſure of ſo great a King, he again fixed him-"ſelf to his Books day and night, as Prometheus on "the Caucaſus, and ſtudied all kinds of Authors with "ſo much application, that even the moſt learned "men would have thought that he ſpent all his life "upon every ſingle one of them." *Tres ipſe horas, quatuor ad ſummum dormiebat, quibus exactis nocte intempeſta, excitatus in horam decimam, donec Rex Sacris operaretur, in literarum ſtudia indefeſſus incumbebat* (25).

(23) Ibid. pag. 25.

(24) Idem, ibid. pag. 41.

(25) Idem, ibid. pag. 42.

[H] *He did not make a long ſtay at Rome, where nothing almoſt pleaſed him, but the remains of antiquity* (26).] The corruption of morals he obſerved at the Court of Rome, ſcandalized him to ſuch a degree, that even ſeveral years afterwards, he could not think nor ſpeak of it, without the utmoſt concern. He went ſo far, as to believe, that at Rome Religion was nothing but a mere ſhew, which ſerved only to impoſe upon mankind, and to keep up the authority of the Pope. Calvin did not go much farther; Calvin, I ſay, who has been ſo much inſulted, and treated as a Calumniator for having wrote the following words. *The firſt article of their ſecret Theology*, he ſpeaks of the Popes and the Cardinals, *which is admitted amongſt them, is that there is no God. The ſecond, that all that is written or preached concerning Jeſus Chriſt is nothing but untruth and deceit. The third, that what the Scriptures teach of eternal life and the reſurrection of the body, are mere fables* (27). Compare this with the following paſſage from Caſtellanus's life, and you will not find a great difference between theſe two paſſages. *Memini eum aliquando, cum Pontificum Romanorum ſupinas libidines, avaritiam & rapacitatem, religionis contemptum, ſuperbiamque Cardinalium, luxum, ignaviam, nundinationeſque, cauponationes, & flagitia reliqua aulicorum Romanenſium deſcriberet, & cætera, quæ tunc vidiſſet commemoraret, ita animo concitari, & indignatione commoveri conſueviſſe, ut ei non modo in facie color, ſed & toto corpore geſtus motuſque immutarentur; ut etiam mihi frequenter diceret, ſibi eſſe perſuaſiſſimum, ne Pontifices quidem Romanos, Religionis & ſacrorum antiſtites, tot ſuis ſuorumque flagitiis ſceleribuſque contaminatos, vere & ex animo Chriſtum colere, quæ autem in Religione facerent, retinendæ dominationis cauſa, veluti larva ad fallendum appoſita, egregiè ſimulare* (28). i. e. "I remember, that ſometimes when he deſcribed the "lewdneſs, avarice, and extorſions of the Popes, the "haughtineſs of the Cardinals and their contempt "for Religion, the luxury, indolence, trading, ſimony, "and the other crimes of the Roman Courtiers, with "the other diſorders he had obſerved in that city, "he uſed to be in ſuch a paſſion, and ſo full of indigna-"tion, that not only his face, but even all the motions "and the whole geſture of his body were altered. He "uſed often to tell me, that he was firmly perſuaded the "Popes

(26) *Cum omnia fere, præter Antiquitatis veſtigia quædam improbaret.* Galland. *Vita Caſtell.* pag. 27.

(27) *Inſtitut.* liv. 4. chap. 7. num. 27. Quoted by Jean Hay, *Défenſe des Demandes*, pag. m. 27.

(28) Galland. *in Vita Caſtell.* pag. 27.

He travelled through that country like a man of ſenſe, for by his obſervations he qualified himſelf to ſpeak of every thing that concerned Egypt, as though he had lived there all his life-time. Having been told, that the Sieur de la Forêt his moſt Chriſtian Majeſty's Embaſſador at Conſtantinople treated the French there with the utmoſt kindneſs, he had a mind to ſee that City; and in his journey thither he ſtaid two months at Jeruſalem. Monſieur de la Forêt conceived a very great eſteem for him, and recommended him effectually to Francis I, and to ſeveral Lords of the French Court. Cardinal Du Bellai, and ſome other Noblemen recommended him to the ſame Prince as a very learned man; and Caſtellanus himſelf confirmed the teſtimonies they had given of him in the converſations he had with the King, with which the King was ſo well pleaſed, that whilſt he was at dinner or at ſupper, he made Caſtellanus diſcourſe to him of a thouſand different things [*I*]. Some time after he made him his Reader, which place had been filled before by Colin [*K*], who fell under his Majeſty's diſgrace. This obliged Caſtellanus to ſtudy more than ever, in order to make himſelf more capable to anſwer all his maſter's queſtions, who was a great lover of the *Belles-Lettres*. He read him to ſleep every night, by explaining to him ſome paſſages of the Ancients (*d*); he alſo ſpent ſome hours in inſtructing Princeſs Margaret that Prince's daughter. He employed the favour he enjoyed for the good and improvement of the Sciences, and cauſed ſome very good regulations to be made to the advantage of the Profeſſors, and to the improvement of the King's Library. It is aſſerted in his life, that he laboured very much for ſupporting the Catholic Religion againſt thoſe, that would perſuade the King of France to ſhake off the yoak of the Pope; not but that he was ſenſible as much as any body elſe, that the Church wanted to be reformed; but he foreſaw, that if Francis I ſeemed to be in the leaſt remiſs and indifferent with regard to the Innovators, they would arrive to ſuch a pitch of audaciouſneſs, as to overthrow every thing, and to involve the State in the deſtruction of Popery. He thought therefore that it was proper to indulge the inquiſitors and accuſers a little [*L*], though it often happened that they accuſed innocent perſons. On the other hand he did not approve of capital puniſhments, and even involved himſelf in ſome

(*d*) *Franciſco Regi ad quietem ſe comparanti, Latinas Græcaſque Hiſtorias & Tragœdiai od verbum pene vertens interpretabatur, & dormitu-rienti aſſidens inter legendum præclari alicujus loci ſententiæve explicatione, tanquam emodulata Pythagoreorum muſica, eum ad quietem tranquillam deterſis curis omnibus & perturbationibus componebat.* Galland. *in vita Caſtell.* pag. 42.

" Popes of Rome, and the Prelates, men guilty of " ſuch heinous crimes did not truly and from their heart " believe in Chriſt, but that all their religious perfor- " mances were nothing but pageantry, artfully calcu- " lated to impoſe upon the world, and to keep up " their authority." See what I quote from Eraſmus in the Remark [*GG*] of the Article of CALVIN.

[*I*] *Francis I made him diſcourſe of a thouſand different things.*] Caſtellanus was not only very well ſkilled in Polite Literature, but he alſo ſpoke with a very good grace, ſo that he was always heard with a great deal of pleaſure and attention, whenever he diſcourſed upon the queſtions which Francis I propoſed to him. *Prandenti Regi fere ſemper aſtabat; & ad ea quæ in percontando ab eo proponebantur, ſic reſpondere ſolitus erat, ut facile quivis naris non obeſæ, eum omnia ingenio ſummo, acerrimis ſtudiis, atque uſu maximo cognita & perſpecta habere judicaſſet. Huc acceſſerat vocis ea lenitas, vultus geſtuſque compoſiti decor, & ſermonis comitas, elegantia & gratia, ut quod de Pericle prodidit Eupolis, Pitho quandam flexaminam in ejus labris ſeſſitare homines putarent. Itaque quoties diſſerebat, Regem, ſilentibus aliis omnibus, in eum oculos conjicere, ex ejus ore veluti auribus ſuſpenſum pendere, & ſingula verba ab eo emiſſa tanquam oracula probare animad-vertiſſet* (29). i. e. " He always almoſt waited upon the King, " when he was at dinner, and anſwered his Majeſty's " queſtions in ſuch a manner, that men not of the loweſt " capacity might eaſily underſtand, that he was perfect- " ly well acquainted with the things he ſpoke of, " by his ſublime genius, cloſe ſtudies, and great expe- " rience. Add to this, the ſweetneſs of his voice, " his agreeable look and decent geſtures, the eaſineſs, " elegance, and gracefulneſs of his ſtile, which was " ſuch, that what was ſaid of Pericles by Eupolis, " could be applied to him, that he had ſome perſuad- " ing Muſe ſitting upon his lips: ſo that whenever " he ſpoke, all were ſilent about him, and the King " himſelf liſtened to him with the utmoſt attention, " and ſeemed to approve every word he ſpoke as " ſo many oracles." The very firſt converſation he had with the King pleaſed his Majeſty extremely (30); and becauſe ſome perſons of note were become very jealous of him, and endeavoured to put him out of countenance, and to prevent his gaining the King's favour by his fine diſcourſes, the King bid the Dauphin to tell him, that he muſt not mind any body's threatnings, but continue to ſpeak with courage and freedom. *Cumque eſſent, qui ejus felicitati invidentes, ſilentium ei imperare contenderent, atque ab hoc de rebus omnibus apud Regem dicendi inſtituto deterrere pararent, per filium natu maximum Delphinum Rex ipſe eum hortatus eſt, ut intrepidè & conſtanter ad ſuam menſam loqueretur, neque cujuſquam interpellatione aut minis de ſententia deduceretur* (31).

(29) Ibid. pag. 42.

(30) *De variis rebus diſſerentem & ſermocinantem avidiſſimis auribus Rex inter cænandum & prandendum eum audiret, & repudiatis aliorum opinionibus in ejus ſententiam deſcenderet.* Galland. *in vita Caſtell.* pag. 38.

(31) Galland. *in Vita Caſtell.* pag. 39.

[*K*] *The King made him his Reader, which place had been filled before by Colin.*] Gallandius pretends (32), that Colin made himſelf odious by his diſcourſes, which cauſed ſome diſturbances; and that as on the one hand his enemies recommended Caſtellanus, and on the other hand that young man's own merit ſpoke in his favour, Colin was diſmiſſed, and Caſtellanus put in his place, tho' he never thought of ſuch a poſt, and had choſen ſome preferment in the army rather than in the Church. Beza relates this affair otherwiſe; he ſays, that *Caſtellanus went to wait on James Colin, then Reader in ordinary to Francis I, and that it pleaſed God that Colin ſhould preſent Caſtellanus to the King, who loved to hear men of ſenſe talk when he ſat at table, and eſpecially ſuch as could learn him ſomething new* (33). *The conſequence was, that Caſtellanus ſupplanted Colin, and continued in favour with the King till his death.* Another Author relates, that Colin and Caſtellanus happened to diſpute one day before the King, upon ſomething, Colin quoted the authority of books, and Caſtellanus talked as an eye-witneſs, and proved that the Authors quoted by Colin were miſtaken. This gained Caſtellanus the King's favour in ſuch a manner, that he was ordered to ſtay at Court, and was afterwards promoted to the Biſhoprick of Tulle. *Narrat Petrus a Sancto Juliano in præfatione ad Hiſtoriam Burgundionum, cum incidiſſet quæſtio quædam inter eum & Caſtellanum, coram Franciſco primo, Colinuſque librorum auctoritate tantum uteretur, Caſtellanus vero, qui rem, de qua agebatur, etiam oculis uſurparat, ſua auctoritate teſtibuſque approbaſſet vera his libris non contineri, tantum hinc iſtum gratiam aſſecutum eſſe apud Regem, ut in Aula manere juſſus ſit, indeque Epiſcopatu Tutelenſi donatum* (34). A man is the worſe for recommending a more able perſon than himſelf; I do not doubt but Caſtellanus did a great prejudice to Colin, either without any deſign, or in the manner Beza relates it.

(32) Ibid. pag. 40.

(33) Beze, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* liv. 2. pag. 80.

(34) Baluzius, *Not. ad Vitam Petri Caſtellani*, pag. 147.

[*L*] *He thought . . . it was proper to indulge the inquiſitors and accuſers a little.*] He knew that there were in the Roman Catholic Church, a great many ſlanderers, who out of hatred, jealouſy, ambition, or covetouſneſs, perſecuted innocent perſons, by charging them falſly with being Lutherans: but he thought that ſuch accuſers deſerved to be ſupported, tho' their ſuſpicions

ſome difficulties, for having interceded in behalf of ſome pretended Heretics, who, it was reported, were to be put to death (*e*). His zeal for maintaining the rights of Epiſcopacy againſt the pretenſions of the Court of Rome, rendered him odious on the other ſide of the Alps; and the Sorbonne was extremely diſpleaſed at him, for the protection he granted to Robert Stephens [*M*]. He was the occaſion of the Aſſembly held at Melun (*f*), in which ſome Prelates, and ſome Doctors of Divinity prepared inſtructions for thoſe who were to be ſent to the Council of Trent. He never appeared more eloquent, grave and majeſtic, than when he prepared Francis I for death, and when he delivered the Funeral Oration of that Prince [*N*]. I forgot to obſerve, that he was promoted to the Biſhoprick of Tulle, and afterwards to that of Mâcon. He intended to retire from buſineſs after the death of Francis I, but Henry II would have him continue to attend the Court, as he had done before, and as ſoon as the place of Great Almoner became vacant, he conferred it upon him. This is a very important poſt, and may enable a man to do an infinite deal of good, when it is filled up by a perſon, who knows and practiſes all that ſuch a poſt requires of him. This is what our Caſtellanus did; and with regard to the good uſes he made of the money, of which he had the diſpoſal, we muſt not omit to mention what he did concerning the lewd women [*O*]. He reſigned the Biſhoprick

(*e*) He appeaſed the King's anger againſt the Waldenſes befose the ſlaughter of Cabrieres and Merindol. *Vita Caſtell.* pag. 6. and he once delivered Dolet out of priſon. Ibid. pag. 62.

(*f*) In the year 1545. See the laſt Remark.

ſuſpicions were ill-grounded. For, ſaid he, they who are falſly accuſed, get themſelves acquitted, and they who are guilty cannot be puniſhed, if they are not accuſed. He quoted to that purpoſe a paſſage from Tully (35), whence he concluded, that in order to deter the bold innovators, it was neceſſary to protect and encourage the dogs, that barked after them. *Neque fieri poſſe, quin in factione quoque diverſa calumniatores eſſent, qui odio, invidia, vel nimio ſtudio ſuas opes & dignitates retinendi potius, quam pietatis affectu, bonos aliquando viros pro Lutheranis perſequerentur; ferendos tamen eſſe, quoties in ſuſpicione a qua etiam crimen abeſſet, ſuſpectos in judicium vocarent. Quod ſi innocentes eſſent accuſati, abſolvi poſſent. Condemnari autem nocentes, niſi accuſarentur, non poſſent. Quam ad rem locum illum ex Cicerone pro Roſcio de canibus Capitolinis adducebat, ut illos olim, cum fures internoſcere non poſſent, recte latratu appetere ſolitos eſſe, quicunque noctu Capitolium ingreſſi eſſent; ita metu lymphaticorum quorundam comprimeretur audacia, quoties moribus & longo uſu in Eccleſia recepta privata auctoritate abrogarent, aut ſeditioſe damnarent, latratores, à quibus appeterentur, Reipublicæ cauſa favore proſequendos eſſe* (36). The paſſage quoted from Tully is in his oration *pro Sex. Roſcio Amerino*, in which he ſays, that tho' dogs cannot diſtinguiſh thieves from honeſt men, yet their barking at every body is uſeful, to alarm the people, and make them be upon their guard. Thus it is the intereſt of the State to encourage accuſers, in order to deter thoſe who would diſturb the public tranquillity by endeavouring to alter thoſe uſes and cuſtoms, which have long prevailed in the Church. This is the ſenſe of the latter part of the paſſage we have juſt now quoted. It cannot be denied, but the maxim here laid down by Caſtellanus, may be of ſome uſe for the public good, eſpecially when the State is diſturbed by parties, tumults, and ſeditions. But it is certain on the other hand, that this maxim may give occaſion to a thouſand unjuſt actions. We muſt lament the fate of men, and the fatal neceſſity there is of ſacrificing on ſo many occaſions the rights of private perſons to the public good. The reputation and innocence of a whole family are but too often the prey of a ſuſpicious or wicked accuſer. It would be juſt to make ſuch an accuſer undergo an exemplary puniſhment either for his raſhneſs, or for his malice; but the public good requires that ſuch men ſhould be ſuffered to bark on againſt every body, and that they ſhould go unpuniſhed, when they happened to miſtake the innocent for the guilty. This keeps the malecontents in awe; and it is better to accuſe ten times without reaſon, than to omit once accuſing thoſe who deſerve it. This is the reaſon why ſo many honeſt men are neglected, whilſt wicked men enjoy the greateſt credit. An honeſt man ſcorns to be a ſpy and an informer; whereas a wicked man is glad of the employment, and thus makes himſelf uſeful and often neceſſary. However that be, you ſee what was Caſtellanus's reaſon for ſparing thoſe unjuſt informers, who blaſted the reputation of ſo many innocent perſons. The good of the Church required, that there ſhould be dogs, to bark not only at heretics, but at all thoſe, who became obnoxious by their moderation and tolerating ſpirit. Caſtellanus is not the only perſon, who admitted that principle.

(35) See above, Quotation (9) of the Article St. BERNARD.

(36) Gallandius, *in Vita Caſtell.* pag. 58.

[*M*] *The Sorbonne was .... diſpleaſed at him, for the protection he granted to Robert Stephens.*] His protection did not laſt long enough; for he ſuffered himſelf to be carried away by the torrent of the Sorboniſts, and gave Robert Stephens up to them. Stephens complained of it after this manner. *Immediately after, as tho' he had been hurried by a kind of madneſs, he made him a prey to the Divines, whom he had defended againſt ſuch furies, by an inſtinct from God rather than thro' any true and real kindneſs. It was in hopes of getting a Cardinal's cap, that he ſubmitted to them without reaſon, and in ſo ſervile a manner, for he hated them from his heart* (37). Caſtellanus altered his mind ſoon after, and was ſorry that ſuch a learned man ſhould be oppreſſed, and forced to retire into another country (38). We may wonder at the fate of Caſtellanus; he was himſelf ſuſpected of being a Lutheran, becauſe he underſtood Greek and Hebrew, and alſo, becauſe he did not like the cruelty of the inquiſitors, and condemned ſome abuſes in the Church; and when he undertook to perſecute others, in order to clear himſelf from the ſuſpicions that were entertained of him, it was pretended, that he perſecuted only out of ambition. Gallandius himſelf acquaints us with all this. *A quibuſdam, qui quicquid politioribus literis tinctum eſſet, aut ex Græcis Hebræiſque literis erutum, ſtatim Lutheranum eſſe clamitant, affinem ei ſectæ, ab aliis vero Aulæ Pontificiæ corruptos mores, nundinationes rerum ſacrarum, & quam vocant ſuperſtitionem improbantibus, purpurei galeri deſiderio fictum & perſonatum ſimulatorem habitum eſſe non ignoro* (39).

(37) Robert Etienne, *Réponſe aux cenſures des Théologiens de Paris*, fol. 22. edit. 1552, 8vo.

(38) Ibid. fol. 24, *verſo*.

(39) Gallandius, *in Vita Caſtell.* pag. 55.

[*N*] *He delivered the funeral Oration of Francis I.*] It conſiſted of two Sermons, which Mr. Baluze cauſed to be printed, when he publiſhed the life of Caſtellanus written by Gallandius. All the world knows the complaints of the Sorbonne, occaſioned by Caſtellanus's expreſſing himſelf very plainly concerning purgatory: he declared, that he believed the King's ſoul was gone directly to heaven. The Deputies of the Sorbonne fell into the hands of a certain banterer (40), who laughed at them. I am very well acquainted, ſaid he to them, with the late King's humour; he ſeldom continued long in the ſame place; and if he went into purgatory, be ſure it was only to taſte the wine. Beza (41) and Thuanus (42) give a particular account of this whole affair.

(40) Mendoza the King's Steward.

(41) *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* liv. 2. pag. 80.

(42) Thuan. lib. 3. pag. 58.

[*O*] *We muſt not omit to mention what he did concerning the lewd women.*] I intend to ſpeak only of thoſe, who had been ſhut up in a Convent as repenting maids, and yet deſerved nothing leſs than ſuch a name, for they were neither repenting nor maids. They had led a diſſolute life, and afterwards confined themſelves in a Monaſtery to expiate their ſins; but not finding there a ſufficient maintenance, they went a begging from door to door, by which means they found opportunities to return to their ancient trade. Caſtellanus did all that lay in his power to provide a fund ſufficient to maintain theſe creatures, and ordered amongſt other things, that they ſhould work for their bread. He had a great deal of trouble to perſuade them, that they muſt no longer ſtroll about the ſtreets, but keep religiouſly in their Cloiſter. *Vix verbis exprimi poteſt, quantis ſudoribus & moleſtiis operam dederit*

Bishoprick of Mâcon, to be translated to that of Orleans, which was in the neighbourhood of those places, in which Henry II loved to pass the greatest part of his life. When this Prince was preparing himself for his journey into Germany, he went from Amboise to Orleans, and gave the Great Almoner leave to be absent from Court for two months. Castellanus had begged that favour of him, in order to regulate the affairs of his Diocese; he had not time to reform all that was amiss in it, but he cleared it of an infinite number of vagabond and ignorant Priests, who led a scandalous life [P]. He preached often, but it happened one day, that whilst he was preaching, he had a fit of the palsy, which soon turned into an apoplexy, and carried him off in a very little time. He died February the 3d 1552 (g). The Protestants made a great many reflections upon his death [Q]. He was

(g) Taken from his Life, written by Peter Gallandius, his friend, and published by Mr. Baluze at Paris in the year 1674.

rit ut mulieres, quæ Lutetiæ corpore vulgato quæstum meretricium feciſſent, ex vitæ contaminatæ penitentia ad caſtitatem, bonam frugem, & religioſam vitam in Monaſterio profitendam converſæ, vere id, quod profiterentur, præſtarent. Nam cum iis reditibus, qui ad uſus vitæ neceſſarios requiruntur deſtitutæ, vicatim & oſtiatim mendicare cogerentur, ut ejus rei occaſione ſuâ copiam magno cum probro facere vulgo dicerentur, re prius diligenter multumque cum prudentibus boniſque viris communicata, illis demum multis rationibus, quamquam ægrè, perſuaſit, ne monaſterium ſemel ingreſſæ, cum hoc ignominioſa boni nominis & famæ jactura, per urbem in poſterum divagarentur (43).

(43) Gallandius, *in Vita Caſtell.* pag. 110.

[P] *He cleared his Dioceſe of vagabond and ignorant Prieſts, who led a ſcandalous life.*] He began the reformation of his Dioceſe with the Prieſts, and ordered, that all those, who had no settled habitations, and who only wandered up and down, begging every where for Masses to be said for a pennyworth, should leave the country immediately. In a fortnight's time he drove so many of those idle Priests out of his Diocese, that they might have made a pretty numerous army. *Doctrinæ & vitæ ſui populi cognitionem, inſtaurationemque a capite, hoc eſt, a Sacerdotibus exorſus, eorum, qui nullam certam ſtationem habentes, velut errones circumforanei, Miſſas undiquaque aucuparentur, tantum numerum intra dies quindecim epiſcopatûs ſui finibus exegit, ut ex iis juſtus propemodum exercitus cogi poſſe videretur* (44). Having examined the Priests, he found them very ignorant and very vicious; yet he gave them wherewithal to pay the charges of their journey. It was a great grievance to suffer such men, who went from door to door offering to say Mass at a very low price. *Cum eos interrogatos literarum omnium ignaros, omnium ſordium maculis infames, nulli certo homini aut loco auctoratos mercedula ſe veluti venales ad ſacra obeunda obtrudere didiciſſet* (45). This grievance has been a little reformed, but is still very great, and drew very heavy complaints from a Roman Catholic Author, whose work was printed in Holland in the year 1681. "It is very odd, says he, to see in Italy ten or twelve "Priests waiting in the Vestry till some fool or another come and give them for a Mass, a *Julio* * to "buy a bit of bread, and often the Sexton drives them "away before they have earned one penny. No such "thing is seen at Paris; but then we have above a "thousand of those strolling Priests, who belong to no "parish, and can hardly get their bread by saying "Mass. I avoid them like so many pick-pockets, "and I am pleased with myself when I think, that "never a Priest nor a Monk received any of my money for the payment of their Masses; I should look "upon it as a kind of sacrilege. Holy Orders should "never be conferred upon any person, without a sufficient title; this would deliver us of all these "strollers (46).

(44) Ibid. pag. 134.

(45) Ibid. pag. 135.

* A piece of money worth about five pence.

(46) *Moiens ſurs & honnêtes pour la Converſion de tous les Héretiques*, Part 2. pag. 26, 27.

[Q] *The Proteſtants made a great many reflections upon his death.*] Let us first transcribe those of Beza. *Lastly*, says he speaking of Castellanus, *he was promoted to the Biſhopric of Mâcon, and then to that of Orleans, after many bargains for livings. He had a great deal of wit, ſpoke Latin very well, and at firſt he favoured the Reformed Religion, ſo far, that he ſupported for a great while the cauſe of Robert Stephens . . when he was attacked by the Sorbonne, who found fault with the Bible, which he had printed* (47). . . *But this good Biſhop ſtooping ſo low as to perſecute thoſe he excuſed before to the utmoſt of his power, was tranſlated to the See of Orleans; but there God had decreed to ſnatch him away; for the day before he was to make his entry, being arrived at a monaſtery, called St. Vuerte* (48), *and being got into the pulpit to preach before a very numerous audience, it being a new thing to ſee a Biſhop preach, as he was threatning very ſeverely thoſe, who are called Heretics, he was taken with ſo ſudden and ſo violent a fit of the cholic, that being carried away, he died miſerably the following night* (49), *to make his entry into another place than Orleans. Five days after, namely on the 9th of July, were alſo executed, &c.* Beza is mistaken with regard to the day and the year. According to him Castellanus died July the 4th, 1549, but he died February the 3d, 1552. To Beza let us add another witness, a good Protestant. *Since we have mentioned the Clergy, it puts me in mind of a Prelate, who is ſeldom forgotten, when the queſtion is concerning ſuch judgments of God; I mean Peter Caſtellanus, for he is, as much as any one can be, an inſtance of God's judgment: having profeſſed the Goſpel publicly under the reign of Francis I, ſo far as to draw upon him for that reaſon the hatred of the Sorbonne (whom he did not fear, becauſe he knew the King ſupported him) turned his coat under the reign of Henry II, becauſe he found that they, who profeſſed the Goſpel, were not well received at Court; nay, he turned his coat ſo well, that it could not be known any longer. Nor was this enough for him, but he came to Orleans (of which City he had lately been made Biſhop) in order to preach with the utmoſt zeal againſt the ſame Religion, which he had formerly ſupported. And indeed he aſcended the pulpit ſometimes; but it happened once, that as he was uttering his blaſphemies againſt the true Religion, in ſpite of his own conſcience, he was ſeized with an illneſs, which did not ſuffer him to come out of the pulpit in the ſame condition as he went into it. It is ſaid, that his illneſs was ſuch, that one part of his body burnt like fire, whilſt the other was as cold as ice; they alſo mention a bloody flux: However that be, he died within few days, lamenting and groaning in a dreadful manner* (50). D'Aubigné (51) quotes a Book, intitled *Dan*, in which it was said, that Bishop Castellanus, who in cold blood sent the Protestants to the stake to be burnt, *died half frozen and half burnt.* Chassanion gives the same account of this Prelate's death, as Beza and Henry Stephens. See the pages 106 and 107 of a Book which he published in 1586 with this title; *Hiſtoires remarquables des grans & merveilleux jugemens de Dieu.* i. e. "Remarkable "Histories of the great and wonderful Judgments of "God."

(47) Beze, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* liv. 2. pag. 80, 81.

(48) Du Peirat, *Antiquitez de la Chapelle*, pag. 384, says, *that this Prelate was taken with a fit of Apoplexy*, as he was preaching the Word of God in the Church of St. Lawrence at Orgeres, before he had made his entry into the City of Orleans.

(49) Gallandius says, pag. 135, that *Caſtellanus had a fit of Apoplexy.* (Thus Mr. Bayle says, perhaps he means a Palsy) *firſt on the left ſide, then on the right, and that afterwards he could not breathe, and was ſuffocated in leſs than three days time.* Ante triduum ſuffocatio ſecuta ſit.

(50) Henry Etienne, *Apologie pour Herodote*, pag. 312.

(51) D'Aubigne, tom. 1. liv. 2. chap. 11. pag. m. 112.

I think, I may observe three things upon this subject. I. That Beza and Henry Stephens, &c. have acted not from a spirit of detraction, but from a zeal for Religion. II. That what they have said, is very serviceable to the cause they espoused, by confirming those, who are already confirmed in their opinions. III. That it is probable they were too hasty in their decisions. Calvin, Beza, and several others imagined, that all those, who at first favoured the Reformation, either by endeavouring to render the persecutors less cruel, or by shewing a great desire to see an end of the evils, which the Church suffered, were so many apostates, and acted against their own conscience, if they continued in the Church of Rome, or if they altered their conduct towards the Reformed. I say, that this was a rash judgment. To believe that the Church wants to be reformed, and to approve of a particular manner of reforming it, are two different things. To blame those, who oppose a Reformation, and to blame at the same time the conduct of them who reform the Church, are two things which are not in the least inconsistent. One may therefore imitate Erasmus, without being either an apostate or a traytor, without sinning against the Holy Ghost, and without acting against the dictates of one's own conscience. Beza does not seem to have understood this; he imagined, that

was very well ſkilled in the Oriental Languages (*b*), and had ſuch an univerſal learning, that Francis I, who boaſted that he had not ſeen one learned man, whoſe ſtock of learning he could not exhauſt in two years time [*R*], declared, that he never found Caſtellanus at a ſtand. He wrote but little [*S*]. They relate very ſurpriſing efforts of his eloquence [*T*]. We ſhall throw into one note our obſervations upon the errors of Moreri, and of ſome other Authors [*V*], and we ſhall relate what Mr. de Varillas obſerves concerning

(*b*) *See* Colomiés *in Gall. Orient.* pag. 14, 15.

all thoſe, who granted that Calvin and Luther were in the right with regard to ſeveral things, muſt for that reaſon be fully perſuaded, that it was neceſſary to ſeparate immediately from the Church, to raiſe altar againſt altar, to break and throw down the images, and not to ſtop even at the ſight of the ſlaughter and bloodſhed which is to follow. This is a wild fancy; there were no doubt ſeveral perſons, who thought, that ſince the Reformation met with ſuch great obſtacles, which were attended with the utmoſt deſolation throughout all Europe, it was a token from God, that the time for reforming the Church, was not yet come. There are a great many perſons, who will always adhere obſtinately to this maxim, that it is a leſs evil to ſuffer the grievances of Church and State, than to endeavour to redreſs them by ſuch means as tend to the overthrow of the Government (52). It would be difficult to determine, whether Caſtellanus was one of them: But all perſons free from prejudice will own, that one ought to be very careful how to charge others with preaching againſt their conſcience. Chancellor de l'Hôpital made very good verſes upon Caſtellanus's dying almoſt in the pulpit; he has beſtowed great praiſes upon this Prelate (53). It has been ſaid that Caſtellanus was poiſoned, and Peter de St. Julien aſſerts (54), that it was the opinion of that Biſhop's ſervants.

(52) *Expediebat quaſi ægræ ſaucieque Reipublicæ requieſcere quomodocunque, ne vulnera curatione ipſa reſcinderentur.* Florus, lib. 3. cap. 23.

(53) Du Peirat, *Antiquitez de la Chapelle*, pag. 384. Mr. Baluze, *Not. ad Vitam Caſtell.* pag. 165. Colomiés, *Gall. Orient.* pag. 13. have quoted the verſes of this Chancellor, they are alſo in Moreri.

(54) In the *Antiquitez de Mâcon*, pag. 245. *apud* Colomeſium, *Gall. Orient.* pag. 12.

[*R*] *Francis I boaſted that he had not ſeen one learned man, whoſe ſtock of learning he could not exhauſt in two years time.*] This deſerves to be taken notice of. Francis I boaſted that amongſt ſeveral very learned men, with whom he had entered into converſation, he had found none but Caſtellanus, who could hold out telling new things for two years. That is to ſay, that all the others had in a ſhort time nothing more to ſay, and were reduced either to be ſilent, or to repeat what they had ſaid before; in a word, their ſtock was out. Whereas Caſtellanus was a running ſpring, which was never dry. Gallandius's words are ſo elegant, that they deſerve to be here tranſcribed. *Cum de doctis hominibus loqueretur* (Rex), *dictitare ſolebat, ſe permultis extra communem aliorum aleam poſitis doctis hominibus perſæpe familiariter uſum eſſe, & delectatum, verum præter Caſtellanum neminem ſibi ad eam diem viſum, cujus eruditionem omnem non intra biennium exhauſiſſet. Hunc veluti omnium artium quendam Oceanum ſemper vivo gurgite redundantem ad ſe accedentem ſemper videri novum nec unquam ante auditum. Eam eſſe ejus immortalis ingenii vim, & doctrinæ fœcunditatem, ut nunquam in ulla diſputatione hæſitare & titubare viſus eſſet* (55). There are perhaps no perſons in the world, whoſe converſations are more to be dreaded for a learned man, than thoſe of a great Lord, who loves the ſciences. For as they are uſed to ſpeak *ex tempore* upon thoſe ſubjects, which belong to their province, they entertain an ill opinion of a man, who cannot anſwer directly to ſuch queſtions as relate to his profeſſion. There are a great many very learned Divines, who would be extremely puzzled, if they were to anſwer directly the queſtions, that might be put to them, concerning the ſubject, the time, the proceedings, the ſucceſs, and the principal circumſtances of any Council. I have ſeen a famous Hiſtorian of France, who could not tell, in what Century Philip the Fair lived. The more one reads, the more collections one makes, the leſs one is capable to anſwer directly the queſtions which relate to matters of fact; ſo that there are ſome men, who are not more admired for the learning, which appears in their works, than for the ignorance they diſcover in converſation. The Blondels and the Salmaſius's and a few more of the ſame claſs, are not ſubject to that misfortune; but the others are in a very dangerous ſituation, when they have to anſwer the repeated queſtions of a Man of Quality, who loves books. I have been told, that Marſhal de Crequi, when he was retired to a country-ſeat during his diſgrace at Court (56), aſked for the moſt learned man in the neighbourhood, The Prior of a Monaſtery was introduced to him, but he had ſcarce been a fortnight with him, but the Marſhal ſaid, they had brought him the moſt ignorant man in the world. Not but that the Monk knew a great many things, and could have ſatisfied Monſieur de Crequi, if he had had time to prepare himſelf; but to tell *ex tempore* proper names, dates, and ſuch other circumſtances, was what he could not do. See the quotation (57) in the margin.

(55) Galland. *in Vita Caſtell.* pag. 71.

(56) In 1672, when he refuſed to ſerve under Marſhal de Turenne.

[*S*] *He wrote but little.*] There is a Latin Letter from Francis I to Charles V, aſcribed to him, it was publiſhed in 1543 (58). I have already mentioned his Funeral Oration on Francis I.

(57) The Preſident de Mêmes was a learned man, and loved ſo well to converſe with the learned, that it was ſaid of him, that in a week's time he could exhauſt the learning of a Doctor. *Suite du Menagiana*, pag. 216.

(58) Mezerai, tom. 2. pag. 1017. Varillas, *Hiſt. de François I* tom. 2. pag. 440.

[*T*] *They relate very ſurprizing effects of his eloquence.*] He made ſuch moving diſcourſes in the hoſpitals, priſons, and convents at Paris that he drew tears from all his audience, and inſpired them with a ſtrong deſire of living well (59). Having ſpent two months in perſuading an Abbeſs of Pontoiſe into her duty, who miſmanaged the income of an hoſpital founded by St. Lewis, he would not leave the Abbey without preaching a Sermon to the Nuns; his diſcourſe affected them to ſuch a degree, that they threw themſelves down upon the ground, ſighed and ſobbed, beat their breaſts, ſhed abundance of tears, and promiſed that for the future they would acquit themſelves of their duty better than they had done before. *Ea vi eloquentiæ, rerumque & ſententiarum e ſacris literis deprompturam tum gravitate, tum copia, de virginitatis, caritatis & miſericordiæ officiis, mundique contemptu nobis præſentibus diſſeruit, ut omnes ſeſe humi affigentes, maximis ſingultibus & ſuſpiriis editis, ſua pectora pugnis contenderent, & maximam vim lachrymarum profundentes ſe longe aliter quam ſuperioribus temporibus officium facturas profiterentur* (60). When he preached to repenting maids *, he uſed to begin with a lively deſcription of the abominations of a lewd life, and cloſed his diſcourſe with the praiſes of repentance and converſion; each part of his Sermon had its particular effect. In the firſt he conducted the ſinners to the very brink of deſpair and deſtruction, and in the ſecond he filled them with comfort and hopes. Gallandius has expreſſed this very nobly; here follow his words. *Ad virum aliquando paſſas, ſed vitæ contaminatæ tædio in monaſterio caſtitatem profeſſas, ingreſſus, cum fœditatem veneream graviſſimis verbis inſectatus eſſet, ea verba de reſipiſcentia & pœnitentia fundebat, ea è ſacris exempla & teſtimonia ad laudem ejus vitæ ad pudicitiam ſanctam converſæ adducebat, ut quæ prima oratione capillo paſſo humi conſternatæ ad pectora pugnis acriter tunderent, faciem unguibus deformarent, & lamentis atque ejulatis omnia complerent, oratione poſtrema ad ſe revocatæ, manibus ad cælum verſis, Deo gratias agerent, ſe longe fæliciſſimas prædicarent, & in ſuſcepto vitæ inſtituto conſtanter perſeveraturas iterum atque iterum voverent* (61). Let us add to this, what the Chevalier Caſal wrote to Pope Paul III. *The Biſhop of Mâcon made King Francis I's Funeral Oration in a very learned manner, and very much to the purpoſe; ſave only that he could not be well heard becauſe of the loud lamentations and heavy ſighs occaſioned by the very words he ſpoke. I ſhall endeavour to get a tranſcript of his Diſcourſe, which I ſhall ſend to your Holineſs.* You will find this in the Epiſtles of the Princes collected by Ruſcelli, and tranſlated by Belleforeſt (62).

(59) Galland. *in Vita Caſtell.* pag. 110.

* *Ladies of Pleaſure. The Repenting Maid*, les filles repenties, *is the name of a Convent at Paris, where ſuch ladies are put to repent of their former pleaſures.*

(60) Ibid. pag. 124.

(61) Galland. *Vita Caſtell.* pag. 124, 125.

(62) Fol. m. 151 *verſo.*

[*V*] *We ſhall throw into one note our obſervations upon the Errors of Moreri, and of ſome other Authors.*] I. Moreri ſuppoſes, againſt the expreſs aſſertion of Gallandius, that Caſtellanus was of Langres and a Plebeian. II. That Francis I made him his Preacher, becauſe of a certain anſwer he made him, and which I have related above (63). Was it not turning that great Prince into ridicule, to pretend that he would reward a witty ſaying, by ſo ſacred a poſt as that of a Preacher? It was by no means that pretended witty ſaying, which gained Caſtellanus the favour of that Monarch;

(63) In the Remark [*A*].

concerning the Aſſembly of Melun [*X*]. Obſerve that the Chancellor Poyet was a great enemy of Caſtellanus, and conſult upon this the Continuation of the *Menagiana*, pag. 289 of the Dutch edition.

Monarch; but his fine and learned diſcourſes: the poſt which was conferred upon him, was that of reader to the King, and not of his Preacher (64). III. If he had taught the *Belles Lettres* at Paris, as Moreri aſſerts, Gallandius would have mentioned it; his ſilence upon this ſubject muſt be taken for a good confutation of Moreri's aſſertion. But further, what likelihood is there, that the King's Reader, who was every day at his maſter's table, and at his *couchee*, ſhould trouble himſelf with teaching in a College? Moreri is more in the right, when he ſays, that Caſtellanus *was the ſame King's Library-Keeper after Budeus*. IV. They did not begin, as he ſays, *to reward his* virtue *by making him Abbot of Auberive*. He meant, no doubt, the Abbey of Hauvilliers (65), which Gallandius calls in Latin *Abbatiam Altovillarenſem*; but it is ſo far from being true, that this was the firſt reward Caſtellanus received, that on the contrary he obtained it only when he reſigned his Biſhoprick of Tulle; and he reſigned it, when he was promoted to the Biſhoprick of Mâcon. He obtained the Abbey of Hauvilliers in the year 1543, and he had been made Biſhop of Tulle in 1539. Mr. Baluze has obſerved (66), that Gallandius was miſinformed, when he ſaid, that Francis I gave three livings to Caſtellanus in the ſame year, viz. the Provoſtſhip of Eſſaus (67), the Biſhoprick of Tulle, and the Abbey of Belleperche (68): *Intra unius anni ſpatium tribus ſacerdotiis, Præfectura Envaonienſi, Epiſcopatu Tutelenſi, & Abbatia Bellopercenſi eum ornavit* (69). For John de Cardaillac was Abbot of Belleperche from the year 1484 to the year 1543, as appears by his Epitaph publiſhed by the Sammarthani in their *Gallia Chriſtiana*. So that that Abbey was not conferred on Caſtellanus till four years after he had obtained the Biſhoprick of Tulle, to which he was certainly preferred in the year 1539. V. It is not true that the poſt of great Almoner of France was conferred upon him before the Biſhoprick of Mâcon: He had the Biſhoprick in the year 1544, and was made great Almoner under the reign of Henry II, November the 25th 1547 (70). Thuanus has committed a blunder here; he thought Francis I made Caſtellanus great Almoner (71); ſeveral others have committed the ſame blunder (72), as du Peirat obſerves: Nor is he himſelf free from all errors, ſince he believes, that Caſtellanus was Chaplain in ordinary to King Francis I, and Biſhop of Macon in the year 1531 (73). This is abſolutely falſe. F. Jacob having ſaid, that William Budeus died in the year 1540, adds, that the place of Library-Keeper to the King was given to Peter du Chatel (Caſtellanus) by Francis I, who gave him afterwards the Biſhoprick of Tulle (74). This is altering the order of time, for we have ſeen that he was made Biſhop of Tulle in 1539. The ſame Author ſays, that Caſtellanus died, when he was preaching, in 1558 (75), he ſhould have ſaid, in 1552. Catherinot has ſaid erroneouſly, that Caſtellanus was Profeſſor at Bourges (76). Mezerai was not better informed, when he ſaid, that he fell under the King's diſpleaſure (77).

(64) See his *Life*, pag. 41. Theſe words of Gallandius, pag. 46. *Primum omnium inter Scribas & Miniſtros cubiculatios Regis cooptatus*, ſignifies, if I am not miſtaken, that he was ſet down in the eſtabliſhment amongſt the Clerks of the Cloſet, and the Officers of the Bed-Chamber; that is to ſay, that the King's Reader was looked upon as one of theſe Officers.
(65) In the Dioceſe of Reims.
(66) *In notis ad vitam Caſtell.* pag. 149.
(67) In the Dioceſe of Limoges.
(68) In the Dioceſe of Montauban.
(69) Galland. *in Vita Caſtell.* pag. 48.
(70) *See* Du Peirat, *Antiquit. de la Chapelle*, pag. 383.
(71) Thuanus, lib. 3. pag. 57.
(72) Jacob. Severtius, *in Tractatu de Epiſcop. Matiſconenſibus*; *Carolus Sauſſeius*, lib. 14. *Annal. Eccleſ. Aurelianenſis.* Claudius Robertus, *in Gallia Chriſtiana.*
(73) Du Peirat, *Antiq. de la Chapelle*, pag. 455.
(74) Jacob, *Traité des Bibliotheques*, pag. pag. 468.
(75) Ibid. pag. 469.
(76) Catherinot, *Annales Typographiques de Bourges*, pag. 4. The whole book contains but 8 pages.
(77) Mezerai, *Hiſt. de Franc.* tom. 2. pag. 1059. in folio.
(78) Varillas, *Hiſt. de François I.* liv. 11. pag. m. 136, &c.

[*X*] *We ſhall relate what Mr. Varillas obſerves concerning the Aſſembly of Melun.*] He ſays (78), "I. That "the chief Divines of the Faculty of Paris were or- "dered to meet at Melun, to write down and com- "municate to his Majeſty their opinions ſupported by "the authority of the holy Scripture, of the Coun- "cils, of the Fathers, and even grounded upon "right reaſon, concerning the points, which the "heretics alledge as pretences for ſeparating from "Communion with the Catholics. II. That the "Doctors diſcharged this duty with ſo much accura- "cy as would be at this time the moſt valuable re- "cord of the Sorbonne, if their opinions had been "tranſmitted with the ſame fidelity as they were deli- "vered; but that the moſt judicious of them were "ſuppreſſed by Caſtellanus." III. *That this man, who was perfectly well ſkilled in the Oriental Languages, and polite Literature, was not ſo well verſed in Divinity.* IV. That *he had a great mind to aſſiſt at the Council, with the character of Embaſſador from France; and that he had credit enough at Court, to obtain that important Commiſſion, becauſe on the one hand there was not a Sword-man learned enough to ſupport the dignity of ſuch a poſt, and on the other hand the Prelates durſt not pretend to it, for fear of being ridiculed, if they appeared as Miniſters of a temporal Prince in an aſſembly, in which they were to be judges.* V. That *he* (Caſtellanus) *thought, he wanted nothing, but ſome particular and extraordinary inſtructions, concerning the Difficulties, which might be propoſed in the Council, that he might have an opportunity of being admired for his learning as well as for his eloquence. And as he was too proud to borrow from others thoſe inſtructions he wanted, he reſolved to ſteal them ſo artfully, that he could not be charged with the theft.* VI. That *he kept the writings of the Doctors, in order to make uſe of them in his pretended negotiation . . . and made ſome abſtracts from them, which contained little more than the Decrees made by the ſame Faculty four years before againſt the Doctrines of Luther.* VII. That "after this manner Caſtellanus, "unknowingly, and without any other motive, but "the deſign of gathering memoirs to ſignalize himſelf "in an employment which he never enjoyed, contribu- "ted towards the encreaſe of Calvin's hereſy in France; "becauſe if the opinions of the Doctors had been "printed, they would have confirmed the people in "the Religion of their anceſtors, and they would not "have been ſo eaſily perſuaded into new opinions." This is a very heavy charge; I cannot ſay poſitively, whether it be falſe or true; but if Caſtellanus was guilty of ſuch a fraud, he deſerves to be much leſs eſteemed, than he generally is. However, I ſhall obſerve, that the Hiſtorian has been miſtaken in two points; he ſuppoſes that Caſtellanus was not yet a Biſhop, when the Aſſembly of Melun was held, that is to ſay, in the year 1545; for he lays it down as a matter of fact, that no Prelate would have dared to make himſelf ſo ridiculous as to pretend to be ſent Embaſſador from France to the Council; he ſuppoſes therefore, that Caſtellanus, who deſired that poſt, was no Biſhop. He did not know then, that in 1539 he had been made Biſhop of Tulle, and in 1544 Biſhop of Macon. This is Mr. Varillas's firſt error, but ſuch an error as overthrows the chief foundation of his whole account. The ſecond is his ſuppoſing, that if the opinions of the Doctors had been printed, the people would not have embraced the Lutheran Religion. This is a very wild fancy. If the Prieſts and the Prelates loſt part of their flock, it was not for want of having publiſhed a great many Books as good as they were capable to write at that time. It would not have been more difficult for Calvin and Beza to anſwer theſe Doctors opinion than the other Books that were publiſhed.

Obſerve, that Mr. Varillas in his Hiſtory of Henry II (79) ſuppoſes, that the Deputies of the Sorbonne, who were ordered to complain of the Funeral Oration of Francis I, in which Caſtellanus had denied the Purgatory, were to lay three things to his charge, the ſecond of which was, his having ſuppreſſed theſe opinions of the Doctors.

(79) Pag. 69. of the Dutch edition.

Let us add to the paſſage of the remark [*D*], in which we mention the bad hand-writing of Eraſmus, that the manuſcript of his *Lingua* was ſo ill-written, that he could hardly read it himſelf, when he wanted to make uſe of that manuſcript to correct the errors, which had crept into the edition of 1525, which by conſequence is the firſt. Eraſmus himſelf owns this in the Preamble to the errata of that edition.

CASTELVETRO (LEWIS), a native of Modena, one of the moſt ſubtle Writers of the ſixteenth Century, is known chiefly by his Commentary upon the Poetics of Ariſtotle. Moreri, and Teiſſier (*a*) will fully inform thoſe, who conſult them, of the hiſtory of his Life. I ſhall only inſiſt upon one particular, which they have not unfolded, and which

(*a*) *Eloges tirez de Mr. de Thou*, tom. 1. pag. 390.

which relates to the proceedings of the inquiſition againſt him [*A*]. He had too ſtrong an inclination for criticiſing [*B*]. Thuanus places his death under the year 1571.

If his too great fondneſs for criticiſing was blameable, his weakneſs in not bearing to be criticiſed himſelf, and the heat, which he is ſaid to have ſhewn againſt thoſe who attempted it, were much more ſo. It is affirmed, that he made uſe of violent means againſt them [*C*]. His manner of quoting is very exceptionable. I have mentioned it in the Preface to this Dictionary (*b*); but the reader will ſee a more particular account of it in the Continuation of the *Menagiana* (*c*). He will find there likewiſe, that *Caſtelvetro's houſe being on fire at Lyons, he cried out* al Poetica, *ſave my Poetics*; and that *the beſt edition of that book is that of Vienna in Auſtria*. It might have been added to this, that he had reaſon to ſhew by his exclamations during the fire, that he conſidered this work as the beſt of his performances. It was known by ſuch a circumſtance as this, what the picture was, which was moſt valued by a famous Painter of Antiquity. The other writings of Caſtelvetro are much inferior to his Poetics, which notwithſtanding is a work in which many defects have been found [*D*]. There are ſome Treatiſes of this Author, which as poſthumous [*E*], want the greateſt part of that perfection, which he would have given them, if he had publiſhed them himſelf.

(*b*) In the firſt edition § 3.

(*c*) Pag. 82. of the Dutch edition.

CASTILLE

[*A*] *I ſhall only inſiſt upon one particular . . . . which relates to the proceedings of the Inquiſition againſt him.*] To avoid the conſequences of thoſe proceedings, he retired into a Proteſtant country. He wanted to have appeared before the Council, in order that his cauſe might be tried there; but the Pope acquainted the Cardinal of Mantua his Legate, that ſince Caſtelvetro had been accuſed before the Inquiſition at Rome, it was neceſſary for him to appear there under the character of a perſon accuſed. The Pope aſſured him, that he would treat him in the moſt gentle manner poſſible; that if he found him innocent, he would not only acquit him, but likewiſe confer favours upon him; and if he proved guilty, he would only require him to make a private recantation. The confidence which Caſtelvetro placed in theſe promiſes of the Pope, did not laſt long, and was of no ſervice to him. He appeared before the Inquiſition, and was examined thrice (1); but finding himſelf embarraſſed by the queſtions put to him, and eſpecially with relation to a certain book of Melancthon, which he had tranſlated into Italian, he fled, and choſe rather to expoſe himſelf to the moſt infamous ſentence, which could be paſſed upon him on account of his contumacy, than to ſurrender himſelf to the mercy of his Judges by imploring their clemency. He retired to Baſil, where he died, repenting of his errors, as we are informed by a certain Author (2). Cardinal Pallavicini is of opinion, that out of regard to the excellent writings of Caſtelvetro, we ought readily to aſſent to that Author in this point. *Quanquam adjumentum, quod ipſius ſtylus ſurpeditavit politioribus jucundioribuſque diſciplinis, obſervationum raritate, commentationum ſubtilitate promeretur, ut grati animi causâ fides benignè habeatur authori narranti, ipſum poſtremo reſipuiſſe* (3).

(1) The 11th, 14th, and 17th of October 1560. Pallavacini, *Hiſt. of the Council of Trent*, lib. 15. cap. 10. num. 15.

(2) Idem, ibid.

(3) Idem, ibid.

[*B*] *He had too ſtrong an inclination to criticiſing.*] Mr. Teiſſier quotes a paſſage of Balzac relating to our Caſtelvetro (4). I ſhall cite another. " I am " deep in the quarrel of Annibal Caro, but I do not " change my inclination, and eſteem him ſtill a more " honeſt man than his antagoniſt, tho' perhaps the " latter is a greater ſcholar than he. I never ſaw a " Grammarian of equal force with this Modeneſe (5), " both here, and in his Commentaries upon Ariſtotle's " Poetics. However it muſt be acknowledged, that " he ſometimes miſtakes by too great ſubtilty, and " that he was likewiſe a public enemy, who could " not bear the merit and reputation of any other per- " ſon." This is what Balzac (6) wrote to Chapelain in the year 1640. Father Rapin (7) aſſures us, that Caſtelvetro was a man of a diſpoſition naturally peeviſh, who thro' a contradictory humour makes it a rule always to find ſomething to except againſt in the text of Ariſtotle. What a ſhocking character is it to be poſſeſſed of a ſpirit of contradiction! It leads one to overturn the moſt ſacred boundaries.

(4) *Eloges tirez de Mr. de Thou*, tom. 1. pag. 390. We may obſerve that in the 2d edition, which was publiſhed ſince the firſt impreſſion of this article, he has quoted part of the other paſſage of Balzac, cited here.

(5) Caſtelvetro was a native of Modena.

(6) Letter 5. book 5.

(7) Preface to his *Reflex. ſur l'Art Poetique.*

[*C*] *He made uſe of violent means againſt them.*] Read the following words of Mr. Chevreau; which are to be found in a letter, which he wrote to Monſr. de la Menardiere. " I have juſt read over your art " of Poetry, in which you treat Caſtelvetro after a " ſtrange manner; and perhaps formerly you would " not have found your account in it, if what Paſquin " reproached him with ſomewhere, be true, *that he pro-* " *ceeded from the tongue to the hands, from the pen* " *to the ſword, from ink to blood; and that he pro-* " *cured a man of great merit to be aſſaſſinated, who* " *had taken the liberty to contradict him* (8)."

(8) Chevreau, *Oeuvres mêlées*, pag. 330. Hague edit. 1697.

[*D*] *His Poetics . . . a work, in which many defects have been found.*] Conſult Monſr. de la Menardiere in the Preface to his Art of Poetry, or if you cannot meet with that work, read Mr. Teiſſier, who has given extracts from it (9). Mr. de Scudery having confuted Taſſo's opinion, *that Morality is not the object of a Poet, who ought only to think of diverting the Reader*, adds, " that Taſſo was not the only perſon, who " maintained this egregious error: Caſtelvetro tho' a " great man, has carried it to a greater pitch of ex- " travagance than he, and after having ſpent half his " life in labouring upon Ariſtotle's Poetics, and em- " ployed in that work all his Learning, tells us that Po- " etry was invented only, *per dilettare, & per recre-* " *are gli animi della rozza moltitudine, & del commune* " *populo*, i. e. to pleaſe and divert the minds of the " rude multitude, and of the common people. See " here an art indeed, which, if ſuch were the end of " it, would highly deſerve the labour of Ariſtotle in " giving us the rules of it; and Caſtelvetro himſelf " would have employed his time to excellent purpoſe, " if his performance was proper for nothing but to " divert the mob:

(9) *Eloges tirez de Mr. de Thou*, tom. 1. pag. 391.

" *De meſme l'Araignée, en filant ſon ordure,*
" *Uſe toute ſa vie, & ne fait rien qui dure,*
That is,
" Thus the ſpider
" His ordure ſpinning waſts his very life,
" But nothing laſting forms."

" ſaid one of our moſt famous Poets. But this is not " the only hereſy of that Author, who within a few " lines after ſays, that Empedocles, Lucretius, Ni- " cander, Heſiod, Virgil, and ſeveral others, whom " he names, are not Poets, becauſe the ſciences are " treated of in their Works. Homer ought there- " fore to be degraded as well as, or even more than " the reſt, ſince there is ſcarce any art or ſcience " known among mankind, which is not to be found " in the Iliad and Odyſſey (10)." I omit the other Remarks, which he makes againſt Caſtelvetro's maxim.

(10) Scudery, Preface to Alaric, pag. 6. of the Hague edition, 1685.

[*E*] *There are ſome Treatiſes of this Author . . . poſthumous.*] The Work, intitled *Le Rime del Petrarca ſpoſte per Lodovico Caſtelvetro*, was publiſhed by James Caſtelvetro, nephew to our Author; who acknowledges that his uncle did not put his laſt hand to it; *avegna che non habbiano recevuto dal loro autore quella perfettione, che, vivendo egli, & riveggendogli, haurebbe loro date.* He informs us in his Epiſtle Dedicatory dated from Modena February the 1ſt, 1552, that the late John Maria Caſtelvetro his father, had publiſhed " una operetta di Lodovico Caſtelvetro ſuo fratello . . . " da lui dettata ne gli ultimi giorni della vita ſuo, " per corregere alcuni falli da altri commeſſi in ma- " teria di lettere, & inſieme con eſſa una giunta fatta " dalla ſteſſo ſuo fratello ad uno de libri della lingua

CASTILE (ALFONSO X of that Name King of) more famous on account of his application to Aſtronomy than of his Crown, began to reign in the year 1252. The firſt difficulties he fell into were occaſioned by the unjuſt fancy which came into his head to divorce his wife (*a*) on pretence of ſterility, and to ſend to the Court of Denmark for another. The King of Aragon, his father-in-law, ſhewed ſome inclination to oppoſe the indignity deſigned to his daughter; but I know not whether he would have ſucceeded therein: the Queen's pregnancy, which was diſcovered at the time of the Princeſs of Denmark's arrival (*b*), was undoubtedly the true reaſon why the divorce did not take place. The Queen paſſed from one extreme to the other; ſhe had nine children, which were more than were requiſite for her huſband's happineſs and repoſe; ſo fruitful a wife was given him as a puniſhment for his ſins (*c*). However he was not contented with this fecundity; for he had ſome children in private by other women. As to the Princeſs of Denmark, ſhe returned not to her own country; the Archbiſhop of Sevil, brother to the King, quitted the Eccleſiaſtical habit for her ſake, and married her; but this expedient gave her no great ſatisfaction: vexation and reſentment of the injury put an end to her life in a very little time. Alfonſo was beloved neither by his ſubjects, nor by the neighbouring Kings; and yet his reputation was very glorious in diſtant countries. His learning, his knowledge, his eloquence, his policy, made a great noiſe there, and induced one part of the Electors to confer (*d*) the Imperial Crown on him [*A*], while the other part choſe Richard Earl of Cornwal, brother of Henry King of England. Alfonſo went not to ſupport by his preſence the party which had elected him, ſo that his title of Emperor had never any reality. They were weary of waiting for him, and as the ſuffrages could not be united in favour of his Competitor, (for he was dead), they proceeded to a new election. The Empire was given (*e*) to Rodolph Earl of Habſburgh, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of Alfonſo's Embaſſadors. The Pope acknowledged Rodolph for Emperor; and not being able to obtain of Alfonſo, who went to meet him at Beaucaire on the Rhone, the renunciation of his right, he obtained it at laſt by threatning him with Excommunication, and granted him ſome amends out of the Tythes belonging to the Church [*B*]. I have already ſaid that this Prince was not beloved by his ſubjects. He was ſeveral times expoſed to repeated Conſpiracies of the Grandees, who very well knew how to hold intelligence with the neighbouring Princes. At length, he ſaw his ſon Sancho at the head of a powerful faction, which rendered itſelf formidable by the people's diſcontent on account of the alteration of the Coin, and by reaſon of the unjuſt methods which he made uſe of to recruit his exhauſted Treaſury. This rebellion muſt have touched him the more ſenſibly, as it was accompanied with a great deal of ingratitude; for he had conſented (*f*), in favour of Sancho, to exclude the ſons of the deceaſed Prince Ferdinand, his eldeſt ſon (*g*), from the ſucceſſion. It is true he had done it only to avoid the troubles which were to be apprehended from Sancho, if the right of Ferdinand's children was not ſacrificed to him. This ſacrifice only kept off the civil wars a little longer. Sancho, being ſure of ſucceeding his Father, was not contented; he thought Alfonſo did not die ſoon enough: for which reaſon, being tired with having waited ſeveral years, he took arms, he ſtrengthened himſelf with the aſſiſtance of the King of Granada, he aſſembled the States of the Kingdom at Valladolid, he granted the Deputies whatever they demanded; and if he refuſed the Title of King, it was either becauſe he thought it enough to poſſeſs the ſubſtantial part of the regal authority, or elſe to raiſe the people's affections the more. In a word, Prince Emanuel, his Uncle, pronounced

(*a*) Iolante, or Violante, daughter to the King of Aragon.

(*b*) In 1255.

(*c*) Some of his children were like thoſe of whom *Ovid, Metam.* Book I, ſays *Filius ante diem patriot inquirit in annos.* i. e. "The Son "impatient waits "his Father's "death."

(*d*) In 1256, or, according to others, in 1258.

(*e*) In 1273.

(*f*) In 1276.

(*g*) Who died in the year 1275, and by his Marriage Contract with Blanche the daughter of St. Lewis, his children were to repreſent him, in caſe he died before his Father. Mezerai, *Abrégé Chronol.* at the year 1269.

"di M. Pietro Bembo:" i. e. *A little Treatiſe of Lewis Caſtelvetro his brother .... written by him in the latter part of his life, to correct ſome errors committed by others in point of Literature, and together with it an addition compoſed by his brother to one of Peter Bembo's Books concerning the Italian Language.* This Expoſition of Petrarch was printed at Baſil in 4to the ſame year at the coſt of Peter Sedabuoni Bookſeller.

[*A*] *One part of the Electors conferred the Imperial Crown on him.*] Thoſe who ſay he refuſed it are deceived. Some have added to this miſtake a pretty odd remark; which is, that he contented himſelf with the ſimple title of Emperor of the Weſt. *Imperium Germanicum oblatum recuſavit; Occidentalis titulo contentus* (1). When a perſon refuſes a Kingdom, he does not give it a place among his titles; and beſides, the Empire of Germany, and the Empire of the Weſt, are not two different dignities. The truth is, Alfonſo accepted the Empire, and really deſigned to go and take poſſeſſion of it; but for having unſeaſonably been what Fabius was when it was neceſſary (2), he entirely ruined his affairs. Wherefore he did not content himſelf with the title, but againſt his will he got nothing elſe. I ſee no manner of foundation for what ſome aſſert, that after having refuſed the Empire he ſuffered himſelf to be perſuaded to accept it by the ſelf-intereſted artifices of Pope Alexander. *Oblatum ab Electoribus imperium modeſtè deprecatus eſt, ſapientiæ ſuæ vim eo ipſo teſtatus. Poſtquam verò perſuaſionibus Pontificis* Alexandri *aures dedit qui ſui commodi .... cauſa eum inſtigavit ut oblatum imperii axioma à Germanis acciperet, & quem recuſarat titulum uſurparet ... multas ... moleſtias ... expertus eſt* (3). They add that his ſon diſpoſſeſſed him of his Kingdom, and afterwards reſtored it to him again (4). The laſt of theſe two facts is falſe.

[*B*] *The Pope granted him ſome amends out of the tythes belonging to the Church.*] The Pope permitted him to appropriate to himſelf the third part of the tythes, which uſed to be applied to the building and repairing of ſacred edifices. Then did the Kings of Caſtile begin to lay their hands on the Eccleſiaſtical Revenues. This is what Mariana informs us (5). But Mezerai goes farther; and we muſt hear him. *King Alfonſo,* ſays he (6), *yielded and reſigned his right to the diſpoſition of the Pope, in conſideration of his being allowed to levy the tenths on the Clergy of his Kingdom, to carry on a war againſt the Moors. So that indemnifications, whatever happens, are always raiſed on the people, who pay all.* For this time however the people had no new burden laid on them; would they not have paid Tythes notwithſtanding? The Clergy were the only ſufferers by it; but they have able ſhoulders, and need not our pity. Mezerai meant perhaps that the Clergy are never at a loſs for inventions to make themſelves amends at the people's coſt: this is another affair.

(1) Hofman. *Lexic. Univ.* vol. 1. pag. 89.

(2) Mariana frequently calls him *Cunctator.* i. e. *a Lingerer.*

(3) Matthias, *Theatr. Hiſt.* pag. 964.

(4) *Omnia conſilio & æquanimitate moderatus, priſtinos honores regios tandem recuperavit.* Idem, ibid.

(5) Lib. 13. *ſub fine.*

(6) Mezerai, *Abrégé Chronol.* at the year 1274.

pronounced in a full Aſſembly of the States a ſentence of Depoſition againſt the King, who at the ſame time held another Aſſembly, much leſs numerous, at Toledo, where out of too great a deſire of keeping a certain medium, he ſhewed neither courage nor circumſpection enough. The ſuccours which he obtained from the King of Morocco ſtood him in little ſtead: and the curſe which he ſolemnly pronounced againſt Sancho raiſed no ſcruple in the rebel's breaſt [C]. That hardened Son cared not, either for the thunder of his temporal father, or that of his ſpiritual father; for he laughed at the Pope's excommunication [D]. But there were ſome towns which forſook him, on account of the interdict, which arrived from Rome, againſt thoſe who ſhould follow his party. Two of his brothers abandoned him likewiſe. The death of Alfonſo put an end to this civil war in the year 1284. He ordered his heart to be interred on Mount Calvary, but this order was not executed. His heart and bowels are at Murcia, and his body at Sevil. He was the firſt King of Caſtile who permitted the public Acts to be drawn up in the vulgar tongue [E]. He cauſed the Bible to be tranſlated into the ſame tongue (*b*). He was unhappy in his wife [F], in his children, and in his ſubjects. No body is ignorant of the great expence he was at in Aſtronomical Obſervations [G], and the cenſure of God's Works which

(*b*) *Ex* Matianæ Hiſtoria.

[C] *The curſe which he ſolemnly pronounced againſt Sancho, raiſed no ſcruple in the mind of that rebel.*] I fancy my Reader will not be diſpleaſed to find here the words which Mariana has made uſe of. *Ab Alphonſo Rege Hiſpali in publico conventu Sanctius furiali carmine devotus, & jure paterno diris execrationibus caput revinctus, regnique ſucceſſione ſpoliatus eſt, octavo menſis Novembris die . . . .* (7). i. e. "*Sancho* was ſo-"lemnly curſed by King Alphonſo in a public aſſem-"bly at Sevil, was loaded with horrid imprecations, "and deprived of the right of ſucceſſion, on the eighth "day of November. . . ." Alfonſo gained nothing by this: his ſon felt not the leaſt remorſe on that account (8), and had even the fortune to reign as a good Prince; ſo that he gave the lie to that maxim of Salluſt, *imperium facile iis artibus retinetur quibus initio partum eſt* (9): i. e. "Power is eaſily preſerved "by the ſame arts by which it was at firſt obtained:" he exerciſed well an authority which he had criminally acquired. *Spoliati ejectique patris nota ad poſteritatem infamis: alioqui in bonorum Principum numero: imperium enim flagitio partum bonis artibus exercuit* (10). i. e. "The ſtripping and depoſing of his father ſet a "mark of infamy on him to poſterity: in other re-"ſpects he may be reckoned in the number of good "Princes; for he worthily adminiſtred that govern-"ment which he had wickedly obtained." This is ſomething: nay, it is a great deal.

(7) Mariana, lib. 14. cap. 5.

(8) *Sanctius neque ea religione tactus.* Idem.

(9) Salluſt. *in Præf. Belli Catilin.*

(10) Mariana, lib. 14. cap. 8.

[D] *His ſon laughed at the Pope's Excommunication.*] Let us again ſee the terms of Mariana. *Novum*, ſays he (11), *ex Italia* (ſubſidium petitum) *religionis objecta ſpecie. Sanctius apud Martinum Pontificem Maximum per oratorem de impietate atque ingrati animi noxa poſtulatur, ſuperſtite patre in omnia regni jura invaſiſſe, neque præ ambitione regnandi ſenis obitum expectare. Ergo in impiorum loco haberi mandatum eſt quicumque relicto Alfonſo filii partes ſequerentur: dati etiam judices a Pontifice in cauſſa: urbes & oppida Sanctio addicta ex ritu Chriſtiano ſacrificiis interdixerunt. Itaque eodem tempore non eadem de cauſſa in Aragonia & Caſtella ſacrorum veluti juſtitium fuit, mœſta provincia, Sanctioque judicibus, ſi eos nanciſceretur, extrema quævis comminanti.* i. e. "New aid was ſollicited from Italy, "under colour of religion. Sancho was accuſed to "Pope Martin by his father's Embaſſador, of impie-"ty and ingratitude, of having uſurped the whole "regal authority during his father's life, and through "an immoderate ambition of reigning, not waiting "the old man's death. Therefore whoever ſhould "abandon Alfonſo and follow his ſon's party were de-"clared excommunicate: the Pope alſo delegated "Judges in the affair; and the cities and towns which "adhered to Sancho were laid under an Interdict. So "that at the ſame time, tho' on different accounts, the "public exerciſe of Religion was ſuſpended both in "Aragon and in Caſtile; the province was afflicted at "it, and Sancho threatened the Subdelegates with the "moſt rigorous puniſhments, if they ſhould fall into "his hands." This was the regard he had to the thunder of the Vatican.

(11) Ibid. cap. 7.

[E] *He was the firſt King of Caſtile who permitted the public Acts to be drawn up in the Vulgar Tongue.*] I know not for what reaſon Mariana attributes the ignorance and barbarouſneſs which ſpread themſelves over Spain to this regulation; for they were no leſs in France, though the like regulation was not eſtabliſhed there till under the reign of Francis I: and it is even true that the ſtudy of elegant Latin was never more in faſhion in that Kingdom, than after all the public Acts were ordered to be written in French. Let us hear Mariana. *Primus Hiſpaniæ Regum vendendi atque paciſcendi vulgari Hiſpanorum lingua poteſtatem conceſſit, eam linguam nimirum quæ rudior erat excolere locupletareque eo decreto cupiebat; ſacros Bibliorum libros in maternam linguam vertendos etiam curavit. Ex eo tempore in regiis diplomatibus ac publicis in tabulis Latina Lingua, cujus antea uſus erat, deſitt uſurpari, unde pudenda litterarum ignoratio in noſtram gentem atque utrumque ordinem invaſit* (12). i. e. "He was the firſt of the "Kings of Spain who allowed contracts to be made "in the vulgar Spaniſh, deſigning thereby to poliſh and "inrich that tongue, which was then ſomewhat rude; "he alſo took care to have the holy Bible tranſlated "into his mother tongue. From that time the Latin "tongue ceaſed to be made uſe of in the Royal "Charters and the public Records, as it had been be-"fore; whence a ſhameful ignorance introduced itſelf "into our Nation, and infected the Clergy as well as "the Laity."

(12) Idem, ibid. cap. 8. Here is what he ſays in the 13th Book, chap. 12: *Primus Hiſpaniæ Regum Latinæ linguæ uſu in publicis tabulis antiquato, Hiſpanicam linguam ſubſtituit.*

[F] *He was unhappy in his wife.*] I find in a Chronicle of Aragon, inſerted in the third volume of the *Hiſpania illuſtrata* (13), that Jolante, the wife of Alfonſo, returned unwillingly to her huſband, after ſhe had eſcaped into Aragon with her two grandſons. This is not the principal fact. The Chronicler adds that ſhe paſſed for an immodeſt woman. *Iolans ad virum ingratis decedit: quæ magnorum Regum filia, uxor, & parens ſummo dedecore impudicitiæ famam effugere non potuit.*

(13) Pag. 113.

[G] *No body is ignorant of the great expences he was at in Aſtronomical Obſervations.*] He chiefly made uſe of the labour of certain ſkillful Jews, whom he ſent for to Toledo. Rabbi Iſaac Hazan (14) was the perſon who contributed the moſt to the conſtruction of the Aſtronomical Tables which are called *Alphonſine*, and which appeared in the year 1270: the Jews of Sevil maintain that Rabbi to be the Author of them (15). Alfonſo ſpent in that Work forty thouſand Ducats, according to Voſſius, *quadraginta ducatorum millia:* but in all likelihood he meant *quadringenta*, or elſe he made uſe of a Book wherein the Printers had put *quadraginta* inſtead of *quadringenta:* for if Alfonſo had expended no more on that Work than forty thouſand ducats, it would not be worth ſpeaking of, and we find in other Authors the ſum of four hundred thouſand ducats (16). But it was not herein that theſe Aſtronomical Tables coſt the King of Caſtile the moſt: their dearneſs conſiſted chiefly in that they were the occaſion of his loſing the Empire of Germany. This, without doubt, is what Mariana alluded to, when he ſaid that Alfonſo loſt the earth, by being too intent on the contemplation of the heavens. *Erat Alfonſo ſublime ingenium, ſed incautum, ſuperbæ aures, lingua petulans, literis potius quàm civilibus actibus inſtructus, dumque cœlum conſiderat obſervatque aſtra, terram amiſit* (17). i. e. "Alfonſo had a ſublime genius, but unheedy, proud "ears, and a petulant tongue; he was better verſed "in learning than in the arts of government, and "while

(14) *That is,* Chanter. *He had this name, becauſe he was Chanter of the Synagogue of Toledo.* Voſſius, *de Scient. Mathem.* pag. 180.

(15) Auguſt. Ricius, *in Libro* de Motu octavæ Sphæræ, *apud* Voſſium, *ibid.*

(16) *Expendit in hanc rem ad quater centena millia aureorum.* Sethus Calviſius, *ad ann.* 1252. Matthias, *Theatr. Hiſtor.* pag. 964. Moreri *ſays four hundred thouſand crowns.*

(17) Mariana, lib. 13. cap. 20.

which is attributed to him [*H*]. It is pretended that Aſtrological Predictions were the cauſe of the misfortunes which overwhelmed him [*I*]. It were to be wiſhed, for the honour of the Sciences, that a Prince ſo adorned by them [*K*], had governed his people with more ſucceſs and greater wiſdom. They had begun under his father's reign to form a Code or Body of Laws. This great Work was completed by his care. No regard was

" while he contemplated the heavens, and obſerved " the ſtars, he loſt the earth." He fixed the epoch of thoſe Tables on the firſt day of June 1252, which was that of his acceſſion to the crown; and he regulated the concurrence of that firſt day of June with the other epochs in ſuch a manner, that he made it fall on the 230th day of the year 2000 of the æra of Nabonaſſar, and ſo of the others, as may be ſeen in Moreri.

[*H*] . . . *and the Cenſure of God's Works which is attributed to him.*] Mariana ſays in general, that Alfonſo had dared to blame the Works of Providence, and the conſtruction of our bodies (18). Of this fact he produces no other proof than a vulgar tradition, which had been delivered down from hand to hand. It is a ſign that the contemporary Hiſtory had not recorded thoſe libertine diſcourſes of the King of Caſtile, nor put the ſeal to it, to prevent its being doubted in future ages. The ſaid Hiſtorian adds, that God very juſtly puniſhed Alfonſo's raſh tongue by the rebellion of Sancho. *Emanuel ſanè patruus* (Sanctii) *ſuo & aliorum procerum nomine Alfonſum publica ſententia in conventu pronunciata regno privavit, ea calamitate dignum quod divinæ providentiæ opera, & humani corporis fabricam inſigni linguæ procacitate ingeniique confidentia accuſare auſus fuerit, uti vulgo hominum opinio eſt, ab antiquo ducta per manus. Vocis ſtoliditatem numen juſtiſſimè vindicavit.* Tho' the ſilence of ſo wiſe an Hiſtorian with reſpect to the Ptolemaic Syſtem ought to be of ſome weight, I believe notwithſtanding that if Alfonſo paſſed his audacious cenſure on any part of the Univerſe, it was on the celeſtial Spheres. For beſides that this was his principal ſtudy, it is certain that Aſtronomers then explained the motion of the heavens by ſuch intricate and confuſed Hypotheſes, that they did no honour to God, and by no means anſwered the idea of a ſkilful Workman. It is probable therefore that it was on conſidering that multitude of Spheres of which the Syſtem of Ptolemy is compoſed, ſo many excentric circles, ſo many epicycles, ſo many librations, and ſo many deferents, that he let fall the expreſſion, *that if God had called him to his council, when he made the world, he could have given him ſome good advice* (19). Before we go any further, let us mention a lenitive ſuggeſted to us by a modern Author (20). If the King of Caſtile had ſpoken that conditionally, which it is pretended he ſaid abſolutely, he would have been very excuſable: inſtead of the words above mentioned, make uſe of the following, " *That if God had* " *made the World ſuch as is ſuppoſed in the Ptolemaic* " *Syſtem, good advice might be given him for another* " *time*, and you will greatly diminiſh the ſcandalous " audaciouſneſs of Alfonſo." Lipſius does not relate the affair as if it regarded the diſpoſition of the heavens in particular; he keeps to general terms. *Mitior*, ſays he (21), ALPHONSI X *Hiſpaniæ Regis, ſed non melior vox aut ſenſus, qui ſolitus providentiam itidem culpare & dicere:* ſi principio mundi ipſe Deo adfuiſſet, multa melius ordinatiuſque condenda fuiſſe. i. e. " More moderate, but not at all better, was the expreſſion or " meaning of Alfonſo X, King of Spain, who uſed " likewiſe to blame Providence, and to ſay, *that if* " *he had been preſent with God at the creation, many* " *things would have been better and more regularly con-* " *trived.*" Lipſius cites no body; but Father Theophilus Raynaud (22), mentioning the ſame impertinent ſpeech, quotes Mariana, Rodericus Sanctius (23), and Alphonſus Spina (24). A modern Compiler adds, that the King *had ſcarce uttered this blaſphemy, but the lightning fell into the bed where he lay, which conſumed his wife and two of his children to aſhes, that he fled through the chambers of his palace followed by the lightning which burned his ſhirt, and would in all likelihood have done the ſame by his perſon, if he had not proſtrated himſelf on the ground to aſk pardon of God for his crime* (25). Our Compiler refers us to Rodericus Sanctius, to Mariana, and to Bzovius. But I am very ſure that Mariana ſays nothing of this, and that he would have ſpoken of it, if there had been any certain Tradition in Spain of ſo wonderful an accident. He knew, without doubt, what another Hiſtorian relates of it; wherefore ſince he has adopted no part of that relation it is to be believed that he ſuſpected it to be ſuppoſitious. However it be, here is the ſubſtance of Rodericus Sanctius's Narrative (26). The King often repeated his blaſphemy, *that if he had aſſiſted at God's Council when man was created, certain things would have been in better order than they are. Si à principio creationis humanæ Dei altiſſimi conſilio interfuiſſet, nonnulla melius, ordinatiuſque condita fuiſſe.* The Infant Emanuel's Governor ſaw, in a dream, an Angel, who informed him that it had been reſolved in the celeſtial Council that Alphonſo ſhould die dethroned, and even a cruel death, if he did not repent: the Governor aſking the reaſon, the Angel replied, that it was becauſe Alfonſo had been raſh enough to cenſure the Works of God; *Blaſphemiam Alfonſi vanamque temeritatem divina opera corrigere molientis id maluiſſe*; and commanded him to go and exhort that Prince to repentance. The Governor obeyed, but Alfonſo laughed at him, and repeated his blaſphemy. He was then at Burgos. Some days after, as he was at Segovia, a Hermit had a like viſion, and went to acquaint him with it, and exhorted him to a retractation: the King fell into a paſſion, called him madman, and returned to his old way of talking. The next night there were ſuch horrible ſtorms, accompanied with thunder and lightning, that one would have thought heaven and earth were coming together. Fire from heaven burned the King's and the Queen's clothes in Alfonſo's chamber: then that Prince being at the laſt extremity ſent for the Hermit, confeſſed his ſin to him, wept, humbled himſelf, and retracted his blaſphemy: the more he wept, the more was the ſtorm obſerved to abate, and at length it ceaſed. Rodericus Sanctius at the beginning of this relation quotes the Annals of Spain (27), and in this reſpect at leaſt there is no doubt but he is miſtaken; for if the Annals made mention of it, Mariana, who wrote after him, and was infinitely more able and judicious than he, would not have ſingly alledged the popular tradition, or have ſuppreſſed the dreams, the ſtorms, and the repentance. However the French Compiler does not relate this prodigy faithfully. A Lutheran Miniſter applies Alfonſo's blaſphemy to the celeſtial ſyſtem, and adds that that Prince's puniſhment was to die in exile in a ſtrange country (28). This is falſe; for he died at Sevil (29), one of the cities which had perſevered in their obedience.

[*I*] *It is pretended that Aſtrological Predictions were the cauſe of the misfortunes which overwhelmed him.*] They ſay, that knowing by means of Aſtrology that he ſhould be diſpoſſeſſed of his Kingdom, he became ſo ſuſpicious, ſo miſtruſtful, and ſo cruel, that he procured himſelf an infinite number of enemies; which thing ruined his affairs. It is very poſſible that a prediction, which in itſelf is no more than a chimæra, may become a moſt real evil by the conduct it inſpires. The examples which are brought of Predictions that have been accompliſhed, are almoſt all built on this foundation. But let us hear Mariana. *Id fore aſtra memorant portendiſſe ejus artis non ignaro, ſi ars eſt & non potius inane mortalium ludibrium quod à prudentibus ſemper accuſabitur, & ſemper tamen patronos habebit. Ex eo ferunt ſuſpicacem eſſe redditum, atque ex metu ſuſceptæ crudelitate magnam ejus odii partem concitaſſe quæ illi calamitati fuit* (30).

[*K*] *The ſciences with which he was adorned.*] He underſtood Aſtronomy, Philoſophy, and Hiſtory, as perfectly as if he had been only a man of ſtudy, and he compoſed Books on the motion of the heavens, and the Hiſtory of Spain, which are excellent. *Quid admirabilius quam in caſtris educato armaque à prima ætate tractanti tantam fuiſſe aſtrorum, philoſophiæ, rerumque geſtarum cognitionem, quantam vix otioſi homines in umbra aſſequuntur? Exſtant de aſtrorum converſionibus, de Hiſpanica Hiſtoria ab Alfonſo edita volumina magno ingenio, incredibili ſtudio* (31). i. e. " What " is

(18) Idem, lib. 14. cap. 5.

(19) *I make uſe of the terms of the Author of the Plurality of Worlds.* The intricacy of all theſe circles, *ſays he, pag.* 15 *of the Dutch Edition*, was ſo great, that at a time when nothing better was as yet known, a King of Aragon (*which is a fault of the preſs, I believe, for a King of Caſtile*) who was a great Mathematician, but not over devout, ſaid that if God &c.

(20) *Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres*, May 1686, pag. 488.

(21) *Monit. & Exempl. Polit.* cap. 4.

(22) Theophil. Raynaud. *Tract. de Eunuchis, Præf. &* pag. 81.

(23) Part. 4. *Hiſtoriæ*, cap. 5.

(24) *In Fortalitio fidei*, lib. 4. Conſ. 9. Bello 138.

(25) Father L'Enfant, *in the Month of March*, pag. 143.

(26) *Hiſt. Hiſpan.* Part 4. cap. 5.

(27) *Ut tradunt Hiſpanorum Annalia.*

(28) Spizelius, *in Felice Litterato*, pag. 218, 219.

(29) Mariana, lib. 15. cap. 7.

(30) Idem, lib. 14. cap. 9.

(31) Idem, lib. 13. cap. 9.

was had to his Will, by which he left his Kingdom to his grandſon Alfonſo [*L*], by intail to Ferdinand the brother of Alfonſo, and afterward to Philip King of France (*i*). Sancho maintained himſelf on the throne, while his two nephews found it difficult to enjoy their liberty. Iolante, their grandmother, had early taken refuge with them at the Court of the King of Aragon, to avoid the attempt which their Uncle would in all probability have formed againſt their lives, even during that of Alfonſo, if he had had them in his power. So true it is, that the luſt of reigning ſtifles all ſentiments of humanity, and ſubverts all juſtice! I am beholden for this Reflection to Mariana [*M*].

(*i*) Mariana, lib. 14. cap. 7.

" is more admirable than that one educated in a " camp, and handling arms from his childhood, ſhould " be maſter of ſuch knowledge in Aſtronomy, Philo- " ſophy, and Hiſtory, as men of leiſure even in a " retirement ſcarce attain? Some volumes of Alfonſo's " are extant, concerning the courſes of the ſtars, " and the Hiſtory of Spain, written with great under- " ſtanding, and incredible application." Rodericus Sanctius gives us to underſtand that Alfonſo did no more than order ſome able men to write thoſe Books. *Idem Alfonſus rerum in orbe geſtarum librum accommodatiſſimum per ſapientes ſcribi fecit, quem generalem Hiſtoriam Hiſpani appellant* . . . (32). *Aſtrologus appellatus eſt. Cujus nomine, neſcio an ſapientia, tabulæ Alfonſinæ & aliæ Aſtrologicæ conſiderationes compilatæ ſunt, & ſub ejus regio nomine luſtrantur* (33). i. e. " The ſame Alfonſo cauſed a moſt uſeful relation of " what had paſſed in the world to be compoſed by " wiſe men, which the Spaniards call a General Hi- " ſtory. . . He is called an Aſtrologer; and under his " royal name, bnt whether by his ſkill I know not, " the Alfonſine Tables and other Aſtrological ſpecu- " lations were compiled and publiſhed." They who can conſult Nicholas Antonio (34) will doubtleſs ſatisfy their curioſity on this head. I do not know where a Miniſter of Rotterdam (35) has read what he reports concerning Alfonſo's learning in the law. *Legibus fuit deditiſſimus, omnium ferè populorum & gentium de Legibus volumina evolvit, ac ſeptem Libros pro æquitatis moderatione collegit, ut & hominibus & divino cultui neceſſaria ſingulis innoteſcerent.* i. e. " He was " much addicted to the ſtudy of Law, he peruſed the " Law Books of almoſt all people and nations, and " collected ſeven Books for the regulation of Juſtice, " that things neceſſary for men and the ſervice of " God might be made known to every one." This, without doubt, has no other foundation than what has been ſaid above (36) concerning the Compilation of the Cuſtomary or Code of Caſtile, made under the reign of Alfonſo; which is no proof that this Prince underſtood Law: unleſs a man will maintain that Juſtinian was the moſt learned Lawyer of his age. Conſider well what I quote from Rodericus Sanctius, and you will no longer doubt that the words of the Miniſter of Rotterdam were taken thence: it is perhaps from the thirtieth hand. *Alfonſus Legibus condendis deditiſſimus fuit. . . . Leges enim Romanas in regnis ſuis legi fecit licet minime eis ſubjiceretur. Demum ex omnibus ſumma moderatione & ratione ac æquitatis vibramine ſeptem Libros quos partitas vocant inſtituit & ſalubriter compilavit, in quibus ſacratiſſimæ Leges non ſolum ad cauſas hominum decidendas, ſed ad divinum cultum dirigendum augendumque continentur.* i. e. " Al- " fonſo was much addicted to the framing of Laws, " . . . for he cauſed the Roman Law to be read in " his Kingdoms, though not ſubject to them. At " length he ſelected and compiled out of all, with the " utmoſt moderation, reaſon, and weighing of equity, " ſeven Books, called *las Partidas*, wherein are con- " tained the moſt Sacred Laws, not only for deciding " civil cauſes, but for directing and promoting the " worſhip of God." It would be to deceive ones ſelf groſly to ſuppoſe that Alfonſo was himſelf the Compiler of theſe Laws. He therein acted the ſame part that Theodoſius, Juſtinian, and Lewis XIV did in the Compilation of the Codes which bear their name. Mariana does not ſuffer us to doubt of it. They who ſay that Alfonſo read over the Bible fourteen times (37) attribute that to him which belongs only to another Alfonſo, King of Aragon and Naples, who lived in the XVth Century: I ſpeak of it in his Article (38). It is not the only thing which has been transferred from the latter to the former: Mr. Hofman has aſcribed to the King of Caſtile, beſides the reading of the Old and New Teſtament fourteen times, what Antonius Panormitanus relates concerning the inclination of the King of Naples for the Sciences, and the curing a diſtemper by the reading of Quintus Curtius. In return, Mr. Lloyd transfers to the King of Aragon the labour and expence of the Aſtronomical Tables of the King of Caſtile.

(32) Roderic. Sanctius, *Hiſt. Hiſpan.* Part. 4. cap. 1.

(33) Idem, ibid. cap. 5.

(34) In his *Bibliotheca Hiſpana vetus*. See the *Journal des Savans* of 1697, pag. 462. of the Dutch Edition.

(35) Ridderus *de Erudit.* cap. 3. pag. 147. *apud* Saldenum, *de Libris*, pag. 318.

(36) Towards the end of the Text.

(37) Moreri *ſays it, and* Matthias *alſo, Theatr. Hiſt.* pag. m. 694. *where he calls him on that account* Regem pium & religioſiſſimum.

(38) NAPLES (Alfonſo I, King of), Remark [C], towards the end.

[*L*] *He left his Kingdom to Alfonſo his grandſon.*] Conclude from hence that the honeſt Monk Dom Peter de St. Romuald had drawn from very muddy ſprings, when he wrote " that Alfonſo declared the youngeſt " of his ſons ſucceſſor to his Crown, preferring him " to Sancho his eldeſt, becauſe he had found by the " rules of Aſtrology that he would be the moſt fa- " voured by the ſtars; which was the cauſe of their " mutual hatred, and at length of the death of that " youngeſt ſon, and of his own likewiſe: for the " eldeſt, not able to bear his being thus diſinherited, " rebelled againſt him, made him die in priſon, and " put his brother to death, and then ſeized on the " Crown (39)." It is not poſſible to heap more lies one upon another than there are here; and yet this paſſage has ſerved (40) and will ſerve as an Original to many other Compilers.

(39) *Abrégé du Threſor Chronolog.* tom. 3. at the year 1282.

(40) Father L'Enfant has inſerted it in his Month of March, pag. 143.

[*M*] *I am beholden for this reflection to Mariana.*] Let us ſet down his words. *Violantes Caſtellæ Regina nepotum ætatem in quos potiſſimum erat propenſa ludibrio eſſe dolens Sanctio prælato, neque ſatis ab ejus injuria tutam, uſque adeo omnia jura pervertit exitiabilis imperandi cupido, fugam meditata . . . . cum illis in Aragoniam abiit, Alfonſo nequicquam cum res eſſet indicata probibere conato dolenteque, adeo ut nulla ſui propria regnique clade moveri magis potuiſſet* . . . (41). *Gallo Regi curæ erat ne in patrui poteſtatem redacti ſalutis, libertatis certè, periculum adirent, non ignaro naturam mortalium ambitioſam & imperii cupiditate in crudelitatem pronam eſſe* (42). i. e. " Violante Queen " of Caſtile, grieving that the age of her grandſons, " of whom ſhe was particularly fond, was deſpiſ- " ed, ſince Sancho had been preferred before them, " and fearing they would not be ſafe from his vio- " lence, to ſuch a degree does the pernicious luſt of " reigning pervert all right, meditating flight . . . . " went with them into Aragon; Alfonſo, ſo ſoon as " the thing was told him, in vain endeavouring to " prevent it, and afflicting himſelf in ſuch a manner " that he could not have been more moved by the " ſlaughter of himſelf and kingdom. . . . The French " King took care leſt, falling into their uncle's power, " they ſhould run the riſque of their lives, or at leaſt " of their liberty; well knowing the nature of men " to be ambitious, and prone to cruelty through luſt " of Empire." This picture is a very good one.

(41) Mariana, lib. 14. cap. 3.

(42) Idem, ibid. cap. 4.

CASTILLE (BLANCHE) Queen of France, and mother of St. Lewis, was a Lady of very great accompliſhments. She was daughter of Alfonſo IX King of Caſtile, and married to Lewis of France, eldeſt ſon of Philip Auguſtus (*a*), May 23d in the year 1200. She was crowned with her huſband Lewis VIII Auguſt the 6th 1223, and declared Regent by the laſt will of that Prince in November 1226. Lewis IX, their eldeſt ſon, was then juſt entered his twelfth year, and at that time the Kings of France were not of age till they were twenty one compleat; ſo that the Regency of this Lady was long enough to give her an opportunity of ſhewing her prudence and courage. She had occaſion

(*a*) At Purmont in Normandy.

caſion for both of theſe talents; for the young King was ſcarce crowned on the firſt of December 1226, but a dreadful civil war broke out. The Princes and great Men of the Kingdom confederated together, and alledged this for the ground of their League, that the Regency of the Kingdom was given to a woman who was a foreigner (*b*). Blanche was not at all confounded by ſo difficult and dangerous a conjuncture of affairs, but making uſe of all the methods which her prudence ſuggeſted to her, ſhe defeated that formidable party, as often as they renewed their plots. It is ſaid that her beauty was not uſeleſs to her [*A*] upon thoſe occaſions, and that ſhe made very great advantages of it without acting in the leaſt contrary to her honour. The laſt point is not univerſally agreed upon, and there never was a Queen who felt ſo much the malignity of calumny as ſhe did. She was accuſed of not only having intrigues herſelf (*c*), but likewiſe aſſiſting her ſon in his gallantries [*B*], with a view to divert him from taking upon him the adminiſtration of affairs, and to preſerve a more abſolute authority in her hands. The particular care which ſhe took of his education [*C*], and the ſucceſs with which ſhe diſpelled all the ſtorms which were formed during his minority, inſpired that young Prince with a great reſpect and affection for her. It may be affirmed, that he ſuffered her to aſſume too great a power over him: Hiſtory has preſerved ſome remarkable particulars with regard to this [*D*], which demonſtrate to us, that this Queen had brought from her own country a diſpoſition a little too haughty. It was not the way to correct it, to engage, as ſhe did, in

(*b*) Joinville, *Chronique du Roy Sainct Loys*, cap. 14.

(*c*) See the Article of THIBAUT, Earl of Champagne.

[*A*] *It is ſaid that her beauty was not uſeleſs to her.*] A modern Hiſtorian ſpeaks of her beauty in the ſame manner as is proper for Clelia or ſome other Romance. There was no Lady, ſays he (1), *who would preſume to diſpute the ſuperiority in point of beauty with Blanche, and all acknowledged, that ſhe ſurpaſſed them infinitely in a fine mein. . . . Her beauty was not altered by ſeaſons or years, and tho' ſhe had borne ten children, yet this did not leſſen the floridneſs or delicacy of her complection.* But let us come to the point. *Her chaſtity*, continues he, *was impenetrable; and yet it was a virtue, which was moſt called in queſtion during her life, and after her death. We read ſtill ſeveral ſatyrs, which attacked her in that tender point, and the worſt is that ſhe furniſhed a pretext for that calumny. She was perſuaded of one of the moſt dangerous maxims, which a Lady can be prepoſſeſſed with, that there are ſome conjunctures, very rare indeed, but yet poſſible, which allow them to neglect the outworks of honour, provided they maintain inviolably the fort itſelf; that is, Queen Blanche laid it down for a foundation in her Politics, that ſhe might in conſcience endeavour to inſpire thoſe Nobles with love, whom ſhe deſpaired of engaging in her intereſts any other way, when the point was to avoid or put an end to a civil war. We ſhall find but too many inſtances of this in the courſe of this Hiſtory.* See the Article of THIBAUT, Earl of Champagne.

(1) Varillas, *Minorité de Saint Loüis*, pag. 8 and 9. It is only a fragment printed at the Hague in 1685.

[*B*] *She was accuſed . . . of aſſiſting the King her ſon in his Gallantries.*] St. Lewis ſhewed thro' the whole courſe of his life a great regard to virtue; but it was almoſt impoſſible for him to preſerve even the appearance of chaſtity, before he was married. Private men offend in this point much more than in any other of the duties of Chriſtianity; whether it is, that their conſtitution hurries them with greater force into incontinence, than into other vices; or whether the point of honour among men is incomparably more favourable to young perſons, who offend againſt chaſtity, than to thoſe who commit other crimes. If this be true with regard to private men, what will it be with regard to a young Monarch? However it is affirmed, that the King, whom we are ſpeaking of, never made any falſe ſtep in this ſlippery path. It is true, "it "did not pleaſe God, that he ſhould eſcape the ef- "fects of calumny. It could not be conceived, that as "he was not then above nineteen years old, he ſhould "be without blemiſh amidſt the dangers of a Court, "and in a ſituation where every thing tempts one's de- "ſires. Beſides this, the debauched Courtiers being "pleaſed that they could juſtify their own irregularities "by the example of their Prince, if they did not raiſe, "at leaſt encouraged the reports which were ſpread, "and which were attended with probability enough "to alarm thoſe, who were concerned for his virtue. "An honeſt Monk among others thought himſelf "obliged to inform the Queen of it, and this he did "in ſuch a manner as to perſuade her, that he was leſs "in doubt concerning it, than he wiſhed to be. He "even made her ſenſible, that ſhe was ſuſpected to "know as much of the affair as any perſon, and to "regard very little what her ſon did, if ſhe could but "govern. She could not have received a more ſen- "ſible ſhock. But conſidering the zeal of the Monk "more than the manner, in which he ſpoke to her, "ſhe juſtified the King, and herſelf likewiſe with ſo "much modeſty, that it was not poſſible to doubt "any longer, but that ſhe was aſſured of her ſon's "virtue, and on her part incapable of having any "hand in the faults, which he might commit. The "King himſelf was ſo averſe from ſuch a conduct "and all his actions ſhewed it ſo viſibly, that theſe "idle rumours vaniſhed ſoon, and were never revived "again. (2)."

(2) *Hiſtoire de Saint Loüis*, liv. 3. *ad ann.* 1233. pag. 134. of the Bruſſels edition, 1688. The Author quotes the 5th volume of the *Hiſtorians of France* publiſhed by Du Cheſne, pag. 446.

[*C*] *The particular care, which ſhe took of his education.*] She nurſed him herſelf, and would not ſuffer him to ſuck any other woman. There is related a very remarkable circumſtance, which will ſhew how extremely obſtinate ſhe was in that point. "One day "when ſhe had a violent fit of an ague upon her, "which laſted longer than uſual, a Lady of Quality, "who either to pleaſe her Majeſty, or after her ex- "ample nurſed her own ſon, ſeeing the infant Prince "cry for the breaſt, ventured to give him her own. The "Queen, when her fit was off, called for her child, and "offered him her breaſt; but he put it by, either be- "cauſe he was fully ſatisfied, or becauſe the freſh milk, "which he had lately taſted, made him more ſenſible "of the heat of that which his mother offered him. "It was not difficult to gueſs the reaſon, and the "Queen immediately ſuſpected what had happened. "She pretended an impatient deſire of returning her "thanks to the perſon, who had obliged her by be- "ing ſo kind to her child, during her indiſpoſition; "and the Lady upon this expecting to gain her fa- "vour, owned that ſhe had been ſo ſenſibly touched "by the infant's cries, that ſhe could not forbear to "give him relief. But the Queen inſtead of an- "ſwering, looked upon her with an air of diſdain, "and thruſting her finger into her ſon's mouth, for- "ced him to caſt up all that he had received from the "Lady's breaſt. This violent behaviour aſtoniſhed "all who ſaw it; and the Queen to remove their ſur- "prize, told them, that ſhe could not bear that any "other woman ſhould have a right to diſpute with "her the title of mother; ſo ſtrongly were people at "that time perſuaded, that the nurſing of children "was part of their education (3)."

(3) Varillas, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 10.

QUEEN Blanche nurſed her own ſon.

[*D*] *Her ſon ſuffered her to aſſume too great a power over him: Hiſtory has preſerved ſome remarkable particulars with regard to this.*] This imperious mother having conceived an hatred againſt her daughter-in-law, prevented her as far as was in her power, from lying with the King her huſband, and this Prince, contrary to his inclination, ſubmitted to this new kind of ſervitude; for when he ventured to go to his Conſort's bed, he took the utmoſt precautions not to be ſurprized. Can there be a more ſevere inſtance of oppreſſion, than when a married couple are debarred the liberty of performing the conjugal duty, whenever they pleaſe? Queen Blanche would not even ſuffer her ſon to viſit his wife, when ſhe was dangerouſly ſick. We ſhall prove theſe particulars by the teſtimony of a contemporary

in a quarrel with the Queen, her daughter-in-law; on the contrary, that rivalſhip for the authority could not but render her paſſions ſtill more imperious. It is eaſy to imagine, that St. Lewis was not in a very quiet ſituation amidſt the conteſts between his mother and his wife; for out of apprehenſion of offending the former, he could not venture to careſs the latter (d). He carried (e) his wife with him to the Holy Land, when he engaged in the Croiſade, and left his mother Regent of his Kingdom. It muſt be acknowledged to the honour of the Queen-mother, that though ſhe undoubtedly expected to govern in her ſon's abſence, ſhe endeavoured to divert him from that unfortunate expedition (f). She did not live till the return of St. Lewis, for ſhe died in 1252 (g), having diſtinguiſhed her ſelf during this ſecond Regency by her prudent conduct amidſt ſeveral hazardous conjunctures of affairs. The Kingdom ſuffered extremely at that time through the madneſs of a great number of weak people (b), who were infatuated by certain viſionaries [E]. The oppreſſion of the Nation under the yoak of the Eccleſiaſtics was very ſhocking. The Queen did a bold action in order to redreſs this grievance in ſome meaſure [F]. The account of Blanche's death extremely afflicted the King her ſon: the Queen her daughter-in-law ſhed tears, but was ſincere enough to confeſs the true reaſon of her regret [G]. Some Authors relate

(d) See the notes [D] and [G].

(e) In 1248.

(f) *Hiſtoire de Saint Loüis*, lvi. 6. num. 15. pag. m. 321.

(g) St. Lewis did not return to France till 1254.

(b) They were called *Paſtoureaux*. See *Hiſt. de St. Loüis*, liv. 10. pag. 113, & *ſeq.* under the year 1252.

porary Writer. "The reaſon why the Queen did not "love the King's mother, was on account of the ſe-"vere treatment, which ſhe received from her; for "the Queen mother would not ſuffer the King to fre-"quent the company of the Queen his wife, and hin-"dered him, as far as was in her power. And when "the King made a progreſs at any time thro' his "Kingdom, and had with him Queen Blanche his "mother, and Queen Margaret his conſort, the for-"mer commonly ſeparated them, and they never "lodged together. It happened one day, that being "at Pontoiſe, the King lodged over the chamber of "the Queen his wife, and he directed the Gentlemen "Uſhers belonging to the Palace, that when he ſhould "go to lodge with the Queen, and Queen Blanche "was coming to the King's or Queen's chamber, they "ſhould beat the dogs, in order to make them howl; "and when the King heard it, he concealed himſelf "from his mother. Queen Blanche one day found "the King in his wife's chamber, when he went to "viſit her, as ſhe was dangerouſly ill in childbirth, "and hid himſelf behind the Queen, for fear Blanche "ſhould ſee him; but ſhe diſcovered him, and ſeiz-"ing him by the hand, ſaid to him, *Come away, "for you have nothing to do here*, and made him leave "the chamber. When the Queen ſaw Blanche force "her huſband out of her company, ſhe cried out "aloud, Alas! Will not you let me ſee my Lord, nei-"ther while I live, nor when I die? and having ſaid thus "ſhe fell into a ſwoon, and it was thought that ſhe "was dead; and the King, who believed ſo, returned "immediately, and recovered her from her ſwoon (4)"

(4) Joinville, *Chronique du Roi St. Loüis*, cap. 76. pag. m. 262, 263.

[E] *The Kingdom was extremely diſturbed at that time thro' the madneſs of a great number of weak people, who were infatuated by certain Viſionaries.*] Queen Blanche did not at firſt diſcover the pernicious conſequences of their errors. A certain Author repreſents it "as a great point of merit in her, that ſhe owned "ſhe had been impoſed upon with regard to the *Pa-"ſtoreaux*, a very ſlight matter of commendation in "my opinion. For to have miſtaken a ſet of wicked "wretches for honeſt men, is only an human error, "which may ariſe from good nature, and which "ſelf-love takes a pleaſure in acknowledging: but if "the caſe had been with reſpect to perſons, who had "been extremely ſlander'd, and had only their inno-"cence to ſupport them, a confeſſion could not be too "much commended, but in ſuch a caſe it is not to be "expected (5)." This reflection of the late Author of the Hiſtory of St. Lewis is a very fine and judicious one.

(5) *Hiſt. de St. Louis*, lib. 10. pag. 125.

[F] *The oppreſſion of the Nation under the yoke of the Eccleſiaſtics deſerved pity. The Queen did a bold action in order to redreſs this grievance in ſome meaſure.*] The Chapter of Paris had committed to priſon *all the inhabitants of Chatenai and ſeveral other places on account of divers things, of which they were accuſed, and which were prohibited to Vaſſals, for ſuch was the condition of the common people, and eſpecially thoſe, who lived in the country* (6). They were ſold with their lands as a dependency belonging to them (7). "A conſiderable "number of theſe unhappy people languiſhed there-"fore in the priſons belonging to the Chapter, in "which they wanted even the neceſſaries of life, "and were in danger of dying of hunger and miſery. "Blanche touched with compaſſion of the complaints, "which ſhe received, ſent to demand that out of re-"gard to her they ſhould be ſet at liberty under ſe-"curity, declaring that ſhe would enquire into the af-"fair, and do juſtice fully. But the Chapter having "returned an anſwer, that no perſon had any authori-"ty over their ſubjects, and that they had a right to "ſtarve them to death, if they thought fit, ſent again "to ſeize the women and children, whom they ſpared "before. And afterwards out of indignation to ſee "them honoured with ſuch a protection, they treated "them in ſuch a manner, that a conſiderable number "died, either with hunger or the inconvenience, which "they ſuffered from the heat in a place ſcarce large "enough to contain them. Blanche reſenting an ac-"tion, which had no leſs inſolence than cruelty in it,.. "went with a ſtrong guard to the priſon of the Chap-"ter, and ordered the gates to be broke open, and as "her attendants might ſcruple to do it for fear of the "cenſures ſo common at that time, ſhe gave the firſt "blow with a ſtaff, which ſhe had in her hand. This "was ſo well ſeconded, that in an inſtant the gate "was broke open, and a great number of men, wo-"men, and children came out with countenances diſ-"figured, who threw themſelves at her feet, and de-"ſired her protection, without which the favour, "which ſhe had ſhewn them, would coſt them "very dear. She protected them ſo effectually, "that having ordered the revenues of the Chapter "to be ſeized, till they had paid a due ſub-"miſſion to the authority, intruſted with her, ſhe "obliged them even to ſet theſe inhabitants free for a "certain ſum to be paid every year. It was about "this time that theſe kinds of infranchiſements be-"gan, or at leaſt became very common." If ſome perſons ſhall think, I have cited too long a paſſage, it will be complaining, that in preſenting them with a fine piece of Hiſtory relating to our Blanche, I have exhibited to them two or three other facts, which are very remarkable. Their complaint therefore would be very groundleſs.

(6) Ibid. pag. 122, 123.

(7) This is what was antiently called *Servos Glebæ*, or *Glebæ adſcititios*.

[G] *The Queen her daughter-in-law ſhed tears; but was ſincere enough to confeſs the true reaſon of her regret.*] It would be a little ſurprizing, that a Queen ſo much reſtrained in her matrimonial rights as the wife of Lewis IX. ſhould be ſorry, that upon her return to France ſhe ſhould not find the cauſe of her reſtraint. The Sire de Joinville was ſurprized at the ſorrow of the young Queen; he knew how much and for what reaſon ſhe hated the deceaſed; but ſee that riddle unravelled here. "After I had left the King's chamber, "ſays he (8), Madam Mary de Bonnes-Vertus came "and deſired me to go to the Queen and comfort "her, and told me, that ſhe was extremely melan-"choly. When I came to her chamber, and ſaw her "weep ſo bitterly, I could not forbear ſaying to her, "that it was true that women's tears are not to be "regarded, ſince the ſorrow, which ſhe ſhewed, was "for a woman, whom ſhe hated above any thing in "the world. She then told me, that ſhe did not weep "for her, but on account of the King's exceſſive ſor-"row,

(8) *Chronique du Roi St. Loüis*, cap. 76. pag. 262.

relate concerning Queen Blanche a great many things, which prepare the way for canonization [*H*]. On the other hand we have ſtill remaining ſome memorials of the paſſion which the Earl of Champagne had for her, and which ſeem to ſhew that he did not always ſigh in vain. I ſhall ſpeak of this in the Article of that Earl. The late Author of the Hiſtory of St. Lewis takes her part with great zeal upon this point; but he does not deny that ſhe had ſome defects [*I*]. The manner in which he expreſſes himſelf, induces me to quote his own words.

" row, and of her daughter, who was left under the " care of men. This daughter was afterwards Queen " of Navarre." He adds this cauſe of her hatred to Blanche, becauſe, ſays he, that Queen hindered, as much as lay in her power, the King her ſon from lying with his Conſort. " And the reaſon why the Queen " did not love the King's mother, was on account of " the ſevere treatment, which ſhe received from her, " for the Queen Mother would not ſuffer the King to " frequent the company of the Queen his wife, and " hindered him as far as was in her power (9).

(9) See the remainder of this paſſage in the note [*D*] quotation (4).

[*H*] *Some Authors relate concerning Queen Blanche a great many of thoſe things, which prepare the way for canonization.*] She was not content with being admitted into the third Order of St. Francis, *according to the devotion of that time* (10), but ſhe likewiſe made a *profeſſion of the Order of the Ciſtercians* (11) in the hands of the Abbeſs of Maubiſſon, a few days before her death. When her body was carried to that Abbey (12), where ſhe deſired to be interred, it was inveſted with the royal ornaments upon her Nun's habit (13). But this is no uncommon circumſtance, and I do not alledge it as a proof of the point in queſtion; I am only of opinion that this was not uſeleſs, in procuring her afterwards *the title of Bleſſed, and a place in ſome Martyrologies, and that ſeveral miracles and apparitions have been aſcribed to her* (14).

(10) Mezerai, *Abrége Chronol. ad ann.* 1252. tom. 2. pag. 731.

(11) *Hiſtoire de Saint Loüis*, tom. 10. pag. 124.

(12) She founded it about the year 1242. St. Lewis confirmed this foundation a little before his expedition to the Holy Land, *Hiſt. de Saint Loüis*, lib. 5. pag. 277.

(13) Ibid. lib. 10. pag. 124.

(14) Idem, pag. 125, 126.

[*I*] *The late Author of the Hiſtory of St. Lewis takes her part . . . but he does not deny, that ſhe had ſome defects.*] The Hiſtorian, whom I am ſpeaking of, is named Monſr. de la Chaiſe. I have heard that he was a Counſellor in the Preſidial of Poitiers, and that he was one of the friends of Meſſieurs de Port-Royal. " There ſcarce ever was a Princeſs, *ſays he* (15), who " had occaſion to be defended from ſo many calum- " nies, if this was a proper place for it. Not that ſhe " never committed any fault; for by what privilege " could ſhe be exempt from errors? She was a woman " and a Queen. But becauſe amongſt ſo many great " qualities there have been diſcovered ſome defects, " was that ground enough to expoſe her to the ill nature " of mankind, and that ſhe ſhould become the object " of thoſe fantaſtic judgments, in which people en- " deavour to do themſelves honour by depreciating " what they ſee univerſally eſteemed? She might ſhew " too much haughtineſs towards the Nobility during " her firſt regency; and perhaps ſhe went too far upon " ſome other occaſions. It is highly probable, that " ſhe treated the Queen her daughter-in-law with too " much ſeverity, out of jealouſy of her authority, which " is but too natural; and I would not venture to affirm, " that ſhe did not endeavour to maintain too long the " power, which her abilities and the character of a " mother had given her over Lewis during his younger " years."

(15) Ibid. pag. 126.

CASTOR, an antient Author. See the note [*O*] of the Article DEJOTARUS.

CASTRITIUS (MARCUS) was a Magiſtrate of Placentia in the year 669 of Rome [*A*], when the Conſul Cneius Carbo, endeavouring to engage all the Cities of Italy in Marius's party againſt Sylla, demanded hoſtages of them. Caſtritius not permitting the Citizens of Placentia to deliver any, Carbo endeavoured to intimidate him by telling him, that he had a great number of ſwords, *And I have a great many years*, replied Caſtritius; and the affair ſtopped there. Such a kind of an anſwer was made by Solon and ſome other perſons [*B*]. It ſignified, that they thought the ſhort term of life which they had remaining, was not worth purchaſing by a criminal action. This Caſtritius could not be the ſame with him who is mentioned by Cicero in his Oration for Lucius Flaccus; for it appears by the honours which the Citizens of Smyrna conferred upon the latter, that he did not live till he was very old (*a*). Add to this that Cicero expreſſes himſelf in ſuch a manner as would perſuade us, that they were not greatly convinced of his merit. The ſame Writer ſpeaks in another place of one *Marcus Caſtritius* (*b*), who was undoubtedly a different perſon from the two others; for he commends him highly, and tells us, that Verres, when he was Prætor in Sicily, made him preſents. Now the Magiſtrate of Placentia was very old, when Verres was only Quæſtor under Cneius Carbo in the year 669 of Rome.

(*a*) *At Caſtritium quibus verbis, Dii immortales! decus patriæ, ornamentum pop. Rom.* FLOREM JUVENTUTIS *appellant.* Cicero, *pro L. Flacco.*

(*b*) M. CASTRITIUM *ſummo ſplendore, ingenio, gratiâ præditum.* Cicer. *in Verrem, Orat.* 8.

[*A*] *He was a Magiſtrate of Placentia in the year* 669 *of Rome.*] The *Variorum* Commentary upon Valerius Maximus places this event under the year of Rome DCXXI, which is an egregious miſtake. But Monſr. Moret de la Fayolle, who places it under the year 667, and Father Cantel (1), who fixes it in 671, have their reaſons for doing ſo: they follow the *Faſti Conſulares*, which differ two years from the others. I cannot tell upon what ground Monſr. de la Fayolle gives Caſtritius the prænomen of Cneius, when he is ſtiled *Marcus* in Valerius Maximus, whom he quotes. See his *Hiſtory of the Roman Republic* (2). In the Supplement to Moreri this article is placed under the word *Caſtratius*. We ſhall obſerve below (3), that Charles Stephens has committed the ſame miſtake.

(1) In *Valer. Maximum.*

(2) Pag. 250 of the 2d Tome. This Hiſtory was printed at Paris in 1675.

(3) In the note [*B*] of the following Article.

[*B*] *He gave Carbo an Anſwer like that of Solon and ſome other perſons.*] I ſhall cite what we find in Cicero upon this ſubject: *Hoc illud eſt, quod Piſiſtrato tyranno a Solone reſponſum eſt, cum illi quærenti qua tandem ſpe fretus, ſibi tam audaciter obſiſteret, reſpondiſſe dicitur, ſenectute* (4). i. e. " This is what Solon anſwered to " Piſiſtratus the Tyrant, when the latter aſking him, " in what he confided, ſince he preſumed to oppoſe him " with ſuch vigour; Solon is ſaid to have replied, *In " old age.*" Conſidius gave ſuch an Anſwer to Julius Cæſar (5), and Ceſellius to the Triumviri (6). See the *Proſe chagrine* of la Mothe le Vayer, p. 337 of the IXth tome of his work.

(4) Cicero *in Catone majore*, cap. 10. *See likewiſe* Plutarch *and* Diogenes Laertius *in Vita Solonis.*

(5) Plutarch. *in Cæſare*, pag. 714, C.

(6) Val. Maxim. lib. 6. cap. 2.

CASTRITIUS (TITUS) taught Rhetoric at Rome in the ſecond Century with greater reputation than any of his contemporaries. Aulus Gellius, who was his ſcholar, ſpeaks of him as a man of great gravity (*a*), and good judgment, and it is eaſy to perceive by his obſervation upon a period in an Oration of C. Gracchus (*b*), that he unfolded very ſubtilly thoſe falſe ſentiments which become almoſt imperceptible, when they are concealed under the harmonious cadence of a beautiful ſtyle. We ſee in another place (*c*) another mark

(*a*) Aulus Gellius, lib. 11. cap. 13. *and* lib. 13. cap. 20.

(*b*) Idem, lib. 1. cap. 13.

(*c*) Idem, lib. 1. cap. 6.

mark of his excellent judgment [*A*]. His manners contributed no leſs than his learning to procure him the eſteem of the Emperor Hadrian (*d*); and if we conſider a little in what manner he cenſured ſome Senators, whom he inſtructed (*e*), and who appeared one day before him dreſſed unſuitably to their rank [*B*], I mean in *deſhabille*, and as we ſay at preſent, *in night-gown and ſlippers*, we ſhall eaſily perceive, that he preſerved the gravity of antient Rome. It cannot well be determined whether he was the ſon or relation of that CASTRITIUS, who is cited by Pliny, as an Author who wrote upon Gardening (*f*) [*C*], nor whether theſe two were deſcended from a CASTRITIUS who diſcovered the conſpiracy of Murena to Auguſtus (*g*), and whom that Prince afterwards reſcued from a very dangerous circumſtance by his interceſſion only.

(*d*) Idem, lib. 13. cap. 20.
(*e*) Idem, ibid.
(*f*) *In Indice* lib. 19.
(*g*) Sueton. *in Auguſt.* cap. 56.

[*A*] *We ſee . . . another mark of his excellent judgment.*] It was when he confuted ſome Criticks, who objected againſt Metellus for acknowledging in his Oration to the people in recommendation of Marriage, that it was neceſſarily a troubleſome ſtate. *Si ſine uxore, Quirites, poſſemus eſſe, omnes eâ moleſtiâ careremus. Sed quoniam ita natura tradidit, ut nec cum illis ſatis commode, nec ſine illis ullo modo vivi poſſit, ſaluti perpetuæ potius quam brevi voluptati conſulendum* (1). i. e. "If we, Romans, could poſſibly live without "wives, we ſhould all avoid that troubleſome ſtate. "But ſince nature has ſo order'd it, that we cannot "live with them with the proper ſatisfaction, nor "live without them in any manner, we ought to re"gard our laſting ſafety rather than a ſhort pleaſure." This, they ſaid, would deter people from marrying, as much as perſuade them to it; and they ſhewed how Metellus ought to have ſtated the affair. It muſt be owned, they turned the ſentiment in a fine manner. But Caſtritius repreſented to them, that a man of Metellus's character, who at that time exerciſed the office of Cenſor, ought to ſpeak in a different way from a Rhetorician; that a Rhetorician is allowed to make uſe of falſe and captious reaſonings, and that it is a diſgrace for him in a bad cauſe not to prevent all objections; that this method ought not to be followed by a Magiſtrate venerable on account of the gravity of his manners and his dignity; for he ought not to ſay any thing in public, which himſelf and others are not convinced of, and eſpecially when it is upon a point open to daily experience, and the ſenſe of the Public (2); that Metellus therefore was obliged to grant what was manifeſt to the whole world, and by that means became more capable of convincing them of the important point, upon which he ſpoke (3): for his frank acknowledgment having covered him from all ſuſpicion of diſguiſe and artifice, diſpoſed his auditors to believe the reſt.

(1) Aulus Gellius, lib. 1. cap. 6.

(2) *Præſertim cum ſuper eâ re diceret, quæ quotidianâ intelligentiâ & communi pervulgatoque vitæ uſu comprehenderetur.* Idem, ibid.

(3) *De moleſtiâ igitur cunctis hominibus eſt notiſſima confeſſus, eâque confeſſione fidem ſedulitatis veritatiſque commeritus &c.* Idem, ibid.

[*B*] *He cenſured ſome Senators . . . who appeared before him dreſs'd unſuitably to their rank.*] One cannot gueſs what Moreri was thinking of, when he made Aulus Gellius ſay, that Caſtritius treated with great ſeverity *two of his Auditors, who came dreſs'd too magnificently.* I. Aulus Gellius does not reduce the Auditors, whom Caſtritius cenſured to two; he ſays *diſcipulos quoſdam ſuos*, i. e. "certain of his diſciples." II. He adds, that they were Senators; and this circumſtance Moreri ought not to have ſuppreſſed. III. He does not ſay, that they *came dreſs'd too magnificently*; but on the contrary, that Caſtritius ſaw them *tunicis & lacernis indutos, & Gallicis calceatos.* Theſe errors have been corrected in the Dutch Edition; but the 21ſt chapter of the 13th book of Aulus Gellius is quoted inſtead of the 20th, which Moreri was right in quoting (4); and they have overlooked his aſſertion, that Caſtritius is moſt commonly called Caſtroitius, for they have retained his words *Caſtritius ſee Caſtroitus*, and after his example give the article of this Rhetorician under the word *Caſtroitius*. We may obſerve, that it is no miſtake to quote chap. xxi; there are ſome editions, which thus give the chapter, which treats of Caſtritius; but as there are others, in which it is the xxth chapter, to correct him properly, it ſhould have been ſaid, *See the XIIIth Book of Aulus Gellius, chap. XX. according to ſome editions, or chap. XXI, according to others.* Charles Stephens gives the name of Caſtratius both to this Rhetorician, and to the Magiſtrate of Placentia; two articles, which have been omitted in Lloyd's Dictionary. Hofman, who has tranſcribed them from Charles Stephens, informs us in the article of the Rhetorician, that we ought to read *Caſtricius*, and added to his original by directing us to read in Aulus Gellius the cenſure of the two Auditors, who were too elegantly dreſſed, *Severitatem ejus contra duos auditores nimium ornatos.* See here, what it is to depend upon bad guides.

(4) There are ſome editions, and among the reſt that of Henry Stephens at Paris 1585 in 8vo, which place this in cap. 20. others in cap. 21. becauſe of chap. 14. they make chap. 14 and 15.

[*C*] *It cannot well be determined, whether he was the ſon or relation of that Caſtritius, who is cited by Pliny, as an Author, who wrote upon Gardening.*] Father Hardouin (5) has taken notice of an error of Simler, who relates (6), that Titus Caſtritius, mentioned by Aulus Gellius, wrote a Book intitled, *Cepurica* (7), from which Pliny has extracted a great many things. If people would conſult originals, they would not fall into ſuch miſtakes. Simler in that caſe would have ſeen, that Aulus Gellius ſpeaks of one Caſtritius, whoſe diſciple he was, and conſequently who could not have written Books quoted by Pliny.

(5) *In Indice Auctorum Plinii.*
(6) *Epit. Bibliothec. Geſneri*, pag. 805.
(7) In Greek κηπυρικὰ, that is, *De re hortenſi.*

CATALDUS, one of the Saints of the Church of Rome, and the particular Patron of the City of Tarentum, was Biſhop of that City (*a*). It is reported that about a thouſand years after his death he appeared to a Prieſt, and ſaid to him, *Go, dig up a book, which I wrote, and concealed in ſuch a place, carry it immediately to the King: it is a work which contains the ſecrets of heaven.* It was in a dream that he appeared to this Prieſt, and gave him this order; he appeared again ſeveral times, for the dream had not been regarded, nor his command obeyed. At laſt he ſhewed himſelf in another manner; the Prieſt being alone in his Church, and fully awake, ſaw St. Cataldus in his Epiſcopal Robes, who commanded him to go and dig up his book the next day in the place which he had directed him to in a dream, and to carry it immediately to the King. He threatned him with a ſevere puniſhment in caſe of diſobedience. The Prieſt was more ready to comply with the command now than he had been before; for the next day he went in proceſſion with the people to the place where the book was buried. It was found there in a leaden box (*b*), and contained an account of the miſeries, which were ſoon to overwhelm the Kingdom of Naples, and of which we have a particular detail in the Writer whom I quote (*c*). It is ſaid that this happened in April 1492 (*d*). We are aſſured by ſome, that this old prophetical book gave hopes, that the Kingdom of Naples would be guarded from the impending ruin, on condition the King would perform what St. Cataldus preſcribed [*A*]. This clauſe, of which Alexander ab Alexandro makes not the leaſt mention,

(*a*) Alexander ab Alexandro, *Gen. Dier.* lib. 3. cap. 15. pag. m. 734.

(*b*) *Poſterâ luce ſolemni pompâ miniſtrum cum populi comitatu ad latebram, in qua longiſſimo ævo libellus latuerat, proceſſiſſe, eumque plumbeis tabellis obſignatum, & clavis obſeratum invemiſſe ſatis conſtat.* Idem, ibid. pag. 735.

(*c*) Idem, pag. 734.
(*d*) Spondanus, *Annal. Eccleſ. ad ann.* 1492. num. 13. He quotes *Infix. in Diar. Vit. S. Cataldi.*

[*A*] *He appeared to a Prieſt . . and directed him where to find a Book concerning the Miſeries, which the Kingdom of Naples would be guarded from, on condition the King would perform what St. Cataldus preſcribed.*] This

tion, would confirm the ſuſpicions of thoſe who take this for a pious fraud [B]. They would not reſt upon mere ſuſpicions, if they had read the paſſage which I ſhall quote from

This condition is mentioned by Spondanus. *Nimirum menſe Aprili, ex revelatione prædicti Sancti, repertum fuiſſe librum tabellis plumbeis ab eo, dum viveret, juſſu divino ſcriptum obſeratumque; quo vaticinium continebatur de calamitatibus & miſeriis, quibus regnum vexandum eſſet, niſi rex, ad quem illicò librum mitti præcepit, ad amuſſim obſervaret, quæ in eo præcepta reperiret* (1). i. e. "In the month of April, by the revelation of the abovementioned Saint, a Book was found written by him, whilſt he was alive, upon tables of lead, by the command of God, and lock'd up; in which was contained a propheſy concerning the Calamities and Miſeries, with which the Kingdom would be diſtreſſed, unleſs the King, to whom he ordered the Book to be immediately carried, performed exactly what was preſcribed in it." He adds, that Philip de Comines mentions this Book of St. Cataldus. But this cannot be aſſerted without taking too great a liberty; for Philip de Comines makes no manner of mention of this Saint. His words are as follow: *King Ferrand . . . was extremely uneaſy to ſee this Army coming againſt him . . . and there was found a Book, as I have been informed by ſeveral of his neareſt dependants, in digging a chapel, upon which was written* *, The Truth with its ſecret Counſel; *and it is ſaid to have contained an account of all the misfortunes which have happened to him; and there were but three perſons, who ſaw it, and afterwards it was thrown into the fire* (2).

[B] *This clauſe . . . . would confirm the ſuſpicions of thoſe, who take this for a pious fraud.*] It is certain, that Ferdinand King of Naples, and his eldeſt ſon, led a life, which ſcandalized the people, and oppreſſed them in a very tyrannical manner (3). There was the higheſt reaſon to fear the preparations and leagues, which were formed againſt the Kingdom of Naples. The people always dread ſuch wars, but eſpecially when they imagine, that the crimes of a Monarch, and his long impenitency, have expoſed him to the vengeance of God. It is then neceſſary to have recourſe to thoſe expedients, which are moſt capable of averting the public calamities. It is a very good expedient to invent a prophecy, which may touch the King, and lead him to ſuch a thorough reformation of his life, that his ſubjects may promiſe themſelves the aſſiſtance and protection of Heaven, its indignation being now appeaſed. It is therefore probable, that at this time ſome perſons zealous for the public good thought proper to employ a pious fraud. They made a box of lead, incloſed in it a Book, which contained what they thought neceſſary, buried it, produced a Prieſt, who affirmed that both in a dream and waking he had received from St. Cataldus a command of the utmoſt importance; the Book was certainly found in the place pointed out, and in it the threats and counſels neceſſary. Here we ſee therefore ſeveral circumſtances proper to convince us, that the diſcovery of this prophecy was an artful invention; but if we ſuppoſe that Cataldus only threatned, and did not preſcribe to Ferdinand an aſſured method of preventing the calamities, we ſhould not ſo eaſily conclude, that it was an artifice of religion and policy.

It is not neceſſary, I ſhould obſerve here, that there is no probability that Cataldus buried ſuch a Book, nor that ſeveral Ages after he diſcovered this treaſure, and ordered it to be preſented to King Ferdinand; but as it is probable that ſuch a thing was contrived, it will not be improper to touch here upon the reaſons, which might render it ſuſpicious. I ſay that the fact of this contrivance is probable; for beſides the advantage, which might be expected in the exigences of the State, and the diſcontent of the people, we have a contemporary Author, who affirms it as a thing certain (4), that this Book was dug up. He not only was living at that time, but likewiſe near the place, which was choſen for the ſcene of the event. He informs us, that the people attended in proceſſion the Prieſt, who diſcovered the prophecy. Beſides he was a man of learning. Could he be deceived in ſuch a fact? Would he have ventured to aſſert a falſity upon ſuch an occaſion? This is what leads one to believe that the prophecy of St. Cataldus was a forgery. But let us ſee what would incline us to doubt it. This Author with all his vaſt learning ſhews a great deal of credulity. Philip de Comines, when he ſpeaks of a prophetic writing ſhewn to King Ferdinand (5), does not mention Cataldus, nor any of the other circumſtances related by Alexander ab Alexandro. It may therefore be reaſonably believed, thoſe, who told him what regarded that writing, ſaid nothing of the Apparitions of that Saint, or of the Proceſſion, which is ſuppoſed to have been made for the diſcovery of the Book. It is therefore very probable, that there was no ſuch proceſſion; for if there had been one, it would have been the firſt thing mentioned to Philip de Comines. Now if Alexander ab Alexandro deceives us in this point, he is not worthy of credit in the reſt.

After having mention'd the reaſons to believe, and thoſe to doubt of this fact, I muſt add, that one of my friends maintained to the t'other day, that it is not poſſible to come to an abſolute certainty in this affair. We are at too great a diſtance from the time, ſaid he, and there is no verbal proceſs concerning this adventure, or, if there was, there would be nothing in it at preſent, which could exclude all ſuſpicions. I have obſerved in another article (6) the prodigious negligence of thoſe, who are fond of relating myſterious events; they do not take any precautions againſt thoſe, who are diſpoſed to believe nothing. They have no charity for thoſe, who have the moſt occaſion for it. Why do not they procure judicial informations, and draw up verbal proceſſes? For inſtance, the Tarentines ſhould have deſired the Magiſtrates to order it to be engraven upon a pillar, that on ſuch a day ſuch a Prieſt had dug up a book before all the people, and had taken his oath, that St. Cataldus had appeared to him &c (7). It would have been proper to have ſent to all the Regiſter-Offices of the Kingdom an authentick copy of the Act, which the Magiſtrates had drawn up; and to have requeſted the Embaſſadors of all foreign States to ſend ſuch a copy to their maſters. You will tell me, that the Legend of St. Cataldus cited by Spondanus gives teſtimony to this great event. I anſwer, that this is of uſe to thoſe only, who have no occaſion for it. Thoſe, who believe ſuch a thing upon the faith of a Legend-Writer, would believe it upon a mere hear-ſay; and thoſe, who are incredulous, and conſequently objects of charity with regard to the great promoters of extraordinary events, which are not well proved, are not at all moved by the teſtimony of the Legend. They are therefore cruelly deſerted, when you neglect to prepare for them the remedy which would cure them.

Let us not be ſurprized, that it is difficult to ſearch out the truth of things, which happened, it is ſaid, about the end of the XIth Century; for I do not think it poſſible for private men to diſcover certainly what relates to the Blackſmith of Salon (8). The affair is freſh: it is but two or three months (9) ſince he was ſent to Paris to execute the command which an apparition had given him, to go and declare certain things to the King. He was at Paris and at Court, and ſent home again. This is all that is certain; a thouſand other facts, which have been related in the public news-papers, are doubtful; for ſome perſons deny, and others affirm them; ſome maintain that he ſpoke with the King himſelf, others ſay only with a Secretary of State. The moſt indefatigable enquirers would loſe their patience, before they could diſcover the truth hid under an heap of oppoſite aſſertions and denials. What is moſt extraordinary and capable of impoſing upon poſterity, is, that an anonymous Writer has had the preſumption to publiſh a Letter (10), in which he gives an account of I know not how many converſations, which he, ſays he, had in confidence with the Blackſmith of Salon. He relates ſo many wonderful particularities, that one cannot be ſufficiently aſtoniſhed. Muſt the public be ſo ſoon deceived, and a ſnare prepared for poſterity ſo ſuddenly? Is it to be ſuffered, that any thing ſhould appear on this point, but what is confirmed by good atteſtations, and may paſs for an inconteſtable evidence? For our part, let us warn the public to reject theſe impoſtures. There is no better

(1) *Annal. Eccleſ. ad an.* 1492. num. 13. pag. m. 204.

* It might be in the Italian, *Il Vero*, or *la Verita*, i. e. *The Truth.*

(2) Lib. 7. cap. 11. pag. m. 465, 466.

(3) Idem, ibid.

(4) *Satis conſtat*, ſays he twice. *In eo certum eſt.* Alexander ab Alexandro, *Genial. Dier.* lib. 3. cap. 15. pag. 734.

(5) See the words of Philip de Comines in the preceding note.

(6) In the note [C] of the Article CATTHO.

(7) Obſerve, that this inſcription ſhould have been made while the event was freſh, for otherwiſe it would not be a good proof now.

(8) It is the country of Noſtradamus in Provence.

(9) I write this in the beginning of June 1697.

(10) It was printed in the *Lettres Hiſtoriques*, and in the *Mercure Politique*, for May 1697.

from a contemporary Author, in which we ſee the hiſtory and motives of this impoſture [C]. Writers are not generally agreed upon the country of Cataldus, nor the time when he lived. Some ſay that he was a native of Scotland, others of Ireland. Some affirm that he lived in the fourth Century, or in the beginning of the ſixth; but Johannes Juvenis relates that he converted the Tarentins in the year 160 (e), after the aſcenſion of our Saviour, or in the 166th of the Chriſtian Æra (f). Bartholomew Moron and Bonaventure Moron his brother, who have written his Life, one in proſe, and the other in verſe (g), follow almoſt the ſame Chronology, ſince they aſſure us that he came to Tarentum under the Pontificate of Anicetus, and the Empire of Marcus Aurelius, about the year

(e) Joh. Juvenis, *in Præfat. Librorum de Antiquitate & varia Tarentinorum Fortuna*, apud *Uſſerium de Britan. Eccleſ. Primordiis*, pag. 749. ed. Dublin 1639.

(f) Idem, lib. 8. cap. 2. *apud eundem*, ibid.

(g) It is a Poem in 6 books, intitled *Cataldius*: printed at Rome in 1604, with a Diſcourſe in Italian by the ſame Author in praiſe of St. Cataldus, and with the Life of this Saint by Bartholomew Moron.

ter way of puniſhing the boldneſs of theſe Writers, than by not paying any regard to their accounts. That News-Writer, who when he publiſhed the anonymous letter, declared that he believed it to be a forgery (11), deſerves highly to be commended. This will be of ſome uſe at a proper time and place.

(11) See the *Mercure Hiſtorique*, for May 1697.

I give you the ſubſtance of a long converſation, in which Mr. **** maintained to me, that we could not be aſſured, that the pretended Book of St. Cataldus was diſcovered at Tarentum. We ſhall ſee preſently that he affirmed too much, and that it is a fact inconteſtable, that there was ſuch a proceſſion, with all its conſequences.

[C] *I ſhall quote a paſſage . . . . in which we ſee the hiſtory and motives of this impoſture.*] I deſire the reader to conſider the preceding note only as a repreſentation of the vanity of conjectures; I mean the moſt plauſible conjectures, which can be formed, when we know but imperfectly the circumſtances of an action, and judge of things without hearing both ſides. We ſhall hear but one in the queſtion before us, if we only conſult Alexander ab Alexandro, and thoſe, who have copied him. We expoſe ourſelves therefore to throw out deluſive conjectures, whatever care we take to conſult probability. To proceed prudently in this point, we ought to enquire, whether other Authors of equal credit have written in a different manner. I have met with one, who ſhews me, that the account of that Writer is the popular one, but that the learned men, who had breathed the air of the Court, would tell the ſtory after another manner. Jovian Pontanus informs me, that a Spaniſh Monk, who was ambitious and bold, took upon him the character of a Preacher, tho' he was entirely ignorant. He preached with ſuch confidence, that he boaſted of a private converſation with an Angel, in which, he ſaid, he learned all that he taught the people with regard to Religion. He aſſured them that this Angel had revealed to him what perſons were in heaven, and who were ſuffering the torments of hell (12). At laſt not being able to perſuade Ferdinand to baniſh all the Jews from his Kingdom of Naples, as his couſin Ferdinand King of Aragon had done from his dominions, he reſolved upon an artifice. He engraved upon a plate of lead what he thought proper, pretending St. Cataldus to be the Author of it, and then buried it near Tarentum under the wall of a Chapel half in ruins. Three years after having ſuborned a Prieſt, who declared that St. Cataldus appeared to him, &c. he cauſed this leaden plate to be dug up; in which were found ſeveral enigmatical expreſſions, which tended to ſhew the King the obligation he was under of extirpating Judaiſm. The pretended command of Cataldus, was, that Ferdinand ſhould read this letter only with that ſervant, whom he knew to be moſt virtuous and faithful. The Prince detected the forgery, and did not employ the Monk in decyphering the prophecy. The Monk was ſo exaſperated, that he declaimed againſt every body with the utmoſt violence. He ſcarce ſpared St. Cataldus himſelf, and grew ſo outrageous, that all the States of Italy, and eſpecially the Court of Rome, were alarmed at the diſcovery of this leaden plate. A great number of people, who underſtand Latin, have not the Books of Pontanus, and will therefore be glad to read here his account in the original language. *Denique cum Ferdinando perſuadere arte nullâ aut ratione poſſet, ut univerſam Judæorum gentem omnino exterminaret è regni finibus, exemplo Ferdinandi patruelis Hiſpaniarum Regis, Tarenti cum ipſe ageret, commentum hoc iniit. E plumbo tabulam divi Cataldi nomine clanculum à ſe inſcriptam haud Tarento procul in ſacello ſemidiruto ſub parietem occuluit, quam triennio poſt eruendam curavit corrupto ſacerdote, qui diceret, in ſomnis aſtitiſſe ſibi Cataldum monſtrantem quo in loco tabella eſſet abdita, commonentemque uti cum populo ſupplice, collegioque Sacerdotum iret ad effodiendam illam, quam effoſſam curaret ad regem deferendam, communicandam ab eo uni tantum viro, quem è ſuis optimum noſceret, ac maximè fidum. Deum enim iratum illi futurum, clademque ac calamitatem immiſſurum, ni quod in tabulâ ſcriptum eſſet, & cautum, à rege præſtaretur. Scriptum verò ipſum per ambages quaſdam, ac latebricoſa verba eò ſpectabat, uti Judæorum exterminatio indicaretur. Rex acceptâ tabulâ deprehendit fraudem, quâ deprehensâ minimè Franciſcum ad eam legendam ſecum adhibuit, arbitratus eum interpretaturum verba in eam ſententiam, diſſimulavitque rem ipſam ſummâ cum taciturnitate ac prudentiâ. At Franciſcus re cognitâ, furore percitus, quod tantum commentum falſum eum habuiſſet, non populo, non regi, vix ipſi Cataldo publicis pepercit in prædicationibus, in tantumque incanduit, ut Italia ferè omnis, ipſeque in primis Romanus Pontifex de tabulæ hujus fuerit inventione ſolicitus atque anxius* (13). We may obſerve, that Philip Camerarius cites the account of the Neapolitan Civilian as a true Hiſtory (14): it is in the ſecond volume of his *Hiſtorical Meditations* (15). He ſubjoins the words of Philip de Comines. Simon Goulart, the French Tranſlator of this Work of Camerarius, has frequently inſerted in it his own Collections in crochets: I am certain, that he would readily have inſerted Pontanus's account, if he had known it. He has introduced on this occaſion another fact, which it is proper to mention here. "John de la "Geſſée, Secretary of the Chamber to Francis de "Valois, Duke of Alençon and Anjou, publiſhed his "Poetical Works at Antwerp, printed by Plantin in "1583. In the VIth Book of his *Miſcellanies*, p. "678 and 679, he tranſlates a Prophecy in Latin of "Cataldus againſt the Apocalyptical Babylon, begin-"ning with theſe words, *Heu, heu, plange, infelix Ba-"bylon.* This is all that there is in Latin, the Poet "being content with giving us forty two French verſes, "which mention the wonderful exploit of a King of "France, his memorable victories, and his death up-"on mount Calvary, after a long courſe of years "ſpent in war. He promiſes then an entire reſtora-"tion of things, and ſpeaks of it as the end of the world. "This I have not thought proper to decypher more "particularly for ſeveral good reaſons (16)." We have here an inſtance of prophetical impoſtures. The pretended Book of St. Cataldus related only to the Kingdom of Naples, and it was ſcarce ſeen by any perſon. And yet here is a French Poet, who about a Century after tells us, that it contained threatnings againſt the Babylon in the Revelations of St. John, and the moſt glorious promiſes to a King of France. Thoſe, who employ ſuch machines, are glad to cover themſelves with ſome great name. That of Cataldus appeared to them proper for this deſign; upon which they heap'd forgery upon forgery.

(12) *Frater Franciſcus Hiſpanus . . . quamvis rudis atque indoctus, tractus tamen audaciâ atque ambitione, pulpitum aſcendere eſt auſus, tantoque ſive faſtu, ſive temeritate, palàm ut aſſeveraret, prædicare ſe de religione Chriſtianiſque rebus, docente ac dictante angelo, cujus admonitu & futura quædam prædiceret, & qui cum divis in cœlo e mortuis agerent, qui rurſus apud inferos cruciarentur, ſciret ac proferret.* Jov. Pontanus, *de Sermone*, lib. 2. cap. ult. p. m. 1623.

(13) Idem, ibid. pag. 1623, 1624.

(14) Alexander ab Alexandro.

(15) Book 1. cap. 11.

(16) Simon Goulart cap. 2. lib. 1. vol. 2. of the *Meditations Hiſtoriques de Camerar.* pag. m. 48.

We ought to reflect that Pontanus's account made no progreſs, nor ſtopped the courſe of theſe falſities. There are a great many Writers, who mention as an inconteſtable truth the diſcovery of Cataldus's Prophecy without taking any notice of the other repreſentation of the affair. Bartholomew Moron is one of theſe in his life of St. Cataldus: he alledges the Regiſters of the Church of Tarentum, he quotes the teſtimony of Alexander ab Alexandro, and what he might have read in the 1ſt Chapter of the VIIIth Book of Peter Galatin *de Eccleſiâ deſtitutâ* (17). Anthony Caraccioli publiſhed at Naples in 1626 an anonymous Annaliſt with four other antient Chronologers. This Annaliſt affirms, that in 1494 there were dug up plates of lead, upon

(17) *See* Uſſer. *de Britann. Eccleſ. Primord.* pag. 758.

year 170. Dempſter makes him flouriſh after the middle of the fourth Century (*b*). Alexander ab Alexandro places him about an hundred years lower. Conſult the learned Archbiſhop Uſher (*i*), who maintains that Cataldus was not in Scotland, as Dempſter affirms, but in Ireland, and cites a great number of Authors. I am ſurprized that he did not know the paſſage of Jovian Pontanus, which I have quoted in the Remark [*C*].

(*b*) Dempſter, *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Scotor.* lib. 3. num. 278.

(*i*) *De Britann. Eccleſ. Primord.* pag. 751, *& ſeq.*

upon which St. Cataldus had engraved his Prophecies, and mentioned the ſudden death of the King; and that in ſhort, the King died as ſoon as this monument was preſented to him. *Iſto anno MCCCCXCIII fuit repertus Tarenti liber Sancti Cataldi conſiſtens in tribus Laminis plumbeis, videlicet duabus extremis ſemi ſcriptis, & media ſcripta ex utroque latere; qui præſentatus fuit Domino Regi, loquens de dicti Regis repentinâ morte; & ſic fuit repente mortuus* (18). i. e. "In "this year 1494 there was found at Tarentum a Book "of St. Cataldus conſiſting of three leaden plates, "the two outermoſt being half engraved upon, and "the middle plate engraved on both ſides; which "Book was preſented to the King, and mentioned "his ſudden death; and ſo he died ſuddenly." We have ſeen that the diſcovery is placed under the year 1492. This was not ſuitable to the views of our Annaliſt; he wanted the ſudden death of the King of Naples, and he found nothing of that kind at that time. He therefore pitched upon the year when Ferdinand died.

(18) See the ſame Uſher. Ibid.

CATIUS, an Epicurean Philoſopher mentioned by Cicero [*A*]. Horace ſpeaks alſo of him in one of his Satyrs, if we may believe the Commentators [*B*]. Mr. Le Fevre has alledged ſome arguments againſt them, which Mr. Dacier his ſon-in-law has confuted [*C*], making

[*A*] *Cicero mentions him.*] He ſays, that Catius called *Spectra*, what Democritus and Epicurus had named εἴδωλα, by which they meant the images, which repreſent to us the object of the ſenſes, and which the School-men call *intentional Species*. He alſo ſays, that it was not long ſince this Catius died, and gives him the ſirname of *Inſuber*. We meet with all this in a Letter (1), which Cicero wrote to Caius Caſſius, one of the conſpirators againſt Cæſar; who was very much addicted to the Epicurean Sect. This man imagining that Cicero had banter'd the Epicureans for Ruſticity, by mentioning theſe *Spectres* of Catius, anſwered him (2), that he would quote him ſo many ruſtical Stoics, that he would be forced to acknowledge, that Catius was of Athens. He adds, that Catius was one of thoſe, who put a very bad conſtruction upon Epicurus's words. And as this was ſaid on occaſion of a very grave ſentence of the Author of the ſect, namely (3), that *a man cannot live with pleaſure, without doing what is honeſt and juſt*, he hints, that as Catius explained very ill the doctrine of the *Idola*, by his *Spectres*, ſo he was one of thoſe unworthy Epicureans, who explained of the corporeal pleaſures, what their maſter meant only of thoſe of the mind. This is, no doubt, the chief argument of thoſe who pretend, that Horace choſe to explain, under the character of Catius, ſeveral rules and maxims relating to Cookery, and very proper to turn the Paraſites and voluptuous Epicureans into ridicule. *Epicuri de grege porcos.* (Swines of the herd of Epicurus.)

(1) The 17th of the 15th Book *ad Familiares.*

(2) This Anſwer is the 19th Letter of the ſame Book. Lambinus, *in Hor.* Sat. 4. ſhould not have aſcribed to Cicero, as he has done, the ſecond paſſage relating to Catius.

(3) Οὐκ ἐστιν ἀδύνατον ἡδέως ἄνευ τοῦ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ζῆν.

[*B*] *Horace . . . alſo . . . if we may believe the Commentators.*] If it be a miſtake to think that the Catius mentioned by Cicero, and the Catius in Horace are the ſame perſon, it is a miſtake of a very long ſtanding. For we read in the antient Commentators of Horace, that this Poet, in order to turn the Epicureans into ridicule, had made uſe of the character of M. Catius, an Epicurean, and Author of four Books concerning the nature of things *, and the *Summum bonum*, or Supreme good. We alſo find there, that when the ſame Catius happened to treat in that work, of ſomething concerning paſtry, he uſed to boaſt that he had invented it (4), *hæc primus invenit & cognovit Catius Miltiades*, ſaid he, ſpeaking of himſelf. The author of theſe four Books is certainly the ſame with him, of whom Quintilian ſpeaks thus in the firſt Chapter of the fourth Book of his *Inſtitutiones Oratoriæ*. *Catius the Epicurean is not an Author of very deep learning, but yet he is agreeable. In Epicureis levis quidem, ſed non injucundus tamen auctor eſt Catius.* It is alſo certain that he is the ſame with the Catius *Inſuber* mentioned by Cicero. The ſirname of Miltiades might indeed occaſion ſome difficulty, and it perſuaded Cruquius that Catius Inſuber is not the perſon ſo much ridiculed in Horace. The other Commentators do not mind this difficulty. Lambinus, Chabot, Fabrini, &c. maintain that the Poet ſpeaks of Catius the Epicurean Philoſopher. Peter Victorius (5) and Gaſſendi are of the ſame opinion. In a word, it was the general opinion of the learned, when Mr. Le Fevre undertook to confute it.

* Or perhaps the *Univerſum De Rerum Natura.*

(4) Mr. Dacier, in the 7th vol. pag. 365. tranſlates the words of the antient Commentator (and perhaps he is in the right) as tho' he had ſaid, that *Catius wrote a book upon Paſtry, in which, ſpeaking of a certain kind of Cakes, he uſed to ſay, I have invented this, I made it be in vogue.* But the other explication ſeems to be more literal; for the Latin words according to Cruquius's edition, pag. 460 are, *Irridet eum quod de opere piſtorio in libro ſcribit de ſe ipſo, hoc primum invenit & cognovit Catius Miltiades.*

(5) *In* Cicer. Ep. 14. lib. 15. *ad Famil.*

[*C*] *Mr. Le Fevre has alledged ſome arguments againſt them, which Mr. Dacier . . . has confuted.*] Mr. Le Fevre's chief argument is (6), that ſince Catius died before Cicero, he could not be alive when Horace wrote the IVth Satire of the IId Book. Mr. Dacier pretends that this proof is *very weak*, and that we muſt follow the general opinion (7). He argues in the following manner. *Does it follow, that Catius was dead, when Horace read this Satire, becauſe he was dead when Cicero wrote the XVIth Letter of the XVth Book? It is certain that Cicero's letter was written, when Auguſtus was Conſul the fourth time, in the year of Rome* 723. *Horace was then* 36 *years old. Why could he not have made this Satire before he was of that age? This will not afford the leaſt room for doubting. So that this paſſage of Cicero, inſtead of proving what Mr. Le Fevre pretended, informs us on the contrary, that this Satire is one of the pieces which Horace wrote in his younger years, and before he was twenty five.*

(6) Tanaquillæ Faber, Ep. 57. lib. 2.

(7) *Remarques ſur Horace*, tom. 7. pag. m. 348.

This is one of thoſe paſſages, concerning which a man can hardly truſt his own eyes, and which would appear a wonder, if we had not daily experience of what may be occaſioned by an abſence of mind. It happens to many Mathematicians, that after they have toiled and ſweated for three or four hours together, in order to correct their accounts, and find out the cauſe of their miſreckoning, they diſcover at laſt, that in multiplying, they ſay, without perceiving it themſelves, three times ſeven is twenty two. It is by ſuch an abſence of mind that Mr. Dacier wrote in his copy, and left in the proof-ſheets, that Cicero wrote to Caſſius in the year of Rome 722, when Auguſtus was Conſul the fourth time *, and conſequently this is a miſtake, from which we ought not to infer any thing againſt his learning, of which he has given ſo many proofs in other places. Every body knew, that Cicero periſhed during the unhappy proſcription of the Triumvirate, A. U. 710. It is not therefore *certain that the letter to Caſſius was written, when Auguſtus was Conſul the fourth time*, A. U. 723. It was written in the fourth Conſulſhip of Julius Cæſar, as it is obſerved in the *Summary* of that Letter, and this has probably occaſioned Mr. Dacier's abſence of mind. However that be, Mr. Le Fevre's argument will have ſome ſtrength, if it be ſufficient to ſuppoſe, that Catius was dead, when Horace wrote the IVth Satire of the IId Book. For ſince Cæſar was Conſul the fourth time, A. U. 708, when Horace was about twenty, it follows that Catius was dead, when Horace was twenty years old. Now, it is not very probable, that he wrote this Satire at that age. There are, I own ſome inſtances of very young Poets, who wrote good Satire; it might alſo be ſaid, that Horace took care to correct this Satire before he publiſhed it, as we have it now. But after all, theſe arguments ſhould have been urged againſt Mr. Le Fevre.

* Mr. Dacier has corrected this miſtake in the edition of 1704. (Addit. of the Amſterd. edition.)

But there is another argument againſt him, which is much ſtronger, namely, that tho' Catius was dead, yet this could not hinder Horace from making uſe of a fiction, or writing by way of dialogue, as he has

making uſe of that liberty, which the Republick of Letters enjoys [*D*]. Gaſſendi deſerves to be a little criticized upon in this place [*E*]. Coſtar deſerves it no leſs.

done. It is well known what liberties Poets take with regard to Chronology: An Anachroniſm is not a ſhameful error in them. So that if any Epicurean Philoſopher lay at Rome under the ill repute, as Montmaur did at Paris, there was no reaſon, why even after his death, he might not be introduced as acting his part in a Dramatic Poem, which was deſigned to expoſe the gluttony and paraſitical humour of the falſe Epicureans. I do not think, that they "would have ſcrupled in France to make uſe of Montmaur's name in a Satire fifteen or ſixteen years after his death, in the ſame manner as Horace did that of Catius. We may perhaps alſo ſuppoſe, that this Poet did not intend, his Satire ſhould be looked upon as a dialogue between Catius Inſuber and himſelf; but that he only pitched upon that name, becauſe he deſigned to expreſs ſome thoughts, which ſuited the character of that Philoſopher (8). This ſeems to me to be moſt probable; but tho' he had intended it as a dialogue between Catius and himſelf, yet I do not think he deſerves to be cenſured, as Plato has been, becauſe in his dialogues he makes dead perſons ſpeak with ſome who were ſtill living (9). The Poets have in this reſpect more privileges than the Philoſophers. Upon the whole the paſſage in Cicero does not ſeem to be a good argument, that Horace wrote this Satire in his youth. A man would be very much miſtaken, who ſhould pretend, that all thoſe whom Juvenal mentions in the preſent tenſe, were then alive (10). Boileau has lately mentioned Roberval in his Xth Satire, as a man ſtill living. If our deſcendants ſhould infer from thence that Roberval was not yet dead in the year 1694, they would be very much miſtaken. The other arguments which Mr. le Fevre alledges, ſhew, that he had not ſufficiently obſerved, that at the time of Catius, the Epicureans were, generally ſpeaking, ridiculed for their delicacy and daintineſs, without any regard to the temperance of Epicurus, nor to the innocence of the maxims he really maintained. The diſſolute life of a great many Epicureans caſt a blemiſh upon the whole ſect; nor ought we to imagine, that becauſe Horace and his friends were of that ſect, he would therefore ſpare thoſe, who diſgraced it, and loſe thus the opportunity of ſetting off his jeſts and witty ſayings; a Satyriſt is too covetous of ſuch opportunities, not to improve them. Do we not ſee even at this time, that the true Carteſians are the moſt forward to exclaim againſt thoſe, who build too many idle fancies upon the principles of Des Cartes, tho' theſe fancies be not prejudicial to virtue, as were the falſe comments upon Epicurus's doctrine, which for that very reaſon deſerved to be and really was expoſed to the ſevere ſtrokes of critical Writers? Who would believe that Mr. Boileau, if he really was a Carteſian, as he ſeems to be, would for that reaſon forbear ridiculing that Sect in a Satire, and would ſcruple to caſt his witty reflections at ſome of Des Cartes's followers, if he found an opportunity for it, and they were gone ſo far in the abuſe of that Philoſophy, as to employ the baſeſt and moſt infamous practices? *Credat Judæus Apella.* But if Mr. le Fevre has not proved, that the IVth Satire of the IId Book of Horace is not levelled at the Epicureans in general, nor at Catius the Philoſopher in particular, yet he ſhews by the paſſage in Cicero concerning the death of Catius, that the ancient and modern Commentators on Horace have not well underſtood in what manner Catius was brought in there. They thought, no doubt, that he was ſtill living, when the Satire was publiſhed, and that the Poet intended his account ſhould be taken for matter of fact, I mean for a real converſation, which paſſed between him and that Philopher. But ſince it is very probable that Catius was dead, when this Satire was written, it muſt not be thought that Horace intended it as a real dialogue with the deceaſed. He only imagined a character, and gave the name of Catius to the perſon repreſented under that character: and this was ſufficient for his deſign.

In what the Critic of Saumur has juſtly pointed out the miſtakes of the Commentators.

[*D*] .... *Making uſe of that liberty, which the Republic of letters enjoys.*] That Republic is a very free State. No other authority is there acknowledged but that of reaſon and truth; under their Auſpices men may make war innocently againſt any perſon whatſoever. The friends ought to beware of their friends, the father of their ſons; the fathers in-law, of their ſons in-law; it is here, as it was in the Iron age,

——— *Non hoſpes ab hoſpite tutus,*
Non Socer a genero (11).
That is,
"The gueſt, by him who harbour'd him is ſlain,
"The ſon-in-law purſues the father's life.
Dryden.

(11) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 1. vet. 144.

Every one is there both ſovereign and accountable to every one. The laws of civil ſociety have not put the leaſt reſtraint upon the independency of the ſtate of nature, with regard to error and ignorance. Every private man has in that reſpect the right of the ſword, and may uſe it, without aſking leave of thoſe who govern. It is very eaſy to know, why the Sovereign was obliged to let every one enjoy the liberty of writing againſt Authors, who are miſtaken, and not that of publiſhing libels. It is becauſe libels tend to deprive a man of his reputation, which is a kind of civil murther (12), and is conſequently a kind of puniſhment, which ought not to be inflicted on any perſon but by the authority of the Magiſtrate. But the cenſuring of a Book tends only to ſhew, that an Author has not ſuch or ſuch a degree of knowledge; and ſince notwithſtanding this want of learning, he may enjoy all the rights and privileges of a member of civil ſociety, without the leaſt blemiſh on his reputation as an honeſt man and good ſubject, it is not incroaching upon the authority of the Sovereign, to acquaint the public with the faults or the errors, which are in a Book. This leſſens indeed the reputation of a learned man, which an Author had gained, and deprives him of the profits which his reputation procured him; but then if this be done by maintaining the rights of reaſon, only for the ſake of truth, and in a civil manner, nobody can juſtly complain of it (13). Such a critick is not in the leaſt like the Authors of Libels; he aſſerts nothing without good authorities; and if he be at the ſame time both the accuſer and the witneſs, he is alſo liable himſelf to a retaliation; he runs the ſame riſk to which he expoſes another. Whereas a writer of Libels hides himſelf, that he might not be called upon to prove his aſſertions; and that he might hurt without being anſwerable for it. It is therefore agreeable to natural juſtice, that every member of the Commonwealth ſhould be independent with regard to the conſutation of Authors, without any regard to the qualities of a father, a father-in-law, a huſband, a brother, &c. And this is alſo very often the cuſtom. Joſeph Scaliger and Iſaac Voſſius have not much regarded the opinions of their fathers; and we ſee that Monſr. Bernoulli Profeſſor at Baſil, and Mr. Bernoulli Profeſſor at Groningen, do not much ſpare one another, tho' they are brothers (14).

(12) See the *Diſſertation upon Libels*, printed at the end of Mr. Bayle's Dictionary in French.

(13) The Abbot of St. Real has made ſome objections againſt this Theſis in his book, intitled, *De la Critique.* But it would be an eaſy task to anſwer them.

(14) See the *Journal des Savans*, for the year 1698.

[*E*] *Gaſſendi deſerves to be a little criticized upon in this place.*] He has obſerved, as a thing very honourable to the memory of Catius Inſuber, that Horace ſtiles him *learned* (15). But if he had rightly conſider'd that paſſage, he would have ſeen that it is a mere raillery, and that Horace can ſo little be quoted in favour of Catius, that on the contrary, his teſtimony can only render that Philoſopher more ridiculous. It is not many years ſince a Carteſian, having ſaid in his conferences, that this propoſition *two and two make four*, cannot be denied, was ſoon after honoured with the title of *Learned Man* for that very thought. *Two and two make four*, ſaid one of the company, *as Mr. ſuch an one has very learnedly obſerved.* If they had publiſhed an account of this Conference, I ſhould rather quote them to prove that this Philoſopher had been ſtiled learned, than quote, with Gaſſendi, the *Docte Cati* of the Satire of Horace, in order to honour the memory of Catius Inſuber. Gaſſendi had done better, not to omit mentioning the four Books, which Catius wrote *de Rerum Natura & Summo Bono.*

(15) Gaſſendi, *de vita & moribus Epicuri*, lib. 2. cap. 6.

Let me beg leave to obſerve by the by, that there are ſo many quotations in Gaſſendi's writings, that we are

(8) Eſpecially if he be the ſame with *Catius Miltiades*, who boaſted, that he had adorned his writings with his own inventions in the Art of Paſtry. See above, quotation (1).

(9) *Apud* Athenæum, lib. 9. cap. 15. pag. m. 505, 506. *See alſo* lib. 5. cap. 16, and 18. *and* Macrob. Saturn. lib. 1. cap. 1.

(10) *Alii vero de Agrippina Claudii uxore (in qua opinione & nos ſumus) intelligi volunt quæ, ut ſcribit Tranquillus, maritum medicato ſuſtulit boleto poſt adoptatum Neronem, nam Poëta ita plerumque de mortuis loquitur, ac ſi viverent præſentesque eſſent ut de Criſpino, Mario, Priſco, Matbone cauſidico.* Britannicus, *in Juven.* Sat. 1. ver. 69. i. e. "Others, "(of whoſe opinion I am) "underſtand it "of Agrippina, "the wife of "Claudius, who "diſpatched her "huſband with "a poiſoned "muſhroom, "after he had "adopted Nero. "For the Poet "uſes to ſpeak "of the dead, as "tho' they were "alive, and preſent; thus he "mentions Criſpinus, Marius, "Priſcus, Ma-"tho the Law-"yer."

*Whether Horace being an Epicurean, could ridicule his brethren.

leſs [F]. Glandorpius alſo is miſtaken [G]; nor would I maintain, on Chabot's authority, that Catius taught Virgil the Epicurean Philoſophy [H]. A particular reaſon obliges me to mention in this Article a miſtake of Scaliger concerning the Coloſſus of Rhodes, which I have mentioned in the plan of this work [I].

CATO

are not to wonder, they are not all very juſt; ſince his chief deſign related to other things, namely the philoſophical opinions. It may be aſſerted, that he was the moſt eminent Philoſopher amongſt the Humaniſts, and the moſt learned Humaniſt amongſt the Philoſophers. *Philoſophorum literatiſſimus; Literatorum maximè Philoſophus.* They, who took care of the edition of his works after his death, had not patience enough; hence it is, that they have not placed the quotations right. For inſtance, in page the 15th of the firſt volume, they quote Terence *in Andr.* over againſt a paſſage from Perſius; whereas they ſhould have placed that quotation three or four lines higher, where the Author had alledged a ſentence of Terence.

* Sat. 4. lib. 2.

[F] *Coſtar deſerves it no leſs.*] Here follow his words. "Is not Catius a polite Author, and has he "any ways leſſened his reputation, tho' in Horace he "diſcourſes of Cookery with ſo much gravity and "ſeriouſneſs (16)?" The moſt ignorant ſchool-boy, who had read that paſſage in Horace with a little attention, would anſwer *yes* to this queſtion of Coſtar; ſince it is plain that the Catius in Horace is a man, who is turned into ridicule. I wonder Mr. Girac did not cenſure this error of his adverſary.

(16) Coſtar, *Suite de la Defenſe de Voiture*, pag. 423.

[G] *Glandorpius is alſo miſtaken.*] Having mentioned Catius Celſus the Prætor under the Conſulſhip of L. Cotta and L. Torquatus, that is, in the year of Rome 688, he adds, that there was another Catius more ancient than this (17), and means him who is the ſubject of this article. For Glandorpius aſcribes to him what Quintilian and Cicero ſay of Catius the Epicurean; he even pretends, that Horace mentions him in the fourth Satire of the ſecond Book. How then could he imagine, that he was more ancient than Catius Celſus? It is probable, that he did not call to mind the common opinion, that the Catius mentioned by (18) Horace was ſtill living when the Poet ſpoke of him, nor the paſſage of Cicero, which acquaints us, that Catius Inſuber died before the year 708 ſince the building of Rome.

(17) Glandorp. *Onomaſt.* pag. 211.

(18) *In Horat.* Sat. 4. lib. 2.

[H] *I would not maintain on Chabot's authority, that Catius taught Virgil the Epicurean Philoſophy.*] If I were aſked, where Chabot read (19) that Virgil took a liking to the Epicurean Philoſophy, by the care of our Catius, who was born at Milan, I think I might anſwer, without fearing to be miſtaken, that he had it from Joſeph Scaliger's Commentary upon Virgil's *Catalecta*. But yet I would not, for all that, be more perſuaded of the truth of this fact; for that great Critic does not alledge one good proof of his aſſertion. I find indeed in Servius, that Virgil and Varus ſtudied Philoſophy under Syron (20); but he does not ſay a word of Catius; and beſides all the *Inſubri* were not of Milan.

(19) *In VI Eclog. Virgilii.*

(20) Scaliger and Chabot call him *Sciron*, and ſay, that Virgil was his diſciple at Milan.

[I] *Here follows a miſtake of Scaliger . . . which I have mentioned in the plan of this work.*] I was determined to ſuppreſs this remark, ſince I might not inſert it in its natural place, which was the article of the Coloſſus of Rhodes, and which I do not publiſh in this edition. I was, I ſay, determined to this, when a particular reaſon obliged me to alter my deſign. I ſhall explain this; but firſt I ſhall tranſcribe my remark as it ſtands in the Sketch of this Dictionary.

A REMARK upon the effects of an abſence of mind; and Scaliger quoted as an inſtance.

The great Scaliger, who practiſed the Rules of Arithmetic oftener than any Banker or Treaſurer, laboured, no doubt, under ſuch an abſence of mind, when he reckoned how much the famous Coloſſus of Rhodes weighed. He found by his reckoning, that ſince the Merchant, who bought the pieces of the Coloſſus, loaded nine hundred Camels with them, they muſt have weighed ſeven hundred and twenty thouſand pounds, and one hundred and forty four quintals (21); for, ſays he, the load of a camel is twice that of a he-mule, and weighs eight hundred pounds. It is eaſy to find by the rules of Multiplication, that nine hundred camels, each of them loaded with eight hundred pounds, bear ſeven hundred and twenty thouſand pounds; but in order to find, that one hundred and forty four quintals are equal to ſeven hundred and twenty thouſand pounds, one muſt multiply the quintals by five thouſand inſtead of an hundred; that is, one muſt not remember that a quintal weighs but an hundred pounds, and think it to weigh five thouſand. A great genius will ſooner commit ſuch a blunder, than a man of an ordinary capacity, and does not therefore deſerve to be inſulted on that account. So that Leo Allatius's ſeverity, who has cenſured this blunder in a very abuſive manner, cannot be well excuſed. Mr. Chevreau cenſures it as he ſhould do (22), which deſerves to be acknowledged; but he muſt give me leave to obſerve, that ſince he thought, that Scaliger reckoned the load of a camel to be of nine hundred pounds, he ſhould not have granted him, that the loads of nine hundred camels comes only to ſeven hundred and twenty thouſand. After he had been ſo far miſtaken as to put nine hundred inſtead of eight hundred, he ought to have found an error in the ſum total of pounds, and not in the equality only which Scaliger ſuppoſes to be between that ſum and one hundred and forty four quintals. This would have been erring methodically, which is a kind of exactneſs not to be deſpiſed. Mr. Chevreau thinks, that this paſſage was ill printed, and therefore he would not employ it to the ſame purpoſe, as I do in this place; namely, as an inſtance of the effects, which an abſence of mind may have upon us.

(21) Scalig. *Animadverſ. in Chron. Euſebii*, pag. 138. edit. 1658.

(22) *Hiſt. du Monde*, tom. 4. pag. 290. Dutch edit. 1687, and pag. 329. Dutch edit. 1698.

This abſtract of the article of the Coloſſus is deſigned as an anſwer to thoſe, who might object to me, that I have no reaſon to ſuppoſe, that in multiplying, one may happen to ſay three times ſeven is twenty two. The manner in which I account for this ſmall miſtake of Scaliger, ſeems ſo much the more probable to me, that I do not find the leaſt ground for a conjecture, which may offer itſelf immediately; namely, that the quintal mentioned by Scaliger, and which is that of Guienne and Spain, weighed five thouſand pounds (23). But perſons, who are well acquainted with this matter, have aſſured me, that they know of no ſuch quintal neither in Guienne nor in Spain.

This is what I have ſaid in the Sketch or Project of this Dictionary; I would not have repeated it in this article, had not Mr. Chauvin, a Miniſter of Rotterdam, communicated to me a writing come from London, containing ſome remarks upon my Project *. They had been ſent to Mr. Chauvin, to be inſerted in his new Journal of the learned, drawn up at Rotterdam. I do not know whether he will inſert them; I have deſired him to do it, and to add my anſwers to them (24). One of theſe remarks contains a conjecture, much more probable than mine, concerning the cauſe of Scaliger's error. I am willing, that the Public ſhould reap the benefit of it, and I am not aſhamed to own, that another conjectured better than I. Here follows that remark: *I think, we may gueſs, how Scaliger came to be miſtaken in his account of the weight of the Coloſſus of Rhodes, the pieces of which made up the loads of nine hundred camels. Scaliger reckons the load of a camel to be eight hundred pounds, which according to him is twice the load of a he-mule; the ſum total comes to ſeventy two thouſand weight, which by a monſtrous error he reduces to one hundred and forty four quintals only. Good Arithmeticians uſe, when they multiply, to leave out the cyphers, which are at the end of the number they will multiply, and of the multiplicator, and multiply the figures only, to ſave the trouble of writing uſeleſs cyphers: afterwards they add to the produce as many cyphers as there were at the end both of the multiplicator, and of the number to be multiplied. For inſtance; if I want to know the price of four hundred hogſheads of wine, at ninety livres a hogſhead, I only multiply nine by four, which are the only figures of my two numbers, and I find the produce thirty ſix, to which I add afterwards three cyphers, there being ſo many in my two numbers, the multiplied and the multiplicated, and I find thirty ſix thouſand livres, which was the price I wanted to know. Thus Scaliger having ſuppoſed the load of a camel to be equal to twice the load of a he-mule, or to eight hundred pounds, which are equivalent to eight quintals, and there being nine hundred camels, he multiplied eight by nine, which gave him ſeventy*

(23) *Vulgo ut mercatores noſtri & Magnarii in Aquitania & Hiſpania loquuntur*, (ſeptingenta viginti millia pondo) *eſſent centum quadraginta quatuor quintalia.* Scaliger, *Animadv. in Chron. Euſebii*, pag. 138.

* Mr. Chauvin died at Berlin, April the 6th 1725, aged 85. (Add. of the Amſt. edit.)

(24) Having been choſen Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Berlin, ſince the firſt printing of this page, he continued his Journal there, and has inſerted this *Writing*, with my *Anſwers* in the Journals of March and April 1696.

CATO the Cenſor. See PORTIUS (MARCUS).

venty two. Now it happens very often, that thoſe, who reckon, are ſo full of a certain notion, that they ſometimes do not only what they did not intend, but even the contrary of what they intended. Scaliger thinking of the double load, which the he-mule can carry, and which is equivalent but to the ſingle load of the camel, inſtead of adding to ſeventy two, the two cyphers of the multiplied number, nine hundred, by which means he ſhould have found the number ſeven thouſand two hundred, which is the real number of the quintals, he doubled the produce ſeventy two, which made one hundred forty four, a number ſo different from ſeven thouſand two hundred, that it is impoſſible to conceive how he could by any other means commit ſuch a blunder: for there is not the leaſt ſhadow of probability, in the conjecture of the Author, who ſuppoſes, that Scaliger forgetting that a quintal is but an hundred weight, *reckoned it as tho' it had been five thouſand.*

What the author of this writing tells us appears to me to be ſo well grounded, that I do not in the leaſt queſtion, but he has diſcovered the true cauſe of Scaliger's miſtake; a miſtake, which even by this account is as great an inſtance of the effects of an abſence of mind, as it is in the manner, in which I have accounted for it.

CATTHO (ANGELO) Archbiſhop of Vienne * in the fifteenth Century was of Tarento. He followed the party of the Houſe of Anjou in the Kingdom of Naples; wherefore the Dukes John and Nicholas of Calabria (*a*), who one after another *pretended to marry the only daughter of Charles Duke of Burgundy ... left him with that Duke, to manage that match for them.* But this negotiation did not ſucceed; *they both died in a very little time.* After their death, the Duke of Burgundy, *who was well acquainted with Angelo Cattho's great judgment and virtue, kept him in his ſervice and gave him a penſion. Cattho took his leave of him in a very civil manner* after the battle of Morat, and went to the Court of Lewis XI (*b*). He was very kindly received, and made Almoner to the King, and afterwards Archbiſhop of Vienne. Some Authors relate, that he was a Phyſician and Aſtrologer to Lewis XI [*A*]. *He was a man of a regular life, of great learning and humility, and very well ſkilled in Mathematicks ... (c) he died after a holy and auſtere life, and lies buried in his Church of Vienne (d).* There was a great friendſhip between him and Philip de Comines, when they were at the Court of the Duke of Burgundy; nor were they leſs friends when in the ſervice of King Lewis XI (*e*). It was at Angelo Cattho's perſuaſion, that Philip de Comines wrote his Memoirs, which are ſtill extant. He declares it in the very beginning, and directs his diſcourſe to him in ſeveral paſſages of his work. It is ſometimes in order to commend him for having foretold events a great while before they happened [*B*]. They relate very ſurpriſing inſtances of this man's prophetical gift [*C*], and which might afford a large field for reflections. I have ſome things

* In Dauphiné.

(*a*) They were heirs to the Houſe of Anjou, and had a right to the Crown of Naples.

(*b*) Taken from a Diſcourſe prefixed to the Proofs and Illuſtration of the Memoirs of Philip de Comines.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 3.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 9.

(*e*) Ibid. pag. 3.

[*A*] *Some Authors relate that he was Phyſician and Aſtrologer to Lewis XI.*] Peter Matthieu having ſaid, that this Prince being in a fainting fit (1), *the Sieur de Bouchage, who was his Phyſician, and afterwards promoted to the Archbiſhoprick of Vienne, came with ſo much ſpeed to his aſſiſtance, that he made him come to himſelf again, after he had made him take a gliſter,* tells us in the Index, that inſtead of *Du Bouchage,* we ought to read *Angelo Cattho.* And where he mentions the Aſtrologers, to whom Lewis XI gave ſome employments, and whom he eſteemed; he expreſſes himſelf thus (2): *But he had a particular eſteem for Angelo Cattho, who came to France with the Prince of Tarento, and had foretold the Duke of Burgundy and the Duke of Gelderland the misfortunes which happened to them. The King gave him the Archbiſhoprick of Vienne, but he could not reſide upon it, becauſe of the great vexations which thoſe of Dauphiné gave him, and was obliged to retire to Rome* (3). Naude ſays the ſame (4), and quotes the Life of Angelo Cattho written by Sleidan (5). I ſhall quote below Claudius Robertus, who aſſerts, that our Cattho was Phyſician to King Lewis XI. This therefore is a matter of fact; for Philip de Comines alſo obſerves it. *You came immediately to him,* ſays he (6), ſpeaking of a ſickneſs of Lewis XI, *My Lord of Vienne, for you was then his Phyſician.* I believe, that Peter Matthieu is miſtaken, when he ſays, that Cattho came to France with the Prince of Tarento; for it appears from Philip de Comines's account (7), that this Prince left the Duke de Burgundy, and went to meet Lewis, the day before the battle of Morat, and that Angelo Cattho was ſtill with the Duke after the loſs of that battle. For does not the Hiſtorian, when he had mentioned the affliction of the Duke of Burgundy after that unhappy day; add the following words? *You knew this better than I, My Lord of Vienne, ſince you comforted him in that affliction, and prevailed upon him to be ſhaved, for he ſuffered his beard to grow* (8). I don't know what we muſt think of Don Juan Vitrian's aſſertion, that Angelo Cattho took ſhelter in France, with John of Anjou Duke of Calabria, and that after the Duke's death, and that of Nicholas of Anjou his ſon, he entered into the ſervice of the Duke of Burgundy (9).

(1) Pierre Matthieu, *Hiſt. de Louis XI*, liv. 10. towards the beginning, pag. m. 522. under the year 1480.

(2) Ibid. liv. 11. pag. 729.

(3) See the Remark [*D*] towards the end.

(4) Naude, *Add. à l'Hiſt. de Louis XI*, pag. 119.

(5) He has prefixed it to his Latin Tranſlation of Philip de Comines.

(6) Philip de Comines, lib. 6. chap. 7. pag. m. 377. under the year 1480.

(7) Ibid. liv. 5. chap. 3. pag. 268.

(8) Ibid. chap. 5. pag. 275.

[*B*] *Comines ... commends him ſometimes for having foretold events, &c.*] He relates, *that Don Frederic of Arragon Prince of Tarento* (10), *who had already been above a year with the Duke of Burgundy, in hopes of marrying his daughter, was at laſt tired with his delays, and took his leave of the ſaid Duke the evening before the battle of Morat. ... And indeed,* continues he, *ſome perſons ſay, that he followed your advice, My Lord of Vienne; for when he was come to the King, I heard him, the Duke of Aſcoli, called Count Julio, and ſeveral others ſay it: and alſo that you had wrote into Italy, and ſaid, what would be the event of the firſt and ſecond battle, ſeveral days before they happened* (11). In another place he ſpeaks to him thus: "King Alfonſus "had a ſon called Don Ferrand (Ferdinand), a very "pretty young man, twenty two or twenty three "years old, who bore arms, and was exceedingly be-"loved in the Kingdom. He had a brother, called "Don Federic (Frederic), who was King after "Ferrand, in our time; he was a man of great pru-"dence and conduct, who commanded the naval Ar-"mies. He was educated for a long while on this "ſide of the Alpes, and you, my Lord of Vienne, "have often told me, by your Aſtrology, that he "would be King; and he promiſed me at that time, "that if this happened he would give me a yearly "penſion of four thouſand livres in his Kingdom. "Now this promiſe was made twenty years before the "thing happened (12)."

(9) Juan Vitrian, *Notes préliminaires ſur Philip de Comines.*

(10) He was the ſon of Ferdinand King of Naples.

(11) Philip. de Comines, liv. 5. chap. 3. pag. m. 266. *ad ann.* 1476.

(12) Ibid. liv. 7. chap. 4. pag. 437. under the year 1494.

[*C*] *They relate very ſurprizing inſtances of this man's prophetical gift.*] There is a ſhort account of Angelo Cattho's Life prefixed to the pieces which ſerve as proofs and illuſtrations of Philip de Comines's Memoirs. This account was *found amongſt the papers of an old ſtudious man and a lover of Hiſtory.* The Author, who wrote that account, declares, that he related *what he had collected and heard concerning him* (13) *from three perſons of great credit, prudence and authority* (14). You will find there the following words (15): "When "he (Cattho) was in the ſaid King Lewis's ſervice... "the

(13) That is to ſay, *Angelo Cattho.*

(14) They are 1. John Francis de Cardonne, Lord of La Foleyne, and Lord Steward to the King. 2. John Briçonnet, ſecond Preſident of the Court of Accounts at Paris. 3. Renaldo d'Albiano, a Neopolitan Nobleman.

(15) *Sommaire, de la Vie d'Angelo Cattho*, pag. 14.

" the third battle was fought at Nancy, in which the " Duke (of Burgundy) was killed on the Eve of the " Twelfth-Day (16). King Lewis was then hearing " Maſs in St. Martin's Church at Tours, which is at " leaſt ten long days journey diſtant from Nancy. " The Archbiſhop of Vienne aſſiſted at Maſs as Al- " moner; and when he preſented the *Pax* * (a) to " him, he told him theſe words: *Sir, God grant you* " *peace and a quiet reign*: *You may enjoy them if you* " *pleaſe*, Quia conſummatum eſt (It is finiſhed). *Your* " *enemy the Duke of Burgundy is dead; he has been juſt* " *now killed, and his army routed.* The hour of the " day having been ſet down, it was found upon in- " quiry, that the Duke had really been killed that " ſame hour. The King, hearing the Archbiſhop's " words was greatly ſurprized, and aſked him, whe- " ther what he ſaid, was true, and how he knew it. " The Prelate anſwered, that he knew it, as he knew " all the other things, which the Lord had granted " him to foretel both to him, the King, and to the " Duke of Burgundy. Whereupon the King made a " ſolemn promiſe to God and to St. Martin, that if " what the Archbiſhop told him, was true (as indeed " it was ſoon after found to be true) he would cauſe " the grate, which encompaſſed St. Martin's Shrine, " and which was but of iron, to be made of ſilver. " He performed his promiſe ſince, having cauſed a " grate to be made, which coſt an hundred thouſand " livres, or very near." Here follow two other pre- dictions. *One day early in the morning Angelo Cattho met William Brigonnet . . . . General of Languedoc*, who was going to wait upon Lewis XI *at Pleſſis near Tours. Cattho having been ſilent for ſome time, looking up to heaven, and then on the General, he told him at laſt:* Sir, I have often told you, that it was dangerous for you to go by water; and that one time or other you will be in great danger, and perhaps find your death there. I come from Pleſſis, whither you are going. The water is very high at Pont-Sainte-Anne, the bridge is broke, and the boat almoſt leaky. Do not go thi- ther, if you will believe me. *The General would not be perſuaded; he was ſoon in very great danger of being drowned; for he fell into the water, and would have been loſt, had he not taken hold of a beam which happened to be there. He was brought home again, and was ill for a long time, his ſickneſs being occaſioned both by his fright, and by the great quantity of water which he ſwallowed* (17). Angelo Cattho viſited him during his ſickneſs, and told him once, you will become a great man in the Church, and be very near being choſen Pope. Briçonnet was married to Raoullette de Beaune, a young woman, who had already bore him ſome children, and who was not well pleaſed with the prediction; *for it was intimating to her, that ſhe would march off firſt (which the women do not much care to do). However ſhe lived a great many years after, and had ſeveral children, ſo that ſhe, and ſeveral other per- ſons uſed to ſay, that the good Archbiſhop did not always tell the truth. Yet ſhe died firſt, and the General her huſband ſurvived her, and continued a widower a long while, without ſhewing the leaſt deſign of entering into Orders* (18). But at laſt, having followed Charles VIII in the Conqueſt of Naples, he *was ordained at Rome, made Biſhop of St. Malo, and Abbot of St. Germain in the Fields; then Cardinal, and afterwards Archbiſhop of Rheims and of Narbonne; and he had ſome votes at the Election of a Pope after the death of Alexander VI* (19). Some Authors relate, that Angelo Cattho fore- told to Bajazet's brother, that " one of the greateſt " Kings in Chriſtendom would endeavour to reſtore " him, but that his deſign would miſcarry; and that " he was in much greater danger from his hidden " enemies, than from thoſe, who declared openly a- " gainſt him, that he had no occaſion to fear the ſword " nor the bow-ſtring, that his fate was hidden, and his " death ſecret (20)." This brother of Bajazet took ſhelter firſt in the Iſland of Rhodes, whence he retired into France, and continued there ſome years; they ſent him afterwards to Rome to be under the protection of Pope Innocent VIII, he lived till the year 1494, when he was poiſoned by Alexander VI, whilſt the King of France deſigned to reſtore him (21).

Theſe are things at which a Philoſopher is extremely puzzled. For it is impoſſible to invent any good Sy- ſtem of Philophy, that will account for them. This obliges moſt of the Philoſophers flatly to deny all the facts of this nature, which are ſo often mentioned in books, and eſpecially in converſation. But it muſt be confeſſed, that this manner of proceeding is not free from inconveniencies, and thoſe cannot reſt ſatisfied with it, who love to examine ſtrictly both ſides of a queſtion. A Chriſtian Philoſopher may eaſily admit, that God endows ſome perſons with the gift of Prophe- cy, when he propoſes to eſtabliſh or to confirm ſome important truths, which concern the Salvation of Men, or to put a ſtop to the exceſſive depravation of manners, or in general to execute ſome extraordinary deſign very neceſſary for the good of the Church. If this or ſome thing of this nature had been the caſe of Angelo Cat- tho, one might believe, that God raiſed him as a Pro- phet. But he was a Courtier, who minded nothing but to conclude a match, which was of temporal ad- vantage, to his principals, or to procure a good em- ployment for himſelf; and beſides, he was a man who ſet up for an Aſtrologer. Now, nothing ſeems more unworthy of God, than to reveal future events to an Aſtrologer, that is to ſay, to reward by ſo great a fa- vour the moſt impertinent and ſilly ſcience, and which is grounded on the moſt abſurd fancies. If a Devil or an evil ſpirit ſhould reveal future events to thoſe men, who calculate nativities, and make figures of geoman- cy (22), we might account for it. For ſince he is a wicked being, he may be capricious, have ridiculous fancies, and direct his actions by trifling motives, in order the better to caſt a ridicule upon every thing. But then, is it poſſible for a created being to know be- fore hand, that twenty years hence, the huſband of a young woman will be made a Cardinal? Is it not ne- ceſſary, in order to foretel this, that a being ſhould know the whole ſeries of almoſt an infinite number of corporeal and ſpiritual motions? Can the knowledge of a creature extend to ſo many things at once? If it does, then there can be no free-will; all the thoughts of men are linked together in a natural and indiſſolu- ble chain. Here then are mazes, in which the reaſon of Philoſophers muſt of neceſſity be loſt and bewildered, They chooſe therefore rather to deny whatever is aſſert- ed concerning Predictions. But even this does not re- move all difficulties; for who would dare to think, that Philip de Comines impoſed upon us, when he aſſerted, that Angelo Cattho foretold him ſeveral times, that Ferdinand of Arragon would be King, twenty years before this happened?

I don't deny, that moſt of the ſtories, which are told concerning Predictions, juſtly deſerve to be conſidered as ſo many impoſtures: for it muſt be owned, that they, who cry them up with the greateſt confidence, are too careleſs in taking the neceſſary precautions a- gainſt an incredulous adverſary; they ſeldom mention the Prediction but after the event; they do not take care to have an account of it inſerted in an authentic Inſtrument drawn up according to the forms of Law, they don't ſupport it by the unqueſtionable authority of a public monument; and ſince they neglect to do all this on thoſe occaſions, in which it would be very eaſy to oppoſe an impenetrable ſhield againſt all the at- tacks of incredulity, they ought not to be ſurprized, that their accounts ſhould be called into queſtion. One of theſe occaſions is the Maſs, during which they pre- tend that Angelo Cattho acquainted the King with the death of the Duke of Burgundy. They ought to have preſented a petition to that Prince, humbly praying, that he would be pleaſed to declare to his whole Coun- cil, what Angelo Cattho had told him, and to order his Chancellor to draw an authentic Inſtrument of it, to be lodged in the Archives amongſt the Records of the Crown, and amongſt the Regiſters of all the ſupreme Courts of the Kingdom: They ought to have per- ſuaded him to cauſe ſeveral columns to be erected with inſcriptions containing an account of the whole fact, or at leaſt, to have it engraved on the grate of St. Martin's ſhrine, ſince this prophecy was the occaſion of his vowing a ſilver grate for that ſhrine, and he had performed his vow. What could the incredulous have ſaid in ſuch a caſe? What could they have ob- jected to ſuch monuments, as were contemporary, and ſo authentic? But even without all theſe precautions, if the ſtory had been true, it would have daily been more and more ſupported, and confirmed by itſelf; Lewis XI would have related it a thouſand times at his table, before the Embaſſadors of foreign Princes; and there would have been ſeveral Books extant, in which the ſtory would be told, and in which the Au- thors would declare, they had it from the King's own mouth;

(16) Peter Mat- thieu ſays, (*Hiſt. de Louis XII*, liv. 7. pag. m. 392) *that it was the day after the battle that Cattho acquainted the King with it, when he preſented the* Pax *to him.*

* See the addition at the end of this remark.

(17) *Sommaire de la vie d'Angelo Cattho*, pag. 5, 6.

(18) Ibid. pag. 7.

(19) Ibid. pag. 8.

(20) Rocolles, *Vie du Sultan Gemes*, pag. 112.

(21) Extracted from the ſame Life, pag. 176, &c.

(22) I have obſerved in the Remark [*D*] of the Article RUGGIERI, that if Aſtrology be a means of knowing future events, it muſt be a part of Magic.

Some Reflections concerning the difficulty there is to explain what is related of predictions, and concerning the careleſneſs of men, in not ſupporting ſuch accounts with juridical formalities.

things to cenſure in Moreri [*D*], in Dr. Nicolo Toppi [*E*], and in Mr. Varillas [*F*].

mouth; and I am ſure, there would be an authentic Act amongſt the Regiſters of the Church of St. Martin's, if it were true, that the King cauſed a ſilver grate to be made in performance of his vow. Since therefore this ſtory is not ſupported, but by the authority of an anonymous Writer (23), who declares, that he relates nothing concerning Angelo Cattho, but what he had from three perſons, we may juſtly explode it. But finding alſo, that Philip de Comines does not mention it, we have a right to aſſert that it is a mere forgery. It is impoſſible he ſhould have been ignorant of his friend's converſation with Lewis XI, and that knowing it, he ſhould have omitted to mention it in his Memoirs, in which he mentions ſome other predictions of Angelo much leſs conſiderable than this. His ſilence is a negative argument, which in this caſe comes up to a full demonſtration, or at leaſt is of quite another weight than that aſſertion of the three perſons mentioned by the anonymous Author. It muſt be obſerved, that he does not ſay, that all the three perſons aſſerted the truth of the converſation of Angelo Cattho with the King; we may therefore ſuppoſe, that this Author heard but one of theſe perſons mention that converſation. Now ſince the chief of the three predictions is a mere invention, the two others may alſo be rejected; and therefore the Author of the ſhort account of Cattho's Life, is not proper to cure any body of his incredulous ſpirit.

(23) The Author of the *Sommaire de la Vie de Cattho*, quoted above.

Obſerve that Monſr. Amyraut quotes theſe three facts, in order to prove, that a man may foretel things to come, without being a Prophet (24); he deſigns thereby to anſwer the following argument of the Roman Catholicks. There have been Doctors in the Church of Rome who have foretold future events; therefore ſhe is the true Church, ſince God continues there the gift of Prophecy.

(24) Amyraut, *de l'Elevation de la Foy, et de l'abaiſſement de la Raiſon*, pag. 258, 259.

* (*a*) *He preſented the Pax to him.*] The *Pax* is that, which the Roman Catholics kiſs out of devotion, either at the Offertory, or when they wiſh one another peace after Conſecration. When a Prelate officiates he gives his ring to kiſs. A curate gives the Patten to kiſs, after the *Pax Domini* or Bleſſing. The Clergy kiſs the Images, or the Shrines. All theſe things, which are given to kiſs out of devotion, are called the *Pax* †. ADD. REM.]

† Furetiere, French edition, under the word PAIX.

[*D*] *I have ſomething to cenſure in Moreri.*] He ſays, I, that Angelo Cattho was born at Benevento; but they who ſhould be well acquainted with his native place, ſay it was Tarento. II. He makes him *Great Almoner of France*; but he ſhould have known that this title did not begin, but with the Cardinal de Meudon in the reign of Francis I (25). Before that time, the only title in uſe, was that of *Great Almoner of the King*; and even this title was ſtill unknown in the reign of Lewis XI. The firſt, who had it, was Geoffry de Pompadour Biſhop of Perigueux under Charles VIII (26). III. Claudius Robertus tells us, that Angelo Cattho was buried in his Metropolitan Church: His words are, *Angelus Cato Tarentinus, ex Medico & Eleemoſynario Ludovici XI, cujus ſuaſu ſcripſit Commentarios rerum Francicarum Philippus Comineus, jacet in ſua Metropoli. Erat ejus Symbolum, ingenium ſupra vires* (27). i. e. "Angelo Cattho of Tarento, "who had been Phyſician and Almoner to King Lewis "XI, and at whoſe perſuaſion Philip de Comines "wrote his Memoirs, lies buried in his Metropolitan "Church; his Motto was, *Wiſdom prevails over "power.*" This makes me queſtion what Moreri aſſerts, namely, *that in* 1492 *he went to Benevento, and died there in* 1497. We have ſeen above that another Author ſays (28), that he was obliged to retire to Rome. This is not certain. As to Moreri's omiſſions, the reader may obſerve them, by comparing his article with mine.

(25) *See* Du Peirat, *Antiquitez de la Chapelle du Roy*, liv. 1. chap. 61.

(26) Ibid.

(27) Claudius Robertus *in Gallia Chriſtiana*, pag. 182. in *Catal. Præſul. Viennenſ.* num. 96. *apud* Dionyſ. Gothofred. In the proofs and the caſtrations of Philip. de Comines's *Hiſtory*, pag. m. 10.

(28) Matthieu above, Remark [*A*], Quotation (1).

[*E*] .... *In Dr. Nicolo Toppi.*] He mentions one Angelo Catone of Benevento, and another Angelo Catone of Tarento. The firſt ſays he had a great knowledge in all the ſciences, and for that reaſon, was very much beloved by Charles VIII: his own merit, and that King's favour raiſed him to be Archbiſhop of Vienne. The ſecond was Phyſician and Almoner to Lewis XI, who prevailed upon him to write *li Commentarii delle Coſe di Francia.* "Memoirs of the affairs of France," as we learn from Philip de Comines, quoted by Claudius Robertus, page 182 of his *Gallia Chriſtiana* (29). It is certain, that the Author of the *Bibliotheca Napoletana* has divided one Author in two: for the ſame Angelo Catto, who was Phyſician and Almoner to Lewis XI, was alſo Archbiſhop of Vienne, even before Charles VIII came to the throne. It is not true, that he wrote a Book at Lewis the XI's perſuaſion, nor that Philip de Comines mentions this, nor that Claudius Robertus quotes him for it. How are circumſtances altered, when a man miſunderſtands the words of an Author? Yet thoſe of Claudius Robertus are very plain. Nicodemo has not cenſured Nicolo Toppi for this.

(29) Nicolo Toppi, *Bibliot. Napolet.* pag. 170.

[*F*] *And in Mr. Varillas.*] Here follows what he tells us (30). "The favourers of judicial Aſtrology "exult here on the authority of Philip de Comines, "who relates, that the famous Angelo Cattho follow-"ed the party of the Duke of Burgundy, either be-"cauſe he had at firſt preferred that Prince before "the King of France, or becauſe he would imitate "the other learned men of his time, who uſed to go "and ſeek their fortune in the Low-Countries only be-"cauſe they could eaſier ſucceed there, than any "where elſe. He continued in that Duke's ſervice "till he foreſaw, by an accurate calculation of that "Prince's nativity, that he would be killed in battle. "He began then to look for a proper opportunity, "that he might leave the Duke with all poſſible de-"cency; and having met with ſuch an opportunity "after the battle of Morat, he took hold of it as a "man of ſenſe. He firſt ſtipulated ſome articles with "Lewis XI, who not only favoured him with his "intimate friendſhip, but alſo preferred him to the "Archbiſhoprick of Vienne, and yet kept him at "Court. Angelo Cattho was ſaying Maſs before the "King, when the battle of Nancy was fought, and "when he gave the King the Patten to kiſs, he "told him, *Sir, God grant you peace*, &c. (31)." There are ſeveral miſtakes in this account. I. The favourers of judicial Aſtrology cannot reap any benefit from what Cattho told King Lewis XI during Maſs, the very moment Duke Charles was killed, for it is plain, that it was not by the means of Aſtrology that he knew what paſſed at Nancy. II. It is not true, that the Aſtrologers lay any ſtreſs on this upon the credit of Philip de Comines. For how could they do it, ſince he does not ſay a word of this prediction? III. It is not true, that the learned men in Italy or in any other places, uſed to *go into the Low-Countries to ſeek their fortune.* IV. Nor that *they could eaſier ſucceed there than any where elſe.* Could he quote a great many inſtances of this? Had it not been better to ſay, that Angelo Cattho was left with the Duke to negotiate the marriage of his maſter the Duke of Calabria. This is the reaſon which firſt obliged him to go to that Court. V. We do not read in the ſhort account of his life, that by calculating the Duke's nativity, he foreſaw that *the Duke would be killed in battle.* We only find there, that *after the battle of Morat*, Angelo Cattho, *knowing how obſtinate the Duke was (and perhaps alſo) the misfortunes which were to befall him and his family, he took his leave of him in a civil manner* (32). How different is this account from what Mr. Varillas relates! The worſt is, that Philip de Comines, whom he quotes, does not even mention the conjecture, which the Reader has ſeen juſt now. VI. It is not true, that Angelo Cattho was Archbiſhop of Vienne, when Duke Charles was killed.

(30) Varillas, *Hiſt. de Louis XI*, liv. 7. pag. 150 of the Dutch edition.

(31) The Author relates here the whole converſation. See the Remark [*C*], Quotation (15) towards the middle.

(32) *Sommaire de la vie d'Angelo Cattho*, pag. 4.

The Spaniſh Author (33), who has wrote a Commentary upon Philip de Comines's Memoirs ſays, that Angelo Cattho having conjectured or gueſſed, that the Duke of Burgundy would be killed, went into the ſervice of the King of France, a little before that Duke's death, and foretold to the King that the Duke would loſe the battles. This is not accurate; for the Duke loſt but one battle after the Aſtrologer was with Lewis XI. I omit obſerving, that this Author is too modern to deſerve any credit when he ſpeaks without quoting his Vouchers.

(33) Juan Vitrian.

CATULLUS (CAIUS (*a*) VALERIUS) a Latin Poet was born at Verona,

(*a*) Quintus, according to Pliny, lib. 37. cap. 6.

Verona [*A*], in the year 666 from the building of Rome (*b*). The beauty of his verſes gained him the friendſhip and eſteem of all the men of wit and learning, who were then very numerous at Rome. As the ancient Romans had no notion of thoſe rules of politeneſs, which now expoſe a man to ſhame and public hatred, who writes ſmutty verſes, in which lewd actions are deſcribed without any veil (*c*), Catullus did not much hurt his reputation by the groſs obſcenities and horrid laſciviouſneſs, with which he has poiſoned ſeveral of his Poems. It is thought (*d*) that he called the moſt celebrated of his miſtreſſes *Leſbia*, for the ſake of Sappho, who was of the Iſland of Leſbos, and with whoſe verſes he was exceedingly delighted, ſome of which he has tranſlated or imitated. The true name of his miſtreſs was Clodia (*e*). He is very far from following the method of our Poets, who are continually complaining of the cruelty and inſenſibility of the Fair. For his part he repreſents his Leſbia as a woman who uſed to aſk him how many kiſſes would ſatisfy him [*B*], and what is worſe, as a woman who yielded to the firſt who aſked her the queſtion. He wrote ſatyrical verſes againſt Cæſar (*f*), but they ſerved only to give the perſon offended a new opportunity of ſhewing his moderation [*C*]. Indeed Cæſar was not unconcerned at the grievous injury he had received, but he contented himſelf with obliging the Poet to make him ſatisfaction, and that very day he invited him to ſupper. Suetonius adds, he continued ſtill to lodge at the houſe of Catullus's father (*g*); but there are ſome very learned men who think, that the Hiſtorian did not well diſtinguiſh the different times [*D*]. All our Poet's verſes are not of dangerous conſequence; there are ſome (*h*), in which he diſcovers ſo great an affliction for the death of his brother, that one cannot but be extremely moved at it. He did not grow rich, either by his verſes, or by his journey into Bithynia, whither he accompanied Memmius (*i*), who had obtained the government of that Province, when the time of his Prætorſhip was out. It is eaſy to know that he was poor (*k*). They who ſuppoſe that he was intimate with Furius and Aurelius, join here together three miſerable wretches [*E*], for theſe

(*b*) The 2d year of the 173d Olympiad, in which St. Jerom places his birth, is A. U. 666. according to Calviſius.

(*c*) See *Nouv. de la Rep. des Let.* June 1684. Art. 4. pag. 367.

(*d*) Iſ. Voſſius, *in Catul.* pag. 189.

(*e*) Apulcius, *Apolog.*

(*f*) Epigram. 30. 58.

(*g*) Sueton. *in Cæſare*, cap. 73.

(*h*) Epig. 67, 69, 102.

(*i*) See how he complains of him in the 28th Epigram, which ought to be but one with the 29th.

(*k*) Epigram. 13, 27.

[*A*] *He was born at Verona.*] St. Jerom does not ſay as Moreri pretends, that our Poet was born in the Peninſula of Sirmion; (he does not in the leaſt mention this; and expreſly names Verona,) nor does he place Catullus's birth in the CLXIIId Olympiad. Moreri has been miſled by the following words of Giraldi (1). *Natus quidem in peninſula Sirmione lacus Benaci in agro Veronenſi, ut ipſemet ad ipſam Sirmionem cecinit, Olympiade circiter CLXX, ut Hieronymus ex Chronicis Euſebii obſervat.* i. e. "He was born in "the Peninſula of Sirmion ſituated in the lake of "Benacus in the territory of Verona, as he himſelf "has ſung near Sirmion, and about the 170th Olym"piad, as St. Jerom obſerves from Euſebius's Chro"nicon." It was not difficult to diſcover here two different quotations, and to ſee that St. Jerom was not quoted for the native place of Catullus.

(1) *De Poetic.* Dial. 10.

[*B*] *He repreſents his Leſbia as a woman, who uſed to aſk him how many kiſſes would ſatisfy him.*] It is in the ſeventh Epigram.

Quæris, quot mihi baſiationes
Tuæ, Leſbia, ſint ſatis ſuperque?

And he anſwers her, that he wanted as many, as there are grains of ſand in the deſarts of Libya, or ſtars in heaven. And as to the diſſolute life of this miſtreſs, he ſpeaks of it in the following manner.

Cœli, Leſbia noſtra, Leſbia illa,
Illa Leſbia quam Catullus unam
Pluſquam ſe atque ſuos amavit omnes,
Nunc in quadriviis & angiportis
Glubit magnanimos Remi Nepotes (2).

(2) Catull. Epig. 59.

That is,

"O Cælius, my dear Leſbia, that ſame Leſbia,
"whom Catullus loved entirely, and more than him"ſelf and all his friends, Leſbia is now a common
"proſtitute."

Some Authors pretend, that this diſſolute woman was the ſiſter of the infamous Clodius, Cicero's great enemy. See the Article of METELLUS CELER, Remark [*A*], Quotation (3).

[*C*] *His ſatyrical verſes againſt Cæſar . . . . ſerved only to give the latter a new opportunity of ſhewing his moderation.*] I ſhall tranſcribe here all that Suetonius ſays of this, by which it will appear, that Moreri gives but a very lame and imperfect account of it. *Valerium Catullum, a quo ſibi verſiculis de Mamurra perpetua ſtigmata impoſita non diſſimulaverat, ſatisfacientem eadem die cœnæ adhibuit, hoſpitioque patris ejus, ſicut conſueverat, uti perſeveravit* (3). i. e. "Tho' his re"putation had been branded for ever by Catullus's
"verſes concerning Mamurra, yet the Poet having
"made him ſatisfaction, he admitted him to ſup that
"very day at his table, and continued to lodge at the
"Poet's father's, as he uſed to do." Crinitus has ſtrangely miſtaken theſe laſt words; for inſtead of ſaying, that Cæſar continued to lodge at Catullus's father's; he ſays, that Catullus was ſuffered to lodge at Cæſar's houſe, as he uſed to do, or to claim the right of hoſpitality, which ſubſiſted between their families (4). He was in the right to infer from this right of hoſpitality between Cæſar and Catullus's father, that our Poet was not of a mean extraction. But he ſhould not have made Suetonius ſay, that Catullus's father lodged familiarly at Cæſar's houſe. Suetonius does not ſay this, and Catullus's father was perhaps never at Rome. Father Briet has tranſcribed all theſe blunders of Crinitus (5).

(3) Sueton. *in Jul. Cæſ.* cap. 73.

(4) Crinitus, *de Poetis Latinis*, lib. 2. cap. 27.

(5) Briet. *de Poet. Lat.* pag. 14, 15.

[*D*] *Suetonius did not well diſtinguiſh the different times.*] Scaliger pretended to find him guilty of a miſtake, and fell himſelf into a very great error (6). He aſſerts that Catullus's reconciliation with Cæſar happened after all the triumphs of the latter, and to ſupport this aſſertion, he obſerves, that Catullus's ſatyrical verſes mention the ſpoils of Pontus, and thoſe of Spain, and were conſequently poſterior to the victory of Munda gained over the ſons of Pompey. Now Cæſar did not return into Gaul after this laſt triumph, and did not therefore lodge any more at Catullus's father's, who lived on the other ſide of the river Po. All this is unqueſtionable, and Scaliger had done well to ſtop here, as Caſaubon had done, when he made uſe of this obſervation (7). But Scaliger goes farther; and ſays, that Cæſar did not return into Gaul, after he had once paſſed the Rubicon. *Cæſar non potuit uti ejus* (Catulli) *patris hoſpitio, niſi ante bellum civile, quum proconſulari imperio obtineret Gallias Ciſalpinam & Tranſalpinam. . . . Poſt tranſitum Rubiconis Cæſar nunquam poſtea in Gallias ſuas reverſus eſt* (8). This is evidently falſe. For he returned into Gaul, when he went to Spain, firſt to drive Pompey's ſons from thence, before the battle of Pharſalia (9), and then again to drive the ſame ſons of Pompey from thence after the defeat of Cato and Scipio in Africa. We ſhall ſhew in the Remark [*I*] (10), that it is not very certain, Cæſar never lodged with his friend of Verona, ſince his reconciliation with Catullus.

(6) Scaliger, *Animadv. in Euſeb.* num. 1960. pag. m. 155.

(7) Caſaub. *in Sueton. Cæſ.* cap. 73.

(8) Scalig. *in Animadv. in Euſeb.* num. 1690, pag. 155.

(9) *Cæſar infectis iis quæ agere deſtinaverat ab urbe proficiſcitur atque in ulteriorem Galliam pervenit.* Cæſar. lib. 1. *de Bell. Civil.* cap. 33. *fin.*

(10) Towards the end of the ſecond *a-linea.*

[*E*] *Furius, Aurelius* and he, *are three miſerable wretches joined together.*] Theſe were according to Crinitus (11) Catullus's intimate friends. And indeed, he repreſents them in his Epigrams, as perſons ready

(11) *Inter cæteros amicos Furium & Aurelium magnopere dilexit.* Crinitus, *de Poetis*, lib. 2. cap. 27.

theſe two were ſtarving. We have not all his works [F]; thoſe, that are extant, have been printed and commented upon ſeveral times (g). The *Pervilium Veneris* ought not to be aſcribed to him (l). St. Jerom ſhould not have placed his death under the laſt year of the 180th Olympiad [H], that is, according to Calviſius, A. U. 696; at this rate he would have lived but thirty years, and he lived longer, but not ſo long as Joſeph Scaliger has aſſerted [I], who makes him live above threeſcore and eleven years; this is paſſing

(l) *See* Lipſius, *Elect.* lib. 1, cap. 5.

to follow him to the extremities of the world, and into the moſt ſavage countries; but in other places he ſays ſo many diſobliging things of them, that it is hardly poſſible to believe that their friendſhip laſted long. I deſcribe them as ravenous beaſts, who for want of a livelihood are ready to ſtarve.

Aureli pater eſuritionum,
Non harum modo, ſed quot aut fuerunt,
Aut ſunt, aut aliis erunt in annis (12).

(12) Catul. *Epigr.* 21.

He could not have deſcribed a beggar otherwiſe than he has done them (13). On the other hand, he repreſents them as greedy of ſodomy (14) as of bread, and threatens them with a terrible puniſhment (15), if they venture to ſlander him, or to debauch the darling object of his love. This is going beyond the bounds of raillery; no man would write ſuch verſes againſt his beſt friends; and if it were true, that men wanted the neceſſaries of life, it would have been more diſobliging to ridicule them for it. It is therefore probable, that Catullus's friendſhip was changed into an exceſſive hatred againſt theſe two perſons, on account of ſome ſhameful intrigue. *Cum horum utroque graves poſtea inimicitias geſſit, eoſque acerbiſſimis verſibus inſectatus eſt, tum quod ipſum mollem notaſſent, tum quod puerum ipſi carum Aurelius quidem tentaſſet, Furius vero etiam conſtupraſſet* (16). i. e. "But he "became afterwards a bitter enemy of them both, "and treated them very ſeverely in his verſes, both "becauſe they had expoſed him as an effeminate man, "and becauſe Aurelius had attempted to raviſh a boy "whom he loved, and Furius had really raviſhed him." How ſtrangely are Poets infatuated in favour of their own writings? They chuſe rather to acquaint the public with the praiſes they have beſtowed on perſons, whom they have ſince ſlandered, than to ſuppreſs the verſes which contain thoſe praiſes. We meet with ſuch inſtances in the Poems, and even in the letters of ſome Moderns. When an Author falls out with any perſon after the firſt edition of ſome book, he uſes to blot out of the ſecond edition the encomiums he had beſtowed upon ſuch a perſon. The Poets therefore, and the Letter-writers, who do not act in this manner, or who, after the example of Catullus, inſert in the firſt edition of their Poems both the praiſes they have beſtowed on a perſon, and ſatyrs they have wrote againſt him, muſt do it, becauſe they are exceedingly pleaſed with the turn they have given their thoughts. They prefer the reputation which they expect to gain by their verſes, before the blame they deſerve for praiſing and cenſuring the ſame perſon in a breath. When I ſaid, *after the example of Catullus*, it was, becauſe he publiſhed himſelf the collection of his Poems, as appears from his dedication to Cornelius Nepos. Let us obſerve here, that Voſſius durſt not venture to affirm, that the Aurelius, mentioned by Catullus, is the ſame with L. Aurelius Cotta, as ſome Authors think: But he aſſerts, that the Furius of the Poet is *Furius Bibaculus*, who, ſays he, was nothing leſs than a ſtarveling; for Horace acquaints us, that he was a fat and luſty man, and a great eater. *Iſte nihil minus fuit quam eſuritor, erat quippe obeſus & vorax ut ex Horatio conſtat* (17). The paſſage in Horace, at which Voſſius hinted, is in the Vth Satire of the IId Book.

(13) Ibid. Ep. 23.
(14) *Verum a te metuo tuoque pene Infeſto pueris bonis maliſque.* Catul. Ep. 15.
(15) *Pædicabo ego vos, & irrumabo,*
Aureli pathice,
& cinæde Furi.
Catull. Epigr. 26. *See alſo* 21.
(16) Muretus, in Epigr. 11. Catulli.
(17) If. Voſſius, *in Catull.* pag. 32.

——— *Seu pingui tentus omaſo*
Furius hibernas cana nive conſpuet Alpes.

Tentus pingui omaſo ſignifies, according to ſome Commentators (18), that *Furius had eat ſo many tripes, that they had made him ſwell, as tho' Horace intended to hint, that Furius lived upon no other meat but that.* But others maintain, the ſenſe of Horace is, that Furius *had a very big paunch.* Voſſius admits both theſe ſignifications. He would not come off ſo eaſily with Catullus, as with Horace, for the Furius of the former was ſo far from being paunch-bellied, that on the contrary, he was ſo lean and dry, that he wanted even ſpittle; I cannot expreſs in Engliſh how deſtitute he was of all kind of moiſture.

(18) *See* Dacier, *on Horace* tom. 6. pag. 411. Dutch edition.

Atqui corpora ſicciora cornu
Aut ſi quid magis aridum eſt, habetis,
Sole, & frigore, & eſuritione.
Quare non tibi ſit benè ac beatè?
A te ſudor abeſt, abeſt ſaliva,
Mucuſque & mala pituita naſi.
Hanc ad munditiem adde mundiorem,
Quod culus tibi purior ſalillo eſt,
Nec toto decies cacas in anno:
Atque id durius eſt faba & lapillis,
Quod ſi tu manibus teras, friceſque;
Non unquam digitum inquinare poſſet (19).

(19) Catull. Epigr. 23.

Whether *Eſuritor* and *Vorax* be words of ſuch a contrary ſignification, as Voſſius pretends, I ſubmit to the judgment of thoſe, who wrote ſo many ſatyrs againſt the Paraſite Montmaur. However that be, Voſſius's miſtaking the Furius mentioned by Catullus, for a fat and luſty man, cannot be excuſed.

[F] *We have not all his works.*] Crinitus obſerves, that Terentianus Maurus mentions an *Ithyphallic* Poem of Catullus, and that Pliny (20) aſcribes to him a Poem concerning inchantments by *Philters* or Love-potions, a ſubject, of which Theocritus had already treated before him, and upon which Virgil wrote after Catullus. As for the *Ithyphallic* Verſes, or the Poem concerning that obſcene Divinity, called Priapus, Crinitus ſhould not have ſaid, that they are loſt.

(20) Plin. lib. 28. cap. 2. Crinitus, and Geſner after him, quote lib. 38.

[G] .... *Thoſe that are extant, have been printed and commented upon ſeveral times.*] The moſt conſiderable editions are thoſe of Scaliger, and of Paſſerat. The former of theſe two critics corrected a great number of paſſages with a very great ſagacity and learning. The moſt ancient edition, if I am not miſtaken, is that of Venice, publiſhed in 1488, with the Commentary of Anthony Parthenius. The Commentaries of Muretus and Achilles Statius, and the various readings of Titius are uſeful. Grævius, to whom the public is obliged for the many good Editions he has procured, publiſhed one of Catullus at Utrecht, in the year 1680, in which he has inſerted intire all the notes of a great many Commentators. Iſaac Voſſius's Edition, printed at Leyden (21) in 1684, contains a very learned Commentary. See upon this, and concerning the Edition *in uſum Delphini* the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* for the year 1684. A Florentine named Tuſcanella has made a very large Index to Catullus, which was printed by John Gebhard in his Edition *Variorum* at Francfort, in 1621.

(21) They have put in the title page, *Proſtant apud Iſaacum Littlebury, Bibliopolam Londinenſem.*

[H] *St. Jerom ſhould not have placed his death under the laſt year of the* 180*th Olympiad.*] Catullus, in his verſes againſt Cæſar mentions that Emperor's expedition in Britain; and he made his firſt expedition in the year 698 from the building of Rome; it is therefore certain, that Catullus did not die in the year 696.

[I] *He did not live ſo long as Scaliger has aſſerted.*] Let us examine his four arguments for that opinion. He ſays (22), I. That Catullus was ſtill alive when Virgil wrote his Æneid, and to prove this, he quotes the following verſes from Martial.

(22) Scalig. *Animad. in Euſeb.* num. 1960.

Sic forſan tener auſus eſſet Catullus
Magno mittere paſſerem Maroni (23).

(23) Martial. Epig. 14. lib. 4.

That is,

"Thus has the tender Catullus ventured perhaps "to ſend his Poems to the great Virgil." Now Virgil did not write his Æneid till a great while after Julius Cæſar's death. 2. That Catullus mentions in his

passing to another extreme, and we shall prove by several arguments, that this great Critic

his Satire Cæsar's four triumphs, this Emperor's death must then have happened soon after his reconciliation with the Poet. For Cæsar died a year after his triumphs. 3. That Cornelius Nepos seems to have written under Augustus; now Catullus mentions Cornelius Nepos's Chronicles. 4. Lastly, that Catullus being threescore and eleven years old was present at the secular games, which were celebrated in the year of Rome 737: this appears plainly by his *Carmen Sæculare*; for why should he have written that Poem, if he had not lived when these games were solemnized?

I. They object commonly against the first of these arguments, that Martial made use of a poetical licence or fiction (24), and that he was sensible he told a downright falsity (25): but that he thought this lie would be acceptable to Silius Italicus, who was a great admirer of Virgil, to whom Catullus compared him: It is added, that the word *forsan* (perhaps) lessons the boldness of the fiction (26). But these are very frivolous reasons: for, to begin with the latter; Martial, notwithstanding his *forsan*, evidently supposes, that Catullus was still living, when Virgil was writing his Æneid. But tho' they had been contemporaries, it could not be inferred from thence absolutely, that Catullus shewed his Poems to Virgil; and this is the reason of the *forsan* (perhaps). But if the one shewed perhaps his Poems to the other, they must have been Contemporaries. So that notwithstanding this *perhaps*, the fact in dispute is clearly supposed and asserted by Martial with the utmost confidence. Now, it is not probable, that he would knowingly assert a falsity: he could not but know, that the Chronological errors, which Poets are allowed to commit, are not of this kind. How would Mr. Boileau escape censure, if he should say, that Marot shewed perhaps his manuscript to Cardinal du Perron? We must therefore answer to Scaliger, that Martial supposed a thing which was false; and that we are not to wonder at it, since Joseph Scaliger himself and Monsieur Menage have made false suppositions concerning the time when Daurat or Ronsard lived (27). I shall observe by the by, that the *Passer* of Catullus signifies in Martial the whole collection of Catullus's Poems, as the *Arma Virumque* signifies in Ovid and Martial the whole Æneis, and the *Æneadum Genetrix* in Ovid, the whole Poem of Lucretius. Scaliger complains (28) that a certain Author stole that observation from him: *Quæ a nobis accepta stellio in suas Varias transtulit.* Isaac Vossius observes upon this, that Carrion is here hinted at, and that Parthenius had made this observation long before Scaliger.

II. The second argument is of no weight; for it is not certain that Catullus mentioned Cæsar's last triumphs; his words are,

Paterna prima lancinata sunt bona
Secunda præda Pontica, inde tertia
Ibera, quam scit amnis aurifer Tagus,
Hunc Galliæ timent, timent Britanniæ (30).

That is,

" He first spent his patrimony, then the riches he " got from Pontus, then those he gathered in Portugal. " They know it but too well, thro' whose country " the Tagus runs carrying gold in his streams. Him " the Gauls, him the Britains dread." I wonder, Vossius did not mind the last verse of those we have just now quoted, since it adds a great deal of strength to his conjectures. The *Præda Pontica* signifies according to him (31), not the spoils of King Pharnaces, whom Cæsar had vanquished after the death of Pompey, but the money which Cæsar got from Bithynia by his correspondence with King Nicomedes (32). And as for the *Præda Ibera*, the same Vossius explains it of the booty which Cæsar made in the war of Portugal in the year 693, and laughs at those who understand it of the victory of Munda; for Munda, says he, is above two hundred miles distant from the Tagus. All this is wonderfully confirmed by the following words, *Hunc Galliæ timent, timent Britanniæ*; here we have the fourth booty; the Gauls and the Britains plundered by Cæsar. The spoils from Spain must therefore have been got before those from the Gauls, and cannot relate to a triumph, which happened several years after the conquest of the Gauls, as was the triumph for the victory of Munda. Why did not Vossius add, that if Catullus had spoken of the spoils of King Pharnaces, he would not have omitted those of Egypt, nor those of Africa; since it is certain that Cæsar triumphed three days successively, first for his victories in Egypt, then for the Kingdom of Pontus, and then for Africa (33), and all this after the defeat of Cato. The next year he triumphed over the sons of Pompey for the victory of Munda. How could Catullus break off short, after he had mentioned Cæsar's plundering the Gauls, if he had spoken before of the triumphs, which followed the civil war? Or how could he forget the spoils of Egypt and of Africa, if he had intended to mention those of Pontus and of Munda. All this inclines me to think, that he wrote his Satire soon after the invasion of Britain. For Isaac Vossius (34) proves very well, that these last words, *Socer generque perdidisti omnia*, " Father-in-law, son-in-law, you have ruined " the State," must not be understood of Cæsar and Pompey, but of Cæsar and Mumurra; and though Vossius were mistaken in this, it must be observed, that the quarrels of Cæsar and Pompey were come to such a height, that all the world might easily know, they would soon end in the total overthrow of the Commonwealth (35). After all this, it is not at all probable, that Catullus would have dared to write such abusive verses against Cæsar, after the party of Pompey had been entirely ruined by the loss of the battle of Munda. Cæsar's power was then too dreadful. I could easily believe, that this Satire was written before Cæsar passed the Rubicon, and that Suetonius therefore is not mistaken, that Cæsar continued his intercourse of hospitality with Catullus's father after his reconciliation with the son. The title of *Imperator unice*, which Catullus gives Cæsar, might be thought an objection against this, because it seems to hint at a decree of the Senate, by which that title was conferred on Cæsar (36). But since Scaliger does not insist upon this argument, it ought to be considered as being of no weight. He owns, that *unicus* may signify *eximius* (eminent) in this place; but I think, it may also be explained in another sense.

Eone nomine Imperator unice
Fuisti in ultima Occidentis insula,
Ut ista vostra diffututa mentula
Ducenties comesset aut trecenties (37)?

That is to say: *Are you therefore the only General, who has been been in Britain? Is it only in order to, &c.* I shall confute, in the Article of MUMURRA (38), those, who assert, that Cæsar, on his return from his last journey into Spain, heard at Cicero's house the news of Catullus's Satire.

III. The third argument is of no weight at all. For tho' Cornelius Nepos flourished, according to St. Jerom, in the year of Rome 714, yet we ought not to infer from it, as Scaliger does, that he was then writing the Chronicle, which Catullus mentions. Scaliger lays it down as a maxim, *That a man is said to flourish, or to become famous, when he publishes a work.* But this cannot he proved, by the authorities he quotes (39), if we consider, at what age different Authors publish the Books, which raise them a reputation. Some Authors publish their first Book, when they are still very young, and write afterwards other Books much better than the first; and the time when they publish these, is the true epocha of their reputation. Others do not become Authors, till they are very much advanced in years. How shall we know, which was Cornelius Nepos's case? He wrote several Letters; and I grant that he may have published many of them under Augustus; must we believe therefore, that his Chronicle was not published under Julius Cæsar, and before he passed the Rubicon. Did not Henry Valesius flourish under Lewis XIV? Who would say, that this phrase is not accurate? And yet he published some excellent Books under Lewis XIII.

IV. The fourth argument must have appeared very strong to Vossius (40), since in order to answer it, he supposes, without the authority of any Writer whatsoever;

(24) Voss. *De Poet. Lat.* p. 18.

(25) Ramirez de Prado, *in Martialem*, lib. 4. Ep. 14.

(26) *Nisi forte confugiat ad hanc vocem* forsan, *quæ vox dubitantis est, non asserentis.* Briet. *de Poet. Lat.* pag. 15. *See also* Vossius, *de Poet. Lat.* pag. 18.

(27) See the Remarks [*E*] and [*R*] of the Article DAURAT.

(28) *Animadv. in Euseb.* pag. 155. edit. 1658.

(29) *In Catul.* pag. 5.

(30) Catul. Epig. 30.

(31) *In Catul.* pag. 72.

(32) *See* Sueton. *in Cæs.* cap. 2.

(33) Plutarch. *in Cæs.* pag. 733. Dion. lib. 43. *ad ann.* 708, says *that Cæsar triumphed four days successively.* 1. *For the Gauls.* 2. *For Egypt.* 3. *For Pontus.* 4. *For Africa.*

(34) *In Catul.* pag. 73.

(35) *Fortunatus illius* Hortensii *exitus, qui ea non vidit quæ providit futura, sæpe enim inter nos impendentes casus deflevimus, cum belli civilis causas in privatorum cupiditatibus inclusas, pacis spem à publico consilio esse exclusam videremus.* Cicero, *in Bruto, sub fin.*

(36) Concerning this decree, Scaliger refers us to *num.* 1972, under the 4th year of the 183d Olympiad, A. U. 709. But neither he, nor St. Jerom say any thing in that *numero.* *See* Dion. lib. 43.

(37) Catul. Epig. 30.

(38) Remark [*B*].

(39) Diodorus, Eusebius, Diogenes Laertius.

(40) *In Catul.* pag. 81.

tic has been very much in the wrong to maintain an opinion which differs ſo much from that of all the other Critics.

Some learned men think that Cicero pleaded for Catullus; but in my opinion they don't bring ſufficient proofs of it [K].

CAVALCANTE

ſoever: that the ſecular games were celebrated in the beginning of the eighth Century of Rome, and before Catullus died. For my part, I would rather ſay, that the Poet, conſidering that the laſt ſecular Games had been celebrated A. U. 604 (41), thought that they would be again celebrated in the year 704, and prepared his *Carmen ſæculare* beforehand, and publiſhed it, though the games had not been celebrated. How many poems do we meet with, which were originally deſigned for ſome ſolemn day, or ceremony, the celebration of which appeared certain, and which yet were not celebrated? I do not aſk, whether Catullus really wrote the title prefixed to that Poem, or whether the praiſes he beſtows on Diana might have no relation at all to the ſecular games, as it is generally believed, the 21ſt Ode of the 1ſt Book of Horace has none. I am willing to grant, what Mr. Dacier obſerves upon that Ode, that *it is only a preparation for the ſecular Hymn, which is at the end of that Book, and an exhortation directed to the two Chorus's, the one of young girls, the other of young boys* (42). If then Horace made an Ode which was only preparatory, might not Catullus alſo write ſome verſes with the ſame view? I may obſerve by the by, that theſe verſes of Catullus are againſt the rule laid down by Monſieur Dacier. *In the ſecular Hymns, which were ſung to Apollo and Diana, there uſed to be two Chorus's, the one of young boys, the other of young girls. They ſung alternately; the former the praiſes of Apollo, the latter thoſe of Diana.* But Catullus makes the boys as well as the girls ſing the praiſes of Diana (43). However that be, and whatever objections may be ſtarted concerning this *Carmen ſæculare* of Catullus, I think the ſuppoſition I have made is liable to fewer difficulties, than Voſſius's opinion; namely, that the ſecular games were celebrated in the beginning of the eighth Century of Rome; or than Scaliger's, who aſſerts, that Catullus was ſtill alive A. U. 737. Voſſius's opinion is not only unſupported, but even contrary to Dion's aſſertion (44). This Hiſtorian tells us, that the ſecular games were celebrated in 737 for the fifth time. Now we know, that they were celebrated the fourth time a long while before the end of the ſeventh Century of Rome. Scaliger's opinion is attended with a thouſand difficulties. How can it be ſuppoſed, that Catullus lived above thirty years without writing one ſingle verſe; and that the reign of Auguſtus, in which there happened ſo many remarkable things, and which was ſo favourable to the Poets, ſhould have left Catullus's poetical vein dry and barren? How came it to paſs, that not one Poet of Auguſtus's Court mentioned Catullus as living then? Why did not Ovid name him amongſt the Poets, with whom he deſired to be acquainted in his youth? Laſtly, would Cornelius Nepos have had ſuch a bad taſte, as to ſuppoſe, that Virgil, Horace, and all the other Poets of the ſame rank, were inferior to Catullus? And yet, it is plain, that he ſuppoſed this, if Scaliger's opinion be true. Here follow Cornelius Nepos's words. *L. Julium Calidium, quem poſt Lucretii Catullique mortem multo elegantiſſimum Poetam, noſtram tuliſſe ætatem, vere videor poſſe contendere, . . . expedivit* (45). i. e. "He ſaved L. Julius Calidius, whom I think I may call the moſt elegant "Poet of our time, ſince the death of Lucretius and "Catullus, &c." It is ſomewhat ſtrange that Lucretius and Catullus ſhould be thus mentioned together, if it were true, that the latter lived till after the year 737, for it is certain, that the former died towards the beginning of the eighth Century of Rome. But without inſiſting upon this, let us but conſider the following difficulty. Is it poſſible that Cornelius Nepos, who, in Scaliger's opinion lived ſome years after the ſecular Games of the year 737, and who conſequently ſaw Virgil and Horace in the height of their reputation, ſhould have thought, that they could not diſpute the firſt rank with Julius Calidius; this firſt rank, I ſay, at which he did not arrive till after the death of Lucretius and Catullus (40)? Voſſius has but too much reaſon to ſay, that this long controverſy of Scaliger concerning Catullus's Age, contains nothing but what deſerves to be exploded. *Hæc ſi attendiſſet Scaliger, profecto non inſtituiſſet longam iſtam diſputationem, de ætate Catulli, in qua nihil omnino eſt, quod non melius ſit tacuiſſe; certe ne ſemel quidem ſcopum attigit* (47). So true it is, that the greateſt Wits fall ſometimes aſleep (48).

[K] *Some learned men think, that Cicero pleaded for Catullus, but in my opinion they don't bring ſufficient proofs for it.*] Balzac followed the opinion, which ſeems ill-grounded to me. I ſhall tranſcribe what he ſays upon this ſubject, beginning with the Latin verſes in which he had ſpoken of Catullus, without naming him.

——— *Peſtem tamen ille minorem*
Scaligeri, Tullique Cliens, & Cæſare læſo
Conſpicuus ſæclis, nigro devovit Averno.
Non tales Verona tulit ſine vindice chartas (49).

That is;

"The Client of Scaliger and Tully, he who is famous "thro' all Ages by his inſulting Cæſar, doomed to "hell a leſs abominable man than this; Verona would "not have ſuffered ſuch writings to paſs unpuniſhed."

There was a Critic, who did not underſtand who was meant in thoſe verſes; and Balzac's reflection upon the pretended obſcurity with which he was charged, is as follows: "They who quote this ancient Poet, without "naming him, think, that he will be ſufficiently "known, if they but call him the Poet of Verona, "witneſs theſe words, *Veronenſis ait Poeta quondam.* "But to make him ſtill better known, and to make "my deſcription of him clearer, I add to the name of "his native place, the two circumſtances of his life, "which are the moſt remarkable, and generally "known. And I maintain, that a man who has "ſome knowledge of antiquity, and is not unacquainted with the preſent ſtate of our Republic of Letters, "is obliged to know that Catullus offended Cæſar by "a ſatyrical Epigram, that in his life-time he was "defended by Cicero's eloquence, and that ſince his "death, he has been reſtored by Scaliger's ſagacity; "that he owes to the one the carrying of his cauſe, "and to the other the preſervation of his reputation, "that is of his writings; a ſecond life better and "more glorious than the firſt (50)." You ſee that Balzac ſuppoſes as a matter of fact and generally known, that Cicero pleaded for Catullus; he is not the only Author who aſſerts it. Achilles Statius ſays the ſame (51), and Peter Crinitus had ſaid it before him, and endeavours to prove it by Catullus giving thanks to Cicero, in the Epigram. *Diſertiſſime Romuli Nepotum, &c* (52). His words are, *Ingenii facilitate & doctrina adeo Romæ acceptus, atque civibus gratus fuit Catullus, ut Marci Tullii patrocinium meruit; quod ipſum eleganti epigrammate ingenue teſtatus eſt, quo gratias Ciceroni patrono egit* (53). i. e. "Catullus was "ſo much beloved at Rome by all the Citizens for "his quick genius and great learning, that he deſerved to have an Orator like him to plead his cauſe; "which he owns in a very elegant Epigram, in which "he thanks Cicero his Patron for that favour." But it is entirely falſe, that in that Epigram Catullus thanks Cicero for the favour he had done him by pleading his cauſe. He thanks him in general, without mentioning any particular favour. Muretus owns, that the reaſon of Catullus's thanks cannot be diſcovered by conjectures. *Agit gratiam M. Tullio, quod ob beneficium ab eo acceptum, divinare non poſſumus. Nam qui ad fundum Tiburtem hoc loco confugiunt, nihil aliud, quam inſcitiam patefaciunt ſuam* (54); i. e. "He thanks Cicero, but for what favour, I cannot gueſs; they who "pretend to explain it of a piece of ground near Tibur, "do only betray their ignorance."

(41) According to Zoſimus, for Cenſorinus places the celebration of them in the year 627.

(42) Dacier, *Remarques ſur Horace*, tom. 1. pag. 664. Dutch edition.

(43) *Diana ſumus in fide Puellæ & pueri integri: Dianam pueri integri, Puellæque canamus.* Catull. Epig. 35.

(44) Lib. 54.

(45) Corn. Nepos, *in Vita Pomponii Attici*. cap. 12.

(46) This might ſerve to prove, that this Life of Pomponius Atticus was written before Virgil and Horace had gained a great reputation.

(47) Iſaac Voſſius, *in Catull.* pag. 73.

(48) *Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus.* Horat. *de Arte Poet.* ver. 359.

(49) Balzac, *Entret.* 17. pag. m. 201.

(50) Ibid.

(51) *Achillet Statius in Catullum*, initio.

(52) Epig. 50.

(53) Petrus Crinitus, lib. 2. cap. 27. pag. m. 671.

(54) Muretus *in Catull.* Epig. 50.

CAVALCANTE (GUIDO) a Nobleman of Florence [*A*] in the thirteenth Century. I ſhall add nothing to Moreri's account of him, but that he was a man of very great meditation, and that it was ſaid, his deep ſpeculations tended only to find out that there was no God [*B*].

(*a*) By Mr. Veyſſiere la Croize.

I have been told (*a*) that the paſſage in Balzac which I have quoted (*b*) is taken from Boccace's Decameron, and that if I ſhould give it more at length, I ſhould oblige a great many readers; for which reaſon I ſhall tranſcribe more of it below [*C*]. I have alſo been adviſed to make ſome additions to Moreri's account. I ſhall therefore obſerve that our Guido, the ſon of Cavalcante di Cavalcanti having followed the party of the Guelfes, experienced the changeableneſs of fortune. He was baniſhed, and afterwards reſtored to his own country again. He ſhewed great courage and ſtrength of mind in his misfortunes, and never neglected to improve his mind. He was not only an able Philoſopher, but alſo a very good Poet. He wrote a Treatiſe in Italian concerning the rules for writing in a good ſtyle; and there are ſome verſes of his extant, which are very much eſteemed. His Song upon the Love of this World has been commented upon by ſeveral learned men [*D*].

(*b*) In the remark [*B*].

He

[*A*] *A Nobleman of Florence.*] We read in a Letter from Rome, dated April the 14th, 1581, and written by Alfonſo Ceccarelli da (1) Bevagna, that the family of the Cavalcanti was repreſented as very ancient, in a Chronicle written about two hundred years ago. *Le dico che le poſſo moſtrare . . . una Cronica manoſcritta di un Giovanni, Figliuolo del Conte Nicolo de Barbiano, ſcritta circa a 200 anni ſono, dove ſi tratta a pieno delle Famiglie di Firenze ſecondo l'Iſtoria ſcritta da Piero Canigiano nel 1103, e della Famiglia de Cavalcanti dice che hebbe la ſua prima origine della nobiliſſima ſtirpe Steeleſia de' Gotti, da Ariberto Cavalcante Steeleſio, e che furono Padroni di Peſcia, con titolo di Conte* (2). The ſame Chronicle relates, that Anſaldo, who is of the ſtock of the Family de Medicis, ſettled at Florence in the year 806, and that he was married with Irinia Cavalcante. The Letter, which I have quoted, mentions another Chronicle (3), which relates but a few things of that Family. *Di Caſa Cavalcanti dice molto poco, e tocca l'origine di queſta imperfettamente e' con poche parole* (4). Obſerve, that Michael Pocciantius does not make our Guido Cavalcante to be of an ancient family, but he relates a circumſtance which ſhews that he was a conſiderable man. The Heads of the Tradeſmen baniſhed him, becauſe he was of the Faction of the White. He was at laſt called home again, and died in the year 1300 (5).

(1) It is inſerted in the volume intitled, *Lettere Storiche, Politiche, ed Erudite, raccolte da Antonio Bulifon*, printed in 1685.

(2) *Lettere Storiche, &c.* pag. 183, 184.

(3) It is that which Antonio Manetri has written.

(4) *Lettere Storiche, &c.* pag. 183.

(5) *Ex* Michaele Pocciantio *de Scriptis Florentinis*, pag. 77. Obſerve that he calls him *Calvacanthius*, and pag. 26. ſpeaking of Bartholomew, he ſays *Cavalcanthius*.

[*B*] *It is ſaid, his deep ſpeculations tended only to find out that there was no God.*] I frankly own, that I borrow the following paſſage only from Balzac (6). *Percioche alcuna volta ſpeculando molto aſtratto da gli huomini deveniva, ſi diceva tra la gente volgare, che queſte ſue ſpeculationi erano ſolo en cercare ſe trovar ſi poteſſe che Iddio non foſſe.*

(6) Balzac, *Let.* 57. *du VI Livre*, pag. 256. of the firſt volume of the folio edition.

[*C*] *I ſhall tranſcribe it below more at length.*] Boccace relates, that there were at Florence ſeveral Clubs of ſubſtantial perſons, who treated one another by turns; and that the club of Meſſire Bette Bruneleſqui had often endeavoured to perſuade Guido Cavalcante to be one of them, *and not without reaſon:* "For he was "not only one of the beſt Logicians in the world, "and a very great Natural Philoſopher; (for which "the company did not much care) but he was alſo a "very civil and pretty Gentleman, a fine Speaker, "and ſo complaiſant, that he was always ready to "do any thing becoming a Gentleman, and did it "with a better grace than any other perſon; and be-"ſides, he was very rich, and could ſhew a great re-"ſpect for thoſe, who he thought deſerved it. But "Meſſire Bette could never draw him into their com-"pany: ſo that they thought his refuſal was owing "to his love of meditation, which was ſuch, that he "daily retired more and more from company; and "as he held ſome of Epicurus's opinions *, the com-"mon people uſed to ſay, that all his contemplations "tended only to find out, that there is no God (7)." It happened one day, that Meſſire Bette and his company paſſing on horſe-back thro' the *Church-yard of St. Repand*, and ſeeing Guido amongſt the marble tombs, which were in that place, they ſaid, "Let us go and "diſturb him; whereupon ſpurring their horſes, "as tho' they intended to aſſault him, they came up "to him, before he was aware of it: They told him, "Guido, you will not come into our company: But "when you ſhall have found out that there is no God, "what will you be the better for it? Guido, finding "himſelf ſurrounded by them, ſaid, You may do with "me what you pleaſe in your own houſe, and putting "his hand upon one of the tombs, which was very "high, he jumped over it very nimbly, and having thus "diſengaged himſelf from them, he went away. They "were all aſtoniſhed, and ſtared at one another, and then "ſaid, that he muſt be mad; that what he had anſwered "them was nothing to the purpoſe; for that they had no "more buſineſs in that place, than any of the other Ci-"tizens, and than Meſſire Guido himſelf. But Meſſire "Bette told them, You are fools your ſelves, if you did "not underſtand him. He has in a few words, and in a "very civil manner offer'd us a very great affront. For if "you will obſerve it, theſe tombs are the houſes of the "dead, for they are put there, and remain in them; "he ſays this is our houſe, to give us to underſtand, "that we, and the other ignorant men, are worſe than "dead, if compared with him, and other learned "men; ſo that being here amongſt theſe tombs, we "are at home. Then they all underſtood what was "Guido's meaning, were aſhamed, and never ven-"tured to diſturb him any more; and they held Meſ-"ſire Bette for a witty and underſtanding Gentle-"man (8)."

* Balzac has omitted theſe words of Boccace. *E percio che che egli aliquanto teneva della opinione de gli Epicurii.*

(7) Boccace, *Decameron, Nouv. IX de la VI Journée*, fol. m. 203. I make uſe of Anthony le Maçon's Tranſlation.

(8) Boccace, *Decameron, Nouvel. IX de la VI Journée*, fol. m. 103.

We find Balzac guilty here of a fault, like that, which we have obſerved in another place (9). If he had quoted the Decameron of Boccace, he would not have given the reader a very great notion of his learning: but as he did not tell whence he had this paſſage, he hoped, 1. that the world would think he had found it in ſome hidden and unknown Author. 2. That they, who had occaſion to mention the character of Guido, would quote him (Balzac) for it; for amongſt a thouſand perſons, who read the Decameron, there are hardly two or three who remember any thing of it beſides love-tales and railleries. Now the novel, in which Cavalcante is mentioned, is not of that kind.

(9) Towards the end of the Remark [*I*] of the Article GONTAUT (Charles de).

[*D*] *His Song upon the love of this world* (10) *has been commented upon by ſeveral learned men.*] The famous Gilles of Rome, who was General of the Order of St. Auguſtin, Archbiſhop of Bourges, and one of the moſt learned Schoolmen of his time (11), wrote a Commentary upon this Song (12), Some perſons think that this was the firſt time, that a Commentary had been wrote by a man upon other verſes, compoſed in a modern language (13). To this Commentary are added in the edition of Sienna, in 1602, 8vo, ſome obſervations of Celſo Cittadini upon the ſame Song (14). Dino del Garbo of Florence, a great Philoſopher, and Phyſician to Pope John XXII, followed the example of Gilles of Rome, with whom he was almoſt contemporary, and wrote alſo a Commentary upon Cavalcante's Song. Fra Paol del Roſſo, James Mini, Plinius Tomacelli, and laſtly Jerom Frachetta, a Philoſopher of Rovigo (15), have alſo commented upon it (16). All theſe Commentaries have been printed (17). The Author, from whom I borrow this, obſerves, that the Italian Poetry has been very much improved by Cavalcante, who gave it ſtrength and beauty. *La prole che l'à reſo immortale, ſono i ſuoi nobiliſſimi Componimenti, a i quali molto e tenuta la volgar Poeſia per cioché da eſſi ricevute non poca robuſtezza e ſplendore* (18). Compare this, if you pleaſe, with the words of a Commentator on Dante, *Cavalcante di Cavalcanti . . . had a ſon named Guido Cavalcanti, a very learned man, a great Philoſopher, and a pretty good Poet;*

(10) It begins with theſe words, *Donna mi prega perche voglio dire.*

(11) He died December the 22d 1316, aged 69 years. Elſſius, *in Encomiaſtico Auguſtin.* pag. 15.

(12) Creſcimbeni, *Hiſt. della volgar Poeſia*, pag. 85, 296.

(13) Ibid.

(14) Ibid.

(15) He lived in the 16th Century.

(16) Creſcimbeni, *ubi ſupra.*

(17) Ibid. pag. 296.

(18) Ibid. pag. 85.

He married the daughter of Farinata de gli Uberti (c) [E]. The famous Poet Dante boasts of having had a ſhare in his friendſhip (d), but makes him to be the ſon of a man, whom he places in hell, with the followers of Epicurus; who denied the immortality of the ſoul (e), ſo that our Guido was an unbeliever by inheritance. I believe I may ſafely aſſert it, that ANDREW CAVALCANTE (f), a man of wit who flouriſhed in the ſeventeenth Century, was of this family. Thuanus affirms it with regard to BARTHOLOMEW CAVALCANTE, a man famous for his writings and for his negotiations; he was born at Florence in the year 1503, and died at Padua December the 9th 1562 (g). See his Article in Moreri, but take care not to believe what Thuanus aſſerts (h), namely, that Guido (i) lived at the ſame time with Petrarch, and that we have ſtill the verſes which Petrarch addreſſed to him; for Guido died before the other was born.

(f) See his Elogium in Mr. Rilli, *Notizie intorno a gli Huomini Illuſtri dell' Academia Fiorentina*, Part 1. pag. 351.
(g) Thuanus, lib. 34. pag. m. 684.
(h) Idem, ibid.
(i) He means, no doubt, the GUIDO CAVALCANTE of this Article.

(c) Taken from Giovanni Mario de' Creſcimbeni, *Iſtoria della volgar Poeſia*, pag. 85.
(d) *Dante ſi gloriava d'aver goduta l'amicizia di lui, e nella Vita Nuova ſua primiero amico lo chiama.* Idem, ibid.
(e) See the *Inferno of Dante*, Cant. 10.

Poet; but as he had not read the Greek and Latin Poets, he wanted that delicacy, which is neceſſary to make a perfect Poet (19). Let us obſerve, that there is a work of Marſilius Ficinus (20), which contains an explication of our Cavalcante's opinions concerning the Nature of the Soul. Cavalcante is there very much commended.

[E] *He married the daughter of Farinata de gli Uberti.*] He is a man, whom Dante places in Hell in the ſame place with Cavalcante di Cavalcanti. He had put himſelf at the head of the Gibeline Faction, who by his directions gained a great victory over the Guelphes of Florence (21). Our Guido was ſtill living, when Dante compoſed the tenth Canto of his Poem on Hell.

(19) Grangier, *Comment. ſur l'Enfer de Dante*, Ch. x. pag. 103.
(20) It is the Commentary in *Convivium Platonis*, among Plato's Works, pag. m. 1167.
(21) See the 10th Canto of Dante's Poem on Hell, and Grangier's Notes.

CAVALIERI (BONAVENTURE), an eminent Mathematician in the ſeventeenth Century, was a native of Milan, and a Fryar of the Order of the *Jeſuati* of St. Jerom (a), which Mr. Collier in the firſt volume of his Dictionary has miſtaken for the Order of the Jeſuits, of which he erroneouſly aſſerts our Author was one. He was chief Profeſſor of the Mathematics in the College at Bologna, where he publiſhed ſeveral works, the moſt remarkable of which are his *Geometria Indiviſibilibus Continuorum nova quadam ratione promota*, printed at Bologna 1635 in 4to, wherein he exhibits the Method of Indiviſibles [A]; and his *Exercitationes Geometriæ*

(a) He ſtiles himſelf in his Latin Works *Ordinis Jeſuatorum S. Hieronymi*; and in his Italian Treatiſes, *Gieſuato di S. Girolamo.*

[A] *His* Geometria indiviſibilibus continuorum nova quadam ratione promota, ... *wherein he exhibits the Method of Indiviſibles.*] Frederic Commandinus in the year 1565 had publiſhed at Bologna in 4to his Treatiſe in Latin *de Centro Gravitatis*; but he having been guilty of ſome miſtakes with regard to the Parabolic Conoid, Lucas Valerius, *Mathematicæ & Civilis Philoſophiæ in Gymnaſio Romano Profeſſor*, was induced (1) to publiſh at Rome in 1604 in 4to, his Treatiſe *de Centro Gravitatis Solidorum*, in three Books, which Mr. Benjamin Robins, F. R. S. in his *Diſcourſe concerning the Nature and Certainty of Sir Iſaac Newton's Methods of Fluxions, and of Prime and Ultimate Ratio's* (2), ſtiles *a moſt excellent Treatiſe*, and tells us, that in it "he demonſtrates with brevity and elegance his propoſitions "concerning the Menſuration and Center of Gravity "of the Sphere, Spheroid, parabolical and hyperbolical Conoids. This Author, *continues Mr. Robins*, "wrote before the Doctrine of Indiviſibles was pro"poſed to the World." And ſince, Andrew Tacquet, "in his *Treatiſe on the Cylindrical and Annular Solids*, "has made the ſame propoſition, though ſomething "differently expreſſed, the Baſis of his Demonſtrati"ons at the ſame time very judiciouſly expoſing the "Inconcluſiveneſs of the Reaſonings from Indiviſi"bles." The manner wherein the ancients demonſtrated what relates to the Menſuration of Curvilinear Spaces not giving any diſtinct notion of the principles, upon which they built their Analyſis of ſuch Problems (3), in 1635, about thirty years before Sir Iſaac Newton invented his Method of Fluxions, Cavalieri propoſed in theſe Problems a new form of Reaſoning in his *Geometria Indiviſibilibus continuorum promota*. In this book he ſuppoſes, that all ſurfaces might be filled up with parallel lines, and all ſolids by parallel planes; and then lays down this fundamental propoſition, That different planes are in the ſame proportion to each other as all the lines contained in each; and diſferent ſolids in the ſame proportion as all the planes contained in them. *At this is a manner of expreſſion hardly accompanied with any ideas; ſince it is not at all intelligible to ſpeak of the collective number of lines or planes, where their number is wholly undetermined and infinite; this Method was from the beginning oppoſed, as ungeometrical, and in no meaſure agreeable to that clearneſs of conception and expreſſion, for which the mathematical Sciences had ever been celebrated. But however, as by proper cautions error in the concluſion might be avoided, and this Method promiſed great aſſiſtance in the analyſis of a ſubject, wherein the ancients had made the leaſt progreſs, it was warmly eſpouſed by* Torricellius, *and others of the moſt illuſtrious Geometers. Our countryman Dr. Wallis, and many after him, thought it an improvement of this Method to ſubſtitute, in the room of lines, parallelograms, whoſe breadth was to be called infinitely ſmall; and for the planes, whereby ſolids were ſuppoſed to be filled up, priſms and cylinders of an infinitely ſmall altitude; ſo that the Method of Indiviſibles at length ſuppoſed all geometrical magnitudes, whether lines, ſurfaces, or ſolids, to be compoſed of an infinite number of homogeneous magnitudes, each infinitely ſmall. But this is a mode of expreſſion no way more intelligible than the other. Sir Iſaac Newton therefore inſtituted a manner of conception upon quite different principles. He obſerving (to uſe his own words) that* Indiviſibles have no being either in Geometry or in Nature *; *inſtead of this infinite and inconceivable ſubdiviſion of magnitude already formed, he conſidered them as produced before the imagination by ſome motion. And thus &c.* (4). Cavalieri's Book was oppoſed by Paulus Guldinus Sancto-Gallenſis in his *Centro-Baryca, ſive de Centro Gravitatis*, printed at Vienna in 1635; by Marius Bettinus in his *Apiaria univerſæ Philoſophiæ Mathematicæ*, printed in three tomes at Bologna 1642; and by Andrew Tacquet in his *Cylindrica & Annularia*, printed at Antwerp 1651 in 4to. Theſe three Writers were Jeſuits. The laſt of them, Tacquet, writes concerning Cavalieri's Method of Indiviſibles as follows (5). *Methodum demonſtrandi per* Indiviſibilia, *vel (ut ego appellare ſoleo) per* Heterogeneas, *quam nobilis Geometra* Bonaventura Cavallerius *in lucem prodidit, pro legitimâ ac geometricâ admittendam non exiſtimo. Procedit illa a lineis ad ſuperficies, a ſuperficiebus ad corpora, atque æqualitatem vel proportionem in lineis repertam concludit de ſuperficie; repertam in ſuperficiebus traducit ad ſolida, quâ ratiocinandi formâ, niſi ad homogenea revocetur, conficitur omnino nihil. . . . Abſit tamen ut invento pulcherrimo debitam laudem cupiam detrahere. Hoc ſolum dico, demonſtrationes per heterogeneas inſtitutas ad aſſenſum non cogere, niſi, quod fieri plerumque poteſt, ad homogeneas reducantur.* Stephanus de Angelis, a Venetian, and Scholar of Cavalieri, wrote in defence of him with prodigious zeal, and in the Preface of his Book *de infinitis Parabolis &c.* printed at Venice 1659 in 4to, tells us, that Guldinus, Bettinus, and Tacquet, were the only perſons, who diſliked Cavalieri's Method; and that it was approved of by Torricellius, Franciſcus a Schooten, Richard Albius an Engliſhman in his *Hemiſpherium diſſectum*, and Iſmael Bullialdus

(1) See the beginning of his firſt book.
(2) Pag. 58. edit. London 1735, in 8vo.
(3) See Mr. Robins's *Account of his Diſcourſe* above quoted, in the *Preſent State of the Republick of Letters* for October 1735, vol. 16. Art. 15. pag. 246.

* Philoſ. Tranſact. num. 342. pag. 205.
(4) Mr. Robins, in the *Preſent State of the Republick of Letters*, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 246, 247.
(5) In the *Scholium*, pag 23, 24.

triæ ſex [*B*], printed in the ſame City in 1647, in 4to. We ſhall mention his other works in the note [*C*]. He died in 1647, as we are informed by Stephanus de Angelis, who had been his ſcholar, in his *Problemata Geometrica ſexaginta* (*b*), printed at Venice 1658 in 4to. We ſhall give his character as it was communicated to us by a very learned and ingenious Gentleman (*d*). "This ſcholar of Galileo may juſtly be eſteemed a "Mathematician of the firſt rank. He was a perſon of quick genius and exquiſite "judgment, as all his works ſufficiently teſtify, being full of fine improvements upon "Archimedes and the antient Geometers, with many noble diſcoveries and uſeful "applications of them to the various parts of the Mathematics; ſo that *Fermat*, *Barrow*, *Wallis*, and *Newton*, have each of them very ſucceſsfully illuſtrated his method, "and in ſome things improved his principles. His *Directorium generale Uranometricum* contains great variety of moſt uſeful practices in Trigonometry and Aſtronomy; many of them new and elegant. The famous *Keplerian* Problem is there ſo "well performed, that all the induſtry of later Aſtronomers has not been able to make "any conſiderable improvements in it with regard to the practice thereof. His Trigonometrical Tables in this work are excellent, and contain the Natural Sines to the Radius 10,000,000,000, the Logarithm-Sines, Tangents, Secants, and Logarithm-Verſed "Sines to eight places of Figures; and the firſt and laſt five minutes of the Quadrant "are computed to every ſecond; the next five minutes to every five ſeconds, and the "next ten minutes to every ten ſeconds. This is the original Table of Logarithm-Verſed "Sines, whence all others ſince have been copied."

(*b*) Pag. 295.

(*d*) *William Jones*, Eſq; Author of the *Synopſis Palmariorum Matheſeos*, printed at London 1706 in 8vo; to which Gentleman we are obliged for ſome particulars of this Article; as we are for others to the learned *Joſeph Leatherland*, M. D.

Bullialdus in his Treatiſe *de Lineis Spiralibus*, printed in 1657, who only diſlikes the name *Indiviſibles*. De Angelis likewiſe in the Preface to his *Infinitorum Spiralium Spatiorum menſura* obſerves, that Vincentius Vivianus in his firſt Book *de Maximis & Minimis, Geometrica Divinatio in quintum Librum Conicorum Apollonii Pergæi*, printed at Florence 1659, approves of our Author's Method, ſo that it be uſed rightly and carefully, *rectè tamen cautéque uſurpata*. Monſ. De Chales likewiſe aſſerts that if it be well underſtood and explained in a manner ſomewhat better than it was exhibited by Cavalieri, it opens a way for the eaſy ſolution of a great number of difficulties. *Si tamen hæc doctrina benè intelligatur, & explicetur paulo melius, quam ab ipſo Authore propoſita fuit, viam ad multas difficultates nullo negotio ſolvendas aperit*. And he ſtiles it one of the nobleſt inventions of the Age.

[*B*] *His* Exercitationes Geometricæ ſex.] The whole title is as follows: *Exercitationes Geometricæ ſex: I. De priori Methodo Indiviſibilium. II. De poſteriori Methodo Indiviſibilium. III. In Paulum Guldinum è Societate Jeſu dicta Indiviſibilia oppugnantem. IV. De uſu eorundem Indiviſibilium in Poteſtatibus Coſſicis* (6). *V. De uſu dictorum Indiviſibilium in uniformiter difformiter Gravibus. VI. De Propoſitionibus miſcellaneis, viz. 1. De modo facili deſcribendi Sectiones Conicas, & in omnibus uniformi. 2. De mirabili quadam vi Parabolicâ. 3. De Perſpicillorum Focis. 4. De deſcriptione Parabolæ per quatuor puncta in angulis Quadrilateri, cujus duo ſaltem oppoſita latera ſint extra concurrentia. 5. De inveniendo puncto, quod à tribus datis quibuſvis diſtet ſecundum minimam quantitatem. 6. De inveniendis Lateribus Trianguli æquicruris ex datâ areâ & perimetro ejuſdem. 7. De Magnitudinum Incommenſurabilitate. 8. De Motu Puncti in Circulo. 9. De Foco Speculi Sphærici Concavi. 10. De Solido infinitè longo æquali finito. 11. De Hydracontiſterio, hoc eſt, Vaſe Aquarum ejaculatoria. Auctore F. Bonaventura Cavalerio Mediolanenſi, Ordinis Jeſuitarum S. Hieronymi Priore, & in Almo Bononienſi Archigymnaſio primario Mathematicarum Profeſſore*. Bologna 1647 in 4to.

(6) i. e. Algebraic Powers.

[*C*] *We ſhall mention his other Works in the Note.*] *I. Lo Specchio Uſtorio, overo Trattato delle Settioni Coniche e alcuni loro mirabili Effetti intorno al Lume, Caldo, Freddo, Suono, e Moto ancora. Da F. Bonaventura Cavalieri Milaneſe, Gieſuato di S. Girolamo, Autore, e Matematico Primario nell' inclito Studio dell Citta Bologna*. Bologna 1631 in 4to. *II. Directorium Generale Uranometricum. In quo Trigonometriæ Logarithmicæ fundamenta ac regulæ demonſtrantur, Aſtronomicæque Supputationes ad ſolam ferè vulgarem Additionem reducuntur. Opus utiliſſimum Aſtronomicis, Geometris, Arithmeticis, Perſpectivis, Architectis, præcipuè Militaribus, Mechanicis, Geographis, necnon ipſis Philoſophis Naturalibus. Authore Fr. Bonaventura Cavalerio, Mediolanenſi, Ordinis Jeſuitarum S. Hieronymi, Priori Titulari, ac in almo Bononienſi Gymnaſio Primario Mathematicarum Profeſſore*. Bologna 1632 in 4to. *III. Tabula Trigonometrica Logarithmica* (7). *IV. Centuria di varii Problemi per dimoſtrare l'uſa e la Facilita de Logarithmi, nella Gnomonica, Aſtronomia, Geograffia, Altimetria, Pianimetria, Stereometria, e Aritmetica Prattica; toccandoſi anco qualche caſa nella Meccanica nell' Arte Militare, e nella Muſica*. Bologna 1639 in 12mo. *V. Trigonometria Plana & Sphærica, Linearis & Logarithmica, hoc eſt, tam per Sinuum, Tangentium, & Secantium multiplicationem, ac diviſionem juxta Veteres, quam per Logarithmorum ſimplicem ferè Additionem juxta Recentiores, ad Triangulorum dimetiendos Angulos & Latera procedens. Cum Canone duplici Trigonometrico & Chiliade Numerorum abſolutorum ab 1 uſque ad 1000, eorumque Logarithmis ac differentiis. Opuſculum univerſæ Matheſi utiliſſimum, omniumque Terreſtrium ac Cæleſtium Dimenſionum Promptuarium. Auctore Fr. Bonaventura Cavelerio, Mediolanenſi &c.* Bologna 1643 in 4to.

(7) See Dr. Thomas Hyde's *Catalogus Impreſſor. Libror. Bibliotb. Bodleianæ*, pag. 151. edit. Oxon. 1674, in fol.

T.

☞ CAVENDISH, a noble family, like other families of the greateſt antiquities, derived its name from their place of habitation. A younger branch of the *Gernons*, famous in Norfolk and Eſſex, ſettled at Cavendiſh in Suffolk, and from that ſeat and eſtate were ſoon diſtinguiſhed by that ſurname (*a*) [*A*]. JOHN DE CAVENDISH was conſtituted one of the Juſtices of the King's Bench 1366, 39. Edward III, and made chief Juſtice of the

(*a*) *Memoirs of the family of Cavendiſh* printed at the end of the *Funeral Sermon on William Duke of Devonſhire in the Church of All-Hallows in Derby on Friday Sept. the 5th 1707. By White Kennet, D. D.* pag. 59. edit. London 1708 in 8vo.

[*A*] *A younger branch of the* Gernons, *famous in Norfolk and Eſſex, ſettled at* Cavendiſh *in Suffolk, and from that ſeat and eſtate were ſoon diſtinguiſhed by that ſurname.*] The *Gernons*, who took their name from *Gernon*, a Caſtle in Normandy, were of great note in the counties of Norfolk and Eſſex, being lineally deſcended from ROBERT DE GERNON, a famous Norman, who aſſiſted William the Conqueror in his invaſion of this Realm, and in reward of his ſervices, had grants of ſeveral Lordſhips. This ROBERT DE GERNON gave the Church of St. Peter in Glouceſter, the Church of Winterbourne, the Church of Laverſtoke, and half the lands thereto belonging to the Abbey of Glouceſter, which was confirmed by King Henry I, in the time of Peter the Abbot. His ſon and heir MATTHEW DE GERNON married Hodierna, daughter and co-heir to Sir William Sackville, lineal anceſtor to Lionel now Duke of Dorſet, and by her had iſſue RALPH DE GERNON, who by his wife, the ſiſter of Sir William Brews Knt, had a ſon of his name, the founder of Lee's Priory in Eſſex, and died in 1248, the 32d of Henry III, leaving iſſue WILLIAM his ſon and heir, who died in the 43d of that reign, and left iſſue by Eleanor his wife two ſons, Sir

the ſame Court by Clauſ. Writ, 15 Jul. 46 Ed. III. 1373 (*b*). In the next reign he was continued in that honourable office, and had the grant of one hundred marks *per ann.* by Letters Patents 26 Jun. 1 Ric. II. 1378, and had his ſummons to Parliament by expreſs writ from 46 Ed. III. to 5 Ric. II. when upon the inſurrection raiſed in Kent under Straw and Tyler, the mob was animated to riſe in other parts, and particularly in Suffolk, a body of fifty thouſand made it their triumph to plunder and murder the Lawyers, and attacking the Houſe of the Lord Chief Juſtice Cavendiſh, they brought him out, and beheaded him, as their accomplices had done to the Lord Chancellor, Lord Treaſurer, and other chief Miniſters (*d*). Of the ſame family was the famous Captain THOMAS CAVENDISH, born in Suffolk, who finiſhed his noble expedition round the world in September 1588, and making another like attempt in 1591, died in his return (*e*).

(*b*) Dugdale's *Chronica Series.*

(*c*) Idem, *Summa Parl.*

(*d*) Thom. Walſingh. *ſub ann.* 1381.

(*e*) *Heroologica Anglica Autore H. H.* pag. 90.

Ralph de Gernon, and GEOFFREY, lineal anceſtor to this noble family. This Geoffrey, in the reign of Edward I, was ſtiled of More-Hall in the Peak in the county of Derby, and was ſucceeded by ROGER his ſon and heir, who was ſeated at Grimſton-Hall in Suffolk, and died in 1318, the 11th of Edward II, having had to wife the daughter and heir of John Potton, Lord of Cavendiſh, by whom he left iſſue *John*, *Roger*, *Stephen*, and *Richard*, who all took the name of *Cavendiſh*. Of theſe ſons, *Roger* the ſecond, married Alice daughter of Geoffrey Stratton, with whom he had the Manor of Stratton, and from whom deſcended Sir *Richard Cavendiſh*, Captain and Governour of Blackneſs, who was Knighted in Scotland by the Earl of Hertford Sept. the 23d 1546, the 37th of Henry VIII, and by inquiſition the 6th of February 1552, the 6th of Edward VI, after the death of Henry Duke of Suffolk, (who died without iſſue July the 14th, the 5th of Edward VI) was found to be ſixty years of age, and was one of his co-heirs, viz. Son of *Richard Cavendiſh*, ſon of *Auguſtine Cavendiſh*, who married Elizabeth, eldeſt daughter of Sir William Brandon Knt. grandfather of Charles Brandon Duke of Suffolk. This Sir *Richard Cavendiſh* had iſſue *William Cavendiſh* of Trimely St. Martin in the county of Suffolk, who died in 1572, poſſeſſed of the ancient inheritance of his anceſtors, viz. Grimſton, Stratton, and other Manors, leaving *Thomas* his ſon and heir under age, who married Mary, daughter to Thomas Lord Wentworth of Nettleſted, and had iſſue ſeveral ſons and daughters, viz. *William*, *Auguſtine*, *Thomas*, *Mary*, *Margaret*, and *Anne*. This *Thomas* was the famous Navigator mentioned by our Hiſtorians. But to return to JOHN DE CAVENDISH, mentioned in the text of the article, eldeſt ſon of *Roger de Gernon*, by his two wives, Roſe and Alice, he left iſſue two ſons and a daughter named Margaret. Of theſe ſons *Andrew* the eldeſt in 1376, 50 Edward III, was Knight of the Shire for the county of Suffolk, and in 1385, 8 of Richard II. was Sheriff of the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, and dying without iſſue in 1395, 18 Richard II, was buried in the Abbey, called the New Abbey near the Tower of London, being ſucceeded by Sir JOHN CAVENDISH his brother. This Sir JOHN was one of the Eſquires of the body to King Richard II; and our Hiſtorians relate that it was he who killed Wat Tyler, after Sir William Walworth, Mayor of London, had arreſted him; for which ſervices he was Knighted by the King in Smithfield, who likewiſe gave 40 *l. per annum* to him and his heirs forever. This *Sir John Cavendiſh*, or another of his name, ſerved under King Henry V, in his wars in France, and on the 24th of October 1415 was in the famous battle of Agencourt. When he died, we do not find; but by his wife Joan, daughter of Sir William Clapton, he had three ſons, WILLIAM, *Robert*, and *Walter*, of which the eldeſt married Joan daughter to **** Staverton, and dying in 1433, 11 Henry VI, left a ſon named *Thomas*, whoſe wife was Catherine, daughter and heir to **** Scudamore, and by her he had a ſon THOMAS, who in the reign of Henry the VIIIth was Clerk of the Pipe in the Exchequer. This *Thomas* married to his firſt wife Alice, daughter and heir to John Smith of Padbrook-Hall in the county of Suffolk, and by her had three ſons, *George*, *William*, and *Thomas*, and a daughter named *Mary*, and dying in 1524, 15 Henry VIII, was ſucceeded by *George* his eldeſt ſon, who was ſeated at Glemsford in Suffolk, and was father of *William Cavendiſh* of the ſame place Eſq; who had two ſons *William* and *Ralph*, but they dying without iſſue, we return to WILLIAM, next brother to the ſaid *George*; which *William* became chief heir-male, and was Gentleman-Uſher of the Chamber to Cardinal Wolſey (1), as we ſhall ſhew in the following article.

(1) *Peerage of England, by Arthur Collins Eſq;* vol. 1. pag. 120, 121, 122. edit. London 1735, in 8vo.

☞ CAVENDISH (Sir WILLIAM), was Gentleman-Uſher to Cardinal Wolſey [*A*], and admitted to a very great ſhare of his confidence, of whoſe Life he wrote an account [*B*]. His fidelity to that unhappy Prelate in all his diſtreſſes recommended him to the favour of King Henry VIII, who immediately after the Cardinal's death ſent for him to Court, and in the thirty firſt year of his reign made him one of the Auditors of the Court of Augmentation, and in the thirty ſeventh year Treaſurer of his Chamber, and one of his Privy-Council (*a*). He bore the ſame relation to King Edward VI and Queen Mary (*b*), receiving the honour of Knighthood (*c*), and a large acceſſion of eſtate by grant of lands belonging to ſeveral diſſolved Priories and Abbies in exchange for his Manors of Northal in Hertfordſhire, and Northawbery in Lincolnſhire, &c. (*d*). But the greateſt addition to his fortunes was made by a marriage with Elizabeth, daughter and coheir of John Hardwick of Hardwich in Derbyſhire Eſq; and widow of Robert Barley of Barley in the ſame county Eſq; (*e*), whoſe large eſtate ſhe procured to be ſettled upon her and her heirs, having no iſſue by him (*f*). By this Lady Sir William Cavendiſh had

(*a*) Dr. Kennet's *Memoirs of the Family of Cavendiſh*, pag. 64.

(*b*) *Life of William Cavendiſh Duke of Newcaſtle; written by Margaret Ducheſs of Newcaſtle, his wife*, Book I. pag. 2. edit. London 1667, in fol.

(*c*) Kennet, *ubi ſupra.*

(*d*) Thoroton's *Nottinghamſhire*, pag. 186.

(*e*) Dugdale, *Baron.* tom. 2. pag. 420. Thoroton, pag. 187.

(*f*) Kennet, *ubi ſupra.*

[*A*] *Was Gentleman-Uſher to Cardinal Wolſey.*] It ſeems probable, that the Cardinal born in Suffolk, took this Gentleman out of the ſame country into his ſplendid family, wherein, as the Lord Burleigh told Queen Elizabeth in his *Memorial* to her Majeſty, he had one Earl, nine Barons, and about one thouſand Knights, Gentlemen, and inferior officers (1).

(1) Dr. White Kennet's *Memoirs of the Family of Cavendiſh*, pag. 61.

[*B*] *Of whoſe life he wrote an account.*] Dr. Kennet informs us (2), that the oldeſt copy of it is in the hands of the noble family of Pierpoint, into which the Author's daughter was married (3). Biſhop Nicholſon in the *ſecond part* of his *Engliſh Hiſtorical Library* (4), having obſerved, *that Cardinal Wolſey's purple will give him a rank with the greateſt of our Prelates, how mean ſoever the circumſtances of his birth and parentage may have been*; and that *the figure that he made in the State as well as in the Church during his Rule and Government (rather than Miniſtry) in the reign of King Henry the VIII, very juſtly challenged the pains of a ſpecial Hiſtorian*; tells us, that "ſuch was *Cavendiſh*, his menial ſervant, who was "alſo in good eſteem with the King, and that he "has left us an impartial account of his maſter's "life, which has had ſeveral editions (5)." Dr. Burnet (6) quotes a manuſcript copy different from what we have in print; and ſo does the Lord Herbert (7); but whether this be not the ſame with the former, Biſhop Nicholſon obſerves that he cannot tell.

(2) Pag. 63.

(3) See the following note.

(4) Pag. 166. edit. London 1697 in 8vo.

(5) London 1590, &c. in 4to.

(6) *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, Part 1. pag. 8.

(7) *Hiſtory of Henry VIII.* pag. 121, 122. in the *Complete Hiſtory of England*, vol. 1. Lord Herbert *by miſtake calls him* George.

had ſeveral children [C]; and after his death ſhe married firſt Sir William St. Lo, Captain of the Guard to Queen Elizabeth, and then George Earl of Shrewſbury (g). She built three of the moſt elegant Seats, that were ever raiſed by one hand within the ſame county, Chatſworth, Hardwick, and Oldcotes (b). She died February 13th 1607, and was buried in the South-ſide of All-Hallows Church in Derby (i).

(g) Idem, pag. 66, 67.

(b) Idem, pag. 68.

(i) Idem, pag. 71.

[C] *By this Lady Sir William Cavendiſh had ſeveral children.*] I. *Henry*, ſeated at Tutbury in the county of Suffolk. He married Grace, the younger daughter of George Earl of Shrewſbury, and died without iſſue October the 12th, 1616. II. WILLIAM, heir to the whole eſtate, and firſt Earl of Devonſhire. III. CHARLES, ſettled at Wellbeck in the county of Nottingham, and father of *William* Baron Ogle, Lord Cavendiſh of Boleſover, Viſcount Mansfield, Earl, Marquis, and Duke of Newcaſtle, whoſe life written by Margaret his ſecond Ducheſs was printed at London 1667 in fol. He died Dec. the 25th, 1676, in the 84th year of his age, and was buried in Weſtminſter-Abbey leaving iſſue by his firſt wife Elizabeth, daughter and ſole heir to William Baſſet of Blore in the county of Stafford Eſq; HENRY, his ſucceſſor, and three daughters, *Jane* married to Charles Cheyney of Cheſham-boys in the county of Bucks Eſq; *Elizabeth* to John Egerton, Earl of Bridgewater, anceſtor to the preſent Duke of that name; and *Frances* to Oliver St. John Eſq; afterwards Earl of Bolingbroke. HENRY, Duke of Newcaſtle, married Frances, eldeſt daughter to William Pierpoint of Thoreſby, Eſq; ſecond ſon to Robert Earl of Kingſton; and by her had *Henry* his only ſon, who was ſtiled Earl of Ogle, and married Elizabeth, ſole daughter and heir to Joſceline Piercy, Earl of Northumberland, but died in his father's lifetime on the 1ſt of November 1680, without iſſue; and his Grace dying July the 26th, 1691, without iſſue-male, his honours became extinct, and his five daughters became his co-heirs. *Elizabeth*, the eldeſt, was firſt married to Chriſtopher Monk, Duke of Albemarle, and afterwards to Ralph Lord Mountagu, created Duke of Mountagu; *Frances* to John Campbel, ſecond ſon to the Earl of Brodalbin in Scotland; *Margaret* to John Holles, Earl of Clare, afterwards created Duke of Newcaſtle; *Catherine* to Thomas Tufton, Earl of Thanet; and *Arabella* to Charles Spencer, Earl of Sunderland (8). IV. FRANCES, married to Sir *Henry Pierpoint* of *Holm-Pierpoint* in the county of Nottingham. V. ELIZABETH, married to *Charles Stuart*, Earl of Lenox, younger brother to the father of King James I; by whom ſhe was the mother of that incomparable Lady *Arabella*, ſo nearly related to the Crown, that *State jealouſy*, ſays Dr. Kennet (8), *confined her, and ſacrificed her in the Tower.* VI. MARY, married to *Gilbert* Earl of Shrewſbury. The Writer abovementioned obſerves (10), that we have here a rare example of two brothers founding two ſeveral Dukedoms, and the ſiſters matched, one into the moſt noble family of England, and the other into a direct branch of the Royal Family of Great Britain.

(8) *Peerage of England, by Arthur Collins Eſq*; vol. 1. pag. 125.

(9) *Memoirs*, pag. 66.

(10) Ibid.

☞CAVENDISH (WILLIAM) the firſt Earl of Devonſhire ſecond ſon to Sir *William Cavendiſh*, was created Baron Cavendiſh of Hardwick May the 4th 1605, in the third year of the reign of James I, and Earl of Devonſhire Auguſt the 7th 1618, in the 16th year of that King (a). He was twice married, and had ſeveral children [A]. He died March the 3d 1625, and was interred at Endſor near Chatſworth (b).

(a) Dugdale, *Baronage*, vol. 1.

(b) Kennet, *Memoirs*, pag. 72.

[A] *He was twice married, and had ſeveral children.*] His firſt wife was *Anne* daughter and heir of *Henry Kighley* of Kighley in the county of York Eſq; by whom he had three ſons and three daughters. I. GILBERT, who died a young man, of incomparable parts and left a very ingenious Book intitled, Horæ Subſecivæ, *Obſervations* and *Diſcourſes*, &c. printed at London 1620 in 8vo. (1). II. WILLIAM, his heir and ſucceſſor. III. JAMES, who died in his infancy. IV. FRANCES, married to Sir William Maynard, afterwards created Lord Maynard. V. MARY, and VI. ELIZABETH, who both died young. His ſecond wife was *Elizabeth*, daughter of Edward Boughton of Cauſton in the county of Warwick Eſq; and widow of Sir Richard Wortley of Wortley in the county of York Knt. by whom he had iſſue Sir JOHN CAVENDISH, who was made Knight of the Bath in 1616, at at the Coronation of Prince Charles, and died without iſſue January the 18th, the year following (2).

(1) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 635. 2d edit. London 1721.

(2) Collins's *Peerage of England*, vol. 1. pag. 127.

☞CAVENDISH (WILLIAM) the ſecond Earl of Devonſhire, ſecond ſon of the firſt Earl, having travelled into France and Italy under the tuition of Mr. Thomas Hobbes, married Chriſtian daughter of Edward Lord Bruce of Kinloſſe in Scotland, the great favourite of King James I, by which Lady, who died June the 16th 1674, he had iſſue, I. WILLIAM, his heir. II. CHARLES, a Colonel in the army of King Charles I. III. HENRY, who died young. IV. ANNE, married to Robert Lord Rich, ſon and heir to Robert Earl of Warwick. This noble Earl was beloved and admired in both Houſes of Parliament, and a great Speaker in them (a); and Mr. Hobbes gives a noble character of him [A]. He contracted a vaſt debt by his magnificent manner of living, and died at his houſe without Biſhopſ-gate in London (where Devonſhire-ſquare

(a) Kennet's *Memoirs*, pag. 74.

[A] *Mr. Hobbes gives a noble character of him.*] He writes thus in an Epiſtle to the Earl's ſon. *By the experience of many years I had the honour to ſerve him, I know this, there was not any, who more really, and leſs for glory's ſake favoured thoſe that ſtudied the liberal arts liberally than my Lord your father did, nor in whoſe houſe a man ſhould leſs need the Univerſity than his. For his own ſtudy it was beſtowed for the moſt part in that kind of learning, which beſt deſerveth the pains and hours of great perſons, Hiſtory and civil Knowledge, and directed not to the oſtentation of his reading, but to the government of his life and the public good; for he ſo read, that the learning that he took in by ſtudy, by judgment he digeſted and converted into wiſdom and ability to benefit his country; to which he alſo applied himſelf with zeal, but ſuch as took no ſtir either from faction or ambition.* "And as he "was a moſt able man for ſoundneſs of advice and "clear expreſſion of himſelf in matters of difficulty "and conſequence both in public and private, ſo alſo "was he one, whom no man was able either to draw "or juſtle out of the ſtrait path of juſtice; of which "virtue I know not whether he deſerved more by "his ſeverity in impoſing it (as he did to his laſt "breath) on himſelf, or by his magnanimity in not "exacting it to himſelf from others. No man "better diſcerned of men, and therefore was he con-"ſtant in his friendſhips, becauſe he regarded not "the fortune nor adherence, but the men; with "whom alſo he converſed with an openneſs of heart, "that had no other guard than his own integrity, "and that *Nil conſcire*. To his equals he carried "himſelf equally; and to his inferiors familiarly, "but maintaining his reſpect fully, and only with "the native ſplendor of his worth. In ſum, he was "one, in whom might plainly be perceived that ho-"nour and honeſty are but the ſame thing in the "different degrees of perſons."

Square is now built) June the 20th 1628, and was interred at All-Hallows Church in Derby (*b*).

(*b*) Idem, ibid. pag. 77.

☞CAVENDISH (WILLIAM) the third Earl of Devonſhire, being nine years of age at his father's deceaſe, was left under the care of his mother the Counteſs Dowager, who in 1631 committed him to his father's tutor Mr. Hobbes, who inſtructed him in the family for three years, and then about 1634 travelled with him as his Governor to France and Italy. The Earl returned in 1637. He married Elizabeth ſecond daughter of William Cecil Earl of Saliſbury, by whom he had iſſue, I. *William*, afterwards Duke of Devonſhire; II. *Charles* born October the 5th 1655, who died unmarried March the 3d 1670, and was interred at Derby (*a*); and III. *Anne*, firſt married to Charles Lord Rich, only ſon of Charles Earl of Warwick, and then to John Lord Burghley, afterwards Earl of Exeter. She died June the 18th 1703 (*b*). He adhered firmly to King Charles I [*A*]. Dr. Kennet ſays (*c*) that he was virtuous in his whole life, and prudent in all his affairs; and that he improved his large inheritance, and took care to let it deſcend entire to poſterity. He died at his Seat at Roehampton in Surrey November the 3d 1684, and was interred with his Anceſtors at Derby (*d*).

(*a*) Collins's *Peerage of England*, vol. 1. pag. 128.

(*b*) Kennet's *Memoirs*, pag. 77, 78, 79, and Collins, *ubi ſupra*.

(*c*) Pag. 104.

(*d*) Idem, pag. 105.

[*A*] *He adhered firmly to King Charles I.*] He follows his Majeſty to the North, and at York in June 1642 he was one of thoſe Peers, who ſubſcribed a declaration of their bearing teſtimony of the King's frequent and earneſt declarations and profeſſions of his abhorring all deſigns of making war upon the Parliament (1). He ſupplied the King with money, attended him in his Parliament at Oxford, and afterwards retired beyond ſea to wait for peace at home. This receſs could afford him no repoſe; he was put into the number of delinquents; his great eſtate was ſequeſtered; and when by the mediation of his friends an ordinance was depending for his compoſition in October 1645, order was given for his return by ſuch a day (2).

(1) Kennet's *Memoirs*, pag. 80, 81.

(2) Idem, pag. 81.

☞CAVENDISH (CHARLES) ſon of the ſecond and brother to the third Earl of Devonſhire, and eminent for his valour and uncommon ſkill in the Sciences, was born at London May the 20th 1620, and at eighteen years of age was ſent to travel into France and Italy; from whence he embarked for Conſtantinople, "dropping his Gover- "nor and Engliſh Servants, as knowing that a traveller may learn moſt from ſtran- "gers (*a*)." After a long circuit by land through Natolia, he went by ſea to Alexandria, thence to Cairo, and was brought by way of Malta to Spain, and back to Paris, and after ſome converſation with the Court returned to England about the end of May 1641. The ſame year he went over to Holland, where he paſſed one campaign in the Prince of Orange's army, the moſt eminent ſchool of war, and came over to England again about the end of November following. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his valour and conduct in ſeveral engagements in defence of King Charles I [*A*], being made Colonel of

(*a*) Kennet's *Memoirs*, pag. 83, 84.

[*A*] *He diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his valour and conduct in ſeveral engagements in defence of King Charles I.*] When the King retired to York upon the Heats in the Houſes of Parliament, Mr. Cavendiſh went thither with his brother, the Earl of Devonſhire, and enter'd himſelf among the Noblemen and Gentlemen Volunteers, who deſired to be put under command for his Majeſty's ſervice; and made it his choice to ride in the King's own Troop, commanded by the Lord Bernard Stuart his kinſman, brother to the Duke of Richmond, among ſo many conſiderable perſons for quality and fortunes, that the King was heard to ſay, that "the "revenues of thoſe in that ſingle Troop would buy "the eſtates of my Lord of Eſſex, and of all the Of- "ficers in his Army (1)." He march'd in this Troop till the battle of Edge-Hill 23d Octob. 1642, when the King, in reſpect and tenderneſs to theſe gallant men, would not expoſe them to equal hazard with the reſt of the Cavalry, but reſerved them for a guard to his own perſon. Mr. Cavendiſh ſuppoſing this to be no poſt of danger, and therefore not of honour, prevailed with the Lord Bernard Stuart, that they ſhould wait upon the King, and intreat his leave to be drawn up on the right hand of the right wing of the Horſe, as the moſt open and moſt honourable place in the battle; to which his Majeſty upon their importunity conſented. This proved to be the poſt of hotteſt ſervice and of greateſt ſucceſs; wherein Mr. Cavendiſh ſo diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his perſonal valour, that the Lord Aubigny, who commanded the Duke of York's Troop, being ſlain, he was preferred to that charge before many other pretenders of eminent birth and merit. This Troop was ſoon after put into the Prince of Wales's Regiment, wherein the ſuperior Officer put ſomething upon Captain Cavendiſh, which he thought an indignity, and therefore deſired his Majeſty to aſſign him a thouſand pounds, (which his own brother the Earl of Devonſhire had preſented to the King,) promiſing, that if his Majeſty would but let him have the Duke of York's Troop out of the Prince of Wales's Regiment, he would go into the North, and raiſe the Duke a compleat Regiment of Horſe, before the Army could take the field; to which the King conſented, aſſuring him the honour of being Colonel of his new Regiment. In order to compleat it, he accepted of Thomas Markham Eſq; to be his Lieutenant Colonel, and Mr. Tuke for the Captain of his firſt Troop; and took his head-quarters at Newark, and kept under many of the Parliament's Garriſons at Nottingham, and in other neighbouring parts, and by degrees became maſter of the whole Country, ſo that the King's Commiſſioners for Lincolnſhire and Nottinghamſhire deſired his leave to petition the King, that he might have the command of all the forces of their two counties, in quality of Colonel General, which he complied with and the King granted (2). In this command he beat the enemy from Grantham (3), and gained a compleat victory near Stamford, and reduced ſeveral of their Garriſon-Towns by the aſſiſtance of Colonel Welby and other brave Officers. After many glorious actions, he had the honour to receive the Queen in her march to Newark, who immediately took notice that ſhe ſaw him laſt in Holland, and was very glad now to meet him again in England. The Counteſs of Derby ſitting at the end of the Queen's coach entertained her Majeſty with great commendations of the Colonel; and when the Queen was to give the word to Major Tuke, ſhe gave that of *Cavendiſh*. He waited on the Queen with a noble Guard toward Oxford, and in his way, by her Majeſty's conſent, took Burton upon Trent by ſtorm, encouraging his ſoldiers to ſwim over the river, and ſcale the works, and enter in the midſt of deaths and utmoſt dangers. The royal cauſe declining, made him the more daring and deſperate (4). In his laſt action he is ſaid to have been murthered in cold blood after quarter given him by Colonel Bury, who made himſelf dear to Cromwell by this and ſome other acts of cruelty (5). Another

(1) Kennet's *Memoirs*, pag. 85, 86, 87.

(2) Idem, pag. 88, 89.

(3) *See* Clarendon. *Hiſtory of the Rebellion*, vol. 2. Part 1. Book 6. pag. 144. edit. Oxford 1707, in 8vo.

(4) *Life of Chriſtian Counteſs Dowager of Devonſhire*, pag. 52. *and* Kennet's *Memoirs*, pag. 94.

(5) *Life of Chriſtian Counteſs Dowager of Devonſhire*, pag. 53.

of a Regiment, but was at laſt killed near Gainſborough in 1643. He was a Gentleman of great merit and learning [*B*], and univerſally beloved and admired.

(6) Lloyd in his *Memoirs of the Lives, Actions, Sufferings, and Deaths of thoſe noble, reverend, and excellent Perſons that ſuffered Death, &c. in our late inteſtine Wars, &c.* pag. 673. edit. London 1668, in fol.

Another Writer (6) tells us, that his horſe ſticking in the mud, he died magnanimouſly refuſing quarter, and throwing the blood, which ran from his wounds, in the faces of thoſe, who ſhed it. Cromwell himſelf was in this action, and valued himſelf ſo much upon the ſucceſs of it, that he gave a particular account to the Committee for Aſſociation ſitting at Cambridge in a Letter dated July 31ſt 1643. "Gentlemen, It "hath pleaſed the Lord to give your ſervant and ſol- "diers a notable victory now at Gainſborow... In the "laſt reſerve unbroken ſtood General Cavendiſh, who "one while faced me, another while faced four of the "Lincoln Troops, which was all of ours, that ſtood "upon the place, the reſt being engaged in the chaſe. At "laſt General Cavendiſh charged the Lincolneers, and "routed them. Immediately I fell upon his rear "with my three troops, which did ſo aſtoniſh him, "that he gave over the chaſe, and would fain have "delivered himſelf from me; but I preſſing on, forc- "ed down a hill having a good execution of them, "and below the hill drove the General with ſome of "his ſoldiers into a quagmire, where my Captain Lieu- "tenant ſlew him with a thruſt under his ſhort ribs. "The reſt of his body was wholly routed, not one "man ſtaying upon the place (7)." When his body was brought to Newark to be interred, the whole Town were ſo fond of it even dead, that they would not ſuffer it for ſome days to be interred, but wept over it, and admired it. Nay and about thirty years after, when his body was removed to be interred at Derby with his mother, freſh lamentations were made by thoſe, who knew, and others who heard his fame, and the whole people of Newark expreſſed the moſt ſorrowful reluctance to part with the reliques of ſo dear a perſon, who had been when alive, the ornament and defence of that place (8).

(7) Ruſhworth, Part 3. vol. 2. pag. 278.

[*B*] *He was a Gentleman of great learning and merit.*] He was well ſkilled in Mathematics, as appears from ſome of his papers in the Library of Dr. John Moore, Biſhop of Ely, given by K. George I to the Univerſity of Cambridge. In ſhort *he was a Gentleman ſo furniſhed with all the interior and politer parts of learning, (obtained at home and abroad, both by reading books and men) as well as courage, that he was prepared to defend his Prince with his head and hand, by the ſtrongeſt reaſon and moſt generous valour* (9).

(8) *Life of Chriſtian, Counteſs Dowager of Devonſhire*, pag. 52.

(9) Ibid.

T

☞CAVENDISH (WILLIAM), the firſt Duke of Devonſhire, was born January the 25th 1640, and attended in his travels [*A*] by Dr. Killegrew, afterwards Maſter of the Savoy, who gave him a true reliſh in Poetry, and all the refinements of ſenſe and wit. Under the ſtyle of William Lord Cavendiſh, ſon to the Earl of Devonſhire, he was created September the 28th 1663 Maſter of Arts in the Univerſity of Oxford by the ſpecial command of the Chancellor (*a*). Soon after he married Mary, ſecond daughter of James Butler Duke of Ormond, and by her, who died July the 31ſt 1710 (*b*), had three ſons and one daughter [*B*]. In 1665 he went a volunteer into the Fleet, and was in the midſt of that dangerous ſea-fight in attendance on the Duke of York. He ſerved as Knight of the Shire for the county of Derby in ſeveral Parliaments [*C*]. In 1679 he was choſen one of the King's new Privy-Council, which was to conſiſt of a number not exceeding

(a) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 154. 2d edit. London 1721.

(b) Collins's *Peerage of England*, vol. 1. pag. 124.

[*A*] *In his travels.*] While he was at Paris he was moſt rudely affronted at an Opera by three Officers of the King's Guard, who came full of wine upon the ſtage. One of them coming up to him with a very inſulting queſtion, my Lord Cavendiſh gave him a ſevere blow on the face, upon which they all drew, and puſhed hard upon him. He got his back againſt one of the ſcreens, and made a ſtout defence, receiving ſeveral wounds, till a ſturdy Swiſs of my Lord Embaſſador Montague caught him up in his arms, and threw him over the ſtage into the pit. In his fall one of his arms was caught upon an iron ſpike, which tore out the fleſh, and left a ſcar very viſible to his dying day. He lay for ſome weeks in danger of his life. The three aſſailants were committed to priſon by the King's command, and not releaſed till my Lord himſelf interceded for them (1).

(1) Kennet's *Memoirs*, pag. 117, 118.

[*B*] *By whom he had three ſons and one daughter.*] I. WILLIAM Marquis of Hartington, afterwards Duke of Devonſhire, and father of the preſent Duke. II. Lord HENRY CAVENDISH, a Gentleman of extraordinary parts and hopes, who died extremely lamented May 10th, 1700, leaving one daughter named Mary, by Rhoda, only ſurviving daughter of William Cartwright of Aynho Eſq; by Urſula his ſecond wife, daughter of Ferdinando, Lord Fairfax of Cameron in Scotland. III. Lord JAMES CAVENDISH, who was elected Member of Parliament for the Town of Derby in 12 Will. III, and ſerved for the ſame Borough in the reigns of Queen Anne and King George I, as he does in the preſent Parliament. His Lordſhip is a Fellow of the Royal Society. He married *Anne*, daughter of Elihu Yale Eſq; Governor of Fort St. George in the Eaſt-Indies, and by her, who died June 27th 1734, has a ſon named *William*, married to a daughter of Dr. Edward Chandler Biſhop of Durham, and a daughter, *Elizabeth*, married to Richard Chandler Eſq; ſon to the ſaid Biſhop. IV. The Lady ELIZABETH, married to Sir John Wentworth of Broadſworth in the County of York, Bart. (2).

(2) Collins's *Peerage of England*, vol. 1. pag. 125.

[*C*] *He ſerved as Knight of the Shire for the County of Derby in ſeveral Parliaments.*] In 1677 when his Majeſty was offended with the Houſe of Commons for addreſſing him to make a league offenſive and defenſive with the States of Holland, and for a mark of diſpleaſure had commanded the Speaker to adjourn the Houſe to Monday July 16th, the Lord Cavendiſh was at the head of thoſe Members, who objected againſt that abrupt diſmiſſion of them, and preſſed it upon the Speaker, "that he would not leave the Chair, but by "a queſtion and the voice of the Houſe;" and offered to ſhew a precedent of the Commons ſitting after an unexpected meſſage to adjourn. And when upon the ſaid 16th of July the two Houſes met, only in order to be adjourned by his Majeſty's pleaſure, this Lord was in the number of thoſe, who would not comply with the Speaker's report of a Royal Command to that effect; but he mov'd, that *their laſt order about Adjournment might be read, to the end that they might take notice of the Authority, by which they met here now; and this he ſaid was uſual and regular to be done.* This motion was ſeconded; and had been carried, if the Speaker had not left the Chair, and run away from the hard words, which followed him (3). In the ſame Seſſions, when a vote of great conſequence was depending, and the Houſe divided, and the Tellers were appointed, and the numbers returned equal on both ſides, by which means he and his friends would have loſt their neceſſary point; he charged a miſtake upon the Tellers againſt him, and would not ſuffer it to paſs, but inſiſted on it, till with great difficulty he gained the proof of it; *by which*, ſays Dr. Kennet (4), *he exaſperated a Court-party to the laſt degree.* In the next Parliament in 1678 he was one in the *firſt* Committee appointed for Privileges and Elections; and in the *ſecond* for drawing up an humble Addreſs to be preſented to his Majeſty for removing all Popiſh Recuſants from within ten miles of the city of London; and in a *third* for examining into the murther of Sir Edmund Bury Godfrey, and other particulars of the Popiſh Plot. And again for deſiring the Lords to join with them in providing remedies for preſervation of his Majeſty's Perſon and Government and the Proteſtant Religion. He was ſent to attend the King with the Vote of the Houſe relating to the Information given againſt Mr. Mountague December

(3) *Private Debates in the Houſe of Commons*, 1677, pag. 95. in 12mo, *and* Kennet's *Memoirs*, pag. 121, 122, 123.

(4) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 122.

exceeding thirty; but January the 31ſt following he, together with his inſeparable friend, William Lord Ruſſel, Sir Henry Capel, and Mr. Powle, deſired leave to retire from the Council-Board; which was granted them. He vigorouſly promoted the *Bill of Excluſion* [*D*], and carried up to the Houſe of Lords the impeachment againſt Sir William Scroggs, Lord Chief Juſtice of the King's Bench (*c*), and continued to oppoſe the meaſures of the Court [*E*]. At the Lord Ruſſel's tryal he appeared as a witneſs for him, and afterwards ſent him a meſſage by Sir James Forbes, that he would come and change clothes with him in the priſon, and ſtay there to repreſent him, if in ſuch diſguiſe he could make his eſcape †. Upon the aſſaſſination of his friend Mr. Thynne he charged Count Koningſmark, who had been acquitted at his tryal with the guilt of blood, and offered to prove it upon him in the open field [*F*]. He ſucceeded to his father's honours and eſtate in November 1684, "and in the reign of King James he was the ſame man, in "greater honour, and in greater concern for his country (*d*)." He ſaw Popery and arbitrary power breaking in upon the Nation; and being firmly attach'd to the intereſts of England and the Proteſtant Religion, blamed, and to the utmoſt of his power, oppoſed every illegal ſtep. Some attempts were made to terrify him, and one witneſs of rebellion was prepared againſt him, whoſe mouth he ſtopt only by deſiring to confront him (*e*). In 1686 he had an exorbitant fine of thirty thouſand pounds laid upon him for ſtriking Colonel Culpepper within the verge of the Court [*G*]. He was one of the earlieſt in inviting

(*c*) Echard's *Hiſtory of England*, vol. 2. Book 2. cap. 3. pag. 604.

† Burnet's *Hiſtory of his own Time*, vol. 1. pag. 560. *and* Kennet's *Memoirs*, pag. 134.

(*d*) Kennet's *Memoirs*, pag. 136.

(*e*) Idem, *Funeral Sermon for the Duke*, pag. 48, 49.

19th; and was appointed the ſame day to aſſiſt in preparing and drawing up Articles againſt the Earl of Danby. In another Parliament, which met March the 6th 167$\frac{8}{9}$, he was among the chief Members appointed to attend his Majeſty with the Vote concerning the Election of a new Speaker March 8th, and of the Committee for drawing up a Bill to ſecure the King and Kingdom againſt the growth and fear of Popery, April 16th 1679. He was likewiſe diſtinguiſhed in carrying up the Addreſs for declaring to revenge upon the Papiſts any violence offered by them to the King's Perſon May 14th. Upon theſe occaſions he ſpoke often with that weight and freedom, that ſome of his Speeches got abroad in imperfect copies, and were much applauded. One of them had ſuch ſevere things in it, that it produced this Order of the Houſe: "The Houſe being informed that there is a "falſe and ſcandalous Pamphlet diſperſed abroad un"der the name of *The Speech of the Lord Cavendiſh*; "Reſolved, it be referred to a Committee to enquire "into the Authors and Publiſhers of that Pamphlet."

[*D*] *He vigorouſly promoted the Bill of Excluſion.*] When this Bill was carried up to the Houſe of Lords November 15th 1680 by William Lord Ruſſel, he was attended by the Lord Cavendiſh, and others. But the King declaring his reſolution of not conſenting to a *Bill of Excluſion*, the great point was to ſecure the Kingdom againſt Popery; and while the Houſe was in a grand Committee upon this Queſtion, and Mr. Powle in the Chair, my Lord Cavendiſh made a ſpeech (4) deploring the loſs of that Bill, and concluding with a motion, "that a Bill might be brought in for the "Aſſociation of all his Majeſty's ſubjects;" which after full debate ended in a Reſolve, "That it is the opi"nion of this Committee, that the Houſe be moved, "that a Bill be brought in for an Aſſociation of all "his Majeſty's Proteſtant Subjects, for the ſafety of his "Majeſty's Perſon, the Defence of the Proteſtant Reli"gion, and the Preſervation of his Majeſty's Proteſtant "Subjects, againſt all invaſions and oppoſitions; and for "preventing the Duke of York, or any other Papiſt "from ſucceeding to the Crown." My Lord Cavendiſh proceeded to argue in the Houſe, as he had done in the Committee, by the following Speech, which he made January 7th 168$\frac{8}{1}$. "Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am "perſuaded that we cannot be ſecure neither of our "Religion, nor Peace and Quietneſs without this "*Bill*. Yet ſeeing we are not like to have it at this "time, I am for going on with thoſe other Bills, that "are afoot, that we may try if we can get them. See"ing we cannot do all the good we would, let us en"deavour to do all the good we can. But I am ready "to agree in the Vote that was propoſed, that it is the "opinion of this Houſe, that neither the King's Per"ſon, nor Proteſtant Religion, can be ſecured any "other way, provided it be not intended to bind the "Houſe from trying what may be done by other laws; "leſt advantage ſhould be taken thereof to break this "Parliament; which I tremble to think of, becauſe "it will be attended with a great ruin to our affairs "both abroad and at home."

(4) *See* Dr. Kennet's *Appendix* to his *Memoirs*, num. 5.

[*E*] *And continued to oppoſe the meaſures of the Court.*] In the Parliament of 168$\frac{9}{1}$ he was one of thoſe, who openly named the evil Counſellors, and promoted the Addreſs to the King to remove them from all Offices of honour and profit, and from his Majeſty's Councils and preſence for ever. Upon this the King prorogued the Parliament January 10th, and diſſolved them by Proclamation in January 18th, and called another to meet at Oxford on March 11th; wherein the Lord Cavendiſh began again to ſtem the tide; but his undaunted efforts were again ſtop'd by a diſſolution of that Parliament after it had ſate but ſeven days. After this, when the King and his Miniſters governed without a Parliament, and began to call the chief Members of the late Houſes into queſtion for their liberties and even lives, particularly the Duke of Monmouth, the Earls of Shaftſbury and Eſſex, Lord Ruſſel, Colonel Algernoon Sidney, and others; the Lord Cavendiſh was thought as obnoxious as any, "and did not decline, "*ſays Dr. Kennet* (5), the meeting with theſe Patriots, "while nothing was propoſed, but what was honour"able and juſt. But in ſome Aſſignation he is ſaid "to have condemned a bold overture that was then "made, and to have declared with great earneſtneſs, "when he came back, that he would never more go "amongſt them. Not that he deſerted what he "thought the public cauſe, or any in it, whom he "eſteemed his friends."

(5) *Memoirs*, pag. 132.

[*F*] *Upon the aſſaſſination of his friend, Tho. Thynne Eſq; he charged Count Koningſmark, who had been acquitted at his trial, with the guilt of blood, and offered to prove it upon him in the open field.*] Lord Cavendiſh had purſued a legal vengeance on the murtherers of Mr. Thynne, and brought the immediate actors to condign puniſhment, and the great abettor of it, Count Koningſmark, to his trial, "who happened to be ac"quitted by a Jury poſſeſſed, or rather prepared in "favour of him (6)." Lord Cavendiſh had great indignation at the diſcharge of the Count, which he thought owing to corruption, and knowing that an Appeal to ſingle combat was antiently the laſt reſort in Law for convicting a murtherer, he obtained the favour of a noble Peer to go in his name to the Count, to charge the guilt of blood upon him; and offer to prove it in the open field. But Dr. Kennet tells us (7), that what is commonly ſaid of an Aſſignation made upon Calais-Sands, is more than he finds atteſted; and that it may be rather preſumed, that the meſſage or the anſwer was dropt, becauſe the Count was in haſte to fly from any ſecond trial.

(6) Kennet's *Memoirs*, pag. 135.

(7) Ibid. pag. 136.

[*G*] *In* 1686 *he had an exorbitant fine of thirty thouſand pounds laid upon him for ſtriking Colonel Culpeper within the Verge of the Court.*] He had been very rudely inſulted within the Verge of the Court by the Colonel, for which he reſtrained himſelf, and only work'd out the ſatisfaction of giving him his pardon, upon condition that he ſhould never more appear at Whitehall. But immediately after the defeat of the Duke of Monmouth, the Colonel was encouraged to ſhew himſelf at Court, and was riſing into a creature of it. The Earl of Devonſhire meeting him in the King's

inviting over the Prince of Orange [*H*]; and King James II, upon the firſt alarm from Holland, being jealous of him, above any other Peer, endeavoured to draw him to Court; which the Earl evaded (*f*). Upon the Prince's landing he appeared in arms for him [*I*], and was afterwards received by him with the higheſt marks of affection and eſteem. In the debates of the Houſe of Lords concerning the vacancy of the Throne, he was very zealous for declaring the Prince and Princeſs of Orange King and Queen of England. In February 168$\frac{8}{9}$ he was admitted one of the Privy-Council (*g*), and appointed Lord Steward of their Majeſty's Houſhold (*b*), and April the 3d 1689 inſtalled Knight of the Order of the Garter (*i*). At the Coronation April the 11th he was made Lord High Steward of England for that day, and carried the Regal Crown next to the Bible and the King's perſon, his daughter aſſiſting in holding up her Majeſty's train. In January 169$\frac{0}{1}$ he attended the King to the Congreſs at the Hague, and outſhone moſt of the Princes there, and invited ſeveral of the ſovereign Princes to dinner, and the King *incognito* among them. April the 30th 1694 he was created Marquis of Hartington, and Duke of Devonſhire,

(*f*) Kennet, pag. 146, 147.

(*g*) Kennet's *Memoirs*, pag. 158.

(*b*) Idem, ibid. and Burnet's *Hiſtory of his own Time*, vol. 2. pag. 5. edit. London 1734, in fol.

(*i*) Mr. Collins in his *Peerage of England*, vol. 1. pag. 128. ſays he was inſtalled May 14th.

King's Preſence-chamber, and receiving from him, as he thought, an inſulting look, he took him by the noſe, led him out of the room, and gave him ſome contemptuous blow with the head of his cane. For this bold act the Earl was proſecuted in the King's Bench upon an information; and had a fine of thirty thouſand pounds impoſed upon him, and was committed, tho' a Peer, to the King's Bench priſon, till he ſhould make payment of it. He was never able to bear any confinement, which he could break from, and therefore eſcaped, only to go home to his ſeat at Chatſworth. Upon the news of his being there the Sheriff of Derbyſhire had a precept to apprehend him, and bring him with the *Poſſe* to town. But he invited the Sheriff, and kept him a priſoner of honour, till he had compounded for his own liberty, by giving bond to pay the full ſum of thirty thouſand pounds, which bond had this diſcharge, that it was found among the papers of King James, and given up by King William. We are informed that the Counteſs Dowager, his Mother, being uneaſy to ſee him under ſo great a hardſhip, waited on the King to beg her ſon's pardon, and for diſcharge of the fine humbly deſired, that his Majeſty would accept of her delivering up bonds and other acknowledgments for above ſixty thouſand pounds, lent by her huſband and his mother to his Royal Father and Brother in their greateſt extremities. But this was refuſed. It was under this load of difficulties that he firſt projected the new glorious Pile at Chatſworth; for he now contracted with workmen to pull down the South-ſide of that good old ſeat, and to rebuild it in a plan, which he gave to them for a front to his gardens. When he had finiſh'd this part he intended to go no farther, till ſeeing public affairs in an happy ſettlement for a teſtimony of eaſe and joy, he undertook the Eaſt-ſide of the new quadrangle, and raiſed it entirely new, in conformity to the South, and ſeemed then content to ſay, that he had gone half-way through, and would leave the reſt for his heir. In this reſolution he ſtopt about ſeven years, and then re-aſſumed courage, and began to lay the foundations for two other ſides to complete the ſquare. After the Revolution his Lordſhip complained of the grievance of his fine to the Houſe of Lords, who order'd Sir Robert Wright, the late Chief Juſtice, Sir Richard Holloway and Mr. Juſtice Powell to attend; where they all begg'd the Earl's pardon, and ſubmitted to their Lordſhips, who reſolved May 6th 1689, that "the Court of King's Bench in over-ruling the "Earl of Devonſhire's Plea of Privilege of Parliament, and forcing him to plead over in chief, it "being the uſual time of Privilege, did thereby commit a manifeſt breach of the Privilege of Parliament; "and that the fine of thirty thouſand pound impoſed "by the Court of King's Bench upon the Earl of Devonſhire was exceſſive exorbitant, againſt *Magna* "*Charta*, the common right of the ſubject, and the "Law of the Land (8)."

(8) Kennet's *Memoirs*, pag. 136, 137, 138, 139, and 160-166.

[*H*] *He was one of the earlieſt in inviting over the Prince of Orange.*] Biſhop Burnet in the *Hiſtory of his own Time* (9) tells us, that the Earls of Danby and Devonſhire, and the Lord Lumley undertook for the North in favour of that Prince. And Dr. Kennet (10) obſerves, that he had no view of Safety but from the Prince; and therefore helped to draw the eyes of the Nobility and Gentry the ſame way. He wrote his mind freely to an Engliſh friend in the Court at the Hague, that their laſt and only hope was from thence; and therefore he was very much in thoſe prudent and ſecret meaſures to invite over the Prince.

(9) Vol. 1. pag. 764, 766.

(10) *Memoirs*, pag. 146.

[*I*] *Upon the Prince's landing he appeared in arms for him.*] He had concerted meaſures with the Earl of Danby, the Lord Delamere, Sir Scroop How, and ſome few others of the greateſt quality and intereſt in thoſe parts. They had at firſt an eye upon the Prince's landing in the North, and when diſappointed of thoſe hopes, they ſtill continued their preparations, and waited for him as their Deliverer. In the mean time the Earl treated with many of his friends and neighbours; but he found them reflecting upon the Duke of Monmouth's unhappy attempt. He had the hearts and wiſhes of many, who dared not to ſtir their hands. Some expectations were not anſwered, and even ſome promiſes were evaded. When the Prince was driven back by a ſtorm, and the King was doing ſome fair things to pleaſe the people, his Lordſhip was then in danger of being delivered up, or at leaſt of being left alone. He did however keep himſelf and ſervants, and ſome few of his friends, in a readineſs and ſilent preparation. They talk'd over the ſcene, which they had laid, in feigned words and phraſes; and when any ſuſpected company ſeemed to underſtand them, they fell into other inventions of ſecrecy and reſerve. As ſoon as he heard of the Prince's landing in the Weſt, he began to move, and reſolved to run the utmoſt hazards for the public ſafety. He marched firſt with a ſmall retinue to the County-town of Derby, and invited many of the Gentry, and entertained thoſe, who adventured to come to his open table, with freedom and diſcourſe. He called out the Mayor and Commonalty, and read to them the Prince's Declaration, and made a ſeaſonable Comment upon it, and delivered to them a paper of the Declaration made by himſelf, and the Nobility and Gentry with him, dated November 21, 1688, "that they would to their utmoſt defend the Proteſtant Religion, the Laws of the Kingdom, and the "Rights and Liberties of the Subject." While his Lordſhip was in this town, a Meſſenger came from London with a Letter in the heel of his boot, ſo much ſoaked in water and dirt, that it could hardly be made legible. The contents were to ſignify the return of King James to Saliſbury, and the advance of the Prince's Army toward London. This occaſioned great joy, but in the midſt of it another Courier arrived with an account directly contrary, and left the wiſeſt of them in ſuſpence, and the reſt in conſternation. The Popiſh Party made their advantage of it, and began to form a plot for ſecurlng the Earl and his company, if they had not left the place with greater expedition. From hence his Lordſhip marched to Nottingham, where the people were well affected; and the Nobility and Gentry ſoon made a number and figure very conſiderable. The Earl at the head of them thought fit to unite them in a declaration of their ſenſe and reſolution; which was accordingly made, and unanimouſly ſubſcribed Novem. 22d upon this profeſſed principle; *We own it rebellion to reſiſt a King, that governs by Law; but he was always accounted a tyrant, that made his will the law; and to reſiſt ſuch an one we juſtly eſteem no rebellion, but a neceſſary and juſt defence.* This Declaration was thought to be ſo juſt and honourable, that many others came daily into it, and were formed into regular troops, and made the appearance of a confederate Army. While her Royal Highneſs,

Devonſhire, which with his Garter, and white Staff, and Juſticeſhip in Eyre, was as much honour as an Engliſh ſubject could enjoy. After Queen Mary's death, when the Adminiſtration of the Government in the King's abſence was to be intruſted in the hands of his honourable ſubjects, the Duke was one of the Lords Juſtices of England for ſeven ſucceſſive years, a continual honour that happened to no other Peer except him, and Dr. Teniſon Archbiſhop of Canterbury. In the caſe of Sir John Fenwick, though he had a conviction of his guilt, yet he was ſo averſe to any extraordinary judicial proceedings, that he oppoſed the Bill, as he did likewiſe another Bill for the reſumption of Eſtates in Ireland. Upon Queen Anne's acceſſion he was continued in his high office and other ſtations, and ſerved her Majeſty with a grateful reverence to the memory of King William [*K*]. At the Coronation of the Queen he was again Lord High Steward for the day. In Parliament he was active for ſecuring the Proteſtant Religion, and declaring war againſt France and Spain, and for ſupporting her Majeſty in her Alliances, to carry on the common cauſe of Europe; and within this firſt year of her reign, he was one of the Commiſſioners on the part of England to treat of an Union with Scotland. He was now in the attempt, and within few years in the accompliſhment of that great work. He oppoſed the Bill for preventing Occaſional Conformity in 1702. He was a manager for the Lords in a free conference with the Commons in March 170$\frac{4}{5}$, in the great cauſe of *Aſhby* and *White*, wherein the rights and privileges of the two Houſes, and the liberty and the protection of the people, and the regularity of Writs of Error, &c. were argued and defended with great judgment and learning. In April following he waited on the Queen to Cambridge, and was there created Doctor in Law [*L*] with the Dukes of Grafton and Bolton, his own ſon the Marquis of Hartington, and many others of the Nobility and Gentry. He died after a ſevere indiſpoſition [*M*] in Devonſhire Houſe in Piccadilly Auguſt the 18th 1707, in the 67th year of his age. His Funeral Sermon was preached by Dr. White Kennet, afterwards Biſhop of Peterborough, in the Church of All-Hallows in Derby, September the 5th 1707; a paſſage in which Sermon relating to repentance gave great offence to ſome perſons [*N*].

We

Highneſs, the Princeſs Anne, was under a neceſſity of providing for the ſecurity of her own Perſon, ſhe went from London with the Biſhop of that See, the Earl of Dorſet, and a ſmall train of Ladies, on Sunday night, Novem. 25th. When ſhe was firſt miſſing, the people were ſo enraged, that they threatned to tear in pieces ſome of the Papiſts in Whitehall, upon a ſuſpicion, that they had committed violence againſt her; but they were ſoon ſatisfied by a very decent Letter, which her Royal Highneſs left for the Queen, and by the news, that ſhe was going to Nottingham. In her journey a rumour was induſtriouſly ſpread, that a party of the enemies would intercept her; upon which the Earl of Devonſhire marched out with a good body of Horſe, and at ſome miles diſtance from the town met her Royal Highneſs with great reſpect and joy, and conducted her to the caſtle, (from whence the Earl of Nottingham had withdrawn,) and kept tables at his own expence, and provided all the other accommodations of a Court and a ſtanding Council. When his ſtock failed, he accepted of ſome contributions, and at laſt borrowed the public money in ſuch a manner, as to ſatisfy the collectors, and pleaſe the Country. When a copy of the Aſſociation came, he readily went into it, and was followed by thoſe, who were moſt hearty in the cauſe. When ſome were ſo cautious as to decline it, he waved their refuſal with great temper; but when they afterwards upon a nearer proſpect of ſucceſs offer'd to ſubſcribe, he then check'd them for their former warineſs, and ſaid that there was now no need of their doing it. The Princeſs being extremely ſatisfied with her reception, propoſed to go towards Oxford, to be nearer his Royal Highneſs Prince George, who had joined himſelf to the Prince of Orange, with the Lord Churchill, the Dukes of Ormond and Grafton, &c. Upon this motion the Earl of Devonſhire and his noble Train were a guard to her Royal Highneſs, and by eaſy and moſt convenient ſtages conducted her ſafe to Oxford, where ſhe was ſoon after met by her Conſort the Prince. The Earl next day haſted with a private friend or two to London; and hearing that the Prince of Orange was come as far as Sion-Houſe, he reſolved to meet him the next morning, and came thither to the Prince as he was taking coach, and was received by him with all the marks of affection and eſteem (11).

(11) Kennet's *Memoirs*, pag. 146-155.

[*K*] *Served her Majeſty with a grateful reverence to the memory of King William.*] When a report was induſtriouſly ſpread, that a project had been formed in prejudice to her Majeſty's Succeſſion to the Crown, and that a paper tending that way was to be found among the papers of King William; at the deſire of the Houſe of Lords, the Duke was one of the Prime Miniſters appointed by the Queen to inſpect the ſaid papers, and ſoon after they ſeverally declared in the Houſe, "That "they did not ſee or find any paper or papers tending "to the prejudice of her Majeſty, or her ſucceſſion to "the Crown, or which might give any ground or co-"lour for ſuch report." Upon which it was reſolved by the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, that *the ſaid report was groundleſs, falſe, villainous, and ſcandalous, to the diſhonour of the King's Memory, and tending to the diſſervice of her preſent Majeſty* (12).

(12) Idem, pag. 174, 175, 176.

[*L*] *Waited on the Queen to Cambridge, and was there created Doctor in Law.*] He had before received a title at Oxford, which he eſteemed an honour; for he had a great reſpect for the Univerſities, and diſliked no part of the education in them, only that he thought the young men were many of them warmed with Politics, before they underſtood the conſtitution of their country (13). He was however tender of the leaſt reflection upon them, and recalled himſelf in theſe lines with good nature and temper:

(13) Kennet, pag. 181, 182.

Say Muſe (ſince no ſurprize or foreign ſtroke
Can hurt her guarded by her walls of Oak,
Since wholeſome laws her liberty tranſfer
To future ages) what can Albion fear?
Can ſhe the dear-bought treaſure throw away?
Have Univerſities *ſo great a ſway?*
The Muſe is ſilent, cautious to reflect
On Manſions, where the Muſes keep their ſeat.
Barren of thought and niggardly of rhime,
My creeping numbers ſhe forbids to climb.
Vent'ring too far my weary genius fails,
And o'er my drooping ſenſes ſleep prevails.

[*M*] *He died after a ſevere indiſpoſition*] "Some "perſons, ſays Dr. Kennet (14), had the vain wick-"edneſs to boaſt, that he died, in their language, *like* "*a man*, and in their nicer phraſe, *like a Gentleman*; "but whatever they mean, he died with repeated "profeſſions of faith, and open declarations of repen-"tance, and evident tokens of charity, and all the "preparatory offices of Religion, i. e. he died like a "Chriſtian." See the Doctor's Funeral Sermon upon him, *p.* 54, 55, 56.

(14) *Memoirs*, pag. 185, 186.

[*N*] *A paſſage in which Sermon relating to repentance gave great offence to ſome perſons.*] The paſſage

is,

We ſhall give the Duke's character in the Note [O].

is that, where ſpeaking of a late repentance, he ſays (15), that *this rarely happens but in men of diſtinguiſhed ſenſe and judgment. Ordinary abilities may be altogether ſunk by a long vitious courſe of life. The duller flame is eaſily extinguiſhed. The meaner ſinful wretches are commonly* given up to a reprobate mind, *and die as ſtupidly as they lived; while the nobler and brighter parts have an advantage of underſtanding the worth of their ſouls before they reſign it. If they are allowed the benefit of ſickneſs, they commonly awake out of their dream of ſin, and reflect and look upward. They acknowledge an infinite Being; they feel their own immortal part; they recollect and reliſh the Holy Scriptures; they call for the Elders of the Church; they think what to anſwer at a judgment-ſeat.* " Not that " God, *continues the Doctor*, is a *reſpecter of perſons*, " but the difference is in *men*, and the more intelli- " gent nature is the more ſuſceptive of Divine Grace. " It was an effect of Solomon's wiſdom to ſee at laſt " his *Vanity*, and to leave his penitence upon record. " We have had in our own age and nation men of " illuſtrious honour and of the moſt celebrated parts, " who had been carried away by the courſe of this " world into extravagant vices and follies, and yet " upon the proſpect of death, theſe *men of under-* " *ſtanding* have felt the *excellent ſpirit* to move with- " in them; they have retracted their looſe opinions; " they have repented of their grievous ſins; they have " made their peace with God, and have died, nay " have ſometimes recovered and lived, like true un- " feigned Chriſtian Converts. So great are the powers " of Religion to work moſt upon the largeſt capacities." The Author of *the life of Biſhop Kennet*, printed at London 1730 in 8vo. vindicates this Sermon from the imputations caſt upon it; and tells us (16), that it had been inſinuated by ſome, that *the Preacher had built a bridge to heaven for men of wit and parts, but that the duller ſort of mankind muſt not hope to paſs that way; when yet he had ſaid nothing at all to that effect, but in this ſound truth, that the more underſtanding a man has, the ſooner he may come to a ſenſe of God and Religion. He ſays nothing, but what common experience and obſervation juſtifies, that the ignorant and unnurtured multitude are not in the nature of the thing ſo likely to be wrought upon by the powers of Religion, as wiſe and underſtanding men, thoſe of a higher and better education.*

(15) Pag. 54, & ſeq.

Earl of Marlborough, Lord Rochester, &c.

Sir Duncomb Colcheſter, &c.

(16) Pag. 40, 41.

[O] *We ſhall give the Duke's character in the note.*] He deſpiſed the Philoſophy, as much as he abhorred the Politics of Mr. Hobbes (17). He had a reverence for the Scriptures, and read them with a diligent eye, and defended whatever he thought the fundamental doctrines in them. " He looked deep into the Soci- " nian controverſy, and declared his judgment freely " againſt thoſe pretenders to reaſon; and was as " much offended at any advocates, who (he thought) " helped to betray the orthodox cauſe (18)." He treated the Biſhops with great eſteem and reſpect, and all the Clergy with a decent regard to their function; and never made his company uneaſy to them or to any others by a profane jeſt, or by any ſhocking expreſſion. His greateſt rebuke to a Clergyman, who meddled in ſome affairs, which his Lordſhip thought not pertinent to him, was only this, *Sir, remember you are to preach on Sunday next* (19). He read the Roman Authors with great attention. Tacitus was his favourite, whom he read over with many juſt reflections, maſtering the ſenſe, and imbibing the ſpirit of the Writer, and digeſting his notions of liberty and power (20). It was his greateſt ambition to love and ſerve good Princes. This put him upon ordering his monument to ſhine with this inſcription. WILLELMUS DUX DEVON. *Bonorum Principum fidelis ſubditus; inimicus & inviſus tyrannis*: i. e. " William " Duke of Devonſhire; a faithful ſubject to good " Princes; an enemy to tyrants, and hated by them." He valued no other political character. His bearing a near relation to moſt of the noble families in England gave him, as he thought, a larger ſhare in the common care and concern for the privileges of the Peers, and rights of the people. He ſeemed to be made for a Patriot (21). He hated the very name of a tyrant; his pen was never ſharp but on that ſubject (22). In a Poem of his, intitled *An Alluſion to the Biſhop of Cambray's ſupplement to Homer*, he has theſe lines:

(17) Kennet's *Funeral Sermon*, pag. 43.

(18) Idem, *Memoirs*, pag. 169.

(19) Idem, ibid. pag. 170.

(20) Idem, *Funeral Sermon*, pag. 42.

(21) Idem, ibid. pag. 51, 52.

(22) Idem, *Memoirs*, pag. 167.

O deſpicable ſtate of all, that groan
Under a blind dependency on one!
How far inferior to the herds, that range
With native freedom o'er the woods and plains?
With them no ſallacies of ſchool prevail;
Nor of a Right Divine *the nauſeous tale*
Can give to one among themſelves the power,
Without controul his fellows to devour.
To reaſoning human kind alone belong
The arts to hurt themſelves by reaſoning wrong.

His mein and aſpect were engaging and commanding; his addreſs and converſation civil and courteous in the higheſt manner. He judged right in the ſupreme Court, and upon any important affair his ſpeeches were ſmooth and weighty. As a Stateſman his whole deportment came up to his noble birth and his eminent ſtations; nor did he want any of what the world calls accompliſhments. He had a fine hand in Muſic, and an elegant taſte in painting and all politer arts, with a ſpirit, which was continually improving his judgment in them. In Architecture he had a genius, and a ſkill and experience beyond any one perſon in the age; and his ſeat at *Chatſworth* for beauty and magnificence is not perhaps exceeded by any Palace in Europe. He had a great ſkill in languages, and was a true judge in Hiſtory, and a critic in Poetry (23), in which kind we have two Pieces of his compoſition: I. *An Ode on the death of Queen Mary*, which Mr. Dryden is ſaid to have preferred to all that was written on that occaſion (24). II. *An Alluſion to the Biſhop of Cambray's Supplement to Homer*. He was a Poet not by genius only, but by learning and judgment. The Lord Roſcommon made him a conſtant reviſer of his immortal lines. He was a maſter of Horace, and would talk of the other Antients with great reliſh and knowledge. He had nothing profane or indecent in any line; and knew the difference between the wit and the Gentleman, and nicely obſerved it (25).

T.

(23) Idem, *Funeral Sermon*, pag. 52, 53.

(24) Idem, *Memoirs*, pag. 172.

(25) Idem, ibid. pag. 172, 173.

☞CAVENDISH (WILLIAM), ſecond Duke of Devonſhire, ſon of the preceding, after the peace of Riſwick, made a tour to France, and in the 7th of King William III, was elected one of the Knights for the County of Derby, as alſo in two other Parliaments in that reign, and was choſen one of the Knights for Yorkſhire, in the two firſt Parliaments called by Queen Anne. He married Rachel, eldeſt of the two daughters of William Lord Ruſſel, and ſiſter of Wriotheſley Duke of Bedford; and by her, who died December the 28th 1725, had four ſons and ſix daughters [A]. While he was Marquis of Hartington, Queen Anne conſtituted him Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard; and

[A] *Had four ſons and ſix daughters.*] His ſons were, I. Lord WILLIAM, the preſent Duke of Devonſhire, born in 1698, who married, on the 27th of March 1718, Catherine, ſole daughter and heir of John Hoſkins of the county of Middleſex, Eſq; and by her had iſſue now living three ſons and three daughters, viz. *William*, ſtiled Marquis of Hartington; *George*, to whom his Majeſty was Godfather; *Frederick*, to whom his Royal Highneſs the Prince of Wales was Godfather; the Lady *Caroline*, to whom her preſent Majeſty was Godmother; and the Ladies *Elizabeth* and *Rachel*. II. Lord JAMES, who in April 1730 was made Captain of a Company in the third Regiment of Guards. III. Lord CHARLES, who is a Fellow of the

and ſucceeding his father in his honours, her Majeſty likewiſe conferred on him his places of dignity and truſt, with this compliment, "that ſhe had loſt a loyal ſubject and a good "friend in his father, but did not doubt to find them both again in the ſon." September the 8th 1707 he was declared and ſworn Lord Steward of the Houſhold and one of the Privy Council; and on the 29th of October conſtituted Warden and Chief Juſtice in Eyre of all her Majeſty's Foreſts, Parks, Chaces, and Warrens, North of Trent, as alſo Lord Lieutenant and Cuſtos Rotulorum for the County of Derby. On the change of the Miniſtry in 1710 he reſigned his places; but having been elected a Knight of the Order of the Garter, he was inſtalled December the 22d the ſame year. On the demiſe of Queen Anne, Auguſt the 1ſt 1714, he was appointed by King George I one of the Lords Juſtices of Great Britain, till he arrived from Hanover; and September the 24th following declared Lord Steward of the Houſhold; and October the 1ſt ſworn of the Privy Council, and on the 9th appointed Lord Lieutenant and Cuſtos Rotulorum of the County of Derby. In 1716 reſigning his office of Lord Steward of the Houſhold, he was the next day declared Lord Preſident of the Council; from which honourable poſt he retired April the 16th 1717, when ſeveral of the Nobility and Perſons of Honour reſigned their places. June the 11th 1720 he was a ſecond time appointed one of the Lords Juſtices of Great Britain, whilſt his Majeſty went to Hanover, as he was a third time June the 3d 1723; and on the 27th of March 1725 was declared Preſident of the Council. June the 3d 1725 he was a fourth time appointed one of the Lords Juſtices during his Majeſty's abſence; and on the 31ſt of May 1727, a fifth time, when on the 11th his Majeſty died at Oſnabrug. September the 10th 1727 he was by his Majeſty King George II again made Lord Lieutenant and Cuſtos Rotulorum for the County of Derby; and on the 20th of the ſame month declared Preſident of the Council; and November the 13th following appointed one of the Governors of the Charter-Houſe. He died June the 4th 1729, and was ſucceeded in his honours by the preſent Duke of Devonſhire. His Grace's Arms are Sable, three Harts Heads caboſh'd, Argent, attir'd, Or; and his Creſt, on a Wreath a Snake noue, proper. The Motto, *Cavendo tutus* (*a*).

(*a*) *See* Collins's *Peerage of England*, vol. 1. pag. 125, 126, 127, 128.

the Royal Society, and was on the 15th of April 1725, elected Member of Parliament for the Borough of Heyteſbury in the county of Wilts, as in 1727 he was for the city of Weſtminſter; and in 1728 was appointed one of the Gentlemen of the Bed-Chamber to his Royal Highneſs Frederick Prince of Wales. In the preſent Parliament is Knight of the Shire for the County of Derby. On Jan. the 9th 172⅞ his Lordſhip married the Lady Anne de Grey, third daughter to Henry Duke of Kent, who died in September 1733. IV. Lord JOHN, who died May the 10th 1720. His Grace's daughters were, I. Lady MARY who died June the 15th 1719; II. Lady RACHEL; III. Lady ELIZABETH, married, on the 2d of July 1723, to Sir Thomas Lowther, of Hocker in the county of Lancaſter, Bart. IV. Lady Catherine, married, on the 14th of May 1723, to William Morgan of Tredegar in the county of Monmouth Eſq; who on the 27th of May 1725 was made Knight of the Bath. V. Lady ANNE. VI. Lady DIANA, who died February the 12th 172⅝.

T.

(*d*) Riolan, *Recherches des Echoles de Medicine*, pag. 184.
(*e*) And not in the year 1499, as Konig ſays, *Bibliotb.* pag. 178.
(*f*) *See* Geſner, *Bibliotb.* fol. 286.

CAULIAC (GUI DE) a Phyſician of the Univerſity of Montpelier (*a*), and Author of a Treatiſe of Chirurgery, which is very much eſteemed [*A*], flouriſhed in the fourteenth Century. He ſtudied at Paris under Henry de Hermondavilla, firſt Phyſician to Philip the Fair (*b*). He was Phyſician to Pope Urban V (*c*), and to Pope Clement VI (*d*). He was at Montpellier, and pretty much advanced in years when he wrote his Treatiſe of Chirurgery in the year 1363. He mentions it with a great deal of modeſty, and as a work, in which he had only collected what he had read in the beſt Authors (*f*).

(*a*) 'Du Verdier Vau-Privas, *Bibl. Franç.* pag. 519.
(*b*) Riolan, *Recherches des Echoles de Medecine*, pag. 196, 213.
(*c*) *See* Lindenius Renovatus, pag. 368.

[*A*] *He is the author of a Treatiſe of Chirurgery, which is very much eſteemed.*] It would be an endleſs taſk, to rehearſe the names of all thoſe who have either tranſlated it, or procured new editions of it with notes, or with ſupplements (1). Let us only name a few. . . John "Tayant, a very learned Phyſician, has enlarged and "improved the Chirurgery of Gui de Cauliac, which is "borrowed from the Arabians, and from the Chirurgery "of the Greeks. He has ſet it off in his fine Latin, "which is as correct as that of Cicero, tho' the ſub-"ject they have treated, be very different (2)." They printed at Lyons in 1579, the Chirurgery of Gui de Cauliac, *newly reſtored to its dignity, by Lawrence Soubert, who beſides his new tranſlation (in French) has added ſeveral curious obſervations in the margin* (3).

(1) *See* Du Verdier, *Bibl. Franç.* pag. 519.
(2) Riolan, *Recherch. des Echoles de Medecine*, pag. 2, 3.
(3) Du Verdier, *Bibl. Franç.* pag. 785.

(*b*) Eleven years at Amiens, and nine at other places, Des Caurres, *Oeuvres Morales*, liv. 6. chap. 43. fol. m. 355 *verſo*.

CAURRES (JOHN DES) a native of Morœul (*a*) in Picardy, was Principal of the College of Amiens, and Canon of St. Nicholas in the ſame City. He had been a teacher of youth twenty years (*b*) when he publiſhed in 1575, a work, of which I ſhall ſpeak below [*A*]. He publiſhed ſome other books, the titles of which are given by la Croix du Maine, and Du Verdier Vau-Privas. He was ſtill living in the year 1584, *and continued to be uſeful to the public, as well by his learned works, as by his inſtructing the youth, which was*

(*a*) And not *Moroent*, as Du Verdier Vau-Privas ſays, *Bibl. Franç.* pag. 666.

[*A*] *He publiſhed a work, of which I ſhall ſpeak below.*] It is intitled, *Oeuvres morales, & diverſifiées en Hiſtoires pleines de beaux Exemples, enrichies d'enſeignemens vertueux, & embellies de pluſieurs Sentences, & Diſcours. Le tout tiré des plus ſignalez & remarquables Auteurs Grecs, Latins, & François, qui ont écrit de tous temps pour l'enſeignement des toutes perſonnes, qui aſpirent a vertu & Philoſophie Chreſtienne.* i. e. "Moral "Works, interſperſed with Hiſtories abounding with "noble inſtances of virtue, and adorned with beautiful "and inſtructive ſentences. The whole collected from "the moſt eminent and celebrated Authors, both "Greek, Latin and French; who wrote at any time "for the improvement of thoſe, that deſire to attain "at the knowledge of virtue and Chriſtian Philoſo-"phy." He cauſed this work to be printed at Paris by William Chaudiere, in the year 1575, 8vo. It contains 357 leaves. I have not ſeen the edition of the year 1583, which is half as large again (1). It was an eaſy taſk for the Author to make additions to ſuch a work; for he did not conſult the originals, but only tranſcribed modern Compilers, as Du Verdier Vau-Priva

(1) La Croix du Maine, *Bibliotb. Françoiſe*, pag. 214.

was committed to his care in the College of Amiens (c). He would meddle with Poetry, and made ſome very indifferent verſes in French. Thoſe he wrote upon the death of Admiral Coligni, and upon the execution of the Count de Montgomery, were full of the moſt bitter invectives; he was not even aſhamed of writing an Ode in praiſe of the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's-day. All theſe pieces are printed in the 4th book of his Moral Works. He had a very great opinion of his own merit, and thought that his eminent qualifications had expoſed him to the perſecutions of the envious [B]. He has acquainted me with a particular which was entirely unknown to me; namely, that there was a time when it was the faſhion for women to wear a looking glaſs upon their belly [C]. I do not know whether he was ever quoted amongſt the Roman Catholic Authors, who relate the ſtory of Pope Joan; but he deſerved it; for he relates that ſtory, without doubting of it in the leaſt (d).

(c) La Croix du Maine, *Biblioth. Franç.* pag. 214.

(d) Des Caurres, *Oeuvres Morales*, liv. 5. chap. 16. fol. m. 225, *verſo*.

Privas very well obſerves. *He has borrowed and collected* his Moral Works, *word for word, from ſeveral French Authors and Tranſlators, as the Anthology of Peter Breſlay of Anjou, the Commentary of John Coras upon the ſentence of Martin Guerre, James Grevin's Tranſlation of the Books concerning the Impoſtures of Devils, and from ſeveral other Books* (2).

(2) Du Verdier, *Bibl. Franç.* pag. 666.

It muſt be obſerved, that this Compiler ſtrangely falſifies and miſrepreſents things, or borrows them from very bad Authors; here follows an inſtance of this. He ſays, that Caligula's cruel temper was owing to his nurſe; and proves it after this manner: "Dion, a "Greek Hiſtorian, relates, that this cruel man was "in his infancy nurſed by a country-woman of Italy, "named Priſcilla, who has as much hair on her breaſt, "as men have beard on their chin; which is not na-"tural to women; and who could run the ring, "manage a horſe, ſhoot an arrow with ſo much dex-"terity, that few young Gentlemen at Rome could "be compared to her. It happened once, as ſhe was "going to give Caligula the breaſt, that one of her "ſervant-maids did ſomething amiſs; at which Priſ-"cilla fell into ſuch a paſſion, that ſhe killed her on "the ſpot; and beſmeared her breaſt with the maid's "blood, ſo that Caligula ſucked it in ſeveral times "and in a great quantity. She followed in this the "cuſtom of country-women, who paint their breaſt "with goat's blood, which they ſay make the chil-"dren grow ſtrong and luſty (3)." It is not true, that Dion relates this; when I read it in Des Caurres's Book I ſuſpected, that he ſtole it from Antonio de Guevara; and having conſulted his *Horloge des Princes*, I found that my conjecture was true. This Spaniſh Impoſtor (4) relates this pretended ſtory of Caligula's nurſe, as though he had read it in Dion, *in the ſecond Book of the Cæſars*. Des Caurres has tranſcribed many other things from Antonio de Guevara, without quoting him, and without denying himſelf the liberty of diſguiſing them a little.

(3) Des Caurres, *Oeuvres Morales*, liv. 2. chap. 25. folio 73.

(4) Antoine de Guevara, *Horloge des Princes*, liv. 2. chap. 21. pag. m. 703.

[B] *He thought that his eminent qualities had expoſed him to the perſecutions of the envious.*] He dedicates his Moral Works to *Monſeigneur Antoine, Sieur de Crequi*, and does not forget the common topic, that he did it, in hopes that *ſo illuſtrious a name being prefixed to his work*, he might thereby be able *to reſiſt and repulſe the attacks of the Zoilus's, the perpetual diſturbers of the happineſs of men* (5). *(For I can aſſure you, my Lord,* continues he, *that if we believe*, as far as *Further* excluſively: in the printed copy folio a iiii verſo of the Dedication prefixed to the *Moral Works of John des Caurres*. Paris, printed for Will. Chaudiere, 1575, 8vo. This Edition muſt be had, becauſe the Dedication is not printed in that of 1583 *.) Compare this with the remark [C] of ANTESIGNANUS.

(5) *Epitre Dedic. des* Oeuvres de Des Caurres, folio a iiii *verſo*.

* Theſe words, which we have put in a parentheſis, are not in the edition of Mr. Bayle's Dictionary publiſhed in 1720. I ſuppoſe they were taken from ſome papers found in his ſtudy after his death. They ſeem to be only a memorandum; and perhaps Mr. Bayle intended to tranſcribe ſomething more from Des Caurres's Dedication. ADDIT. REM.]

[C] *He has acquainted me ... that it was the faſhion for women to wear a looking-glaſs upon their belly.*] I believe, that this faſhion did not laſt long; but it may be of ſome uſe to obſerve, that it was once in vogue. John des Caurres cenſures it very bitterly. I ſhall tranſcribe a long paſſage, in which he condemns ſome other faſhions. "And here, (Ladies) I muſt aſk you, "whether you can poſſibly be acceptable to God, and "be ſaved, when you practiſe what he forbids? By "no means; and, whether you will or not, you muſt "either *untwiſt*, *unbat*, and *unnet* your hair, that "is, not wear it dreſſed in the manner of bat's wings, "and like nets, to catch the men diabolically, in or-"der to ſatisfy your diſorderly luſt, or you muſt be loſt "or damned for ever. For this is certainly a thing "prohibited both in the Old and New Teſtament. "If the King had forbidden, you would be forced to "obey; but as for God's Commandments, you will "not mind them, and will die, (as it is ſaid) in your "diſobedience and obſtinacy, thro' that worldly va-"nity and pride, which deceives you, and which "even makes you look ſo ugly and ſo abominable, "that if you knew, how much that hair-dreſs miſ-"becomes you, you would rather burn it than wear "it. Would to God, it was lawful to call all thoſe, "who appear in ſuch a dreſs, whores and proſtitutes "in order to reclaim them. O Lord! in what un-"happy times do we live! to ſee ſuch a deprava-"tion of manners, that even at church the women "wear looking-glaſſes, the inticements to lewdneſs, "hanging upon their belly. Conſult all the Hiſtories, "divine, human, and profane, and you will not find, "that even common proſtitutes ever wore them in "public, till this day, that the Devil is got looſe a-"mongſt us in France. This is ſtill more abominable "before God and men, than all the other abomina-"tions. And altho' none but Courtezans and maſked "Ladies wear them now, yet in time every Citizen's "wife, and every chamber-maid will follow the "faſhion, as they already begin to do (6)."

(6) Des Caurres, *Oeuvres Morales*, liv. 6. chap. 11, folio 305.

CAUSSIN (NICHOLAS) a French Jeſuit, and Confeſſor to Lewis XIII ſurnamed the Juſt, was born at Troyes in Champagne (a), in the year 1580. At the age of twenty ſix he entered into the Order of the Jeſuits, and gained a great reputation by teaching Rhetoric in ſeveral of their Colleges. He began afterwards to preach (b), and as the reputation he gained that way, was kept up and encreaſed by the books he publiſhed, it was thought he deſerved to be made ghoſtly Father to the King. He did not diſcharge the duties of his function to the ſatisfaction of the Prime-Miniſter [A], and it is the

(a) His father practiſed Phyſic there. *Eloge du Pere Cauſſin*, prefixed to the *Cour Sainte*.

(b) Alegambe, *Biblioth. Script. Societ. Jeſu*, pag. 351.

[A] *It was thought he deſerved to be made Ghoſtly Father to the King. He did not diſcharge the duties of his function to the ſatisfaction of the Prime Miniſter.*] F. Cauſſin's diſgrace at Court was one of thoſe events, about which men think much, and talk but little, and of which the cauſe is never preſently underſtood. However the Public has had ſome knowledge of it. It is pretended, that a little before this Jeſuit died, he gave to one of his friends the originals of ſome of his Letters, written in his own hand, to the General of his Order, to Father Seguiran, and to the Prince of Condé. It appears by ſome extracts of theſe Letters, which have been publiſhed (1), that Father Cauſſin fell under this diſgrace, becauſe he would not reveal ſome things, which

(1) See the *Entretiens d'Eudoxe & d'Euchariſte ſur l'Hiſtoire de l'Arianiſme & ſur l'Hiſtoire des Iconoclaſtes du Pere Maimbourg*, reprinted in Holland in the year 1683. That book was burnt at Paris by the common Hangman, in 1674.

common opinion, that it was because he behaved himself as an honest man ought to do. Some Authors assert, that he suffered himself to be deceived by the artifices of a Jesuit of the Duke of Savoy's Court [B]. There is some probability that he caballed, to get Cardinal Moreri has not been less mysterious than the two Jesuits who published the Bibliotheque of the Writers of their Order; he mentions neither this employment of F. Cauffin, nor his banishment from Court.

which he knew by the King's confession, not even take advice of his superiors, how he was to behave himself in the direction of the King's conscience, when he could not do it, without breaking thro' the laws of confession. There are some hints in the same extracts, which shew, that he did not approve Lewis XIII's conduct towards the Queen his Mother. Now, this was the most proper means to exasperate the Cardinal. Mr. de la Barde has observed, that his Eminence caused F. Cauffin to be removed, because he raised scruples in the King's mind about the hardships, which Mary de Medicis suffered. *Hic postea Ludovici XIII Regis Confessarius fuit, qui quoniam ei scrupulum injecerat, de Mariâ Reginâ Matre haud satis pie habitâ, atque Aulâ & Regni finibus abscedere coactâ, Aulâ & ipse Richelii operâ, cui cum Maria litis intercessere, successere prudens jussus fuerat* (2). The Author of Father Cauffin's Elogium very justly observes, that we ought to have a very great esteem for a man, who chose rather to draw upon himself the indignation of such a Cardinal, by following the dictates of his conscience, than to do the least thing against it in order to please that Minister. "It must be confessed, in honour to this generous "Father, that his conduct at Court was such as deserves to be had in admiration; he forced the whole "Court to own with astonishment, that he had an "uncommon generosity and strength of mind, since "being to cope with a man, who was powerful enough "either to load him with favours, or to crush him in "a moment, yet he never courted his favour, either "for himself or his friends, and did so little dread a "disgrace, that he rather chose to suffer in his own "person, than to do the least thing inconsistent with "the duty of a faithful Confessor. This indeed is a "very great encomium; [St. Augustin bestowed it on "his dear Alypius"; but it suits perfectly well with "the generous R. Cauffin's character; and is more glorious to him, than a thousand other things, that might "be said of him." The Author of this Elogium did not know, that F. Cauffin's Letters concerning his disgrace are in the hands of the Jansenists (4); who thinks they are lost; for he says, "I know that this affair was a "very great secret, and that when it happened, it "was ascribed by the public to very different reasons: but time has at last reconciled the various opinions of men, and the truth of the matter being "known, this heroic and glorious action has appeared in its full light. He had given an account of it "himself in an excellent Letter, which has been unluckily lost, and deserved yet to be published for the "satisfaction of the curious, if it could be found."

It is asserted, that this Jesuit did not believe, that *an attrition caused only by the fear of hell was sufficient to justify a man, who take the Sacrament* (5); it is even said, that his opinion upon this subject occasioned his disgrace. Monsieur Arnauld will be my voucher. "We have heard from very creditable persons of the late King's Court, that your F. Cauffin, "when he was that Prince's Confessor, thought it his "duty to declare to his Majesty, that this (attrition) "was not sufficient, and that a man could not be justified without the love of God. Cardinal de "Richelieu, who suspected him, took hold of this opportunity, to have him removed, and banished to "Quimper by persuading the King, that the Jesuit's "doctrine was erroneous. It was for this reason also, "that he afterwards employed all his credit to procure "a condemnation of what F. Sequenot had written upon this subject in his observations upon the Book "concerning the holy Virginity; for he told the King, "that F. Sequenot's opinion was the same with Father "Cauffin's, with which the latter had acquainted his "Majesty (6)."

We cannot sufficiently wonder at the silence of Father Alegambe and of his Continuator. The former, who published his Book after F. Cauffin's disgrace, does not even say, that he had been the King's Confessor: and the latter, who published his book after this Jesuit's death, says indeed, that he was Confessor to Lewis XIII, but without a word of his disgrace.

[B] *Some Authors assert, that he suffered himself to be deceived by the artifices of a Jesuit, of the Duke of Savoy's Court.*] Let us give an Abstract of what Monsieur Aubery published upon this subject (7). Father Monod, the Duchess of Savoy's Confessor, who had a design to embroil the affairs of France, laboured with an uncommon zeal, to have the Queen Mother recalled. *For which reason, in his journey to the Court of France, he took care to engage in an intimate friendship with Father Cauffin, who was also a Jesuit, and Confessor to the King, and to have several conferences with him, in which he had no great trouble to win him, and to gain as much power over him, as he desired, being a much greater Statesman and more cunning Courtier than F. Cauffin was,* and having as much wit and malice, *if we may believe the Cardinal-Duke in some of his Letters,* as the other had of simplicity and ignorance: *so that having already gained this point, he did not doubt, but he would succeed in his design, and was confident that so devout a Prince, as Lewis XIII was, would follow the directions and counsels of his Confessor in a matter of conscience. And indeed the King appeared very uneasy and anxious, since Father Cauffin had raised new scruples in his mind concerning the banishment of the Queen Mother, and had persuaded him to call her back, against the inclination and advice of his Prime-Minister. The Duke of Savoy acquainted the Cardinal with the correspondence and intrigues of the two Fathers* (8). *Others say, that they were found out thro' the imprudence of F. Cauffin, who being pressed by the Duke of Angoulême to grant him a Patent for an Abbey of Nuns, gave him to understand, that he must have patience till the Cardinal was removed, which would certainly be within a few days, and that he would then be quickly dispatched. The Duke gave* (8) *the Cardinal notice of this Father's intrigues; the Prime-Minister was very well pleased with the news, because it explained to him the cause of that great uneasiness under which the King had laboured of late. He endeavoured immediately to find out a remedy against this evil.* This remedy was a Note which he wrote to the King, and which very much puzzled the Confessor, who *was not proof against so heavy an attack, nor in a condition to resist in this open war. So that finding himself much the weaker, he was forced to submit, and to accept the terms which a powerful adversary would impose upon him, who caused him to be removed in a manner somewhat dishonourable to him, and to be banished to Quimpercorentin in Lower Britany* (9). Monsieur Aubery places this under the year 1639; but he furnishes us himself with an argument to prove that he mistook the year. *The Cardinal,* says he (10), *having thus humbled one of the Ghostly Fathers, he could not so easily subdue the other, or at least not so soon, tho' at last he had him punished in a more full and exemplary manner.* Some pages lower (10) he tells us, that on the 4th of Jan. 1639 the Duchess of Savoy gave the Cardinal notice, that Father Monod had been arrested. Most of the Historians, I mean those, who set down the year in the margin, are guilty of such blunders, more than it were to be wished. See the remark (G) towards the end.

It follows from this account, tho' one should give it the most favourable turn for the Cardinal, that Father Cauffin's design was only to recall Mary de Medicis. This design might certainly have been lawful; for it is hardly probable that a King can use his mother ill with a safe conscience. But yet it is certain, that considering in what condition France was in at that time, the King could not well keep Mary de Medicis at Court, without exposing the whole Kingdom to a great many disturbances, so much was that Princess then beset with busy persons, who had no other intentions but to imbroil the State. After all, it was very difficult to labour for the restoration of Queen Mary, without a design to ruin the Cardinal. An Author, whom I have quoted above, tells us, that Father Cauffin

(7) In the *Life of Cardinal de Richelieu*, liv. 6. chap. 16. pag. 474. of the 2d vol. Dutch edition.

(8) The Cardinal himself writes this, as Mr. Aubery asserts. Ibid. pag. 48.

(9) Ibid. pag. 50.

(10) Ibid. chap. 17. pag. 50.

(11) Pag. 63.

(2) Labatiscus, *de Rebus Gallicis*, lib. 9. *sub finem.*

(3) *Eloge du Père Cauffin*, prefixed to the *Cour Sainte*.

(4) This appears by the *Entretiens d'Eudoxe & d'Euchariste*, quoted above.

(5) Arnauld, in the last page of the Advertisement prefixed to the *IV Denonciation de l'Hérésie du Péché Philosophique.*

(6) Ibid.

Mirantibus omnibus insistatum Animam, quæ hominem tantum innumerabilibus præstandi, ostendique artibus celebratum, vel amicum non aspiraret vel non formidaret inimicum. S. Aug. *Conf.* lib. 6. cap. 10.

Cardinal de Richelieu removed [C]. However that be, he was deprived of his employment, and baniſhed to a City of Britany. He got leave to return to Paris after the Cardinal's death, and died there in the Convent of the Jeſuits July the 2d 1651 [D]. None of his works did him more honour than that which he intitled, *La Cour Sainte* [E]. He publiſhed ſeveral other books both in Latin and in French [F]. They relate very extraordinary circumſtances of his ſympathy with the Sun (c). The Sieur Bullart has committed ſome blunders with regard to Chronology [G].

(c) See the Remark [G] quotation (28).

I have

ſin laboured effectually to procure a reconciliation between Lewis XIII and the Queen his Conſort, and by that means to put a ſtop to that Princeſs's barrenneſs. This, I think, is moſt probably the ſenſe, which we can put upon that Author's words. Lewis the XIIIth, ſays he (12), *gave Father Cauſſin a very free acceſs to him, and being extremely pleaſed with his converſations, granted him a conſiderable ſhare in his favour, and even admitted him with great familiarity. The confidence he repoſed in him was grounded on the knowledge he had of that worthy Father's eminent qualities, by which he had ſo eaſily and ſo ſoon gained his Majeſty's heart. It was not doubted in the leaſt, but the generous and ſtrong inclination he had for his King's ſervice and glory, inſpired him with a very great zeal for the public good, and made him endeavour to eſtabliſh a good underſtanding between all the perſons of the Royal Family, which was the chief deſign of all his actions. And we have been informed by faithful and unqueſtionable witneſſes, that it is to his wiſe Counſels France is partly beholden for the valuable preſent ſhe received from heaven, and ſtill enjoys in the ſacred perſon of her auguſt Prince, the worthy ſon of his father, whoſe great virtues he has inherited.*

(12) *Eloge du Pere Cauſſin.*

[C] *There is ſome probability, that he caballed to get Cardinal de Richelieu removed.*] If we may believe the Abbé Siri in his Memoirs (13), this Jeſuit, in his private converſations with the King, inſiſted upon the Cardinal's removal for the four following reaſons. 1. Becauſe the Queen-mother was baniſhed. 2. Becauſe his eminence left Lewis XIII only the empty name of King. 3. Becauſe this Miniſter oppreſſed the nation. 4. Becauſe he powerfully aſſiſted the Proteſtants to the great prejudice of the Catholic Church. F. Cauſſin even engaged to maintain theſe four articles againſt the Cardinal in the King's preſence, and he offered the Cardinal's place to the Duke of Angoulême. The Duke having acquainted the Prime Miniſter with this plot, was the occaſion of F. Cauſſin's diſgrace, according to the Abbé Siri.

(13) Tom. 8. pag. 573, &c. They who cannot conſult theſe Memoirs, may read the new *Life of Cardinal de Richelieu* [By Mr. Le Clerc] publiſhed at Amſterdam in 1694, tom. 2. pag. 312, &c.

[D] *He died . . . July the 2d 1651.*] Moreri, who was miſtaken with regard to the time when F. Cauſſin entered amongſt the Jeſuits (14), has been ſtill more miſtaken with regard to the year of his death, he places it in 1655. Meſſieurs Bullart and Witte have rightly placed the time of our Jeſuit's death, but then they are in the wrong with regard to the length of his life; the one ſays, that F. Cauſſin died *July the 2d* 1651 *in the 69th year of his age* (15); the other pretends, that he died July the 2d, 1651 in his 81ſt year, and in the 57th ſince his entering amongſt the Jeſuits (16). This does not agree, either with F. Alegambe, or with F. Southwell; according to the former Cauſſin entered amongſt the Jeſuits in the year 1606, and was then twenty ſix years old; whence it follows that he died in the 71ſt year of his age, and the 45th ſince he was a Jeſuit. But F. Southwell ſays, that Cauſſin became a Jeſuit at the age of twenty ſix, in the year of 1596; whence it would follow, that he died aged eighty one, and had not been a Jeſuit above 55 years. I think we ought to follow F. Alegambe's account.

(14) He ſays, that Cauſſin turned Monk, in 1605; it was in 1606, according to Alegambe, and in 1596, according to Southwell.

(15) Bullart, *Acad. des Scienc.* tom. 2. pag. 225.

(16) Witte, *Diar. Biograph.*

[E] *None of his works did him more honour, than that which he entitled,* la Cour Sainte.] It has been printed a great many times (17), and tranſlated into Latin, Italian, Spaniſh, Portugueſe, German, and Engliſh (18). The firſt edition of the firſt volume was publiſhed in the year 1625, 8vo. The other volumes followed ſoon after. I ſhall below (19) cenſure Mr. Bullart, who ſays that Cauſſin retired from the Court in order to compoſe his *Cour Sainte*; he ſhould have ſaid, that he reviſed and enlarged it during his diſgrace.

(17) My edition is of Bruſſels 1664, in 2 vol. 4to. There is another of Paris, 1680, in 2 vol. fol.

(18) Sotuel, *Bibliotb. Societ. Jeſu*, pag. 627.

(19) Remark [G] quotation (30).

[F] *He publiſhed ſeveral other Books both in Latin and in French.*] The firſt eſſays of his pen were the ſacred ſymbols, ſome pieces of Poetry inſerted in the *Pompe Royale*, and the *Compariſon between ſacred and profane Eloquence* (20). He wrote theſe three Books *being ſtill pretty young*, as the Author of his Elogium ſays. And yet it is obſerved in the Bibliotheque of the Jeſuit Writers, that the *Electorum Symbolorum & Parabolicarum Hiſtoricarum Syntagma, ſeu de Symbolica Ægyptiorum Sapientia & Polybiſtoris Symboliti Libri XII.* ("A Commentary upon Symbols and parabolical Hiſtories of the Egyptians; or twelve ſymbolical Books concerning the ſymbolical wiſdom and learning of the Egyptians,") was printed at Paris in 1618; and that the *Eloquentiæ ſacræ & humanæ Parallela* was printed at la Fléche * in 1690. The Author was then very near forty years old according to Father Alegambe's account, or very near fifty according to Father Southwell's, when he publiſhed theſe two Books. Can it be ſaid of a man of that age, that he is *ſtill pretty young?* Amongſt his other Works I ſhall take notice chiefly of his apology for the ſociety of the Jeſuits, printed in 1644; his anſwers to the objections concerning Moral Theology; the triumph of Piety, which he publiſhed on occaſion of the taking of Rochelle in 1629; the anſwer which he publiſhed three years after to Mr. Drelincourt's Book (21) againſt that triumph of Piety; the *Angelus Pacis*, (Angel of Peace) printed in 1650; the *Regnum Dei, ſeu Diſſertationes in Libros Regnum cum aliis tractatibus.* (The Kingdom of God, or Diſſertations upon the Books of Kings, with ſome other Tracts) printed alſo in the year 1650 (22).

(20) *Eloge du Père Cauſſin.* See the laſt Remark.

* A ſmall City in the Province of Anjou, in which there is a famous College of the Jeſuits founded by King Henry IV.

(21) This book of Mr. Drelincourt is the 2d Part of the *Triomphe de l'Egliſe ſous la Croix.* The Author tells us in his Preface, that Cauſſin had made uſe, in his book, of all poſſible artifices, in order to prove, that the taking of Rochelle was an argument that this City was heretical. Mr. Drelincourt confutes this fancy unanſwerably in his Preface.

[G] *The Sieur Bullart has committed ſome blunders with regard to Chronology.*] I have already obſerved (23) his miſtake concerning Father Cauſſin's age. Let us examine now his other blunders. "It was not "long ſince he (*Father Cauſſin*) had conſecrated him-"ſelf to God, under the habit and according to "the Statutes of St. Ignatius, when he preſented "the public with the firſt fruits of his labours. It "was a curious Book concerning the Sacred Symbols; "in which the Author diving into the Hieroglyphicks "of the Egyptians, explains the enigmas which an "ancient Writer hid under thoſe myſtical figures (24)."

We have obſerved already, that this Book was printed in 1618, that is, according to Father Alegambe twelve years, according to Southwell twenty two years, after Cauſſin entered amongſt the Jeſuits. As I cannot compare the different editions of the Book *De Symbolica Ægyptiorum Sapientia*, I deſire thoſe, who have an opportunity to do it, that they would examine, whether the approbation of the Provincial of the Jeſuits be rightly dated in the Edition of Cologne. In my Edition, which is of Cologne, 1631, 8vo, the approbation is dated from la Fleche November the 19th, 1627. I do not doubt but the Printers put 1627 inſtead of 1617: ſo that I will not inſiſt upon this date, to prove that the Book concerning the Hieroglyphicks of the Egyptians was not the Jeſuit Cauſſin's firſt Eſſay. The Preface of that Work might furniſh me with an argument to prove this; for the Author ſays, that whilſt he compoſed his Rhetoriek, he thought of this work. *Cum Libros de triplici eloquentia & apparatum quendam ex florentiſſimæ exemplorum copia ad oratoriam facultatem inſtruerem, adjeci quoque animum ad ſymbolicam veterum ſapientiam*, i. e. "Whilſt I compoſed my Books concerning the three "kinds of eloquence, and collected ſome inſtances of fine "oratorial touches from the rich ſtores which are left us, "I alſo applied my ſelf to the ſymbolical wiſdom of the "Ancients." Obſerve, that he had publiſhed a collection of Greek Poems (25) in the year 1612; and a Latin tranſlation of a work of Richeome (26) in the year 1613; ſo that ſtrictly ſpeaking, one could not ſay, that his expoſition of the Hieroglyphicks was the *firſt Eſſay of his pen. Theſe excellent Works* (theſe are Mr. Bullart's words (27), and he ſpeaks, 1. of the ſacred ſymbols. 2. Of the Royal Pomp; 3. The Compariſon of the Sacred and Profane Eloquence) *having rendered his name famous at Court amongſt the learned, his ſuperiors deſired*

(22) Taken from Southwell, *Bibliotb. Societ. Jeſu*, pag. 627.

(23) Above, Remark [D], quotation (15), &c.

(24) *Académie des Arts & des Sciences*, tom. 2. pag. 224.

(25) *Theſaurus Græcæ Perſeos ex omnibus Græcis Poetis collectus*, Alegambe, *Bibliotb. Soc. Jeſu*, pag. 351.

(26) *Vertit è Gallico Latinè juſta Funebri Henrico Magno Galliarum Regi a Ludovico Richeomo ſcripta.* Idem, ibid.

(27) *Académie des Artes & des Sciences*, tom. 2. pag. 224.

I have juſt been reading a Letter (*d*), in which it is aſſerted, that the Queen-mother obliged him to leave Paris, and baniſhed him into Britany, to pleaſe Cardinal Mazarin, whom he had diſobliged; and that his diſgrace was occaſioned by his book *de Regno & Domo Dei* (concerning the Kingdom and Houſe of God) publiſhed in 1650, in which he had made a very good obſervation upon the qualities with which Princes ought to be adorned.

(*d*) Of Gui Patin, printed with thoſe of ſome other eminent men at Amſterdam, *ex Muſæo Joannis Brandt*, anno 1702, 8vo. See pag. 200.

that the Prince ſhould alſo know him perſonally. Father Gonteri, one of the moſt celebrated Preachers of the Society, conducted him to the Louvre, and preſented him to Henry IV, who received him very kindly, and obſerving the brightneſs which ſhone in his face, he ſaid, that F. Cauſſin would become one of the moſt eminent men of his Society. This is confounding the times in a very groſs manner: for theſe three Works of Father Cauſſin were not publiſhed till after the death of Henry IV. The Symbols, according to Mr. Bullart, were printed in the year 1618. The account which we read in Father Cauſſin's Elogy, is not more exact with regard to Chronology. Here follow the words of the Author of that Elogium (28). "Father Cauſſin "had a very extraordinary ſympathy with the hea- "vens, eſpecially with the ſun, which he called his "*ſtar*, and which had very remarkable effects both "upon his body and ſoul, according as it was more "or leſs diſtant, or as it ſhined bright or was covered "with clouds. The effects of the ſun upon him "were not tranſient, but appeared conſtantly by the "ſparkling of his eyes, and the lively colour of "his face, which had ſomething celeſtial, that made "a very ſtrong impreſſion upon the mind of Henry "the Great. This Prince, who could diſtinguiſh the "character of men with ſo much ſagacity, obſerved "one day very attentively our Cauſſin, who being "ſtill very young, had accompanied F. Gonteri, one "of the moſt famous Preachers of his time, to Court. "The King had never ſeen him before, nor heard of "him; but as ſoon as he perceived him, he went to "him, and obliging the crowd to make room for "him, took him by the hand, and treated him with "ſo much kindneſs, that young Cauſſin was aſhamed, "and the by-ſtanders aſtoniſhed; but the King ſaid, "that he had diſtinguiſhed this youth amongſt the "crowd, and expected that he would ſerve him and "his family faithfully, and ſpeaking to F. Gonteri, "he told him with a loud voice, as a very remarka- "ble omen, *Father, you have here an attendant, who "if I am not miſtaken, will become in time one of "the greateſt ornaments of your Society.*" Compare this with Mr. Bullart's account: what a great difference will you not find between the original and the tranſcript? For we may be ſure, that Mr. Bullart took his account from the Elogium of F. Cauſſin, and gave it a turn after his own fancy. He has not ſucceeded better in the following paſſage. Father Cauſſin "ac- "cepted indeed this difficult poſt (29), and diſcharged "his duty in it for ſome time with a great deal of "prudence and piety; but ſeeing the Royal Family "at variance, he reſigned his employment with very "little concern, and returned into his Convent, where "being free from the vexations of a profane Court, "he employed all his thoughts in the compoſition "of that great and admirable work, which he in- "titled, *La Cour Sainte*." Now, this Work was already tranſlated into Latin, before Father Cauſſin left the Court (30); and it was by no means of his own accord that he left it; he was obliged to ſubmit to the arbitrary will and to the perſecutions of the Prime Miniſter; nor did he retire into his Convent, but was baniſhed into Lower-Britanny.

(28) Pag. 1, 2.

(29) That of Confeſſor to Lewis XIII.

(30) You will ſee in Alegambe, pag. 157, that Henry Lamormaini tranſlated moſt of the books of the *Cour Sainte* in 1636, and 1637, and F. Cauſſin was baniſhed in December 1637, if I am not miſtaken.

I am perſuaded that moſt of the Elogiums of illuſtrious men abound with ſuch Chronological blunders, and that the Authors of thoſe Elogiums are oftener guilty of the ſophiſm, called *a non cauſa pro cauſa*, than the ſchoolmen. That is they miſtake the cauſes of the facts they relate. To avoid this, it would be proper to write the lives of eminent men in the form of Annals. But the Annaliſts themſelves are not free from Anachroniſms. For they often relate an affair only under the year in which they were finiſhed; in this caſe, they reſume the affair higher, relate the origin and progreſs of it, and relate in a breath all that paſſed in five or ſix years time, without mentioning any date; ſo that they lead their Readers out of the road of an exact Chronology.

☞CAXTON (WILLIAM), eminent for the works which he publiſhed, and for introducing the Art of Printing into England, was born in the Weeld of Kent, as he tells us himſelf (*a*), bred very reputably in the way of trade, and ſerved an apprenticeſhip to Mr. Robert Large, a Mercer, who after having been Sheriff and Lord Mayor of London, died in 1441, and left by will xxiiii Marks to his apprentice William Caxton, a conſiderable legacy in thoſe days, and an early teſtimonial of his good character and integrity (*b*). From the time of his maſter's death, he ſpent the following thirty years beyond Sea in the buſineſs of Merchandize; where in the year 1464 we find him employed by King Edward IV in a public and honourable negociation, jointly with one Richard Whitehill Eſq; to tranſact and conclude a treaty of commerce between the King and his brother-in-law the Duke of Burgundy, to whom Flanders belonged. The commiſſion ſtiles them *Ambaſſiatores, Procuratores, Nuncios, & Deputatos ſpeciales*, and gives to both or either of them full powers to treat &c. (*c*). He was undoubtedly the firſt who introduced the Art of Printing into England [*A*], and publiſhed ſeveral works, either of

(*a*) See his Preface to the *Recuyll of the Hiſtoryes of Troye*. Dr. Fuller in his *Worthies* is miſtaken in ſaying that he was born at Caxton in Hertfordſhire.

(*b*) Dr. Conyers Middleton's *Diſſertation concerning the Origin of Printing in England; ſhewing that it was firſt introduced and practiſed by our Countryman* William Caxton *at* Weſtminſter, *and not, as is commonly believed, by a foreign Printer at* Oxford. pag. 19. edit. Cambridge 1735, in 4to.

(*c*) Rymer's *Fœdera*, tom. xi. pag. 536. *and* Mattaire's *Annal. Typograph.* Append. ad tom. 1. pag. 33.

[*A*] *He was undoubtedly the firſt, who introduced the Art of Printing into England.*] This point has been very accurately diſcuſſed by the learned and ingenious Conyers Middleton, D. D. principal Librarian of the Univerſity of Cambridge, in his *Diſſertation concerning the origin of Printing in England; ſhewing that it was firſt introduced and practiſed by our countryman* William Caxton, *at* Weſtminſter; *and not, as is commonly believed, by a foreign Printer at* Oxford (1). He obſerves (2), that it was a conſtant tradition delivered down by Hiſtorians, that Caxton by his travels abroad and reſidence of many years in Holland, Flanders, and Germany, in the affairs of trade, had an opportunity of informing himſelf of the whole method and proceſs of the Art of Printing, and by the encouragement of the Great, and particularly of the Abbot of Weſtminſter, firſt ſet up a preſs in that Abbey, and began to print Books ſoon after the year 1471. This tradition was univerſally received, till a book, which had ſcarce been obſerved before the reſtoration, was then taken notice of by the curious, with a date of its impreſſion from Oxford, *anno* 1468, and was conſidered immediately as a clear proof and monument of the exerciſe of Printing in that Univerſity ſeveral years before Caxton began to deal in it. The Book, which is in the public Library at Cambridge, is a ſmall volume of forty one leaves in quarto with this title: *Expoſicio Sancti Jeronimi in Simbolum Apoſtolorum ad Papam Laurentium*; and at the end, *Explicit expoſicio, &c. Impreſſa Oxonie, & finita an. Dom. M.CCCC.LXVIII, xvii die Decembris**. The appearance of this book robbed *Caxton* of a glory which he had long poſſeſſed, of being author of printing in this Kingdom, and Oxford ever ſince carried the honour of the firſt Preſs. The only difficulty was to account for the ſilence of Hiſtory in an event ſo memorable, and the want of any memorial in the Univerſity

(1) Printed at Cambridge 1735, in 4to.

(2) Pag. 1, 2.

* *See* Mattaire's *Annal. Typog.* vol. 1. pag. 63. edit. Hagæ-Comit. 1719, in 4to.

of his own compoſition, or tranſlated by him [*B*]. Dr. Middleton obſerves (*d*), that whoever turns over his printed works, muſt contract a reſpect for him, and be convinced that he preſerved the ſame character through life of an honeſt, modeſt man, greatly induſtrious to do good to his country to the beſt of his abilities, by ſpreading among the people

(*d*) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 20.

Univerſity itſelf, concerning the eſtabliſhment of a new art amongſt them, of ſuch uſe and benefit to learning. But this was likewiſe cleared up by the diſcovery of a record, mentioned in the Article of ATKYNS (*Richard*) (3), in which it is ſaid that "Thomas Bourchier, Archbiſhop of Canterbury, moved "Henry II to uſe all poſſible means to bring the Art "of Printing over to England, and that the King "approving the propoſal, diſpatched Mr. Robert Turniſour, an officer of the Robes, into Flanders, furniſhed with money for the purpoſe; who took to "his aſſiſtance *William Caxton*, a man of abilities and "knowledge of the country; and theſe two found "means to bribe and intice over into England one "*Frederic Corſellis*, an under-workman in the Printing-houſe at Harlem, where John Guttemberg had "lately invented the Art, and was then perſonally at "work; which *Corſellis* was immediately ſent down "to Oxford under a guard, to prevent his eſcape, and "to oblige him to the performance of his contracts," where he produced the piece abovementioned, but without any name of the Printer. Dr. Middleton examines this pretended record, and makes ſeveral obſervations upon it, and at laſt (4) pronounces it to be a forgery, and tells us, that Mr. Atkyns, *who ſeems by his manner of writing to have been a bold and vain man, might poſſibly be the inventor; for he had an intereſt in impoſing it upon the world, in order to confirm the argument of his book, that* Printing was of the Prerogative-Royal, *in oppoſition to the Company of Stationers; with whom he was engaged in an expenſive ſuit of law, in defence of the King's Patents, under which he claimed ſome excluſive powers of Printing.* With regard to the Book abovementioned, which ſtands as a monument of the exerciſe of Printing in Oxford, *ſix years older* than any Book of *Caxton* with date, the Doctor obſerves (5), that there are ſuch contrary facts to ballance it, and ſuch circumſtances to turn the ſcale, that he takes the date in queſtion to have been falſified originally by the Printer, either by deſign or miſtake, and an X to have been dropt or omitted in the age of its impreſſion; of which examples are very common in the Hiſtory of Printing. Beſides, not to inſiſt on what is leſs material, the neatneſs of the letter, and regularity of the page, &c. above thoſe of Caxton, it has one mark, which ſeems to carry the matter beyond probable, and to make it even certain, viz. *the uſe of Signatures*, or letters of the alphabet placed at the bottom of the page, to ſhew the ſequel of the ſheets and leaves of each Book, an improvement contrived for the direction of the Book-binders; which yet was not practiſed or invented at the time when this Book was ſuppoſed to be printed (6). What further confirms this opinion is, that from the time of the pretended date of this Book, *anno* 1468, we have no other fruit or production from the Preſs at Oxford for eleven years next following; and it cannot be imagined that a Preſs, eſtabliſhed with ſo much pains and expence, could be ſuffered to lie ſo long idle and uſeleſs; whereas if the Doctor's conjecture be admitted, all the difficulties, which ſeem inſuperable and inconſiſtent with the ſuppoſed Æra of Printing there, will vaniſh at once (7). Dr. Middleton afterwards proceeds (8) to ſtate the poſitive evidence, which remains of Caxton's being the firſt Printer of this Kingdom, and obſerves, that all our Writers before the Reſtoration, who mention the introduction of the Art amongſt us, give him the credit of it without any contradiction or variation. Stowe in his *Survey of London*, ſpeaking of the XXXVII year of Henry VI, or *ann.* 1459. ſays, *The noble Science of Printing was about this time found at* Magunce *by* John Guttemberg *a Knight; and* William Caxton *of London Mercer brought it into England about the year* 1471, *and firſt practiſed the ſame in the Abbey of* Weſtminſter. Truſſel in his *Hiſtory of Henry VI*, and Sir Richard Baker in his *Chronicle*, give the ſame account; and Mr. James Howell in his *Londinopolis* (*) deſcribes the place, where Iſlip the Abbot of Weſtminſter ſet up the *firſt Preſs for* Caxton's *uſe* in the *Almonry* or *Ambry*. But above all the famous John Leland, Library-Keeper to Henry VIII, who by way of honour had the title of *the Antiquary*, and lived near to Caxton's own time, in his *Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis* (9) expreſly ſtiles him *Angliæ Prototypographus*, i. e. "the firſt Printer of "England;" and as he had ſpent ſome time in Oxford, after having firſt ſtudied and taken a degree at Cambridge, he could hardly be ignorant of the origin and hiſtory of Printing in that Univerſity. Mr. Henry Wharton in his *Appendix* to Dr. Cave's *Hiſtoria Literaria* (10), affirms Caxton to have been the firſt, who imported the Art of Printing into this Kingdom; *primuſque omnium artem typographicam Angliæ intulit*; upon whoſe authority it is probable, that Monſr du Pin (11) ſtiles him *the firſt Printer in England*. To the atteſtation of our Hiſtorians, who are clear in favour of Caxton, and quite ſilent concerning an earlier Preſs at Oxford, the Works of Caxton himſelf add great confirmation. The rudeneſs of the letter, irregularity of the page, want of ſignatures, initial letters &c. in his firſt impreſſions, give a prejudice at ſight of their being the firſt productions of the Art amongſt us. But beſides theſe circumſtances, Dr. Middleton (12) has taken notice of a paſſage at the end of the third Book of his *Recuyell or gadryng together of the Hiſtories of Troye*, printed without a date in fol. which amounts in a manner to a direct teſtimony of it. *Thus end I this book*, &c. *and for as moche as in wrytyng of the ſame my penne is worn, myn hands wery, and myn eyen dimmed with over moche lokyng on the white paper— and that age creepeth on me dayly—and alſo becauſe I have promyſed to dyvers Gentilmen and to my frendes to addreſſe to hem as haſtely as I myght this ſayd Book, therefore I have practyſed, and lerned at my grete charge and diſpenſe to ordeyne this ſayd Book in prynt after the maner and forme as ye may here ſee, and is not wreten with penne and ynke as other bokes ben to thende that every man may have them attenes, for all the bookes of this ſtorye named, the Recule of the Hiſtoryes of Troyes, thus emprynted as ye here ſee, were begonne in oon day, and alſo finiſhed in oon day &c.* Now this is the very ſtyle and language of the firſt Printers, as every body knows, who has been at all converſant with old Books. *Fauſt* and *Sheffer*, the inventors, ſet the example in their firſt Works from Mentz, by advertiſing the public at the end of each, that "they were not drawn "or written by a pen (as all Books had been before) "but made by a new Art and Invention of Printing, "or ſtamping them by characters or types of metal, "ſet in forms." In imitation of whom the ſucceeding Printers in moſt cities of Europe, where the Art was new, generally gave the like advertiſement, as we may ſee from Venice, Rome, Naples, Verona, Baſil, Auſburg, Louvain, &c. juſt as our Caxton in the inſtance above (13).

(3) Note [*B*] vol. 2. pag. 410.

(4) Pag. 6.

(5) Pag. 7.

(6) Ibid. pag. 9.

(7) Ibid. pag. 10.

(8) Pag. 14.

(*) Pag. 353.

(9) Tom. 2. cap. 586. pag. 480. edit. Oxon. 1709. He calls him *Caxodunus*.

(10) Pag. 39. ed. Colon. Allobrog. 1720 in fol.

(11) *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Cent. 14. pag. 71. edit. Engl.

(12) Pag. 15, 16.

(13) Idem, ibid. pag. 16.

[*B*] *Publiſhed ſeveral works, either of his own compoſition, or tranſlated by him.*] We ſhall give a Catalogue of them from Bale, Pits, Mattaire's *Annales Typographici*, Palmer's *General Hiſtory of Printing*, and Dr. Middleton's Diſſertation. I. *Fructus Temporum*, or *Frute of Tymes*, printed in 1483. There was likewiſe another edition printed at Weſtminſter by Winken de Worde in 1497 (14), and another at London 1515 in fol. (15). II. *The Life and Hiſtory of King Arthur*, in 21 Books, written and printed by Caxton at Weſtminſter in 1480 in fol. III. *Thymage or Mirrour of the World, tranſlated from the Frenſhe, and fyniſhed the VIII of Marche, the XXI yere of Kynge Edward IV.* Printed at Weſtminſter 1480 in fol. Caxton tells us, that "it treteth of the World and the "wonderful Dyviſion thereof; in whiche a man reſonable may ſee by the figures therein the ſituacion "and movyng of the Firmament, and how the uny"verſal Erthe hangeth in the myddle of the ſame— "tranſlated out of Latyn into Frenche 1245, and now "rudely out of Frenſhe into Engliſhe by me ſymple "perſone William Caxton &c." IV. *A Deſcripcion of Britayne and Irlond, taken oute of the Policronicon. Fyniſhed XVIII of Auguſt.* Printed at Weſtminſter 1480 in fol. V. *Polycronicon; compiled in Latin by Ranulph Higden,*

(14) Idem, ibid. pag. 13.

(15) Nicholſon's *Engliſh Hiſtorical Library*, Part I. p. 5. edit. London in 8vo.

people ſuch books as he thought uſeful to Religion and good manners, which were chiefly tranſlated from the French. The novelty and uſefulneſs of his art recommended him to the ſpecial notice and favour of the Great, under whoſe protection and at whoſe expence the greateſt part of his works were publiſhed. Some of them are addreſſed to King Edward IV, his brother the Duke of Clarence, and their ſiſter the Ducheſs of Burgundy, in whoſe ſervice and pay he lived many years before he began to print (*d*), as he often acknowledges with great gratitude. He printed likewiſe for the uſe, and by the expreſs order of Henry VII, and his ſon Prince Arthur, and many of the principal Nobility and Gentry of that age; all which confirms the notion of his being the firſt Printer; for he would hardly have been ſo much careſſed and employed, had there been an earlier and abler Artiſt all the while at Oxford, who yet had no employment at all for the ſpace of eleven years. It has been generally aſſerted and believed, that all his books were printed in the Abbey of Weſtminſter; yet we have no aſſurance of it from himſelf, nor any mention of the place before the year 1477; ſo that he had been printing ſeveral years, without telling us where (*e*). Mr. Echard in his *Hiſtory of England*, at the end of Edward the IV's reign, among the Learned of that age, mentions *William Caxton as a Writer of Engliſh Hiſtory*, but ſeems to doubt whether he was the *ſame with the Printer* of that name. Had he looked into Caxton's books, the doubt would have been cleared. There is no exact account of Caxton's age; but he was certainly very old, and probably above fourſcore at the time of his death. In the year 1471 he complained at the end of his *Recuelyl* (*f*) of the infirmities of age creeping upon him, and feebling his body; yet he lived twenty three years after, and purſued his buſineſs with extraordinary diligence in the Abbey of Weſtminſter till the year 1494, in which he died (*g*). Voſſius (*h*) remarks, that Simler, and Poſſevinus who generally follows the former, repreſent him as flouriſhing in the year 1538, which is a very flagrant miſtake. It is a little ſurpriſing that neither Bale, nor Pits, nor Voſſius, ſhould take the leaſt notice in their articles of him of his having been the firſt Printer in England. He collected Chaucer's Works, and publiſhed an edition of them. Bale ſtiles him a man not *abſolutely ſtupid* or *indolent* (*i*). But Pits (*k*) gives him a more advantageous character, and tells us, that he was a man of piety, learning, and induſtry, and though ſollicitous for his own reputation, yet much more zealous for the honour of his country. John Major, the Scots Hiſtorian, in his fourth book, acknowledges, that he had tranſlated ſeveral Hiſtories of our Author out of Engliſh into Latin, and taken the greateſt part of his own work from thence (*l*).

(*d*) Idem, ibid. *See* Caxton's Preface to his *Recuelyl of the Hiſtoryes of Troye*, and Balæus, *Scriptor. Illuſt. Major. Brytann. Catalog.* Cent. 8. cap. 43. pag. 618. edit. Baſil. 1557, in fol. *and* Pitſeus *de illuſtrib. Angliæ Scriptor.* num. 882. pag. 670.

(*e*) Dr. Middleton, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 20.

(*f*) See note [*A*].

(*g*) Dr. Middleton, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 21.

(*h*) *De Hiſtor. Latinis*, lib. 3. cap. 9. pag. 636, 637. edit. Francofurti *ad Mænum* 1677, in 4to.

(*i*) *Vir non omnino ſtupidus, aut ignavid torpens*, &c.

(*k*) *Ubi ſupra.*

(*l*) *See* Pits, *ubi ſupra, and* Voſſius, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 636.

CAYET

Higden, Monk of Cheſtre. Tranſlated into Engliſhe by John Treviſa, vycarye of Barkeley, at the requeſt of Thomas Lord Barkeley. Continued from 1357 *to* 1460 *by me ſymple perſon William Caxton.* Ended 2d of Juyll xxii of Edward IV, a thouſand four honderd and foureſcore and tweyne. Printed at Weſtminſter in fol. 1482. VI. *Life of King Edward the Confeſſor.* VII. *The Game of the Cheſſe*, tranſlated out of Frenche into Engliſhe. Weſtminſter 1474 in fol. VIII. *The Cronicles of England*; fyniſhed the X of Juyn, and enprynted in the Abbey of Weſtmeſtre. Fol. 1480. IX. *Godefrey of Boloyne, or the laſt Siege and Conqueſt of Jheruſalem; tranſlated out of Frenſhe in thAbbaye of Weſtmeſtre.* Fol. 1481. X. *The Legende of Sayntes, called the Golden Legende; tranſlated out of Frenſhe, and fynyſhed the XX day of November the fyrſt yere of Kyng Richard the thyrd, at Weſtmeſtre.* Fol. 1483. XI. *The Boke called* Caton [or Cato's Precepts in Latin, with a Verſion and Comment in Engliſh,] *tranſlated out of Frenſhe in thAbbaye of Weſtmynſtre, XXIII of Decembre. the firſt of Rychard III. dedicated to the Cyte of London.* Fol. 1483. XII. *The book of thEnſeignmentes and techynge that the Knyght of the Toure made to his daughters. Tranſlated out of the Frenche, Enprynted the laſt day of Janyver, the firſt of Richard III.* Fol. 1483. *XIII. The Ryal Book, or Book for a Kyng; in whiche ben compryſed the X Commandements, the XII Artycles of the Fayth, the VII dedely Synnes, the VII Petycions of the* Pater noſter, *the Yeftes of the Holy Ghooſt, the VII Vertues, &c. reduced out of Frenſhe into Engliſhe at the requeſt of a ſingular Frende, a Mercer of London. Fyniſhed XIII Septem. the ſecond of Rich III.* Fol. 1484. XIV. *The Hiſtory of the noble and valiant Knyght Parys and the fair Vyenne the daughter of the Doulphin of Viennois.* Tranſlated out of French into Engliſh by William Caxton of Weſtminſter, finiſhed the laſt of Auguſt 1485, and imprinted the XIX of Decem. the ſame year. XV. *The Book of Good maners; delyvered to me by a ſpecyal frende of myn a Mercer of London named William Praat; tranſlated out of Frenſhe. Fynyſhed the VIII of Juyn M. IIIICLXXXVI, firſt yere of Kyng Henry the VII. enprynted XI of Maye after.* Fol. 1487. XVI. *The Doctrinal of Sapyence, right utile and prouffytable to alle Chryſten Men; tranſlated out of Frenche at Weſtmeſter, and fynyſhed VII of May.* 1489. XVII. *The Book of the Fayt of Armes and Chyvalrie, whiche Chryſtyne of Pyſe drewe out of Vegecius* de re militari, *which being in Frenche was delyvered to me by the mooſt Chriſten Kyng my Soverayn Lord Hen. VII. to be tranſlated into Engliſhe, XXIII of Jan. the III yere of his reign. Enprynted XXIIII Juyll next following.* Fol. 1489. XVIII. *The Boke of Eneydos -- made in Latyn by that noble Poet, and grete Clerke Vyrgyle ... tranſlated from the Frenche into Engliſhe XXII Juyn, fyfthe of Hen. VII,* Fol. 1490. XIX. *The Recueyll or gadryng togeder of the hiſtoryes of Troye*, tranſlated out of French. Fol. XX. *The Lyf of the gloryous Vyrgyn and Martyr Saynt Katheryn of Sene; with the Revelacyons of Saynt Elyſabeth the Kynges Doughter of Hungarye.* Fol. XXI. Speculum Vite Chriſti, *or the Myrroure of the bleſſed Lyf of Jheſu Chryſte, compiled from the Latin Book of Dr. Bonaventure* de Meditacione Vite Chriſti; ... *together with a ſhorte treatyce of the hyeſt and moſte worthy Sacrament of Criſtes bleſſid Body and the merveylles thereof.* Fol. XXII. *The Curlace of Maſter Aleyn Charetier*, tranſlated out of French into Engliſh. XXIII. Vitas Patrum. *The ryght devout and ſolytary Lyfe of the auncient or olde holy Faders Hermytes dwelling in the deſertes -- upon which have wrytten St. Jerom -- tranſlated out of Frenſhe into Engliſhe by William Caxton of Weſtmynſtre late deed, and fyniſhed at the laſt daye of his Lyff. Enprynted in the ſaid Towne of Weſtmynſtre by me Wynken de Worde.* 1495. XXIV. *The Hiſtory of Lombardy* in one Book. XXV. *John Tinmouth's* Sanctilogium Britanniæ, *epitomized by Capgrave, and tranſlated into Engliſh by Caxton.* XXVI. *A Collection of Chaucer's Poems.* H.

CAYET (*a*) (PETER VICTOR PALMA) firſt a Miniſter of the Reformed Church [*A*], and afterwards a Doctor of Divinity of the Faculty of Paris, ought to be reckoned amongſt the learned men: but there were very ſtrange reports of him, which caſt a blemiſh upon his reputation; for he was accuſed not only of having wrote an Apology for public ſtews [*B*], but alſo of having ſold himſelf to the Devil [*C*]. The Synod deprived him of the office of a Miniſter, upon which he turned Catholic in the year 1595, and as

(*v*) In Latin *Cajetus* or *Cajetanus*.

[*A*] *He was firſt a Miniſter of the Reformed Church.*] I find in a Letter (1), which I ſhall mention in the laſt remark, that he *was born at Montrichart in Touraine* (2) *of very poor parents*; that *in his youth he was maintained at the grammar ſchool by a worthy Gentleman*; that *having made a progreſs there, they of the Proteſtant Religion conceived ſome hopes of him, and furniſhed him with the neceſſary means to ſtudy* Divinity, and admitted him a Miniſter; that about the year 1582 they made him Paſtor of the Congregation of Poitiers, which uſed to meet at Montreuil-Bonnin, and that *Cayet finding an opportunity to enter into the King's houſehold, he left his Church and followed the Court*, and was made Chaplain to the Princeſs Catherine Henry IVth's ſiſter, to inſtruct and confirm her in her religion.

(1) It is inſerted in the 1ſt vol. of the *Memoires de la Ligue*, pag. 343, &c.

(2) Obſerve therefore, that the ſurname of *Navarrus*, which is given him in the *Gallia Orientalis*, pag. 144. *and in* Konig, *Bibliath.* pag. 151. ſignifies only, that he was a Doctor of Divinity of the College of Navarre.

To this we may add the account, which we read in the remarks upon the *Catholic Confeſſion of Sanci*, page 268, of the edition publiſhed in 1699. "Peter Cayet "of Montrichard in Touraine, born of very poor "parents, who with their ſon had embraced the Pro-"teſtant Religion (*a*), ſtudied in his youth at Geneva, "at which time Calvin, whoſe ſervant he was, fore-"told the child's father, that *his ſon would become one* "*day the plague of the Church, and wage war with* "*God* (*e*). However he acquired a great deal of learn-"ing, eſpecially in the Oriental Languages, and was "choſen a Paſtor firſt at Poitiers, and afterwards in "Mr. de la Noue's Family (*i*) at Monſtreuil Bonnin, "and gave in theſe two places great proofs of his am-"bition and inconſtant mind; he was afterwards "made Chaplain to King Henry the Great's ſiſter."

(*a*) *See* Beza's Epigram upon Cayet's Apoſtaſy amongſt Beza's Latin Poems, publiſhed at Geneva in 4to, 1597, pag. 201.

(*e*) *Avis aux fidéles ſur l'Apoſtaſie de Mr. Pierre Cayet*, pag. 7. of the edit. of the year 1596.

(*i*) *Vie de* Mr. De la Noue, pag. 203. under the year 1576.

[*B*] *He was accuſed . . . of having wrote an Apology for public Stews.*] D'Aubigné aſſerts it in ſeveral paſſages of his works. Here follow the words, which he makes Sanci ſpeak. "We ſhould not have look'd up-"on ſimple fornication or adultery committed out of "love, amongſt unlawful actions, according to Ca-"hier's doctrine in his learned Book concerning the "Reſtoration of Stews, and his learned Commentary "on the ſeventh Commandment. In this Command-"ment, which is *non mœchaberis*, only the ſin of "the children of Onan is prohibited; for μοιχάω, ac-"cording to this modern Theology, comes ἀπὸ τῦ "μοίχω & χέω *quod eſt humidum fundere* (to ſpill a li-"quid) (3)." The verſes, which are at the end of the ſame book, are ſtill more ſharp.

(3) *Confeſſion Catholique de Sanci*, liv. 2. chap. 2. pag. 392. edit. of Amſterd. 1693. *See alſo* Le Baron de Fæneſte, liv. 2. chap. 12.

Cahier voulut loger les Putains en franchiſe,
Canoniſer pour ſaints les vérolez perclus;
Nôtre Egliſe le prit, quand vous n'en vouliez plus:
Catholique il pourſuit encor ſon entrepriſe.
La paillarde le voit martir pour les Bordeaux,
L'Avocat des Putains, Sindic des Maquereaux.
Elle ouvre ſes genoux, l'acole très humaine,
Honteux, banni, puant, vérolé, ladre vert,
Hugenots, confeſſez, que l'Egliſe Romaine,
Tient ſon giron paillard a tout venans ouvert (4).

(4) Pag. m. 446.

It is a Roman Catholic that ſpeaks here; the ſenſe is, "Cayet made an Apology for the ladies of pleaſure, "and would canonize all thoſe, who had got ſome "diſtemper in the Temple of Venus. When you "rejected him (*he ſpeaks to the Reformed*) our Church "received him with all poſſible kindneſs, tho' he was "very much ſeaſoned. Own then, ye Huguenots, "that the Church of Rome opens her lap to the firſt "comers."

The following paſſage has much more weight, ſince it is borrowed from an Hiſtory, and not from a ſatyrical piece. "It happened alſo that Cayet, who appli-"ed himſelf to Magic, was ſoon after depoſed; be-"ing alſo accuſed of having wrote two Books, the "one in which he laboured to prove, that neither for-"nication nor adultery were prohibited in the ſixth "* Commandment, but only the ſin of Onan; the o-"ther to prove that it was neceſſary to reſtore all the "ſtews. Hereupon having been rejected (*by the Re-*"*formed*) he went over to the other ſide, and was "very well received by the Sorbonne, but not by "the Jeſuits (5)." The Author of the Notes upon the Confeſſion of Sanci obſerves, that *D'Aubigné is here miſtaken*, and that *all thoſe fine maxims, aſcribed to Cayet were to be met with in one piece only, entitled*: Diſcours contenant le remede contre les Diſſolutions publiques, preſenté à Meſſieurs du Parlement (6). i. e. "A Diſcourſe containing a Remedy againſt the pub-"lic immoralities; offered to the conſideration of the "Parliament."

* According to the Roman Catholics, the ſeventh according to the Proteſtants.

(5) D'Aubigné, *Hiſt. Univerſelle*, tom. 3. liv. 4. chap. 11. pag. m. 502. under the year 1595.

(6) *Notes ſur la Conf. de Sanci*, pag. 53. edit. 1699.

[*C*] *. . . . Of having ſold himſelf to the Devil.*] Theodore Tronchin, Profeſſor of Divinity at Geneva, and one of the Fathers of the Synod of Dort, ſpeaks thus in one of his Books (7). *Amongſt the other facts, for which Cayet was deprived of his office of a Miniſter, he was alſo accuſed by creditable witneſſes of a correſpondence with the Devils. After he was depoſed, inſtead of repenting, he grew worſe and worſe, and forſook the true Religion. He came afterwards to ſuch a degree of wickedneſs, that he entered into an agreement with Satan under the name of Terrier the Prince of the ſubterraneous Spirits, gave himſelf up to him ſoul and body for ever, on condition that this evil Spirit would promiſe him, that he would make him gain the victory in all his diſputes with the Reformed, and render him perfectly ſkilled in the knowledge of the languages. This Contract ſigned with blood was found after his death, and has been ſeen by ſeveral of the Gens du Roy* †. Mr. Colomiés, who has quoted theſe words, will furniſh me with another paſſage, which is as follows. "The "complaints againſt the Sieur Cayet were, that he "had left his Church at Poitiers, which had been "committed to his care, and had made uſe of wicked "practices to intrude himſelf firſt into the King's "houſhold, and then into that of his Majeſty's ſiſter, "that he applied himſelf ſo much to magical Arts, "that he was commonly called Petrus Magus, (*the* "*Magician,*) and that he behaved himſelf indecently "with regard to a certain Lady (9)." I wonder that Montigny ſays nothing of the two Books, which according to D'Aubigné were the chief and firſt cauſes of Cayet's deprivation. *Le chaſſaſtes vous pour la Magie?* Did you depoſe him for his magical Arts? This is Fæneſte's queſtion; to which it is anſwered. *At firſt he was only accuſed of having compoſed two Books, in the one of which he maintained, that neither fornication nor adultery was the ſin prohibited in the ſeventh Commandment, which forbids only* τὸ μοίχον χέειν, *meaning the ſin of Onan, whence he drew upon him the hatred of the ſacred Society. His deſign in the other Book was to reſtore the public ſtews. But whilſt this affair was depending, he was alſo accuſed of Magic, and the Books he wrote upon that ſubject to Tiel Chauvin were produced before us* (10). In the ſame work D'Aubigné relates in a very pleaſant manner a ſtory of Baron; here follow his own words. Cayet "m'a monſtre de Libres "de Magie compouſez par lui de dûs pieds de haut; "il m'a fait boir dans une couque d'uf où il faiſet "l'ou petit home avec des germes des Mandragores, "de la ſoye cramauſie, & un fu lent, pour parbenir à "des choſes, que je ne bus pas dire; il m'a monſtrai "les images de cire, qu'il faiſoit fondre tout velle-"ment pour echauffer le que de la galande, & celles "qu'il vleſſoit d'une petite fléche pour faire périr un "Prince à cent lieues de là (11). That is, "Cayet "ſhewed me a heap of Books of Magic written by "himſelf, and two feet high; he made me look into "an egg-ſhell, in which he made a little man with "young buds, Mandrakes, crimſon ſilk, and a ſlow "fire, in order to arrive at ſuch things, which I will "not tell; he ſhewed me images of wax which he "uſed to melt, and thereby inſpired a woman with "love for her ſweet-heart; he had other images, "which he wounded with a ſmall arrow, and by that "means could kill any Prince at an hundred leagues "diſtance."

† The *Gens du Roy* are the King's Advocates and Attornies General in Superior Courts, and only the King's Advocates and Attornies in Inferior Courts.

(7) *Preface ſur la Défenſe de nos Verſions*, 1620.

(8) Colomeſ. *in Gallia Orient.* pag. 145.

(9) Idem, ibid. pag. 44. *Ex libello cui titulus, Avertiſſement ſur la Dépoſition du Sieur Cayet du S. Miniſtére, & ſur ſa revolte. Auctore Franciſco Loberano, Domino de Montigni, Pariſienſi quondam Eccleſiaſte*, pag. 5.

(10) Baron. *de Fæneſte*, liv. 2. chap. 12. pag. m. 81.

(11) Ibid. pag. 79.

as he was known to Henry IV [D], he was soon after made Regius Reader for the Oriental Languages [E]. He commenced Doctor of Divinity in the year 1600 (b). He wrote several books against those he had abandoned [F], in which amongst other things he

(b) Launoius, *Hist. Gymnas. Navarr.* pag. 791.

"distance." This may pass for a raillery; but what follows is related in a serious manner, as a matter of fact, and attended with all its circumstances. "The "Scripture tells us, that there are Conjurers, and Sorcerers; the former are scarce; witness a Duke of "Savoy who spent an hundred thousand crowns to "find some; the latter are but too numerous; I "reckon Cayet amongst them, who sold himself to "the Devil by a Note signed with his own hand, and "required from him by the buyer. You have heard "how dreadful and terrible his death was. But I "have seen the original in the hands of Monsieur "Gilot, when the Court was consulting, whether they "should have his corpse burned, or hanged by the "feet at Montfaucon; but there were so many Lords "and Ladies of an high rank, who were his accom-"plices in these abominations, that this affair was "hush up, as a great many others are at present, "which it is better to bury in an eternal oblivion, "than to publish them (12)." It is surprizing, that D'Aubigné, who was so well acquainted with this whole affair, should yet have been ignorant of the most remarkable circumstance of this story. He did not know, that the Devil carried Cayet away with and body, and they, who took care of his burial, were obliged to fill the coffin with stones instead of Cayet's corps, which the Devil had carried away; and this they were obliged to do, in order to deceive those, who carried the coffin to the burying-ground. *Maresius Tom. 2. contra Tirinum, pag.* 434, *ait, Vict. Cabierum, qui superiori sæculo vixit ex Ministro Reformatæ Ecclesiæ Sorbonistam, Caballistam, & Magum factum, ejusque corpus a Diabolo ablatum esse, ut lapides vice illius ejus in loculo condendi fuerint.* i. e. "Ma-"resius, (Des Marets) in his second volume against "Tirinus, page 434, says, that *Cabierus* (Cayet) "who in the last Century was a Minister of the Re-"formed Church, turned a Sorbonist, a Caballist, "and a Magician, and that the Devil carried his "body away, so that they were obliged to bury stones "instead of him." This is what we read in Konig's *Bibliotheca*, under the word *Cabierus* (13).

(12) Ibid. pag. 80.

I am obliged, I think, to observe here, that I did not find any thing concerning these strange and abominable crimes laid to Cayet's charge, in the Roman Catholic Writers; except these words of Leo Allatius. *His quam simillima inter quotidianos congressus quibus utor familiarissimis, ab omnis honestioris eruditionis Mysta Gabriele Naudæo de Unicor. Palma* (14) *Cajetano & Constantino Chymista frequenter audivi* (15). He had related some stories concerning the conjuring up of Devils, and adds that his good friend Gabriel Naudé often told him the like stories of Victor Cayet and of Constantine the Chymist. But we must observe two things here. First, it does not appear that Naudé ever believed the stories that are told of Sorcerers and Magicians. Secondly, that having had some opportunities in his works to mention Cayet with regard to these matters, he has not said the least thing, to charge him with sorcery. Read his Dialogue of Mascurat, you will find there the following words (16). "S. "The Devill take either of us, who ever heard it "mentioned. M. At that rate he would take us both. "S. However, it would not be in the manner he took "D. Faustus and his servant, for I would not hold "you by the feet. M. You mention there an ima-"ginary person, a chimera of the Germans, which "silly story, that great Doctor *Peter Victor Palma Ca-"jetanus*, or rather *Caillete, credulum illud animal & "stultum, (that credulous and foolish animal)* has trans-"lated into French, as it had already been into English. *Adeo omnia * si nescis loca sunt plenissima nugis, quarum tota cohors est inimica mihi.* i. e. "All the books "are full of such idle fancies, and I hate the whole "band of these Writers." Add to all this, what we shall observe in the remark [H].

(13) Observe, that Konig did not know Cayet's true name, and thought that *Victor Cabierus*, and *Petrus Victor Cajetanus*, and *Petrus Victor Palma Cajetanus*, were three different persons. In the *Journal of Oxford*, it is supposed that *Victor* was *Cayet's* true name, whereas it was only the name he took at his Confirmation.

(14) Read *Naudæo de Victore Palma.*

(15) Allatius de Patria Homeri, pag. 5.

(16) Pag. 519, 520. The letter S. signifies *Saint Ange*, a Bookseller, and one of the persons who speak in the Dialogue. *M.* signifies *Mascurat*, a Printer, the other person, who speaks here.

* Sariberiens. *in Eutheico.*

Take notice, that one might judge, by the Dedication of that Book, which Naudé turns into ridicule, and which is signed V. P. C. that our Cayet was wonderfully zealous against the art of Magic. Let us also transcribe the whole title of his Translation: *L'Histoire prodigieuse & lamentable du Docteur Fauste; avec sa mort épouvantable. Là où est monstré combien est miserable la curiosité des Illusions & des Impostures de l'Esprit malin. Ensemble la corruption de Satan par luimesme, estant contraint de dire la vérité.* i. e. "The "wonderful and lamentable History of Dr. Faustus, "with his terrible death: In which is shewed, how "dangerous it is to enquire after the fallacies and im-"postures of the evil Spirit; together with Satan's "corruption by himself, being forced to speak the "truth." The edition I make use of is that of Roan, 1604, in 12mo.

[D] *He was known to Henry IV.*] He had followed that Prince almost constantly, since he entered into that Prince's service with the Sieur de la Gaucherie, who had been the King's Tutor. These are Mr. Maimbourg's words, in his Preface to the History of the Leagues.

[E] *He was soon after made Regius Reader for the Oriental Languages.*] He has that title in the Privilege or Licence which he obtained for his controversial works June the 15th, 1596, and we find the following words in page 26 of a Book (17), which he published in 1597. *I do not blame the study of the Hebrew, Chaldaic and other languages, far from it; I teach them myself, God be praised, for his service, and for that of the Church, with the most Christian King's leave.* Mr. de Launoi was therefore mistaken, when he asserted that Cayet was preferred to that post in 1599 (18). I am indebted for this observation to the Author of the Notes upon the Confession of Sanci. But I must observe, that according to James Du Breul our Cayet succeeded Francis Jourdain Regius Reader and Professor of the Hebrew Tongue, who died in September 1599 (19). We may reconcile this; if we suppose, that Cayet had the title of Reader, and read Lectures as soon as the year 1596, but that the place not being yet vacant, he was not, properly speaking, promoted to it nor installed in it till after the death of Jourdain in the year 1599.

(17) Intitled, *Instance de la Réunion en l'Eglise Cathol. Apost. & Romaine.*

(18) Launoii, *Hist. Gymnasii Navarr.* pag. 701.

(19) Du Breul, *Antiquites de Paris*, pag. mi. 567.

[F] *He wrote several Books against those he had abandoned.*] You will find a Catalogue of them in the History of the College of Navarre (20); I shall only give here the title of the first which we meet with in that Catalogue; it is as follows. *Remonstrance Chrestienne & très utile à Messieurs de la Noblesse de France, qui ne sont point de la Religion Catholique; a Paris*, 1596. i. e. "A Christian and very important admonition "to those of the Nobility of France, who are not of "the Catholic Religion." Mr. de Launoi observes, that this Book contains the Letter, which the Author had received from Clement VIII, and several other things relating to the Origin and Progress of the Huguenots (21). When Cayet published that Book, he lodged at the same place where Postel died; for he dates his *Admonition à Mrs. du Tiers Etat, qui ne sont point de la Religion Romaine* ("Admonition to the Com-"moners of France, who are not of the Catholic Re-"ligion") from the Abbey of St. Martin's in the Fields. This Admonition was printed in the year 1596. You will find this in the Remarks upon the Catholic Confession of Sanci (22), where the Author of these Remarks explains the following words of the Preface: "They should at least keep Spondanus in an "honourable prison in the Abbey of St. Mathurin (or "Martin) as they did formerly Postel, and now Cayet, "all learned and mad." This may make us suspect that Mr. de Launoi is guilty of another mistake: for he asserts, that Cayet lived already in the College of Navarre, when Pope Clement VIII wrote him a Letter, dated March the 20th 1596. *Quo tempore datæ sunt hæ literæ, jam Cajetus . . . in Navarræ Collegium secesserat* (23). I do not know in what Book of Controversy this Proselyte quotes seventy four Propositions asserted by John Hus, and which are contrary to John Calvin's Doctrine (24). Mr. de Launoi's Catalogue does not mention the Book which Peter Cayet published concerning the Minister Rotan who wrote an excellent answer in the year 1596 (25).

(20) Page 792.

(21) Launoii, *Hist. Gymnas. Navarr.* pag. 792.

(22) Printed at Amsterdam in 1693. pag. 458.

(23) Launoii, *Hist. Gymnas. Navarr.* pag. 790.

(24) *See* Feuardentius, *Theomachia Calvinistica*, tom. 2. B. 13. chap. 8. pag. 178. edit. of Cologne, 4to, 1629.

(25) *Remarques sur la Confession de Sanci*, pag. 523.

he complains of their Satyrs [G]; he also had a conference with the celebrated du Moulin. This conference lasted several days [H], and, as it is usual in such cases, both parties published very different accounts of it. Cayet had also the title of Chronologer, and wrote several Histories [I]. He lived almost constantly (c) in the College of Navarre at Paris (d), after he had embraced the Roman Catholic Religion, and died there July the 22d 1610,

(c) We shall observe in the Remark [F] that he lodged some time in the Abbey of St. Martino.

(d) Launoi, *Hist. Gymnas. Navarr.* pag. 790.

[G] . . . *He complains of their Satyrs.*] He renewed his complaints in his novenary Chronology; he says, that the Protestants had published several Answers to the Motives of his Conversion, and that the persons, who collected the Memoirs of the League inserted one of these Answers amongst them, without inserting at the same time Cayet's Answer; he flatly denied the story of his amours with a Lady of Bearn (26), he observes, that none of those who spread these slanders abroad named himself, so that *he did not know to whom he ought to direct his Answers.* He adds, that no reply was made to his Vindication concerning the Book *the Restoration of Stews.* He says positively, that he was not the Author of it, and that Robert Stephens acknowledged, that he had passed his word never to shew the manuscript of it to any person whatsoever. He also says, it was not this Book that vexed the Ministers, but the *Consilium primum de componendo Religionis dissidio:* (the pious Method for adjusting the religious disputes) of which they knew that he dispersed several copies. *Since that time,* adds he, *they spread abroad, that I intended to turn a Roman Catholic, and that the King had given me for that purpose an Abbey near la Rochelle, . . . and yet it is true, that till this very time, which is the year* 1607 . . . *I have neither an Abbey, nor any other living* (27). There is a great deal of moderation in this part of his History. Monsieur Maimbourg has been much more passionate in his behalf. "This, *says he* (28), *speaking of Cayet's* "*conversion, which was supported with arguments, and* "*imitated by a great many persons* (a), exasperated his "ancient brethren the Ministers to such a degree, that "they inveighed most furiously against him; they "loaded him with injuries, and endeavoured to blacken "his reputation with the most abominable calumnies, "which they published in several libels, and amongst "others in that, which they inserted amongst the "Memoirs of the League (e), dissembling in the most "shameful manner, the solid and convincing answers "he had published against them; which alone is sufficient to expose the falsity of all that they have "written to defame him according to the genius of "their heresy. For of all the heretics, none have "ever been so cruel and malicious as the Calvinists, "none ever revenged themselves more barbarously of "their pretended enemies by the sword, or by other "violent means, when it was in their power to do it, "or when they could not do otherwise, by their shame"ful libels, and by traducing and reviling their ad"versaries by all kind of injuries and impostures." This is indulging one's passion too much. Mr. Maimbourg might have complained in a more moderate manner of the Protestants for their repeating the same Satyrs over again, without answering the least thing to the arguments offered in favour of the person accused. See the Remark [O]; you will find in the Remarks upon the Confession of Sanci the titles of some other pieces, which were published against Cayet soon after he changed his Religion (29).

(26) The Baronness d'Aros.

(27) *Chronologie novenaire*, liv. 7. under the year 1595, folio 545 *verso* 546, 547.

(28) Maimbourg, *Preface de l'Histoire de la Ligue.*

(a) *Lettre d'un Gentilhome Catholique a un sien ami*, 1595.

(e) *Memoires de la Ligue*, tom. 6. pag. 343. Cayer f. 545.

(29) In pag. 97. of the edition publish'd in 1699.

[H] *His Conference . . with du Moulin lasted several days.*] We read in the Life of du Moulin (30), that he was challenged to this dispute by Cayet; that he had no second to attend him, tho' Cayet was assisted by two Carmelites; that they disputed fifteen days following: that when the dispute had lasted a week, Cayet was severely reproved by the Sorbonne, because he did not well maintain his cause, and that he suffered his adversary to dive into matters more than was consistent with the interest of the Catholics; that the Bishop of Paris forbad Cayet to sign the Acts of the Conference; that since that time Cayet disputed very cautiously, and declared several times, that he did it without any public Commission; That the Sorbonne went in a body to the Advocate-General, to acquaint him that if this dispute was not prohibited by authority, there were reasons to fear it would occasion a sedition; that it is not known what the Magistrates ordered, but that du Moulin coming to the place where the Conference was held, found the door shut; that they opened it soon after to Cayet; and Du Moulin being also entered, the Master of the house received a letter, by which he was advised not to admit these Gentlemen any more, for that otherwise he would be imprisoned; upon which these Gentlemen lost all hopes of finding another place where they could meet; that Cayet being challenged to sign the Acts of Conference, refused it, and on his going away said to Du Moulin, *you will hear of me another time* (31); that after this he never spoke of beginning the Conference again; that some years after they heard the history of his death which was but too true and infamous (32), namely that the Devil had killed him; and that they found the contract he had made with the Devil Terrier; and that Archibald Adair a Scottish Bishop, who had been witness to all that passed on both sides in this dispute, published an exact account of it. Matthias Zimmerman has committed a blunder with regard to the conclusion of this account. It is in page 300 of his *Florilegium Philologico-Historicum*, printed at Meissen * in the year 1687. His words are; *Cayetus . . . tergum obvertens dixit*, Tu de me alias audies; *sed nihil de iteranda disputatione auditum, vere* ENIM *a Diabolo necatus, & membranæ inventæ, quibus cum Dæmone Terrier fœdus percusserat.* i. e. "Cayet (Cayet) turning his "back, said, *You will hear of me another time*; but "nothing was heard afterwards about renewing the "disputation, FOR Cayet was killed by the Devil, "and his contract with the Devil Terrier was found." This ENIM is a falsification of the History of Du Moulin, for the Author of that History did not say, nor would he or could he say, that Cayet did not mention the dispute any more, because the Devil killed him. Cayet published three pieces concerning this Conference. I. *Le Sommaire véritable des Questions proposées en l'entrevue entre le Docteur Pierre Victor Cayet, & le Ministre Du Moulin. Ensemble la Réponse à l'escrit calomnieux publié par Du Moulin.* i. e. "A true Account of "the Questions proposed in the Conference between "Dr. Peter Victor Cayet, and the Minister Du "Moulin: Together with an Answer to the slander"ous Account published by Du Moulin." II. *Les Actes de l'entrevue dite Conference avec le Ministre Du Moulin.* i. e. "The Acts of the meeting called the "Conference with the Minister Du Moulin." III. *La Defense & Arrest de la Vérité, contre Archibaud Adair Ecossois* (33). i. e. "A Defence and Assertion of "Truth, against Archibald Adair a Scotsman."

(30) You will find it in Dr. Bates's (in Latin *Batesius*) Book, published at London in 1681, and intitled, *Vitæ selectorum aliquot Virorum, qui Doctrina, Dignitate aut Pietate inclaruere.* See pag. 703 of that book.

(31) *Tu de me alias audies.*

(32) This conference was held in 1602, and Cayet died in 1610.

* In Upper Saxony.

(33) Launoi, *Hist. Gymnas. Navarr.* pag. 792.

Let us not omit the Book which Cayet published against Du Moulin in the year 1603, and which he entitled, *La Fournaise ardente, & le four de reverbere, pour evaporer les prétendues eaux de Siloë, & pour corroborer le feu du Purgatoire.* i. e. "The burning Fur"nace, and the reverberate Fire, proper to make the "waters of Shiloah evaporate, and to corroborate the "fire of Purgatory." This Minister observes in a new edition of his *Eaux de Siloé* (Waters of Shiloah) that notwithstanding the Approbation, which the Sorbonne had granted to Cayet's Book, *the Jesuits caused him to be chastised and treated severely, and cried him down in their Sermons, so that he was thereby disgraced for ever* (34).

(34) *Notes sur la Conf. de Sanci*, pag. 98. edit. 1699.

[I] *He wrote several Histories.*] *La vraye Narration de la Guerre d'entre les Turcs & les Chrestiens d'Hongrie, depuis le Mois de Septembre* 1597 *jusqu'au Printemps de l'Année* 1598, *à Paris*, 1598. i. e. "A true account "of the war between the Turks and the Christians of "Hungary from September 1597, to the spring in the "year 1598; Paris, 1598." *Chronologie Septenaire de l'Histoire de la Paix entre les Rois de France & d'Espagne . . ., depuis le commencement de l'an* 1598, *jusqu'à la fin de l'an* 1604. i. e. "A Chronological ac"count for seven years, containing the History of "the peace between the Kings of France and Spain . ., "from the beginning of the year 1598, to the end "of the year 1604." *Chronologie novenaire, contenant l'Histoire de la Guerre sous le Régne de Henry IV . . ., depuis*

1610, and was buried at St. Victor's (e). He had endeavoured to find the Philosopher's Stone [K] by all that be true, which some relate of him, concerning the disguel with the Count of Soissons had of marrying the Lady Catherine sister to Henry IV, would assert, that Cayet acted sometimes like an honest man [L]. It is surprising, that when some Authors say, that the Devil killed him (f), and that the Parliament of Paris had some design to deny him a Christian burial, others should assert that he always led a good moral life after his abjuration [M]. I wonder that Scaliger did not write the character of this man; could he forget the crimes which were laid to his charge, or did he think they were not sufficiently proved? However it be, he only says this: *When Cabier was a Minister, he preached better extempore, than when he took a great deal of pains to compose his Sermons, which were then very bad* (g). Observe that he calls him *Cabier*. Most Authors commit the same blunder [N]. I could not meet with any of the books which Cayet published, to clear himself of the crimes for which he was deposed from his office of a Minister; but his own confession concerning the book upon public stews, is a strong argument in favour of the Synod that deposed him [O]. The Authors of the Supplement

(e) Idem, ibid. pag. 792. Du Breul *Antiquitez de Paris*, pag. 561. affirms, that he died July the 22st on St. Victor's day.

(f) See the Remarks [C] and [H].

(g) Scaligerana, pag. m. 46.

depuis le commencement de son Regne l'an 1589 *jusqu'à la Paix faite à Vervins en Juin* 1598 (35). i. e. "A "Chronological account for nine years, containing the "History of the war under the reign of Henry IV . . . . "from the beginning of his reign in the year 1589, "to the peace concluded at Vervins in June 1598." These four letters P. V. P. C. with which he subscribes his Dedications, signify *Petrus Victor Palma Cayet*. Monsieur de Launoi did not know, that this Writer published in the year 1600 *Appendix ad Chronologiam Genebrardi* (An Appendix to the Chronology of Genebrard.) Anthony de Laval mentions this Work in a very honourable manner. *To those, who desire to read a complete body of universal History*, says he (36), *I would recommend the Chronology of the learned Genebrard, continued and improved by that oracle of all languages Doctor Cayet.*

(35) Launoii, *Hist. Gymnas. Navar.* pag. 791.

(36) *Desseins des Professions notables*, pag. 322. edit. 1613, quoted by Colomies, *Gall. Orientol.* pag. 145.

[K] *He had endeavoured to find the Philosopher's Stone.*] The Author of the *Mercure François* tells us this particular, with some others, which the Reader will not be displeased to find here. We shall therefore transcribe the whole passage. *Doctor Peter Victor Cayet . . . . never had any enemies, but those to whom he had done some kindness. This was his fate, and under this misfortune he laboured all his life time. He died in the College of Navarre, and was buried at St. Victor's. His cloaths, his manner of living, and his curiosity after the Philosopher's Stone, rendered him despicable as much as he was esteemed for his learning, and it was on account of his learning that all who knew him, mourned at his death. As for my part, I knew him for a true born Frenchman, who did not in the least favour the principles of the Italians; he has acquainted me with several considerable things he had done for the King's service* (37).

(37) *Mercure François*, tom. 1, folio 350, under the year 1610.

[L] *If that be true, which some relate of him concerning . . . . the Count of Soissons . . . . he acted sometimes like an honest man.*] There is an Author, who has made some remarks upon the book intitled, *Histoire des Amours du Grand Alcandre*, i. e. "the History "of the amorous intrigues of the Great Alcandre;" this Piece is printed with the Journal of Henry III. As Henry IV is there described under the name of the Great Alcandre, so the great persons of his Court are also described under borrowed names. This Prince's sister is called Grassinde, and the Count of Soissons Palamede. Now one of the Remarks is as follows. "The marriage of Palamede with Alcander's sister "was in so great a forwardness, that Peter Cayet "Grassinde's Chaplain, was commanded to marry them "immediately, but he desired to be excused; where- "upon Palamede threatened to kill him, but the "Chaplain answered to Palamede, that he chose ra- "ther to be put to death by a Prince, than by the "common Executioner (38)."

(38) See the *Journal de Henri III*, pag. 295. of the edition of Amsterdam, 1693.

[M] *Others assert that he always led a good moral life after his abjuration.*] *All that the Huguenots wrote with so much, I do not say passion, but even fury, against Cayet, soon after his conversion, cannot in the least prejudice his reputation, any more than their ridiculous predictions, in which they asserted, that in a short time, he would be neither a Huguenot nor a Catholic, and that he would raise a third party between the two Religions. For he always lived so well amongst the Catholics, that after he had given on several occasions great proofs both of his virtue and learning, he was found worthy to receive Priest Orders, and to be admitted a Doctor of Divinity, and was made Regius Reader and Professor for the Oriental Languages* (39). The Protestants will no doubt have more regard for the testimony of Mr. de Launoi, I shall therefore quote his words here. *Multis modis claruit evasit* (Cajetus) *imprimis quod Hæresim puræ sinceræque mentis deposuerit, deinde quod Jacobus Perronius Ebroicensium Episcopus eum judicaverit dignum qui eâ super re literas a Clemente VIII acciperet, tum quod Clemens ei per literas conversionem gratulatus fuerit . . . . postremo, quod sui temporis Historiæ memoriæ prodiderit, & vitam insuper virtute conjunctam transduxerit, postquam effectus est Catholicæ communionis particeps* (40). i. e. "Cayet has "gained a reputation several ways, particularly be- "cause he renounced his heresy with a sincere heart; "and also because James du Perron Bishop of Evreux "thought he deserved to be recommended to Pope "Clement VIII, who wrote him a letter to congra- "tulate him for his conversion. . . . Lastly, his re- "putation is owing to the Histories he wrote of his "own time, and to the virtuous life he led since his "admission into the communion of the Catholic "Church."

(39) Maimbourg, *Preface de l'Histoire de la Ligue.*

(40) *Hist. Gymnas. Navarr.* pag. 791.

[N] *Most Authors commit that blunder, of calling him* Cahier.] This blunder would be pardonable, if that man had not prefixed his name to most of his Books; for as the pronunciation of names differs very often from the manner in which they are spelt, and that men, especially in France are not used to sound the last letter of a word, they, who only heard the name of our Author, without seeing it written or printed, might easily imagine that his name was *Cayer* or *Cahier*; but the mistake of those who wrote against him cannot be excused. Had they not seen how his name was spelt in the Books they undertook to confute? It might perhaps be said in their behalf, that his name is spelt *Cayer* in the *Avertissement sur les Points de la Religion pour en composer les differens*. "Advertisement "concerning the controverted points in Religion, in or- "der to reconcile the different opinions," which this Author published at Paris in 1596; that this name, I say, is there found in the title-page, in the Epistle to the King, in that to the Bishop of Evreux, in the approbation of the Doctors, and in the license (41); but this will not excuse them. They ought to have observed, that since his name was written *Cayet* in the Books he published before that time, and in those many, which he published since, there was an error of the Press in the passages of the Advertisement, where his name was spelt *Cayer*. There are so many Authors, who write a bad hand, that it may very well be supposed, that the Printers of this Advertisement could not guess, whether Cayet had put an *r* or a *t* at the end of his name; and having once mistook an *r* for a *t*, they put the first of these letters every where in the Licence, in the approbation of the Doctors, &c.

(41) The Author of the *Notes* upon the *Confession of Sanci* has acquainted me with this.

[O] *His confession concerning the Book upon public stews, is a strong argument in favour of the Synod that deposed him.*] He has thought it to say something upon this subject in his History of Henry the Great (42). But if he could not defend himself better in other respects, than he has done on this occasion, it is my opinion, that his cause was very bad. He owns, that he

(42) *Chronologie Novenaire*, under the year 1595, folio 545.

ment up Motin's own (a), that he wrote the *Remede aux dissolutions publiques* (the Remedy for public loosenes). This is the book concerning the reformation of public flews. I forgot to observe, that he disputed for a Professorship in the Canon-Law at Rheims in 1597, but he did not carry it. Mr. Doujat acquaints me with this particular (b).

(a) Doujat, *Præn. Canonic.* pag. 643.

(b) Under the word *Cahier*. They mention him again under the word *Cayet*. This is a very good way to encrease the number of Ministers at a little expence.

he lent R. Stephens the Book concerning the reformation of public Stews, and does not say a word against the testimony of his adversary. This testimony was, that the Manuscript, which was in the Synod's hands, had been transcribed from a copy written in Cayet's own hand. The letter, which is inserted amongst the Memoirs of the league, represents that Book as something so abominable, that Clergymen ought not to be tolerated, when they keep such Books in their Libraries; how much less can they be excused, when they give them to a Printer? The letter I have just now mentioned, is a very good Piece; the Author of it speaks like a true Roman Catholic, and knows how to give things a likely turn; he seems to be very well skilled in Ecclesiastical History. He charges Cayet with a very odious crime; namely, that he kept for his own use, the money which Princess Catherine gave him for charitable uses (43). He also charges him with saying, that his Manuscript was only a translation of an Italian Book, printed at Venice forty years before that time, and written by one Nicholas Perrot (44); he accuses him besides *of having lodged at a tavern which was a noted bawdy-house in the street called* de la Huchette, *of having continued there above three months, taking his ordinary meals with the Judge of Candon, who is one of the greatest Sorcerers and Magicians on earth, and was very intimate with one L'Etoile a Mountebank, who believed nothing less than the being of God.* He adds, that Cayet *had been formerly publickly loaded with infamy, because he applied himself to Magic, and to the occult Sciences; witness his frequently casting up of Nativities, and his so much celebrated opinion delivered to the late Sieur de la Rochefoucaud, concerning the success of the Siege of La Rochelle, and of the Sieur de Strosse; voyage into Africk.* See the Remarks upon the Confession of Sancy, page 553 of the Edition published in 1699.

(43) *Mem. de la Ligue*, tom. 6. pag. 347.

(44) Some printed copies were shewed with this title, *Discorso del remedio delle publiche dissolutione, di Nicolo Perroto.*

A REFLEXION upon the bad effects of a false zeal.

Let us not end this remark without making an observation which shews, that a false zeal for Religion completes what the sin of Adam had but too effectually begun. There are certainly very great disorders in all civil Societies; who can deny this? And yet we do not find, that when a man is banished from a city by a legal sentence, in which it is declared, that he has been convicted and found guilty of several villainous and wicked actions, we don't find, I say, but such a man is so kindly received in another city, as to be promoted to honourable posts, before he has perfectly cleared himself. Some remains of good sense and justice hinders men from acting after that manner. But these remains of good sense are not to be observed in Ecclesiastical Bodies; here you see Cayet deposed and loaded with infamy by a sentence of the Synod grounded upon the most odious actions of which he was accused; he renounces the Reformed Religion, embraces the Catholic Faith, and is admitted with the utmost kindness; the Catholics boast of so glorious an acquisition, he is promoted to Ecclesiastical Honours and Dignities, without the least information whether he has been justly or unjustly deposed;

Tantum Religio potuit suadere malorum.

The same persons, who acted thus in an affair relating to Religion, would not have done it in an affair purely civil. The Readers cannot too much consider this observation (45).

(45) See above, the end of the Remark [B] in the Article BEZANITES.

CEA or CEOS an Island in the Ægean Sea, or Archipelago. See ZIA.

CECIL (WILLIAM) Lord Burghley or Burleigh, Lord High Treasurer of England in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, was descended from an antient and good family [A], and son of Richard Cecil Esq; Groom of the Robes to King Henry VIII (a), by Jane, daughter and heiress of William Heckington (b) of Bourn in the County of Lincoln Esq;. He was born at Bourn September the 13th 1521 (c), and educated in the schools

(a) Camden's *Life and Reign of Queen Elizabeth, ad ann.* 1598. pag. 609. in the *Complete History of England*, vol. 2. edit. London 1706. David Lloyd's *State-Worthies*, p. 473. 2d edit. London 1670. and the *Account of the Family of Cecil by Arthur Collins Esq*; prefixed to his edition of the *Life of William Cecil Lord Burghley*, published from the original manuscript wrote soon after his Lordship's death. London 1732, in 8vo.

(b) Collins's *Account of the Family of Cecil*, pag. x. Camden calls it *Ekinton*.

(c) *Life of William Cecil, Lord Burghley, published from the original Manuscript*, pag. 3.

[A] *Was descended from an antient and good family.*] Mr. David Lloyd (1) observes, that some were of opinion, that the Cecils were descended from the Roman *Cæcilii*. But we have the most exact account of this family by Arthur Collins Esq; prefixed to his Edition of *the life of that great Statesman* William Cecil *Lord* Burghley, &c. *published from the original Manuscript wrote soon after his Lordship's death, now in the Library of the Right Honourable* Brownlow *Earl of Exeter* (2). He observes (3), that the name of this family has been, like others of long continuance, variously written, as *Sitsilt*, *Sicelt*, *Seycil*, *Cicil*, &c. yet that is evident (4), that tho' the name was so differently spelt, the persons so written were of the same lineage. It is agreed by Camden and other Genealogists, that ROBERT SITSILT (5), an assistant to *Robert Fitz-Hamon*, in the conquest of Glamorganshire, in the 4th year of the reign of King William Rufus, *anno* 1091, was the ancestor to this family. This ROBERT was rewarded with lands by the said Robert Fitz-Hamon, and afterwards by marriage had Alterennis in that part of Herefordshire called Ewyas land, with other lands in Herefordshire and Gloucestershire (6). He was succeeded by his son and heir Sir JAMES SEISEL, Baron of Beaupört, now called Beaupere, in Glamorganshire, killed at the siege of Wallingford Castle in the fourth of King Stephen (7), leaving issue JOHN SEISEL his son and heir; who was taken prisoner at the siege of Lincoln in the ninth of King Stephen (8), and paying for his ransom 400 marks, was obliged to sell his Lordship of Beauport, and all his lands in Gloucestershire. He had by Maud his wife, daughter of .... de Prenes, *Eustace* his son and heir, who married Eleanor daughter of Sir Walter Pembridge, Knt. and had issue Sir BALDWIN SEISEL, knighted by King Henry II, and slain at the siege of the Castle of Cardiff, his father being then living. This Sir BALDWIN by his first wife, daughter of Maurice de Brampton, had issue five sons (9), *Gerard*, *Eustace*, *Henry*, *John*, and *Walter*, and two daughters, *Catherine* wife of Hugh Mureduke, and *Eleanor* married to Walter Wallis. By his second wife, Margaret daughter of Sir Stephen Radnor Knt. he had issue, *Stephen*, *Roger*, *Hugh*, *David*, *Maud* a Nun, *Joan* married to John de Solers, and *Anne* to Owen ap Meredith. The eldest son GERALD SEISSEL married Mabel daughter of Sir William Moigne Knt. and had issue *Robert*; *Owen* a Monk in the Abbey of Dore in Herefordshire; *Catherine*, married to Sir Griffin ap Yereford Knt. then to David ap Evan, and thirdly to Geoffrey son of Sir Walter Bret Knt.; *Anne*, wife to Robert, son of Richard Bromwich; and Ellen, wife to John, son of Sir Richard Abrahall Knt. He was succeeded by ROBERT SEISCEL, who married Alice, daughter of Sir Robert de Tregoze Knt, and had issue, *James*, *Gerald*, *Thomas*, *Baldwin*, *Margaret*, and *Elizabeth*. JAMES CECIL, eldest son of Robert, married Isabel daughter of Sir John Knowle Knt., by whom he had issue, *James*, who died young, *Gerard*, *Robert*, *John*, *Alice*, wife of Walter Monnington, *Grace*, married to Roger son of William Blunt, *Eleanor* wife to Thomas Paine, *Margery* married to Morgan ap Meredith, and *Cecilie* wife to Hewel ap Blethin, and afterwards to Sir Hugh Bruge Knt. GERARD CECILL, eldest son, by his first wife Margaret daughter of Stephen de la Bere, had issue *John*; by his second wife, Bridget widow of Sir Simon Ward Knt. had a son James; by his third wife, daughter of Martin Hopton, had issue Martin, Henry, David, and Jane; and by his fourth wife, Joan daughter of Robert Emerton, had issue, Stigand Seissel, killed at the siege of Strivelin in Scotland. JOHN CECIL, the eldest son by the first wife, married Sibil daughter of Robert Ewyas, and had issue Sir *John*, and *George Cecill* (10). Sir JOHN CECIL or SEYSSEL,

(1) *State Worthies*, marginal Note (*a*) pag. 473. 2d edit. London 1670.

(2) Printed at London 1732, in 8vo.

(3) Pag. 3.

(4) Camden's *Remains, Surnames*, pag. 140.

(5) *History of Wales*, pag. 124, 141, and 142.

(6) Barnes's *History of King Edward III*, pag. 75.

(7) Idem, ibid.

(8) *Ex* Stemmate, *apud* Collins, pag. 4.

(9) *Ex eodem* Stemmate, *apud eundem*.

(10) Collins, pag. iv, v.

schools of Grantham and Stamford. At the age of fourteen in May 1535 he was sent to the University of Cambridge, and admitted into St. John's College, where he pursued his studies with such application, that he hired the Bell-ringer to call him up every morning at four a-clock. He was Reader of the Sophistry-Lecture, when he was but sixteen years old, and afterwards read the Greek Lecture there, as a Gentleman for his exercise without position, before he was nineteen years of age (*d*). When he had proceeded Master of Arts, and continued at the University about six years, May the 6th 1541 he removed to Grays-Inn, where he made a considerable progress in the Common Law (*e*), and his company was extremely valued on account of his agreeable and facetious disposition [*B*]. About the latter end of King Henry VIII's reign paying a visit to his father at

(d) Ibid. pag. 6.

(e) Ibid. pag. 7.

Stysted, being at the siege of Berwick in the 7th of Edward III. 1333 (11), there arose a great controversy between him and Sir William Falconham (12), concerning a Banner of Arms, charged with this Coat, viz. *a field Barry, of ten pieces, argent and azure, on six escutcheons, three, two, and one, sable, as many Lions rampant of the first.* These Arms each challenged as his right (13), and offered to maintain the same by combat in his proper person. But the King was pleased to forbid it, and ordering the Heralds to decide the affair by law and justice, they solemnly adjudged the right of bearing those Arms to Sir John Cecil, as heir of blood lineally descended from the body of James Cecil Baron of Beauport, slain at the siege of Wallingford Castle in the fourth of King Stephen. This Sir John married Alice, sister to Sir Robert Baskerville, and had issue John his son and heir, who died in his life time, having married Joan daughter of Sir Richard Mannington Knt., by whom he left Thomas Ceissel of Alterennes in Herefordshire Knt., who succeeded his grandfather Sir John Ceissel. Thomas Ceissel married Margaret daughter and heir of Sir Gilbert Winston Knt. (14), and had issue Richard his son and heir, who married Margaret daughter of Sir John Philips Knt. (15), by whom he had Philip Sicelt, as the name was then written; who married Maud, daughter and heir of William-Philip Vaughan of Tillisglase (16), by Wenlian his wife, daughter and coheir of Sir Thomas Barry, by Elizabeth his wife, daughter of Richard Lord Talbot; which Sir Thomas Barry was son and heir of Gerald de Barrye, Lord of Castle Scalt in Herefordshire. Philip Sicelt by the said Maud had issue Philip his son and heir, and David Sicelt (17), ancestor to the present Earls of Exeter and Salisbury. Philip, the eldest son, was father of John Sycill (as he wrote his name) of Alterennes, and of the parish of Walterston in Herefordshire (18), who by his last Will and Testament, dated June the 21st 1551 the fifth of Edward VI, orders his body to be buried in the parish Church of St. Peters in Walterston, and leaves to Elizabeth Wennston his wife his Mansion-house of Alterennes, with the lands thereto belonging for life, and after her decease to William his son and heir and his heirs for ever, and entails his other lands in Herefordshire and Monmouthshire on the said *William* his son, and in default of issue on *Thomas* his son, remainder to *Philip Sycill* his son, remainder to Anne and Alice his daughters. David, the younger son of *Philip Sicelt* abovementioned, having purchased a fair estate in Lincolnshire, in 22 Henry VII, founded a Chantry in St. George's Church in Stamford (19); and in 3 Henry VIII, was constituted (20) Water-Bayliff of Wittlesey-mere in Huntingdonshire, and Keeper of the Swans there, and throughout all the Waters and Fens in the counties of Huntingdon, Cambridge, Lincoln, and Northampton, for the term of thirty years. In the fifth of Henry VIII, he was made one of the King's Serjeants at Arms (21); and having this employment at Court, obtained for *Richard* his son and heir the office of a Page of the Crown (22). In the eighth of Henry VIII he obtained a grant to himself and his son of the place of Keeper of Clyff-Park in the county of Northampton; and in the fifteenth of that King (continuing still Serjeant at Arms) he was constituted Steward of the King's Lordship of Cole-Weston in that county (23). In the twenty third of Henry VIII, upon the death of Sir William Spencer Knt. he was appointed Sheriff of Northamptonshire for the remaining part of that year, and the next ensuing year (24). And having been Alderman of Stamford three times (25), died in 1541, the thirty second of Henry VIII. as appears from the probates of his last Will and Testament, which bears date that year. Richard, his eldest son, in the eighth of Henry VIII, was made one of the pages of the Crown (26); in the 12th he waited on the King at the famous interview with the King of France between Calais and Guisnes (27); and in the 22d being Groom of the Robes to that King obtained a grant of the office of Constable of Warwick Castle, then in the Crown (28). In the 27th of Henry VIII, being one of the Grooms of the Wardrobe he had a grant of the office of the King's water, called Wittleley-Mere, and the custody of the Swans, and of those Waters called Great-Crick and Merys, in the counties of Cambridge, Lincoln, Huntington, and Northampton, for the term of thirty years, after the expiration of that granted to David Cecyll his father (29). In the thirty first of Henry VIII, he was Sheriff of Rutlandshire (30). The year following, being written Richard Cecyll of Burley in the county of Northampton Esq; he had a grant to him, his heirs and assigns for ever, of the Scite of St. Michael's Priory near Stamford, and the Church, and 299 acres of arable land, lying in the Parish of St. Martin's in Stamford, in the county of Northampton (31). In the thirty fourth of Henry VIII, being then Yeoman of the Wardrobe, he was made Steward of the King's Manors of Nassynton, Yarwell, and Upton, in the county of Northampton for life (32). In the thirty sixth Henry VIII, he purchased the Manor of Esyngdon in the county of Rutland, then also in the Crown, as part of the Earl of Warwick's land (33). The year following he surrendered his custody of Warwick Castle (34). He died March the 22d 1553, and was buried in St. Martin's Church in Stamford, leaving issue by Jane, his wife, daughter and heir to William Heckington of Bourn in Lincolnshire Esq; William, his son and heir, the subject of this article, and three daughters, *Margaret* married to Roger Cave of Stamford in Northamptonshire Esq; *Elizabeth* to Robert Wingfield of Upton in the same county Esq; and afterwards to Hugh Allington Esq; and *Anne* to John White of Tuxford in Nottinghamshire Esq; (35).

(11) Barnes, *ubi supra*, pag. 75.

(12) Powel's *History of Wales*, pag. 147.

(13) John Boswel's *Concords of Armory*, fol. 80.

(14) Chancey's *Hertfordshire*, pag. 308.

(15) *Visit. de Com. Hereford. not. 9. A. 17. in Bibl. Harley.*

(16) *Ex Stemmate per Camden. penes præhon. Tho. Dom. Lovel.*

(17) Ibid.

(18) *Ex Registr. vocat. Buck. qu. 16. in Cur. Prærog. Cant. apud* Collins, pag. vii.

(19) Pat. 22. H. VII. pag. 1.

(20) Pat. 3. H. VIII. pag. 2.

(21) *Ex MS. quodam in Recepta Scacc.*

(22) Pat. 8. H. VIII. pag. 2.

(23) Pat. 15. H. VIII. pag. 1.

(24) Fuller's *Worthies, Northamptonshire*, pag. 299.

(25) Butcher's *Survey of Stamford*, pag. 43.

(26) Pat. 8. H. VIII. pag. 2.

(27) *MS. Not. B. 5. in Bibl. Joh. Anstis apud* Collins, pag. ix.

(28) Pat. 22. H. VIII. pag. 1.

(29) Privat. Sigill. 27. H. VIII.

(30) Wright's *Rutlandshire*, pag. 12.

(31) Pat. 32. H. VIII. pag. 7.

(32) Pat. 34. H. VIII. pag. 7.

(33) Pat. 36. H. VIII. pag. 28.

(34) Collins, pag. x.

(35) Idem, ibid.

[*B*] *His company was extremely valued on account of his agreeable and facetious disposition.*] The Author of the Manuscript life of him, written soon after his death, and published by Arthur Collins Esq; has the following passage (36). "But as his yeats and company required, he wold manie tymes be merry amongst young Gentlemen, who were most desirous of his companie for his wittie mirth and merry temper; among the rest I herd him tell this merriment of himself, that a mad companion incited him to plaie, where in short tyme he lost all his money, bedding, and books to his companion, having never used plaie before; and being among his other company told how such a one had misled him, saieing he wold presently have a device to be even with him; and with a long trenche made a hole in the wall near his plaie-fellow's bed's head, "and in a fearfull voice spake thus thorough the trenke; *O mortal man, repent, repent of thy horrible synne, plaie, coseinge, and such lewdness, or els thou art damned, and canst not be saved*: which at midnight all alone so amazed him, as drive him into a sweate for feare. Most penitent and heavy the next daie in presence of the yewthes he told with tremblinge what a fearful voice spake to him at midnight, vowing never to plaie againe; and calling for Mr. *Cecill* asked him forgivnes on his knees, and restored all his money, bedding, and books. So two gamsters weare both reclaymed with this merry device and never plaid more. Manie other of the like merry jests I have heard him tell."

(36) Pag. 7, 8.

at Court, he met in the Preſence-Chamber two Prieſts, Chaplains to O Neale, and talking long with them in Latin, he fell into a diſpute with them, in which he ſhewed ſo much learning and wit, that the Prieſts were entirely foiled, and went away in great indignation. The King being told that young Mr. Cecil had confuted both O Neale's Chaplains, ſent for him, and after a long diſcourſe with him, being highly pleaſed with his anſwers, directed his father to find out a proper place for him; upon which he ſollicited for a reverſion of the *Cuſtos Brevium* Office in the *Common-Pleas*, which the King readily granted (*f*). Auguſt the 8th 33 H. VIII he married Mary Cheeke, ſiſter to Sir John Cheeke, a Gentleman of diſtinguiſhed learning (*g*) [*G*], who lived with him not above a year and a quarter, by whom he had Thomas (*h*) afterwards Earl of Exeter. Dec. the 21ſt 38 H. VIII. he married for his ſecond wife Mildred Cooke, one of the daughters of Sir Anthony Cooke, a Lady excellently ſkilled in the Latin and Greek Tongues [*D*]; by whom he had Robert, afterwards Earl of Saliſbury, Anne, married to Edward Earl of Oxford, and Elizabeth to William heir of the Lord Wentworth, and three other children, who all died young (*i*). In the firſt year of King Edward VI, the Duke of Somerſet, then Lord Protector, appointed him Maſter of the Requeſts; and the ſame year he attended the Duke to Muſſelborough Field againſt the Scots, where he was like to have been killed, but ſaved by a perſon, who putting out his arm to thruſt Mr. Cecil out of the level of the Cannon, had it ſtruck off. In the ſecond year of King Edward he was committed to the Tower upon the Duke of Somerſet's being firſt called in queſtion, but after a quarter of a year's confinement was ſet at liberty. The Duke perceiving the King's eſteem for Mr. Cecil, preferred him to be Secretary of State and Privy Counſellor (*k*) [*E*]. October the 11th 1551 he received the honour of Knighthood (*l*). The Dukes of Somerſet and Northumberland endeavoured to engage him in their intereſts by great offers and preſents, which he refuſed, and, though with difficulty, carried himſelf even to them both all the King's reign, upon whoſe death he was ſeverely threatened by the Duke of Northumberland for oppoſing the conveyance of the Crown from the Ladies Mary and Elizabeth to the Lady Jane Grey [*F*], though he was of the number of thoſe who ſubſcribed it (*m*). When Queen Mary aſcended the Throne, ſhe granted him a general pardon, and offered him the poſt of Secretary of State and Privy Counſellor, if he would change his Religion; which he refuſed [*G*]; but made his court to

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 8, 9.

(*g*) See the Article of CHEEK.

(*b*) *Life of Cecil, Lord Burghley*, pag. 5 and 9.

(*i*) Ibid. pag. 5, and 10.

(*k*) Ibid. pag. 10.

(*l*) Mr. Strype's Note (*q*) on Sir John Hayward's *Hiſtory of the Life and Reign of King Edward VI*, in the *Complete Hiſtory of England*, vol. 2. pag. 320.

(*m*) Camden, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 609; and *Life of Cecil*, pag. 11.

[*C*] *Auguſt the 8th 33 Henry VIII. he married Mary Cheeke, ſiſter of Sir John Cheeke, a Gentleman of diſtinguiſhed learning.*] This the Author of his life aſſures us of (37), and tells us that he married that Lady, *after he had ſpent ſome time at the Inns of Court.* Camden therefore is miſtaken in aſſerting (38), that at twenty years of age he married her, while he was a ſtudent at the Univerſity of Cambridge, *and buried her in a year or two, after which he ſtudied the laws for a year or two at Gray's-Inn in London.*

(37) Pag. 9.

(38) *Life and Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, in the *Complete Hiſtory of England*, vol. 2. pag. 609. edit. London 1706.

[*D*] *Dec. the 21ſt 38 H. VIII. he married for his ſecond wife Mildred Cooke, one of the daughters of Sir Anthony Cooke of Giddy-Hall in Eſſex a Lady excellently ſkilled in the Latin and Greek tongues.*] This we are informed of by Camden *, and the Author of the life of Cecil †, who tells us that her perfection in the Greek language was ſo great, that ſhe tranſlated a piece of St. Chryſoſtom out of Greek into Engliſh.

* Ibid.

† Pag. 10.

[*E*] *Preferred him to be Secretary of State and Privy Counſellor.*] The Author of his life tells us (39), that it was about the third year of the King's reign, and that he was then but twenty five years old (40). Now this is evidently a miſtake; for ſince Edward the VIth came to the Crown January 28 1547, and this Author aſſerts, that Mr. Cecil was appointed Secretary of State and Privy Counſellor in the third year of that King's Reign, that Gentleman, who was born Sept. the 13th 1521, muſt be then about thirty years of age. Mr. John Strype (41) informs us, that he was made Secretary of State upon Dr. Wotton's reſignation of that office, which was Sept. the 6th, 1550, as it is noted in King Edward the VI's Journal: ſo that Mr. Cecil was then twenty nine years of age.

(39) Pag. 10.

(40) Ibid. and pag. 65.

(41) In his note (*q*) upon Sir John Hayward's *Life and Reign of King Edward VI*, in the *Complete Hiſtory of England*, vol. 2. pag. 320.

[*F*] *He was ſeverely threatned by the D. of Northumberland for oppoſing the conveyance of the Crown from the Ladies Mary and Elizabeth to the Lady Jane Grey.*] Sir John Hayward in his *Life and Reign of King Edward VI* ‡ having affirmed, that the Duke in his contrivance to procure the Crown to be ſettled upon his daughter-in-law the Lady Jane, *uſed the advice of two eſpecially, the Lord Chief Juſtice* Mountague, *who drew the Letters Patents, and Secretary* Cecil; *and that thoſe furniſhed the Patent with divers reaſons, whereof ſome were of law and ſome of policy in ſtate.* Mr. John Strype in his Note upon that paſſage * tells us, that he groſsly wrongs the memories of thoſe two Gentlemen, *out of what deſign*, ſays he, *I know not, nor as little do I know whence he had it; for neither* Stow *nor* Sanders *mention it. For firſt as for* Cecil, *he was ſo far from aſſiſting in this matter, or deviſing reaſons for the Patent, that he oppoſed it as much as he could (and ſo* Camden expreſly *ſaith) tho' he ſigned with the reſt. Moreover I have ſeen an apology of* Cecil's *own drawing about his concern therein. There he ſhewed,* how he refuſed to ſubſcribe the Book, when none of the Council did refuſe, whereby he incurred the indignation of the Duke of Northumberland. That he refuſed to make a Proclamation for the proclaiming Queen Jane, and turned the labour to *Throgmorton.* That he refuſed the writing of a letter to ſend abroad in the Realm for the ſhewing Queen Jane's title. That this he refuſed, becauſe he would not write Queen *Mary Baſtard.* And the Duke wrote it himſelf. That he avoided being preſent at the drawing up of the Proclamation for the publiſhing Queen *Jane*'s title, tho' he was eſpecially appointed thereunto. That he avoided anſwering the Queen's Letters, which ſhe wrote from Keninghall to the Council requiring their obedience. That he avoided likewiſe writing all public letters to the Realm upon *Jane*'s Acceſs to the Crown. That he practiſed with the Lord Treaſurer to win the Lord Privy Seal, that he might by the Lord *Ruſſel*'s means cauſe Windſor Caſtle to ſerve the Queen, and they two to levy the weſt parts for the Queen's ſervice. That he opened himſelf to the Lord Arundel, whom he found thereto diſpoſed. That he did the like to the Lord Darcy. That he purpoſed to have ſtolen down to the Queen's Highneſs, and *Goſnald* offered to lead him thither, becauſe he knew not the way. And that he had his horſes ready at Lambeth for that purpoſe. That when he firſt ſecretly heard of the purpoſe of making the Lady Jane Queen, he diſliked it, and fearing the event, conveyed away his lands, his goods, and his leaſes. *All thoſe things conſidered,* ſays Mr. Strype, *who can think it true, that he* furniſhed the Patent *of ſettlement* with arguments taken from law and policy? *The moſt he did, was to ſign with the reſt; which alſo he did as a witneſs to King* Edward's *deed, and not as an abettor or Counſellor.*

‡ [Printed in the *Complete Hiſtory of England*, vol. 2. pag. [325] *ad ann.* 1553.

* Ibid.

[*G*] *Offered him the poſt of Secretary of State and Privy Counſellor, if he would change his Religion; which*

to the Lady Elizabeth, who made uſe of him as a neceſſary inſtrument, whilſt ſhe was a private perſon (*n*), which expoſed him to the malice of his enemies, though he defeated it by his prudence and dexterity. However the Queen ſent him in the ſecond year of her reign to Bruſſels with the Lord Paget to bring over Cardinal Pole (*o*). Upon Queen Elizabeth's acceſſion to the Throne he was advanced to be Secretary of State, and was the firſt perſon ſworn of her Privy Council at Hatfield (*p*). He had the principal hand in the ſettlement of Religion, and the alteration of the coin; and in the ſecond year of her Majeſty's reign was ſent Embaſſador into Scotland to treat of peace, which by his management was concluded (*q*). January the 10th the year following (*r*), upon the death of Sir Thomas Parry, he was made Maſter of the Wards [*H*]. In 1569 there was a deſign formed by ſeveral of the Nobility to ruin him; but it was defeated [*I*]. The ſame year by his prudence and care, though he was Secretary alone, he ſuppreſſed the rebellion in the North without any battle, blood, or danger to the honour of the Queen or ſafety of the Realm (*s*). In 1570 he was ſent with Walter Mildmay to treat with the Queen of Scots at Chatſworth in Derbyſhire (*t*); and on February the 25th 157$\frac{0}{1}$ was created Baron Burgley (*u*). In 1572 he was invited with the Earl of Leiceſter to Paris to the marriage of the King of Navarre with Margaret, ſiſter to the King of France, in order that thoſe two Noblemen might be cut off in the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's Day (*w*). In June the ſame year he was made Knight of the Garter (*x*), and July the 15th following Lord High Treaſurer of England, upon the death of William Powlet, Marquis of Winchester (*y*). This poſt he diſcharged with great fidelity and applauſe [*K*], and conſiderably augmented the public purſe, and his own private eſtate, tho' he abhorred the baſe and corrupt methods of amaſſing riches; for he ſeldom or never ſuffered any thing to be expended, but for the Queen's honour, the ſecurity of this Nation, or the ſupport of ſome

(*n*) Camden, pag. 609.

(*o*) *Life of Cecil*, pag. 12.

(*p*) Ibid. pag. 13.

(*q*) Ibid. pag. 14, 15, 16.

(*r*) Ibid. pag. 17. *See* Camden, pag. 609.

(*s*) *Life of Cecil*, pag. 17.

(*t*) Camden, pag. 429.

(*u*) Idem, pag. 431. and *Life of Cecil*, pag. 20.

(*w*) Camden, pag. 444.

(*x*) *Life of Cecil*, pag. 20.

(*y*) Ibid. pag. 21, *and* Camden, pag. 445.

he refuſed.] This we are informed of by the Author of his life, who tells us (42), that *to this purpoſe ſome wiſe men weare under-hand ſett to allure him, and diſcover his diſpoſition; but like himſelf he wiſely and chriſtianly aunſwered, he was taught and bound to ſerve God firſt, and next the Queene; but if her ſervice ſhould put him out of God's ſervice, he hoped her Majeſty would give him leave to chooſe an everlaſting rather than momentarie ſervice; and for the Quene, ſhe had byn his ſo gracious Ladie as he wold ever ſerve and praie for her in his heart, and with his body and goodes be as ready to ſerve in her defence, as anie of her loyall ſubjects; ſo ſhe wold pleaſe to graunt him leave to uſe his conſcience to himſelf, and ſerve her at lardg as a private man, rather than to be her greateſt Counſellor.* Camden obſerves (43), that upon his oppoſing in King Edward the VIth's time the pretended conveyance of the Crown from the Ladies Mary and Elizabeth, "he "got into favour of the former, tho' he was in the number of thoſe who ſubſcribed it; and his dexterous "management preferred him to a perfect intimacy "with Cardinal Pool, Tonſtal, and Sir William Peter. "But whereas he had a real and hearty veneration "for the Proteſtant Religion (however he might humour the preſent occaſion) and finding the road to "preferment lay another way, he made his Court to "the Lady Elizabeth."

(42) Pag. 11, 12.

(43) Pag. 609.

[*H*] *Made Maſter of the Wards.*] *This office he diſcharged, as he did all others, like a good huſband for the Queen and the Wards, very modeſtly in reſpect to his private advantages, and not unprofitably for his followers and dependants, tho' without the leaſt blemiſh upon his intergrity* (44).

(44) Idem, ibid. See likewiſe the *Life of Cecil*, pag. 32, 33, 34, 35, 36.

[*I*] *In* 1569 *there was a deſign formed by ſeveral of the nobility to ruin him; but it was defeated.*] Camden informs us (45), that upon occaſion of detaining the money ſent from Spain to the Netherlands, ſeveral Peers, and amongſt others, the Duke of Norfolk, the Earls of Arundel, Northumberland, Weſtmoreland, Pembroke, and Leiceſter, began to clamour againſt Cecil, as they had done once or twice before, about the ſupplies ſent to the Proteſtants of France. But the real cauſe was this, that they envied the intereſt, which he had in the Queen; were jealous of his favouring the houſe of Suffolk in point of the ſucceſſion, and apprehended him to be a main obſtacle to the progreſs of their deſigns. They therefore concerted meaſures to procure him to be put into the Tower, Throckmorton (another of thoſe, who could not bear his greatneſs) having inſinuated to them, that if they could once get him confined, it would be no difficult thing to effect his ruin. *But the Queen had timely intelligence of theſe deſigns, by what means, I know not; and Cecil had the happineſs of finding the whole project daſhed by the ſole bravery of his Royal Miſtreſs, who ſurprized them in the very inſtant, and by the authority of her Royal Preſence, awed them out of theſe baſe meaſures* (46). The Author of his *Life* in his account of the plots tells us (47), that in the time of his fortunate riſing, the hearts of ſome roſe alſo againſt his fortune, who were more hot in envying him, than able to follow him, detracting from his praiſes, diſcouraging his ſervices, and plotting his danger. "As on a tyme, ſays he, I hard him ſay, that a Book "peſtilently and paſſionately penned againſt the Nobi"lity came to his handes, and was ſeene upon his "table by a great Nobleman and Counſellor, which "Book he had read with great diſlike, noting manie "notable lies and faultes of the Writers. Yet there "was a formall tale told the Lords of the Counſell, "who then weare moſt of them great Noblemen, and "to divers other of the Nobility, inferring and inforcing it to be done or procured by himſelf to diſgrace "the Nobility. Whereupon ſuch a fire was kindled "againſt him in the hartes of all the Lords, as a "platt was laid to cut him off. He was thereupon "called before the Counſell without the Quene's know"ledg and charged; which though he ſufficiently aun"ſwered, yet it was reſolved what aunſwere ſoever "he made, he ſhould be ſent to the Tower, and then "they wold find matter enough againſt him. Where"of he haveing advertiſement, wrote to the Quene of "theire purpoſe, who commanded nothing ſhould be "done againſt him without her privity, or els he had "byn ſent to the Tower without her knowledge. So "the fire was covered, but not quenched; for not long "after a vilaine was hired to kill him, and ſet at a "ſtaires foote to diſpatch him as he came from the "Queen; but being warned of it, he went down an"other waie and eſcaped death. Here maie be noted "howe great miſchiefs maie riſe upon ſmall cauſes; "for this was only for haveinge the Booke, which he "deteſted and condemned as much as they, and "ſought to have the Writer apprehended as belonged "to his place, yet his jelous ennemyes torned his ho"neſt meaninge to a horrible miſchiefe."

(45) *Ad ann.* 569, pag. 417.

(46) Idem, ibid.

(47) Pag. 18, 19.

[*K*] *Made . . . . High-Treaſurer . . . . which poſt he diſcharged with great fidelity and applauſe.*] He had a ſtrict eye upon the Farmers of the Cuſtoms, but without harſhneſs or pedantry. He uſed to ſay, *that he never cared to ſee the Treaſury ſwell like a diſordered ſpleen, when the other parts of the Commonwealth were in a conſumption.* And he employed all poſſible means (and with good ſucceſs) to enrich the Queen and the Kingdom by his adminiſtration, it being a common expreſſion with him, *that nothing could be for the advantage of a Prince, which makes any way againſt his reputation.* Wherefore he would never ſuffer the rents of lands to be raiſed, nor the old tenants to be put out (48).

(48) Camden, Pag. 609.

some neighbouring Allies (*z*). He lived in a very hoſpitable and magnificent manner (*aa*); and conſtantly beſtowed in alms five hundred pounds a year (*bb*). He entertained the Queen at his houſe twelve ſeveral times, each of which coſt him two or three thouſand pounds (*cc*). He was highly reſpected by the Nobility (*dd*), and endeavoured always to advance men of Quality and merit (*ee*). He was mild in his anſwers to perſons of all ranks (*ff*); and took particular care to prefer valuable men in the Church, and in the poſts of the Law (*gg*). He was ſtrict in his devotion, kind to his friends, gentle to his enemies, averſe to pomp, temperate in diet, and impenetrably ſecret (*hh*). His chief diverſion was in reading or converſing with his friends (*ii*). Not long before his death, he was deſirous of leaving his Queen and country in perfect peace and tranquillity; to which end he endeavoured to effect an accommodation with the King of Spain, but in this point was oppoſed by the Earl of Eſſex (*kk*) [*L*]. Whilſt his Lordſhip lay ſick, by his prudent conduct a treaty was ſet on foot with the States of Holland, by which the Queen was eaſed of a yearly expence of an hundred and twenty thouſand pounds (*ll*.) He died at his houſe in the Strand Auguſt the 4th 1598 (*mm*), with ſtrong ſentiments of piety and reſignation (*nn*), and interred at Stamford in Lincolnſhire, where a monument was erected to him (*oo*). We ſhall give ſome account of his poſterity in the note [*M*]. Camden tells

(*z*) Camden, pag. 609.

(*aa*) *Life of Cecil*, pag. 37, & *ſeqq.*

(*ee*) Ibid. pag. 46.

(*ff*) Ibid. pag. 48.

(*gg*) Ibid. pag. 55, 56.

(*hh*) Ibid. pag. 38.

(*ii*) Ibid. pag. 40.

(*kk*) Ibid. pag. 45.

(*ll*) Ibid. pag. 56-64.

(*mm*) Camden, pag. 608.

(*nn*) *Life of Cecil*, pag. 68, & *ſeq.*

(*oo*) Stowe, *ubi ſupra.*

(*mm*) Idem, ibid. pag. 610.

(*nn*) Stowe's *Annals*, p. 148.

[*L*] *Endeavoured to effect an accommodation with the King of Spain; but in this point was oppoſed by the Earl of Eſſex.*] The Earl having been bred to the ſword, and gained ſome reputation by it, was averſe to an accommodation, and ſtiffly urged the impoſſibility of making any honourable Treaty with Spain, or indeed any Terms, but what they would break, upon theſe and the like ſuggeſtions; "that the Spaniards are a ſubtle and "enterprizing people, and very ambitious of extend-"ing their Empire; that they bore a moſt inveterate "averſion to England, and profeſſed a Religion quite "contrary to it; that the Pope's diſpenſing power "was unlimited, and that axiom generally eſpouſed, "that *Faith is not to be kept with heretics.*" Theſe arguments and the apprehenſion of future dangers and inconveniences he much inſiſted on, ſo that the Lord Treaſurer was provoked to ſay, *That he ſeemed intent upon nothing but blood and ſlaughter.* And after a very warm debate upon this point he took out a prayer-book, and without uſing any words pointed to this paſſage, *Men of blood ſhall not live out half their days.* "Some "however there were, continues Camden (49), who "approved Eſſex's meaſures, as conceiving he was prin-"cipally concerned for the honour and welfare of his "country. Others condemned him as a deſigning "and ambitious perſon, who was for advancing him-"ſelf and his creatures at any rate. To ſilence theſe "men he wrote a formal kind of defence, in which "he exhibited what has been already mentioned &c." Mr. Collins at the end of his edition of *the Life of Cecil* (50) has committed a ſtrange miſtake with regard to this laſt paſſage of Camden, from which he erroneouſly concludes that Lord Burleigh wrote a Defence of his opinion in favour of peace againſt the Earl of Eſſex's party; whereas it is evident from Camden's words, that it was the Earl, who wrote in favour of a war with Spain. Mr. Collins's words, for which he cites the place above quoted, are as follow: *Some however there were, who approved Eſſex's meaſures, as conceiving he was principally concerned for the honour and welfare of his country. His Lordſhip* (51) *therefore to ſilence theſe men, wrote a formal kind of Defence, wherein he exhibited ſuch weighty arguments to ſupport his opinion for a peace, as convinced all diſpaſſionate men. And tho' they produced not the deſired effect, yet whilſt his Lordſhip lay ſick, by his provident conduct, &c.*

(49) Pag. 608.

(50) Pag. 74.

(51) Lord Burghley.

[*M*] *We ſhall give ſome account of his poſterity in the note.*] His eldeſt ſon THOMAS CECIL, was born in the year 1542 (52), and in the 5th of Queen Elizabeth elected Member of Parliament for the Town of Stamford in Lincolnſhire (53). May 26th 1601 he was inſtalled at Windſor one of the Knights companions of the moſt noble Order of the Garter (54). In the third of King James I. he was created Earl of Exeter (55). He died Feb. 7th 162½, and was interred in Weſtminſter. By his laſt wife the Lady Frances Bridges he had no other iſſue than one daughter Sophia-Anna, buried Sept. 15, 1621; but by the firſt, one of the coheirs of John Nevil, Lord Latimer, he had five ſons and eight daughters, viz. *William*, who ſucceeded him; Sir *Richard Cecil*, anceſtor to the preſent Earl of Exeter; Sir *Edward Cecil*, created Viſcount Wimbleton; *Chriſtopher* drowned in Germany; and *Thomas*. His daughters were theſe; *Catherine*, who died unmarried; *Lucie*, married to William Marquis of Wincheſter, by whom ſhe had iſſue John Marquis of Wincheſter, Father to Charles late Duke of Bolton; *Mildred*, firſt married to Sir Thomas Read Knt. and afterwards to Sir Edmond Trafford of Trafford in the County of Lancaſter Knt. *Mary* to Edward Lord Denny; *Suſan*, who died unmarried; *Elizabeth* married firſt to Sir William Hutton Knt. and afterwards to Sir Edward Coke, Knt. Lord Chief Juſtice of the King's Bench; *Dorothy*, to Sir Giles Allington of Horſheath in the County of Cambridge Knt.; and *Frances* to Sir Nicholas Tuſton of Hothfield in the County of Kent Knt., afterwards Earl of Thanet. His Lordſhip's third ſon, Sir *Edward Cecil*, who was one of the moſt famous Generals of his time, was created Baron Cecil of Putney Nov. 9th 1625, and on July 25th the year following made Viſcount Wimbleton. He married three wives; firſt Theodoſia, daughter of Sir Andrew Noel of Dalby in Leiceſterſhire Knt., by whom he had iſſue four daughters, *Dorothy* who died unmarried; *Albinia*, married to Sir Chriſtopher Wray of Barlings in Lincolnſhire Knt.; *Elizabeth*, to Francis Lord Willoughby of Parham; and *Frances* to James, ſon and heir of William Viſcount Say and Sele. His ſecond wife was Diana, daughter of Sir William Drury of Halſtede in the County of Suffolk Knt. by whom he had iſſue only one daughter *Anne*, who died in her infancy. By his third wife Sophia, daughter of Sir Edward Zouch of Woking in the County of Surrey Knt., he had iſſue an only ſon, *Algernon*, who likewiſe died in his infancy. His Lordſhip died at Wimbleton Nov. 16th 1638, and was interred there. His eldeſt brother WILLIAM, Earl of Exeter, was married in his youth to Elizabeth, ſole daughter and heir to Edward Manners Earl of Rutland, who died April 11th 1591, leaving iſſue an only ſon William, who, in right of his mother, bore the title of Lord Roos. His ſecond wife was Elizabeth, ſiſter and coheir of Sir Robert Drury of Halſtede in the County of Suffolk, Knt., by whom he had only three daughters, *Elizabeth*, wife of Sir Thomas Howard Knight of the Bath, afterward created Lord Howard of Charlton, Viſcount Andover, and Earl of Berkſhire; *Diana*, firſt married to Henry Earl of Oxford, and afterwards to Thomas Lord Bruce, Earl of Elgin in Scotland, afterwards created Earl of Aileſbury; and *Anne* to Henry Lord Grey of Groby, afterwards created Earl of Stamford. His Lordſhip's only ſon *William* Lord Roos married on Feb. 12th 1616 Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Thomas Lake Knt., Principal Secretary of State. He died at Naples June 27th 1618 of poiſon, as was ſuſpected. The beforementioned *William*, Earl of Exeter, his Father, was inſtalled one of the Knights of the Garter at Windſor October 5th 1630, being then one of the Privy Council to King Charles I, and departing this life was interred July 8th 1640, in Weſtminſter-Abbey; and leaving no iſſue, his nephew *David Cecil*, ſon and heir of his brother Sir *Richard Cecil*, daughter of Sir Anthony Cope of Hanwell in the County of Oxford, Bart. ſucceeded him in his honours. DAVID, Earl of Exeter, married Elizabeth, daughter of John Earl of Bridgwater, by whom he had ſix ſons and three daughters: *Thomas*, the youngeſt of the ſons, was buried at Tinwell in Rutlandſhire May 28th 1641; and *Elizabeth*, one

(52) *Ex Stemmate.*

(53) *Ex Not. Parl. MS. per Brown Willis Arm.*

(54) Collins's *Memoirs of the Family of Cecil*, ſubjoined to the *Life of Cecil*, pag. 106.

(55) Idem, ibid.

(pp) Pag. 610. tells us (*pp*), that he was one of thoſe few who lived and died with a ſound and large reputation.

one of the daughters, was buried there Novemb. 13th 1638. *Anne*, another daughter, died young; and *Frances* was married to Sir Anthony Aſhly Cooper, afterwards Earl of Shaftſbury. His ſons, who ſurvived him, were *John* Earl of Exeter, *William*, and *David*. His Lordſhip died at London April 18th 1643, and was buried in the Church of St. Martin in Stamford. JOHN, Earl of Exeter, by the Lady Frances his firſt wife, daughter to John Earl of Rutland, had iſſue *John*, Earl of Exeter; *David*, who died young, and *Frances*, married to John Lord Viſcount Scudamore in the Kingdom of Ireland; and deceaſing in June 1694, left iſſue James Lord Viſcount Scudamore, whoſe daughter and heir is married to the preſent Duke of Beaufort. The ſaid *John*, Earl of Exeter, married to his ſecond wife the Lady Mary, daughter to Mildmay Fane, Earl of Weſtmoreland, widow of Sir Brian Palmes of Aſhwell in the County of Rutland Knt.; but by her had no iſſue. And departing this life at Burleigh-Houſe near Stamford in February 1677 was buried in St. Martin's Church aforeſaid. He was ſucceeded in his honour by JOHN his only ſurviving ſon, who married Anne, only daughter of William Earl of Devonſhire, and ſiſter to William Duke of Devonſhire, widow of Charles Lord Rich, ſon and heir of Charles Earl of Warwick; by whom he had iſſue *John* his ſon and heir; *William Cecil* of Snape in the County of York Eſq; *Charles*, and *Edward*; and four daughters, *Chriſtian*, *Anne*, and *Frances*, who died young; and *Elizabeth*, married to Charles Boyle, Earl of Orrery in Ireland, and Baron of Marſtown in England. His Lordſhip, who had a learned education and excellent genius, died at Iſſy near Paris in his return from Rome Aug. 29th 1700, and was interred in the church of St. Martin at Stamford. His eldeſt ſon and heir JOHN Earl of Exeter, married firſt in February 1696 Annabella, daughter of John Bennet Lord Oſſulſton, by whom he had no iſſue, ſhe dying in Auguſt 1698 without iſſue; and ſecondly Elizabeth, eldeſt daughter, and one of the coheirs of Sir John Brownlow of Belton in Lincolnſhire Bart. in Sept. 1699, who died in the 43d year of her age November the 28th 1723. His Lordſhip had iſſue five ſons, *John* Lord Burghley; *Brownlow* the preſent Earl of Exeter, *William*, *Francis*, and *Charles*, who died unmarried; and a daughter, *Elizabeth*, married to William Aiſlabie Eſq; ſon and heir of John Aiſlabie of Studely in the County of York Eſq; Chancellor of the Exchequer, and of the Privy Council to King George I. His Lordſhip departed this life Decemb. 21ſt, 1721, and was buried at Stamford, and ſucceeded by JOHN his eldeſt ſon and heir, who dying unmarried April 9th 1722, was ſucceeded by his brother and heir BROWNLOW, now Earl of Exeter, then Member of Parliament for Stamford. His Lordſhip in the year 1724 married Hannah-Sophia, daughter of Thomas Chambers of the town of Derby Eſq; and Merchant of the city of London, by whom he hath iſſue two ſons and two daughters, the right honourable *Brownlow*, Lord Burghley, Lady *Margaret-Sophia Cecil*, the honourable *Thomas-Chambers Cecil*, and Lady *Elizabeth Cecil* (56). The Arms of the Earl of Exeter are Barry of ten Argent and Azure, over all ſix Eſcutcheons 3, 2, and 1. Sable each charged with a Lion rampant of the field. The Creſt, in a Chapeau Gules, turn'd up Ermine, a Garb Or ſupported by two Lions, that on the dexter ſide Argent, the ſiniſter Azure. Supporters, two Lions Ermin. Motto, *Cor unum, via una*.

(56) Collins, pag. 106-118.

We ſhall proceed now to the children of William Lord Burghley by his 2d wife *Mildred Cooke* (57), daughter of Sir Anthony Cooke, by whom, beſides three children, who died young, he had a ſon, *Robert*, and two daughters, viz. *Anne*, the eldeſt was married to Edward Earl of Oxford, by whom that Earl had three daughters, *Elizabeth*, married to William Earl of Derby, *Bridget* to the Lord Norris, and *Suſan* to Philip Earl of Montgomery. *Elizabeth* his ſecond daughter, was married to William, the heir of the Lord Wentworth, who had no children (58). ROBERT CECIL was by Queen Elizabeth made Principal Secretary in 1596 (59), Maſter of the Court of Wards in 1597 (60), and employed in ſeveral negotiations. He was likewiſe Chancellor of the Univerſity of Cambridge. Tho' that Queen, eſpecially in the latter part of her life, was impatient of hearing the name of her ſucceſſor, yet Sir *Robert* held a correſpondence with the King of Scots, which was once very near being diſcovered. "For the Queen taking the air upon Black-Heath "near Greenwich, a poſt ſummoned her to enquire "from what quarter his buſineſs came; and hearing "from Scotland, ſhe ſtaid her coach to receive the "packet. But the Secretary, Sir *Robert Cecil*, being "in the coach with her, fearful that ſome of his ſe-"cret conveyances might be diſcovered, having an "active wit, calls for a knife ſuddenly to open it, "leſt put-off and delays might beget ſuſpicion; and "when he came to cut it, he told the Queen, it look-"ed and ſmelt ill-favouredly, coming out of many "naſty budgets, and was fit to be opened and aired "before ſhe ſaw it; which reaſon meeting with her "diſaffection to ill ſcents, hindred her ſmelling out "his under-hand contrivances (†)." May 13th 1603 he was created Baron Cecil of Eſendon in the County of Rutland; and Auguſt 20th the year following Viſcount Cranborn in Dorſetſhire; and May 4th 1605 Earl of Saliſbury (61). He was inſtalled Knight of the Garter May 20th 1606 (62), and made by King James I Lord High-Treaſurer May 6th 1608 (63). He died in his return from Bath at Marlborough in Wiltſhire on Sunday May 24th 1612 (64), and was interred at Hatfield in Hertfordſhire. He married Elizabeth, daughter of William Brook Lord Cobham, by whom he had a ſon named *William*, and a daughter, *Frances*, married to Henry Clifford Earl of Cumberland. WILLIAM, Earl of Saliſbury, was made Knight of the Garter, Captain of the Band of Gentlemen Penſioners, and one of his Majeſty's Privy-Council, and died December 3d 1668, aged 78, and was interred at Hatfield. He married on Decem. 1ſt 1608 the Lady Catherine, youngeſt daughter of Thomas Howard Earl of Suffolk, by whom he had a ſon, *Charles*, and four daughters, viz. *Anne* married to Algernon Piercy Earl of Northumberland; *Elizabeth* to William Cavendiſh Earl of Devonſhire; *Catherine* to Philip Lord Liſle; and *Mary* to William Lord Sandes of the Tine in Hampſhire. *Charles*, their brother, dying before his father, left iſſue by Jane daughter and coheir to James Maxwell Earl of Darlton in Scotland ſeven ſons and five daughters; of which daughters *Catherine* was married to William Earl of Kinnoul in Scotland, and *Frances* to Sir William Bowyer of Derham-Court in the County of Bucks Bart. Of the ſons JAMES the ſecond (the eldeſt being dead) ſucceeded his grand-father. He was of the Privy Council to King Charles II, and on Auguſt 31ſt 1680 was made Knight of the Garter. He died in June 1683. He married Margaret, daughter of John Maners Earl of Rutland, by whom he had five ſons and five daughters. *Catherine*, the eldeſt daughter, was married to Sir George Downing of Eaſt Hatley in the County of Cambridge Bart.; *Frances* to Sir William Halford of Welham in Leiceſterſhire Bart.; *Mary* to Sir William Foreſter of Dothill in the County of Salop Knt.; *Margaret*, firſt to John Lord Stawel, and ſecondly to Richard Jones Earl of Ranelagh in Ireland, who died Feb. 21ſt 172$\frac{2}{3}$ in the 55th year of her age; and *Mildred*, the youngeſt, to Sir Uvedale Corbet of Langnor in the County of Salop Bart. The ſons were *James*, *Robert*, *William*, *Charles* and *George*; whereof Robert married Elizabeth daughter and heir to Iſaac Mennil of Mennil-Langley in the County of Derby, and Relict of William Hale of King's-Walden in the County of Hertford Eſq; and died in February 1715. JAMES, the eldeſt, in 1683 ſucceeded his father. He let out Saliſbury-Houſe to build upon, by which means he greatly improved his eſtate, and died in December 1694. He married Frances, one of the daughters and coheirs of Simon Bennet of Beechampton in the County of Bucks, Eſq; and by her, who died July the 8th 1713, had one only ſon JAMES, late Earl of Saliſbury, who was Lord Lieutenant of the County of Hertford, and aſſiſted Octob. 20th 1714 at the Coronation of King George I carrying St. Edward's ſtaff. He married Febr. 12th 1705. the Lady Anne Tufton, ſecond daughter and coheir of Thomas Earl of Thanet; and dying October the 9th 1728, aged 37, by her left iſſue *James* his ſon and heir, *William*, and three daughters, Lady *Anne*, *Catherine*, and *Margaret*. JAMES, the preſent Earl of Saliſbury, was born October 20th 1713, and upon his return from his travels

(†) Arthur Wilſon's *Life and Reign of King James, ad ann.* 1603.

(57) *Life of Cecil*, pag. 5.

(58) Camden, pag. 610.

(59) Idem, pag. 594.

(60) Idem, pag. 599.

(61) Camden's *Annals of King James I.*

(62) Idem, ibid.

(63) Idem, ibid.

(64) Collins's *Peerage of England*, vol. 2. Part 1. pag. 77. *and* Camden's *Annals of King James.*

(qq) *Life of Cecil*, pag. 66.

putation. He was of a middle ſtature, and had an agreeable countenance, and an excellent complexion (*qq*).

travels in 1734 took his ſeat in the Houſe of Lords. The Arms of the Earl of Saliſbury are the ſame with the Earl of Exeter, with a Creſcent for the difference. Creſt, on a wreath fix arrows Or, heads and feathers Argent, girt together with a bandage or belt Azure, garniſhed Or, and over theſe feathers a Morion cap proper. Motto, *Sero, ſed ſerio* (66). T.

(66) Collins's *Peerage of England*, vol. 2. Part 1. pag. 77-81.

CERASI (TIBERIO) lived about the cloſe of the ſixteenth Century. He pleaded at the Bar in Rome, for twenty years; and was afterwards made one of the conſiſtorial Advocates in 1589. He was alſo Advocate of the Exchequer, and the Apoſtolical Chamber; afterwards Clerk of that Chamber, and at laſt Treaſurer to the Pope. Tho' he had written a great number of pieces, none of his writings have been publiſhed, except his *Anſwers*, inſerted in the *Councils of Farinatius*. He died at Rome the 7th of May 1601, with grief, as it is related, for his having been ſharply reprimanded by Pope Clement VIII (*a*). He was in his fifty ſeventh year. He bequeathed his whole eſtate to the Hoſpital *di Conſolatione*, and was interred in the Church of our Lady *del Populo* (*b*).

(*a*) *Tiberii mortis cauſam attuliſſe dicitur Clementis Pontificis acris quædam ac vehemens objurgatio.* Proſper. Mandoſius, *Bibliotb. Romanæ*, Cent. 1. pag. 24.

(*b*) Extracted, ibid.

CERATINUS (JAMES) a learned man of the ſixteenth Century, and an excellent Grecian, aſſumed this name, according to the cuſtom of that age, from his being a native of Hoorn in Holland [*A*]; all which we ſhall explain [*B*]. Eraſmus honoured him with very great encomiums [*C*], not only on account of the regularity of his life and manners, but alſo for his erudition. George, Elector of Saxony, having deſired Eraſmus to make choice of ſome perſon to ſucceed Moſellanus in his employment in the Univerſity of Leipſic, ſent him Ceratinus (*a*), who was alſo offered the Greek Profeſſorſhip in the College of three Languages at Louvain. Ceratinus did not meet with a very good reception at Leipſic; and we find by ſome letters of Eraſmus (*b*), that he drew this contempt upon himſelf, for his not diſcovering a ſufficient diſinclination to the Lutheran principles. This was in 1525. Before this he had taught the Greek tongue privately in Louvain (*c*), whither he had retired, when the war and the peſtilence forced him to quit his employment in the College of Tournay. He died at Louvain the 10th of April 1530, in the flower of his age (*d*). He was a Prieſt; and a circumſtance happened at his Ordination which deſerves to be known [*D*]. He was miſtaken when he told Eraſmus by letters,

(*a*) Eraſm. Epiſt. 29. lib. 20. pag. 994.

(*b*) The 42d and 44th of lib. 30.

(*c*) Eraſm. *Epiſt.* 12. lib. 17. pag. 756.

(*d*) Valer. Andr. *Biblioth. Belgic.* pag. 406.

[*A*] *He aſſumed that name . . . from his being a native of Hoorn.*] Moreri ſhould not have been in the leaſt doubt on this occaſion; he does not know whether Ceratinus was *born at Hoorn in Holland, or Hoorne in Guelderland*. In propriety of ſpeech, the *Horne* hinted at by him is not in Guelderland.

[*B*] *All which we ſhall explain.*] *Hoorn* ſignifies, in Flemiſh, a *horn*. In Greek a horn is called κέρας; in this manner *James Ceratinus* is the ſame as *James the horned*, or the *cuckold*, a title which was preferred to that of *Hornanus*, by which this Author had ſometimes diſtinguiſhed himſelf; and to that of Teyng, which was the name of his family; the name abovementioned, I ſay, was choſe preferably to any other, both as it was Greek, and by that means concealed the infamy affixed to the word *horn*; as becauſe, perhaps, the celibacy of Ceratinus ſecured him from the malicious alluſions, to which his name would have expoſed him, had he been married.

[*C*] *Eraſmus honoured him with very great encomiums.*] Eraſmus thought him a man of ſufficient learning, to be Profeſſor in the middle of Italy, and greatly ſuperior to Moſellanus. *Jacobus Ceratinus*, ſays he (1), *homo tam Græcanicæ literaturæ callens, ut poſſit vel in media Italia profiteri, nec ſe ipſo inferior in literis Latinis.* i. e. "James Ceratinus, a man ſo well "ſkilled in the Greek, that he is able to be Profeſſor "of it in the midſt of Italy; nor is he inferior in the "Latin." In another Letter (2) he expreſſes himſelf in ſtill ſtronger terms. *Græcanicæ literaturæ tam exactè callens, ut vix unum aut alterum habeat Italia quicum dubitem hunc committere, nec in Latinis ſui diſſimilis eſt.* i. e. "He is ſo great a maſter of the Greek "Tongue, that there are ſcarce two perſons in Italy, "whom I would ſcruple to compare with him; nor "is he leſs ſkilful in the Latin Tongue." He ſpeaks as follows in another place (3): *Succedit Petro Moſellano ſed decem Moſellanis eruditior, etiam Moſellani doctrinam & ingenium haud vulgariter amabam.* i. e, "He ſucceeded Peter Moſellanus, but he had ten times "his learning, and yet I had a more than common "eſteem for Moſellanus's learning and abilities." As to his manners, he declares that he is the moſt good natured creature living, being free from diſguiſe or artifice, and modeſt to a fault. *Modeſtia pene immodica, moribuſque plane niveis & ab omni fuco prorſus abhorrentibus.* (4). *Moribus eſt ſinceriſſimis & ad amicitiam appoſitis; adeo ut non minus videatur natus gratiis quam muſis* (5). i. e. "His manners are perfectly upright, and happily "formed for friendſhip; ſo that he ſeems to have been "born for the Graces no leſs than for the Muſes. . . . *Habet unum hoc vitium Ceratinus noſter, immodice modeſtus eſt, ſic verecundus ut pene putidulus ſit* (6). i. e. "Our Ceratinus has but one fault, and that is, his too "exceſſive modeſty; he is ſo baſhful, that it is almoſt "troubleſome." Valerius Andreas quotes a conſiderable part of theſe paſſages; and alſo cites Junius, who has greatly applauded Ceratinus in his Proverbs (this I ſhall mention hereafter) and in his *Batavia*, *In qua à ſingulari modeſtia ac virginali quodam pudore commendat.* i. e. "In which he commends him for his ſin-"gular modeſty, and a certain virgin-like baſhfulneſs." But Valerius Andreas did not obſerve, that the elogium *exactiſſimi vir judicii* (a man of a moſt conſummate judgment) which he fancies Eraſmus beſtows on Ceratinus, relates to Henry Stromer, to whom he was then recommended. See Epiſt. XXIX of Book XX (7).

(1) Eraſm. Epiſt. 28. lib. 20. pag. 993.

(2) The 31ſt of the ſame book, pag. 995.

(3) Epiſt. 41. lib. 30.

(4) Epiſt. 28. lib. 20. pag. 993.

(5) Epiſt. 29. lib. 20. pag. 994.

(6) Epiſt. 31. lib. 20. pag. 995. *See alſo* Epiſt. 41. lib. 30. p. 1929.

(7) Pag. 994.

[*D*] *A circumſtance happened at his ordination, which deſerves to be known.*] Adrian Junius, Ceratinus's countryman, after having laviſhed the greateſt encomiums on him, adds (8), that he is aſſured from good hands, that Ceratinus being unwilling to diſobey the ſevere commands of his father, went to Utrecht, in order to be ordained Prieſt. He was examined according to cuſtom; and upon his confeſſing ingenuouſly that he did not know by heart ſo much as one of the grammar-rules they put to him, he was diſmiſſed as an ignorant fellow, and ordered to go and apply himſelf more aſſiduouſly to the grammar. According Ceratinus went away as ſilently as poſſible; and only told the reaſon of his being excluded to a learned Clergyman; who going immediately into the room, where the examiners were aſſembled, told them the blunder they had made; that there was not a more learned man in all Louvain than the perſon they had ſent back to read his accidence; and that he had given public proofs of his learning by the exact Latin verſion he had given of St. Chryſoſtom's Books relating

(8) Adag. 4. Cent. 5.

letters, that he had ſeen him at Daventer [*E*]. He wrote a piece intitled *de Sono Græcarum Literarum*; a tranſlation of St. Chryſoſtom's firſt and ſecond dialogue on the excellency of the Prieſthood, and a Greek and Latin Lexicon [*F*], which was printed, with a preface written by Eraſmus, anno 1524.

to the Dignity of Prieſthood. The examiners were very ſenſible of their miſtake, ſo that they called back Ceratinus; and excuſed themſelves from the neceſſity (they ſaid) they were under, of going thro' the uſual form, and thereupon he was ordained Prieſt. Had theſe Gentlemen aſked Ceratinus, *per quam regulam?* (by what rule?), as Scholars are examined from Deſpautere's Grammar, who are obliged to decline their name by rule; had they treated, I ſay, Ceratinus in this manner, becauſe they had been told he was proud, they would not have been to blame. There goes a ſtory, that a preſumptuous young fellow, juſt going to receive Orders, had the mortification to have the following queſtion put to him, *Muſa quæ pars orationis?* (What part of ſpeech is *Muſa?*) and that anſwering, *Aquila non captat muſcas*, i. e. "The eagle "does not catch at flies:" he was anſwered, *neque eccleſia ſuperbos* "nor the Church at proud fellows," and thereupon was diſmiſſed.

[*E*] *He was miſtaken when he told Eraſmus (by letter) that he had ſeen him at Daventer.*] We find by a Letter which Eraſmus wrote to him, in April 1519 (9), and wherein he ſtiles him *Hornenſis*, I, that Ceratinus had deſired Eraſmus to indulge him his friendſhip; and, among other particulars, that he had had the honour to ſee him at Daventer. II, That he had hinted ſome circumſtances to Eraſmus, which he imagined would recall it to his memory. Eraſmus anſwered, that it was all a dream, and proved it to be ſo from the very ſame circumſtances. He tells him, that when he ſet out from Daventer, the bridge was not yet built, and that he did not go immediately after to England (10). Should I be aſked, why I take notice of ſuch minute particulars, I anſwer, that it is to exhibit an illuſtrious example of a very common illuſion, and for which ſome perſons might better excuſe themſelves than they commonly do, if they conſidered how many learned men fall into it. The illuſion is this: When a Writer becomes very famous, thoſe who ſtudied in the ſame Univerſity with him, take I know not what pleaſure, in declaring in all companies wherein that great Writer is mentioned, that they have known him many years, that they remember him a ſcholar &c. Theſe people imagine, that they hereby ſhare in the glory of ſuch a great man; and thereupon they relate more particulars concerning him, than are believed; and more are believed than are true (11). I am ſure that many perſons will ſee their own pictures on this occaſion. Be this as it will, we ſee here by the example of Ceratinus, that we ought not to depend too much on our memories; for there is no doubt but the laſt mentioned thought he had really ſeen Eraſmus.

[*F*] . . . *He wrote . . . a Greek and Latin Lexicon.*] Boxhornius (12) is much miſtaken when he aſſerts, that this is the firſt Greek Lexicon that was ever compiled. Valerius Andreas (13) is little leſs miſtaken, where he tells us that Ceratinus was the firſt, after Aldus Manutius, who augmented and publiſhed ſuch a Lexicon. The Preface (14) which Eraſmus made to this work of Ceratinus, is ſufficient to ſhew, that it had been already enlarged by ſeveral Writers, and borne ſeveral impreſſions. Some perſon or other had even introduced certain proper names into it, a circumſtance, which Eraſmus does not approve. One would ſuppoſe at firſt ſight, that Geſner had imagined, that this cenſure was levelled at Ceratinus (15), which will appear manifeſtly falſe, to any one who examines but ever ſo ſlightly the Preface in queſtion: but if Geſner's expreſſion is carefully weighed, he will be cleared. Boxhornius does not diſtinguiſh the manner how Ceratinus taught the Greek Tongue in Louvain. *Græcæ* (Linguæ) *profeſſorem egit Lovanii*, ſays he. Now theſe words are deceitful; they naturally induce every reader to ſuppoſe, that Ceratinus was Greek Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Louvain, which is not true. Swert (16), from whom Boxhornius borrowed Ceratinus's epitaph, with the typographical error *Minoritidas* for *Minoritas*, i. e. the Franciſcans, ſhould have made him believe, that Ceratinus taught the Greek only in private (*privatim*), which word is employed by Valerius Andreas.

(9) It is the 32d of Book 5.

(10) *Quod exiſtimas me tibi Daventriæ conſpectum vel hoc argumento facile deprehendes te vana ludi mentis imaginatione, quod cum ego Daventria diſcederem, nondum fluvius qui urbem præterfluit ponte junctus erat.*

(11) See on this ſubject, the remark [*I*] of the article CAMDEN.

(12) *In Theatr. Holland.* pag. 373.

(13) *Biblioth. Belg.* pag. 406.

(14) It is the 28th book of his Epiſtles.

(15) Geſner. *in Biblioth. in Ceratino.*

(16) Athen. *Belg.* pag. 358.

CERINTHUS, a Hereſiarch contemporary with the Apoſtles, aſcribed the Creation of the World not to God, but to the Angels (*a*). He taught that Jeſus Chriſt was the Son of Joſeph, and that the uſe of Circumciſion ought to be retained under the Goſpel. He is looked upon as the Head of the converted Jews, who raiſed in the Church of Antioch (*b*) the tumult of which St. Luke has given the Hiſtory in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts. They cauſed that diſturbance by declaring to the faithful, that without Circumciſion they would unavoidably be damned. It is alſo ſaid that he was one of thoſe who, ſome years before (*c*), had cenſured St. Peter for having publiſhed the Goſpel to the Gentiles (*d*). St. Epiphanius, who tells us all this (*e*), ſuppoſes notwithſtanding that Cerinthus came after Carpocrates: this is to pervert Chronology [*A*]. Cerinthus paſſes for one of the principal Heads of the Millenarians: he is accuſed of having taught that after the reſurrection the Church ſhould remain on earth one thouſand years, and that this would be the reign of Jeſus Chriſt, a time of temporal proſperity and delights [*B*]. Whereupon,

(a) Epiphan. *adverſus Hæreſ.* pag. 110.

(b) In the year 51.

(c) That is, in the year 35.

(d) See the 11th chap. of the *Acts of the Apoſtles.*

(e) Epiphan. *adv. Hæreſ.* pag. iii.

[*A*] *St. Epiphanius . . . ſuppoſes that Cerinthus came after Carpocrates: this is to pervert Chronology.*] Lambert Danæus very juſtly cenſures thoſe who ſay that the Cerinthians are a ſpawn of the Carpocratians (1). He ſays Tertullian and St. Epiphanius affirm this, that St. Auguſtin alſo affirms it being miſled by S. Epiphanius, and that Iſidore (2) has copied this fault of S. Auguſtin. He ſhews from two reaſons that Cerinthus lived in the time of the Apoſtles; one is drawn from what will be related below, when we take notice that S. John would not enter the bath; the other is taken from that Apoſtle's having, as it ſeems, refuted ſome errors of Cerinthus (3). He maintains on the other hand that Carpocrates lived under Antoninus Pius (4); and he obſerves that Theodoret places him under the reign of Hadrian, and that Euſebius makes him live at the ſame time that Saturninus dogmatized (5). It ſhould have been ſaid that Euſebius aſſerts this no otherwiſe than on the authority of St. Irenæus; which would have added weight to the proof. Danæus forgets not to obſerve, that St. Epiphanius had refuted himſelf, having acknowledged that Cerinthus oppoſed the Apoſtles more than once (6). Let us conclude that Moreri is miſtaken, when he ſays Cerinthus was the ſcholar of Carpocrates.

(1) Lamb. Danæus, *de Hæreſ.* cap. 8. folio m. 25.

(2) Iſidor. lib. 8. *Etymolog.* cap. 5.

(3) In his 1ſt Epiſtle, chap. ii. ver. 19, 22; and chap. iv. verſ. 3.

(4) Danæus, *de Hæreſ.* cap. 7. folio 22 *verſo.*

(5) Euſeb. lib. 4. cap. 8.

(6) Danæus, *de Hæreſ.* cap. 8. fol. 25.

[*B*] *He is accuſed of having taught* Chriſt's reign *of a thouſand years, a time of temporal proſperity and pleaſure.*] Caius gives the following account of this opinion (7). In certain relations * which Cerinthus wrote, as if he had been ſome great Apoſtle, he tells us of ſeveral monſtrous opinions, which he feigns the Angels revealed to him: he affirms that the reign of Jeſus Chriſt ſhall be eſtabliſhed on earth after the reſurrection, and that men ſhall live in Jeruſalem ſtill ſubject to their appetites and pleaſures, and that this will be a marriage-feaſt which will laſt a thouſand years. It is thus that Caius repreſents this matter: Dionyſius Biſhop of Alexandria in the time of Euſebius makes uſe of more groſs

(7) *Caius adverſus Proclum, apud* Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 3. cap. 28. pag. m. 109. * Theſe Relations ſeem to have been no other than the Apocalypſe of S. John, which Caius believed was written by Cerinthus. See Grabe's *Spicil. Patrum*, Sect. 1. pag. 312.

Whereupon, ſome believed him to be the real Author of the Apocalypſe [C], and that he fathered it on St. John. Every one knows what is told of that Apoſtle with regard to his averſion to Cerinthus; every one, I ſay, knows it is related that he would not enter into the ſame bath where this Heretic was. The Ancients vary as to this fact, and the Moderns have added circumſtances to it which might paſs for a pious fraud [D]. Some have applied to Cerinthus what Theodoret has ſaid concerning certain defenders of the Law

groſs expreſſions. Cerinthus, ſays he (8), believed that the reign of Jeſus Chriſt would be on earth; and as he was very much addicted to ſenſual pleaſures, he feigned that the delights which he wiſhed for would be the eſſential part of that reign: he made it to conſiſt in ſatisfying the belly and the inferior members, that is to ſay, in eating, drinking, marrying, feaſting, and ſacrificing; for he covered thoſe pleaſures under theſe laſt terms, which are more decent. I will ſet down the Greek words, with the Latin verſion of Henry Valeſius, that it may be ſeen whether my conjecture have any ſort of foundation (9): Ἐπίγειον ἔσεσθαι τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλείαν. καὶ ἐπειδὴ αὐτὸς ἀφίγετο φιλήδονος· ἐν ᾗ καὶν σαρκικὸς, ἐν τούτοις ὑπειροπολεῖν ἔσεσθαι, γαστρὸς καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ γαστέρα πλησμονῶν. τουτέστι σιτίοις καὶ ποτοῖς καὶ γάμοις, καὶ δι' ὧν εὐφημότερον ταῦτα ὠνόμαζε ποιεῖσθαι, ἑορταῖς καὶ θυσίαις καὶ ἱερείων σφαγαῖς. *Regnum Chriſti terrenum futurum. Et quarum rerum cupiditate ipſe flagrabat, utpote voluptatibus corporis obnoxius carnique addictus, in iis Regnum Dei ſitum fore ſomniavit, in ventris, & earum quæ infra ventrem ſunt, partium explenda libidine: hoc eſt in cibo & potu, ac nuptiis, atque ut honeſtiori vocabulo ejuſmodi voluptates velaret, in feſtis* (10) *& ſacrificiis & hoſtiarum mactationibus.* My conjecture is, that Cerinthus did not expreſſly teach that the felicity and glory of the reign of Jeſus Chriſt would conſiſt in ſatisfying gluttony, and luxury: he made uſe of another manner of expreſſion, he had recourſe to the rejoicings which are proper to feaſt-days, and particularly to days deſtined to the offering of victims, and eating of ſacrifices. The Greek words which I have quoted clearly inſinuate that he had ſhrouded himſelf under decent phraſes. But it was thought allowable to draw the vail aſide, and to paraphraſe them in ſuch a manner that all the uglineſs of his opinions might eaſily be ſeen. If my conjecture were certain, there would be ſome unfairneſs in the proceeding of Cerinthus's enemies; for what right has any one to impute to an Author particulars which he does not ſet out? Why cannot he enjoy the benefit he might expect from the generality of his expreſſions? It may not be improper to obſerve, that Henry Valeſius does not approve that inſtead of εὐφημότερον we ſhould read ἰουδαϊκώτερον (11), and he confirms his opinion by the verſion of Rufinus: *Nec aliter legiſſe Rufinum ex verſione ejus apparet. Sic enim vertit:* Et ut aliquid ſacratius dicere videretur, legales ajebat feſtivitates rurſum celebrandas. *Feſtorum ſcilicet & ſacrificiorum nomine libidines ſuas velabat Cerinthus, ut honeſtatem quandam in ſpeciem præferret* (12).

(8) Dionyſius, lib. 2. *de Promiſſionibus, apud* Euſebium, ibid.

(9) Euſebius, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 3. cap. 28. *ex Dionyſio*, lib. 2. *de Promiſſion.*

(10) The Tranſlation which has been made of theſe Greek Words quoted by Euſebius in the 25th chapter of the 7th Book, ſeems to me to be better; it is this: *Et in iis quibus iſta honeſtius parari exiſtimabat; feſtis nimirum, &c.*

(11) As *Chriſtopherſon* does.

(12) Valeſius, *Not. in Euſebium*, pag. m 54.

[C] . . . *Whereupon, ſome believed him to be the real Author of the Apocalypſe.*] The ſame Dionyſius whom I have quoted in the preceding Remark, acquaints us, that there were ſome perſons who intirely rejected the Revelations as a Work not written by St. John, or any Apoſtle, or any Eccleſiaſtical Author, and which deſerved not the title of Revelation, becauſe it is covered with ſo dark a vail, that it is impoſſible to make any thing of it; that Cerinthus had compoſed it, and had ſet St. John's name to it, in order to make his own idle imaginations paſs under the authority of ſo venerable an Apoſtle. Κήρινθον δὲ τὸν καὶ τὴν αἵρεσιν ἀπ' ἐκείνου κληθῆσαν Κηρινθιανὴν, συνησάμενον αἱρέσεις, ἀξιόπιστον ἐπιφημίσαι θελήσαντα τῷ ἑαυτῦ πλάσματι ὄνομα. *Cerinthum enim, qui nominis ſui ſectam conflavit, cum magnæ auctoritatis nomen ad faciendam fidem commentis ſuis vellet præfigere, Joannis titulum operi ſuo indidiſſe* (13).

(13) Euſebius, lib. 7. cap. 25. pag. m. 273, *ex eodem* Dionyſio. See Rem. [B], Citation (†).

[D] *It is ſaid that* S. John *would not enter into the ſame bath where* he *was. The Ancients vary as to this fact, and the Moderns have added to it . . a pious fraud.*] The variation of the Ancients conſiſts in this, that ſome pretend this fact concerns Cerinthus, and others that it concerns Ebion. You will find in Euſebius, that S. John having entred the bath, and hearing that Cerinthus was there, immediately fled away, and bade his companions do the ſame: let us fly, ſaid he to them, for fear a bath which holds the enemy of the truth ſhould fall. Φύγωμεν μὴ καὶ τὸ βαλανεῖον συμπέσῃ, ἔνδον ὄντος Κηρίνθου τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθροῦ. *Fugiamus, inquit, ne balneum corruat in quo Cerinthus eſt veritatis inimicus* (14). Euſebius quotes S. Irenæus, who ſays he heard it from S. Polycarp (15), and that the thing happened at Epheſus. If you conſult S. Epiphanius, you will find that S. John, who never went to the bath, was one day moved to go thither by the Holy Ghoſt. But being informed that the Heretic Ebion was there, he underſtood the reaſon of the inſpiration on which he had received; he perceived that the Holy Spirit had cauſed him to take that ſtep, only to give him an opportunity of ſhewing how much truth ought to be eſteemed, and with what diſtinction we ought to treat the friends of God, and the inſtruments of the Devil. He groaned therefore, and ſaid loud enough to be heard by all who were preſent, *Haſte, my brethren, let us depart hence, leſt the baths be overturned, and cruſh us together with Ebion, becauſe of his impiety* (16). Baronius, to reconcile St. Irenæus and St. Epiphanius, ſays that perhaps Cerinthus and Ebion were together in the bath (17); but Mr. de Tillemont takes notice that *there was no neceſſity to fly to this conjecture, it being no unfrequent thing for St. Epiphanius to miſtake in point of Hiſtory* (18). He adds to the ſtory before us, ſays he (19), *divers particulars leſs certain and leſs important.* Obſerve here the progreſs of Relations: St. Irenæus ſeems to have been the firſt who publiſhed the action of S. John: he contented himſelf with relating what he had heard of it; but thoſe who came after him, finding his narrative too naked, added ſome embelliſhments to it. They did not think it glorious for the memory of that Apoſtle, that he might be ſuppoſed to bathe in a public place; wherefore they aſſerted that he never did, and that if he had one day a deſign to do it, it was by an order from above. Then ſome reaſon for the inſpiration was to be ſought for; and they found it in the great importance it was of to acquaint the faithful that they ought to have the enemies of the truth in abhorrence, and to believe that divine juſtice is always ready to give extraordinary examples of ſeverity againſt Hereſiarchs. But as it ſeemed of no uſe to let the readers imagine that S. John was afraid without occaſion, or that the implicite menace contained in his words was vain, it was thought proper to ſuppoſe that the Heretic, with whom he would not bathe, was cruſhed to death under the ruins of the houſe. This is what ſucceeding ages have added to the imbroidery of St. Epiphanius.

(14) Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 3. cap. 29. pag. 100. He cites S. *Irenæus* in the 3d Book againſt *Hereſies. See the ſame* Euſebius, lib. 4. cap. 14. pag. 128.

(15) Ὡς ἐκ παραδόσεως Πολυκάρπου, that is, according to the Verſion of Henry Valeſius, *ait ita ſe à Polycarpo accepiſſe*; but ſince Euſebius, lib. 4. cap. 14. pag. 128, *obſerves that* Irenæus *relates that people who were yet living had heard Polycarp ſay this, it is a proof that* Irenæus *was not of the number.*

(16) Epiphan. *adv. Hæreſ.* num. 30. pag. 148, 149.

(17) Baron. *ad ann.* 74. num. 9.

(18) Tillemont, *Memoires de l'Hiſt. Eccleſiaſtique*, tom. 1. pag. 1085, of the Bruſſels Edition.

(19) Ibid. pag. 924.

I ingenuouſly acknowledge that I had never read this Addition, when I met with it in a Letter of the learned Reineſius; but I have ſince found it in ſeveral Authors whom he does not mention. He ſpeaks of it after having obſerved that the contemporary Writers do not ſay the Emperor Frederic Barbaroſſa was trampled on by the Pope, tho' their ſilence has not hindred their deſcendants from inventing that circumſtance, and affirming it boldly. *Similis huic hiſtoriæ interpolatio temeratiove*, adds he (20), *commiſſa eſt ab illis, qui ſive Ebionem ſive Cerinthum (variant enim) Epheſi ruinâ balnearum, in quibus diſputaret unà cum auditoribus ſuis, appreſſum eſſe narrarunt. Cum enim legiſſent apud* Iren. l. 3. c. 3. Epiphan. hær. 30. Euſeb. l. 3. Hiſt. Eccl. c. 23. & l. 4. c. 14. *è relatu B. Polycarpi, S. Johannem Evang. & Apoſtolum, cum in balneis quas loturus intraverat Cerinthum cum ſuis eſſe audiviſſet, Feſtinate, dixiſſe, fratres; Egrediamur; ne domus corruat & pereamus cum Cerintho, qui intus eſt, inimico Veritatis; quod timere ne fieret dixerat Apoſtolus, id factum ſic eſſe interpretati ſunt. In hac culpa eſt ille qui notas marginales Epiphanio Latino, excuſo Baſil. an.* 1560 *intulit; fingit enim* miraculum à Johanne editum: & Victor. Strigel. *qui* Schol. ad Proverb. Salom. c. 22. *tanquam Irenæi ipſius adfert hæc:* Egreſſo Johanne domus ſtatim collapſa Cerinthum & turbam reliquam oppreſſit: *quod veterum & proximorum Apoſtoli & Cerinthi temporibus nemo dixerat. Plura ejuſmodi Oratores*

(20) Thomas Reineſius, *Epiſt.* 57. *ad Rupertum*, pag. 520, 521.

Law of Moſes, who were for having the Angels worſhipped, and grounded their doctrine on this reaſon, that ſince God could neither be ſeen, touched, nor comprehended, it was neceſſary to procure the divine benevolence by the Miniſtry of Angels (*f*). It is alſo ſuppoſed that St. Paul had this Heretic in view, when he warned the faithful to reject thoſe who through a voluntary humility, and worſhipping of Angels, intruded into thoſe things which they had not ſeen; and we are aſſured that Cerinthus, having had ſome acquaintance at Alexandria with the Jews, with the Pagans, and with the Magicians, framed an Hypotheſis compoſed of Judaiſm, Paganiſm, and Magiſm, and publiſhed it chiefly in Phrygia and Piſidia, and that he even worked wonders by the invocation of Angels (*g*). He rejected the Acts of the Apoſtles, and the Epiſtles of St. Paul, and admitted only the Goſpel of St. Matthew (*b*). He did not even admit the whole of that, if we believe St. Epiphanius (*i*).

(*f*) *See* Father Garnier, *in Auctario Operum Theodoreti, apud* Ittigium, *de Hæreſiarch. Seculi I & II.* pag. m. 52.

(*g*) Garnier. *in Auctar. Theod. apud Ittigium*, ibid.

(*b*) Philaſtr. cap. 36. *apud eund.* ibid.

(*i*) Epiphan. *Hæreſ.* 28. cap. 5.

tàm Eccleſiaſticos quàm Politicos peccaſſe circà hiſtorias ſine dubio notaſti, (ſanè obſervantur quotidie) deque iis moneri Juventutem veræ hiſtoriæ & elegantiorum literarum intereſt. i. e. "An interpolation or corruption "very like this has been made by thoſe who tell us "that either Ebion or Cerinthus (for they differ as to "the perſon) was killed at Epheſus by the fall of a "bath, in which he was diſputing with his auditors. "For when they had read in Irenæus, &c. who had it "from a tradition of S. Polycarp, that St. John the "Evangeliſt and Apoſtle, when he heard that Cerinthus and his diſciples were in the bath which he had "entered with a deſign to waſh, ſaid, Make haſte, "brethren, let us go out, leſt the houſe fall and we "periſh with Cerinthus, the enemy of the Truth, who "is within; what the Apoſtle had ſaid he feared "would happen, they concluded did really happen. "Of the ſame fault has he been guilty who inſerted "the Marginal Notes in the Latin Edition of St. Epiphanius, printed at Baſil in the year 1560: for he "feigns *a miracle wrought by S. John:* and *Victorinus Strigelius*, who in his *Scholia on the Proverbs of Solomon chap.* 22. quotes this as a ſaying of Irenæus: "*When St. John was gone out, the houſe immediately "fell, and cruſhed to death Cerinthus and the reſt:* "which had been ſaid by none of the ancients who "lived neareſt the times of the Apoſtle and Cerinthus. "You have, without doubt, obſerved that ſeveral "faults of the like nature have been committed by "Eccleſiaſtical as well as Political Orators, (and indeed they are taken notice of daily,) and it is for "the intereſt of true hiſtory and polite learning that "youth ſhould be warned of them." If I had ſhortened this paſſage, I had deprived ſeveral of my readers of the knowledge of one thing which will pleaſe them; that ſuch falſifications are found in Orators both of the Clergy and of the Laity, againſt which it is of conſequence that young men ſhould be cautioned. A fault a hundred times more common than it ought to be! Let one Author ſay that certain things were feared, and another will ſay they came effectually to paſs. A miſchievous and ſhameful imitation of the News-Writers (21)! Reineſius perhaps recollected no more than the two Authors whom he quotes; but here are ſeveral others. Friar Bernard of Luxemburgh ſays Venerable Bede aſſerts that St. Polycarp relates (22) what St. John ſaid and did; and that ſo ſoon as the Apoſtle was got out, the bath fell, and knocked Cerinthus on the head. *De iſto Cherintho dicit Beda ſuper epiſtolam Joann. narrat enim de illo ſcilicet Joanne auditor ejus ſanctiſſimus vir & martyr fortiſſimus Polycarpus Smyrneorum Antiſtes, quod tempore quodam cum apud Epheſum balnea lavandi gratia fuiſſet ingreſſus, & vidiſſet ibi Cherinthum exire, continuo diſceſſit non lotus, dicens: Fugiamus hinc ne balnea ipſa nos corrumpant, in quibus eſt Cherinthus inimicus veritatis. Quo egreſſo, balneum cecidit, & hæreticum cum ſuis oppreſſit* (23). Prateolus affirms that St. Irenæus, in the third Chapter of the third Book againſt Hereſies, relates, that S. John found Cerinthus ſitting in the bath with his followers, and diſputing violently, and denying impudently and as a blaſphemer that Jeſus Chriſt was God: S. John roſe up, and warned his friends to retire with him, for that God was going to puniſh ſuch ſhameleſs blaſphemies. So ſoon as he was gone out, the houſe fell, and deſtroyed Cerinthus and all his company. You may believe that Prateolus does not let ſlip ſuch an opportunity without moraliſing againſt the Authors of Sects. "Here, *ſays he*, may be ſeen the dreadful example of "divine vengeance on thoſe, who with manifeſt im- "piety blaſpheme the name of God and his ſound "doctrine, not fearing to introduce ſects of perdition; "and how ſeldom the divine wrath ſuffers them to "eſcape unpuniſhed." Read his whole narration. *Quod verò contemporaneus ſancto Joanni Evangeliſtæ fuerit, teſtatur Divus Irenæus libr.* 3. *adverſus hæreſes cap.* 3. *cùm de Beato Polycarpo loquens, ait veniſſe aliquando in balneum Joannem, & illic reperiſſe Cerinthum hæreticum unà cum conſortio ſuorum ſedentem, inter quos Cerinthus acerrimè diſputabat, impudenterque blaſphemus negabat Chriſtum Deum eſſe. Atque ſurgens Johannes monuit amicos ſuos qui ei aſſidebant, ut unà ſecum abirent: nam non velle Deum ampliùs ferre blaſphemias tam impudentes. Illico verò cùm egreſſus eſſet, collapſa domus, Cerinthum cum ſua cohorte extinxit. Ex quo licet videre horrendum exemplum divinæ ultionis & vindictæ in eos, qui manifeſta impietate nomen Dei & ejus ſanam doctrinam blaſphemant, non verentes ſectas perditionis introducere: & quàm ira divina illos non patiatur tandem inultos* (24). Join to this Latin the following words of Mr. de Tillemont (25): *Feuardentius quotes from St. Jerome againſt the Luciferians, that the bath actually fell, and cruſhed Cerinthus.* [*I have read that whole Treatiſe on purpoſe, and find no ſuch thing in it.*] I have a Catalogue of Heretics, compoſed in form of a Catechiſm by a German Miniſter (26), and here is the Anſwer I find to the Queſtion: *Quomodo periit* (Cerinthus)? *Ruina balnei oppreſſus: Cum enim Johannes Evangeliſta, cum diſcipulis ſuis, Epheſi, lavandi cauſſa, in balneum veniſſet, ac vidiſſet intus eſſe Cerinthum, reſiluit inde ſtatim, ac dixit: Diſcedamus citò, ne ruina balnei opprimamur, cum intus ſit Cerinthus, hoſtis veritatis. Id quod etiam, diſcedente eo, factum eſt. Ut exprimitur in verſibus Strigelii:*

Impia Cerinthus ſancto convitia Chriſto
Dum facit, & ſtulta garrulitate furit:
Concidit & rapido blaſphemum contudit ictu
Collapſæ ſubito facta ruina domus.

That is,

"How did Cerinthus come by his end? He was kil- "led by the fall of a bath: for when St. John the E- "vangeliſt, with his diſciples, went into a bath at E- "pheſus to waſh, and ſaw Cerinthus there, he imme- "diately ſtarted back and ſaid: Let us depart quickly, "leſt we be cruſhed to death by the falling of the "bath; for Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is in "it. Which happened accordingly, ſo ſoon as he de- "parted; as is expreſſed in theſe verſes of Strigelius:

"*While impiouſly Cerinthus Chriſt revil'd.*
"*Venting his fury in diſcourſes wild;*
"*The houſe fell ſudden on his guilty head,*
"*And rapid cruſh'd the bold blaſphemer dead.*

Micrælius has not been more exact in conſulting the originals, tho' he cites them: See the margin (27). Ittigius ſeems to think that Prateolus is the firſt who tacked to Irenæus's Narrative what relates to the fall of the houſe where Cerinthus was bathing (28). It is certain that this additional ornament is more ancient than Prateolus.

(24) Prateolus, *in Elencho Alphabet. Hæreticor.* pag. m. 128.

(25) Tillemont, *Mémoires de l'Hiſt. Eccleſ.* tom. 1. pag. 1085.

(26) Johannes Pontanus, *Eccleſiæ Regiomontanæ in Neomarchia Paſtor, & Vicinarum Inſpector, in* Catalogo Hæreticorum, *folio B.* 3 *verſo. This Book was printed in the year* 1615, *in* 12*mo.*

(27) *Epheſi*, Irenæo teſte lib. 3. cap. 3. *è balneo egreſſus* (Joannes) *Cerinthum hæreſiarcham vidit ædium ruina obrui.* i. e. "(St. "John), as is "teſtified by *Ire-* "*næus*, going "out of a bath "at Epheſus, "ſaw Cerin- "thus the he- "reſiarch cruſh- "ed by the fall "of the houſe." Micræl. Syntag. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* pag. m. 223.

(28) Ittigius *de Hæreſiarch. I & II Seculi*, pag. 58. edit. 1690.

(21) *There is a paſſage in this* Dictionary *(the end of the Remark* [*A*] *of the Article* VIRGILIUS Biſhop of Saltzburgh) *where I have ſaid that the News Writers having ſeen Letters which adviſe that the Army of their party is preparing to lay ſiege to a Town, affirm the ſiege is already formed.*

(22) *It is not true that S. Polycarp relates this: St. Irenæus only ſays that he had been heard to ſay ſo. Here then is already one Addition.*

(23) F. Bernardus Lutzenburgus, *in Catalogo Hæreticorum,* Voce *Cherintiani.*

CERISANTES, a very ingenious and brave man in the ſeventeenth Century. There is an Article of him in the Supplement to Moreri. The reader muſt not give credit to the inſidious

inſidious falſities which may have crept into it; and I muſt deſire him to attend the obſervations I ſhall here give, which are extracted from a manuſcript Apology, ſent to me from London by Mr. de St. Helene (*a*) two or three months before his death. He had drawn it up for Mr. de Ceriſantes his brother, ſome time after the Duke of Guiſe's Memoirs had appeared in public. Mr. de Ceriſantes is very much abuſed in thoſe Memoirs; but the Author of the *Apology* aſſerts, that what is therein ſaid againſt him is rank calumny. He does not believe that this work was written by the Duke de Guiſe; and he ſuſpects that Mr. de Sainction (*b*) either *invented the whole, or introduced the ſeveral fictitious Particulars in it; prompted either by the great affection he bore to his maſter, or to make the piece more agreeable* (*c*), and get a better price from the Bookſeller for the manuſcript. He begins with refuting certain contemptuous terms which are employed, and the reproach caſt on Ceriſantes, viz. of his being meanly deſcended [*A*]. He owns that he had a quarrel with the Duke de Candaule; but aſſerts, that the circumſtances and conſequences of it are falſly related [*B*]. He does not deny but that his brother was a little

(*a*) He left France in the time of the laſt perſecution, and fled for refuge to England. He died in London the 20th of January 1697.

(*b*) Secretary to this preſent Duke. It was he who publiſhed his Memoirs.

(*c*) The manuſcript Apology. Pag. 3.

[*A*] *Mr. de Ceriſantes is very much abuſed in thoſe Memoirs. . . . His brother who drew up his apology . . . . refutes certain contemptuous terms* (1), *and the reproach caſt on Ceriſantes, viz. of his being meanly deſcended.*] He ſays that theſe words will appear very ridiculous, when it ſhall be known, *that Cardinal de Richelieu had ſo good an opinion of Ceriſantes as to ſend him to Conſtantinople in* 1641, *in order to treat of ſome important affairs there; and that in* 1644, *Chancellor Oxenſtiern, and the reſt of the regents of Sweden, during the minority of Queen Chriſtina, judged him worthy of being admitted as a Counſellor of State of that Kingdom; and of being afterwards ſent to the Court of France, in quality of Reſident. . . . This appears by the Sieur de Ceriſantes's commiſſion; by a letter which the ſaid Chancellor writ to him at Paris; and by another which the Sieur de Chanut, at that time Reſident of France in Sweden, wrote to Mr. Gueffier at Rome; which pieces are in the hands of Mr. de Sainte Helene, as well as all the reſt, of which mention will be made hereafter* (2). It is to be obſerved, that the Queen of Sweden had firſt given Ceriſantes a regiment in the army of Germany; *but being come within two days journey of Stockholm, in order to go and take poſſeſſion of it, a Courier who was diſpatched to him, obliged him to return back; the Regents of the Kingdom of Sweden, having thought it more adviſeable to ſend him to France, with the character of Reſident* (3). It is alſo to be obſerved, that *he had been Lieutenant in the firſt company of the regiment of Navarre . . . and that he performed ſuch glorious actions in the ſeveral employments he exerciſed in this regiment, and diſplayed ſo much vigour, capacity and courage in various engagements, that the Prince, at that time Duke of Enguien, and Marſhal du Chatillon, de la Meilleraye, and de Gaſſion, beſtowed publickly on him, in preſence of all the Officers, ſuch applauſes as might have inſpired the moſt modeſt perſons with vanity* (4). The Author of theſe Memoirs to the Duke of Guiſe, is told, that in *aſcribing too little merit and experience to* Mr. de Ceriſantes, he *contradicts himſelf, ſince he owns in the ſame page* 177, *that he was endued both with wit and eloquence; in the next page, that he was a brave man, and that few perſons equalled him in Latin Poetry. In page* 195, *that he made a lodgment within ten paces of a poſt in which the enemy had five hundred men; where he behaved as gallantly as before at the attack; and that he put it into ſo good a poſture of defence, that it could not be taken afterwards. In page* 254, *that the Duke of Guiſe having come to an engagement, only to extricate Jacomo Rouſſa from imminent danger; and finding him ſafe, he only aimed at his retreat, the care of which he gave to the Sieur de Ceriſantes, who came (ſays the Author of the Memoirs) very opportunely for him; then he rejoyned the Duke of Guiſe after a ſlight ſkirmiſh, and without loſing ſo much as one man.* To all this is added, *that the command of four thouſand Calabrians which that Duke beſtowed upon him, was another indiſputable proof which the King had of his experience in military affairs. This is proved by page* 375, *as alſo by the Memoirs of the Count of Modena, Tom.* III, *page* 51; *and alſo by the commiſſion which the Duke of Guiſe gave Ceriſantes for that employment.* The concluſion is, that the reaſons alledged by the Author of the Memoirs, *for the refuſal which he pretends the Duke of Guiſe made Ceriſantes of the poſt of Colonel-General,* are weak; *ſince he afterwards gave him another that was much more conſiderable with reſpect to the function, though not quite ſo honourable* (5).

(1) Theſe are in pag. 116. of the *Mem. du Duc de Guiſe.* Paris edit. 4to.

(2) *Manuſcript Apology*, pag. 4, and 5.

(3) Ibid. pag. 15. We are referred to Mr. de Chanut's Letter.

(4) Ibid. pag. 11.

(5) Ibid. pag. 6 and 7.

With regard to the meanneſs of extraction, it is obſerved that the author of the Memoirs ſays falſly, that the father of Ceriſantes was a Miniſter (6), and the conſequence which he would draw from it is refuted. It is aſſerted, that this would not prove that Ceriſantes was of noble deſcent; and after follow theſe words: "His "father whoſe name was Mark Duncan, was a famous Doctor of Phyſic, a native of Scotland, and "born a Gentleman. Coming into France in his "youth, he ſettled at Saumur in Anjou, where he "married a Gentlewoman of a good family. He "had not been long here before he gained ſo much "reputation in his art, that James I King of Britain "ſent for him, with an offer of making him his Phyſician in ordinary; and for this purpoſe he ſent "him the patent of it (as a ſecurity of what he was "promiſed) before he croſſed the ſea; but as his wife "was extremely deſirous not to leave her native "country, her relations and acquaintance, he yielded "to the tears of his wife, of whom he was paſſionately fond; and ſo refuſed to accept of an employment that was ſo honourable, ſo advantageous "to his family, and ſpent the reſt of his life at Saumur, where he died in 1640, to the univerſal regret of every one whether high or low, or Papiſt or "Proteſtant. He was admirably well ſkilled in Philoſophy, Divinity, and Mathematicks; beſides Phyſick, which he practiſed with great honour. The "moſt valuable circumſtance in him was, his being "a man of the greateſt probity, and of a moſt exemplary life (7)." Add to this what I ſhall obſerve in the laſt remark.

(6) *Memoires du Duc de Guiſe*, pag. 178.

(7) *Apology*, pag. 9. See the following remark.

[*B*] *He owns . . . the quarrel with the Duke of Candale; but aſſerts that the circumſtances and conſequences of it are falſly related.*] Here follow the words of the apology, which clear up an incident that will be thought curious by many Readers. "M. de Ceri"ſantes had a quarrel with the Duke of Candale, and "ſent him a challenge; but the Duke of Guiſe, in "caſe he were Author of thoſe Memoirs, would have "leſs reaſon than any one to make him ſuch a reproach; ſince it was purely to ſerve the beautiful "Mademoiſelle de Pons, his miſtreſs, at that time "one of the Queen Regent's Maids of Honour, whom "the Duke of Candale had publickly affronted, as "ſhe was in a coach with Mr. de Ceriſantes. More"over, I will be ſo ingenuous as to confeſs, that be"ing at that time Reſident from the Crown of Sweden, "the ſtricteſt laws of prudence would not permit him to "carry his reſentments to ſuch great lengths; but where "ſhall we meet with the generous men, who are able "to practice ſo ſevere a virtue, when their honour is "attacked? There is no doubt but the ill treatment "which this beautiful Lady had received publickly, "reflected ſo highly on the Gentleman who was then "talking to her, that it was ſcarce poſſible for him "to diſpenſe with endeavouring to repair it. Mr. "de Ste. Helene, his brother, diſcourſing on this ſub"ject ſome months after, told him frankly; that, in "his opinion, he had injured his character by ſuch a "conduct, and in ſome meaſure renounced the privi"leges which the law of nations gave him, as a man "in a public character. You ſay right brother, ſaid "Ceriſantes; but you are to know that the Court"Ladies, from time immemorial, have been the abſolute

little too haughty, and *perhaps carried his ambitious views too far* (*d*) . . . *but*, adds he, *if such a defect may be excused in any one; it might be in him, . . . who was a handsome man, very witty, very well skilled in polite Literature, extremely brave, greatly skilled in the military Science; and that he possessed in a very eminent degree all those talents, which may recommend a man to society, with regard to the arts either of peace or war.* The Author denies his having been removed from his employments by the Queen of Sweden [*C*], and disapproves his leaving the Court of France. He insinuates (*e*) that he left her Swedish Majesty's service, in order to execute the resolution he had formed of changing his Religion; and accordingly he quitted the Protestant faith and turned Roman Catholic. He was sent to Naples in quality of the King's Resident, and to watch the motions of the Duke of Guise, of whom the Court of France entertained some little suspicion (*f*). The Author denies his having assumed the title of Embassador [*D*]; and declares that the subject and circumstances of his confinement were not faithfully related [*E*]. Some

(*d*) *Manuscript Apology*, pag. 12.

(*e*) Ibid. pag. 17.

(*f*) See the note [*D*].

" solute dispossers of fame and reputation. Had I " suffered a Lady to be affronted in my company, I " should have quite lost my honour in the opinion of " the fair-sex, and should have never dared to appear " before them. But I absolutely deny that this quar- " rel preceded the time of his being Resident, and " obliged him to leave Paris. Several persons belong- " ing to the Court at that time, will remember per- " fectly, that when he challenged the Duke of Can- " dale, he had exercised his employment upwards of " a year; and that he continued it nine or ten months " after, in spite of the sollicitations, which the late " Duke of Orleans, the Duke of Espernon, and " Mr. de Metz, at that time Abbot of St. *Germain* " *des Prez*, now Duke of Verneuil, employed with " her Swedish Majesty, in order to have him recalled. " To effect this they set every engine at work; and " attacked him about his birth, (either out of mere " malice, or from the same argument employed by " the Author of the Memoirs, viz. that as he was son " to a man of letters, there was some probability of " his not being a Gentleman) but all in vain, for Mr. " de Cerisantes having been informed by Mr. de Lyonne " of all that was hatching against him, sent with all " imaginable diligence to Sweden, a copy of the in- " strument of his Nobility, which one of the Secre- " taries of State had compared with the Original, with " which the Queen his Mistress seemed entirely sa- " tisfied; so that she laughed at the multitude of " letters which were sent her, in prejudice of her re- " sident, whom she not only continued in his employ- " ment at the Court of France, as I before observed; " but also approved his treatment of the Duke of " Candale (8).

(8) *Apology*, pag. 12.

[*C*] *The Author denies his having been removed from his employment by the Queen of Sweden.*] " This is " also a false assertion, since it appears by a letter Mr. " de Cerisantes sent to his brother Mr. de Ste Helene, " from Stockholm, and dated the 28th of April 1646, " which is still in his hands, that he resigned, and " set out from the Court of France unknown to the " Queen his Mistress. I do not pretend either to de- " fend or excuse his going away without leave; it be- " ing very certain, that he might have been tried for " it. Mr. de Cerisantes was not insensible of the dan- " gerous consequences of this; but hearing from good " hands, that some powerful friends of Mr. Grotius " endeavoured to undermine him, out of hatred from " a supposition that he had supplanted them, he ven- " tured at all, and hazarded undertaking the journey, " to invigorate his party by his presence; and to de- " fend a post which his enemies attacked with so much " fury, or else to bury himself under its ruins. It is " also very evident from the discharge, which Mr. de " Cerisantes obtained from the said Queen his mistress, " that she was extremely well satisfied with his nego- " ciations, and the industry he had employed; and " that she desired to keep him in her service; for " it is expressly said in this discharge, that he himself " desired it, in order to have an opportunity of mak- " ing his fortune that way; and that during the whole " time he transacted the affairs of that Crown, he " acquitted himself with the utmost diligence, fidelity, " and industry. The letter of Mr. Chanut, which " has already been mentioned twice, testifies the same " thing, saying that the Queen had assured him by " word of mouth, that to keep the said Mr. de Ce- " risantes in her service, she had put it to his option, " either to have a regiment or a considerable pen- " sion (9)."

(9) Ibid. pag. 15, & *seq.*

[*D*] *The Author denies his having assumed the title of Embassador . . . at* Naples.] All the French who " were at the same time in Naples, can testify that " he assumed no other title there than that of the " King's Agent, which the Memoirs in question al- " low him to have been, in page 116; as do also " those of the Count de Modena, Vol. II, page 237. " . . . As such he consequently had a right to assem- " ble the Council, and to make such proposals in it " as he judged necessary; having particular orders " for that purpose, and general ones to observe the " Duke of Guise's actions, and give advice of his " conduct; that his designs, even when he was at " Rome, seemed very suspicious to the Ministers of " France (10). The Author of the Memoirs says, " that Cerisantes would place himself on the left hand " of the Duke of Guise, at Mass and in public Ce- " remonies; but that the Duke would not suffer it, " and treated him ill upon that account. The Apo- " logist answers (11), that he had never once heard " of such a quarrel; and that Cerisantes was so brave, " and so tender of his honour, that since he did not " show his resentment by some desperate action, or " by leaving Naples, we ought to believe that the " Duke of Guise did not give him the abusive lan- " guage mentioned in the Memoirs. The whole 205th " page, adds he (12), *is filled with injurious and in-* " *sulting expressions which do not merit an answer,* " *because it is evident they were dictated wholly by pas-* " *sion; and that Mr. de Cerisantes's original sin is, his* " *having devoted himself entirely to the interest of the* " *Marquis de Fontennai Mareuil, at that time Embas-* " *sador of France at Rome; and that he was too eagle-eyed* " *to suffer himself to be over-reached by the artifices of the* " *Duke. Nevertheless, I will not scruple to observe,* " *that the slanders of a very passionate Prince, cannot* " *be put in parallel, with the approbation of the* Cardinals " de Richelieu, Mazarine, *and Ste Cecile, of Chancellor* " *Oxenstiern and the rest of the Regents of Sweden*; " *of the Bishop of Angers, the Marquis de Fontenai, the* " *Sieurs de Lyonne and Chanut; and of several other* " *persons of quality and merit, who honoured* Mr. de " Cerisantes *with their esteem, so far were they from* " *considering him as a madman, and a chimerical* " *creature.*

(10) Ibid. pag. 5.

(11) Ibid. pag. 19, 20.

(12) Ibid. pag. 22.

[*E*] *. . . and . . . that the subject and circumstance of his confinement are not faithfully related.*] Here follows the story as I heard *it from his Valet de Chambre* (13). " The Duke suspecting that Mr. de Cerisantes " did him some ill offices at the Court of France, " and with the Marquis de Fontenai at Rome, went " one day to his house, with a great train; and com- " ing into his apartment would oblige him, partly by " fair words, and partly by threats, to deliver up his " cyphers to him, in order to clear the suspicions he " entertained, concerning some letters he had inter- " cepted; which Mr. de Cerisantes however refused ab- " solutely, protesting, that as he was not to give him " an account of his actions, he would never part with " those letters unless they were forced from him. " Upon this, they came to high words on both sides; " and the Duke flying into a great passion, caused " his guards to put him under an arrest; with orders " from them to watch him so narrowly, that he " might

(13) The Author of the *Apology*, pag. 19. says, that he undertook a journey to Paris, purposely to be informed by Cerisantes's Valet de Chambre, who was lately returned from Naples, of the several transactions of Mr. de Cerisantes his master, ever since his leaving Sweden, as well in the Courts of Poland, Muscovy, and the Imperial, as particularly at Rome and at Naples. *He adds*, pag. 26. *that this Valet de Chambre* was a very worthy man, and acknowledged to be so brave by the Duke of Guise himself, that he gave him a Cornet's commission after the death of Cerisantes.

Some complaints are made of the truth being diſguiſed with regard to his death [*F*]; and the particulars concerning his will are rejected as fabulous [*G*]. This is perhaps, of all the calumnies which have been publiſhed againſt Mr. de Ceriſantes, that which may expoſe him moſt to the laughter of all readers; but at the ſame time no circumſtance can be refuted in ſo unanſwerable a manner; there being a copy of his will regiſtred in due form by a Notary Public, to produce againſt all thoſe who publiſh and ſpread ſuch a report. The Apologiſt does not fail to obſerve (*g*), that this alone is ſufficient to invalidate all the other calumnies; for that man who has the aſſurance to publiſh falſities, which are afterwards invalidated by the Regiſter of a Public Notary, does not deſerve the leaſt credit. Nevertheleſs, the particulars relating to Ceriſantes inſerted in the Memoirs of the Duke de Guiſe made a ſtrong impreſſion on the readers, and have been tranſcribed into other books. Du Maurier has taken them in; the Continuator of Moreri copied du Maurier; and it appears by the *Menagiana*, that they ſerved as topicks for converſation to the wits who uſed to meet at Mr. Menage's [*H*]. In this manner does fortune exerciſe her

(g) *Manuſcript Apology*, pag. 28.

" might not have the leaſt communication or correſpondence with any perſon whatſoever. A few " days after, the Duke's paſſion being cooled, he with- " drew his guards; and after making an excuſe to " Mr. de Ceriſantes, for his rigorous proceeding, and " imputing the cauſe of it to ſome malicious and ill- " deſigning people, who by their inſidious diſcourſes " had exaſperated him (the Duke) againſt Ceriſantes; " he ſo ſoothed and flatterred him, the Duke, (having " a peculiar talent in winning the affections of " people, and captivating them, whenever he deſired " to do it) that they were ever after good friends, " or at leaſt pretended to be ſuch (14)."

(14) *Manuſcript Apology*, pag. 23.

[*F*] *Some complaints are made, of the truth's being diſguiſed with regard to* Ceriſantes's *death.*] " Here " (15) the Duke, as in ſeveral other places of the " Memoirs, is very ſparing of the truth; for I know " from perſons of credit, that Mr. de Ceriſantes hav- " ing already packed up his baggage, in order to " go back to Rome, whither he was ſent for, in or- " der to be Chamberlain to Pope Innocent X (16); the " Duke intreated him to ſuſpend his journey till after " the general attack, which he intended to make upon " all the poſts of the enemy at the ſame time; which " requeſt Mr. Ceriſantes made no ſcruple to grant " him, he being overjoyed at meeting ſo favourable " an opportunity of acquiring Glory. And indeed, " he diſplayed his valour in a moſt ſignal manner at " the attack, on that ſide where the gate Chiaia " ſtood, as is affirmed by ſeveral perſons who were eye " witneſſes to it; which may be farther juſtified by " the Paris Gazette of April 22, 1648, the extract " whereof is contained in a letter which Mr. Rauſſin, " Secretary to Mr. de Ceriſantes, writ to Saumur to Mr. " de Ste Helene, dated the 18th of May 1648, from " Paris, where the ſaid Mr. de Ceriſantes had left " him upon ſome affairs; which was afterwards con- " firmed to him by the Valet de Chambre abovemen- " tioned. . . . Altho' Hiſtorians are anſwerable for the " truth of all they write, and their miſtakes will " not admit of any excuſe, I yet will not take much " advantage of the falſity we meet with in the Me- " moirs, concerning the date of Mr. de Ceri- " ſantes's death, becauſe it is of no great importance, " and may be looked upon as a very innocent error. " I ſhall only obſerve, that the Poſts were attacked the " 12th of February 1648, (according to the Memoirs) " and that he died three days after; which is evident- " ly falſe, ſince his will is dated the 27th of the " ſame month, and that he died one or two days " after, that is, the 28th or 29th; with which the " Gazette abovementioned alſo agrees. Thoſe who " have heard of the funeral honours which were paid " to the corps of Mr. de Ceriſantes; of the great con- " courſe of people who accompanied it to the grave, " and the grief of all the Calabrian Officers as well " as Soldiers; of the French Gentlemen and the com- " mon people, will conſider this as an infallible con- " ſequence of the great merit of this Gentleman (17)."

(15) i. e. pag. 574 and 375.

(16) The Apologiſt, in pag. 31. complains that this was not mentioned in the *Memoirs of the Duke de Guiſe*; and declares this ſilence to be a wilful omiſſion.

(17) *Manuſcript Apology*, pag. 25, 26.

This laſt incident ſeems to be produced, as the reproach of a willful omiſſion: It is true indeed, that the complaints are not exactly made as in the words of page 31. *The Memoirs of the Duke of Guiſe take no notice of Mr. de Ceriſantes's being ſo well beloved by the people of Naples, that they gave him a fine country ſeat a few miles from the city, where his menial ſervants continued ſome days after his deceaſe.*

[*G*] *The particulars concerning his will are rejected as fabulous.*] " This Author of the Memoirs, to " crown the work, finiſhes his calumnies by the moſt " notorious falſity that was ever publiſhed, ſaying that " Ceriſantes, carrying his vanity to its utmoſt height, " appointed the Duke his Executor; to which he adds, " that he left either as endowments, donations or pious " bequeſts, upwards of five and twenty thouſand crowns, " tho' he was not worth a ſhilling (theſe are the very " words of the Memoirs) which may be very eaſily " diſproved by a copy of the Will it ſelf, delivered " by the Notary who drew it up, and which is in the " hands of Mr. de Ste Helene. It appears by this Will, " that Signior Carlo is named Executor of it; and that " the legacies, donations and endowments amount only " to the ſum of five hundred and fifty ducats. He " alſo ordered, that the monies ariſing from the ſale " of 80 tuns of wine, which belonged to the ſaid de- " ceaſed, ſhould be employed by the ſaid Executor, " in adorning St. Anne's Chapel of the Carmelites " Church in Naples, where he will have his body in- " terred; and in having an epitaph made for him; " all this is far from five and twenty thouſand " crowns (18).

(18) *Manuſcript Apology*, pag. 27, 28.

[*H*] *It appears by the Menagiana, againſt the particulars abovementioned relating to Ceriſantes . . . ſerved as topicks for converſation . . . at Mr. Menage's.*] The Apologiſt informs us (19), that he ſhould not have taken his manuſcript *from among the heap of papers under which he had buried it*, had Ceriſantes been ſlandered by no one beſides the Author of the Duke of Guiſe's Memoirs. He at firſt intended to publiſh his apology; but he changed his reſolution, after his friends had obſerved to him, I, that theſe Memoirs *being conſidered as a Romance, tho' very well writ and extremely diverting, were yet very much fallen in reputation, becauſe of the great number of fictitious ſtories inſerted in them.* II. That his brother's reputation was too well eſtabliſhed to need a defence. But when he found that other Authors copied as true the incidents related in theſe Memoirs; and added other particulars to them, he thought it his duty to be no longer ſilent. Here follows another paſſage from his manuſcript. *In the Book entitled,* Menagiana, *Menage is made to ſay* (20), *that Ceriſantes, being removed from his employment of Reſident of Sweden at the French Court, reſolved to turn Mahometan, in hopes of being made Grand Viſier, in leſs than two years; and by that means to find an opportunity of revenging himſelf on Sweden. . . . Now all this is falſe and ridiculous. . . . Mr. de Ceriſantes was ſent by Cardinal Richelieu to Conſtantinople in* 1641; *and was not Reſident in Sweden, till anno* 1644, *as I before obſerved in page* 5 *of this manuſcript. . . . He afterwards ſays, that Mr. de Ceriſantes died in the Duke of Guiſe's ſervice: this alſo is a falſity, he being the King's Agent, and not in the Duke's ſervice. . . . He adds,* that Ceriſantes, *by his will, bequeathed to his eldeſt brother, his lands and jewels, and to another relation, his ready money and moveables, with two hundred thouſand livres in pious bequeſts; and that he had the aſſurance to appoint the Duke of Guiſe his Executor. . . It appears by the will of the Sieur de Ceriſantes, that he left but* 550 *ducats in pious bequeſts; and that he ordered that the monies ariſing from the ſale of* 80 *tuns of wine, which the city of Naples had preſented him with, ſhould be applied to the adorning a Chapel in the Carmelites Church, in which he deſired to be interred; and in getting an epitaph made for him. . . . At the time of Mr. de Ceriſantes's death, he had only a younger brother named Ste Helene. . . The Duke was not Executor, but one Carlo* (21).

(19) Ibid. pag. 36.

(20) *Menagiana*, pag. 401, and 402. Dutch edit.

(21) *Manuſcript Apology*, pag. 72.

her capricious tyranny over the memory and reputation of men; and hence we see how dangerous it is for a perſon to have his character drawn by an Hiſtorian who is reſolved to divert his readers, and has the art of pleaſing. I will communicate to the public ſome particulars, with which a friend of the Apologiſts has been pleaſed to favour me [*I*].

[*I*] *I will communicate ſome particulars with which a friend of the apologiſt has been pleaſed to favour me.*] Here follows an Extract from his letter. "Duncan "ſettled in Saumur, where he practiſed Phyſic with "great reputation. He was at firſt, Philoſophy Pro- "feſſor, and publiſhed an Epitome of Logic (22). "He reſigned this employment and was head of the "College. He had three ſons, Ceriſantes, Sainte "Helene and Montfort (fictitious names) and three "daughters. He writ a Book relating to the Nuns "of Loudun, concerning their being poſſeſſed by the "Devil, as was falſly ſuppoſed (23); for which Lau- "bardemont would have brought him into great trou- "ble, had he not been protected by Marſhal de Breze's "Lady whoſe Phyſician he was, and who had a great "affection for him. He had a footman whoſe ſon, "(a boy about twelve or thirteen) being ſeized with a "violent fit of coughing, ſpit out his tongue; when "carrying it to his father; here, ſays he, is my "tongue which I juſt now ſpit out. The boy ſpoke "as diſtinctly after this accident (which doubtleſs was "owing to the ſmall pox that had eat the root of his "tongue) as before; except that the ſounding of the "letter r gave him ſome trouble. He was ſhewn all "over Europe, and lived a great many years. A "Surgeon of Saumur having publiſhed a treatiſe on "this ſubject to which Mr. Duncan gave the title of "*Agloſſoſtomographia*; another Phyſician of Saumur (24) "who had a pique againſt Duncan, printed a trea- "tiſe to prove that it ſhould be *Agloſſoſtomatographia*, "and prefixed theſe lines to his Piece:

(22) Burgersdiſcius applauds it highly in the preface to his *Inſtitutiones Logicæ*, which he compoſed on that model.

(23) See the remark [*B*] of the article GRANDIER at the beginning.

(24) His name was *Benoiſt*. It was he who gave a Latin Tranſlation of Lucian.

"*Lecteur tu t'eſmerveilleras*
"*Qu'un garçon qui n'a point de langue*
"*Prononce bien une harangue;*
"*Mais bien plus tu t'eſtonneras*
"*Qu'un barbier qui ne ſçait pas lire*
"*Le Grec, ſe meſle d'en eſcrire.*
"*Que ſi ce plaiſant Epigramme,*
"*Doux fruit d'un penſer de mon ame,*
"*Te ſemble n'aller pas tant mal,*
"*C'eſt que je l'ai fait à cheval.*
That is,
"Reader, 'twill certainly excite thy wonder
"To hear a tongueleſs boy harangue the crowd:
"But what will raiſe thy admiration higher;
"A *Tonſor*, who can't read a word of Greek,
"Pretends (O ſtrange!) to write that lofty language.
"Now ſhould this pretty Epigram, (the fruit,
"And ſoft production of my leiſure moments)
"Seem to creep tolerably on all four,
"The reaſon's this—I made it when on horſeback.

"Some waggs changed the laſt verſe in all the co- "pies as they could meet with, and in the following "manner,

C'eſt que je l'ai fait en cheval.
That is,
"The reaſon's this — I made it like a horſe*.

* Or as we ſhould ſay in Engliſh, I made it like *an Aſs*.

"There is another circumſtance which appears to me "ſingular enough, viz. that Mr. Duncan, his three "ſons, and the only ſon of Ste Helene, (the five per- "ſons who formed the whole male line of that branch) "ſhould die and be buried in five different Kingdoms; "Mr. Duncan in France, Ceriſantes at Naples, Mont- "ford at Stockholm, Sainte Helene at London, and "his ſon in Ireland."

It is with joy I here embrace the opportunity of mentioning Mr. Duncan, who practiſes Phyſic at Bern with great reputation; and for whom I have always preſerved the utmoſt eſteem and friendſhip ever ſince we ſtudied Philoſophy together, in 1668. He is deſcended from a famous Philoſophy Profeſſor (25) who was of the ſame family with the Phyſician of Saumur. He was born at Montauban, and practiſed Phyſic there with great reputation, when a deſire of living purſuant to the dictates of his conſcience, obliged him to retire to Bern, after the repeal of the edict of Nantes. The works he has publiſhed are excellent in their kind, and do him great honour. He is Author of *the new and mechanical explanation of the animal actions*, printed at Paris in 1678: *Natural Chymiſtry; or a chymical and mechanical explanation of the nouriſhment of the animal*, in three parts, printed at Paris, the firſt in 1681, and the two laſt in 1687; *Hiſtory of the animal, or the knowledge of the animated Body, by Mechanicks and Chymiſtry*, printed at Paris in 1687. The Journaliſts have mentioned it with applauſe (26).

(25) In the Univerſity of Montauban.

(26) See the *Apparatus ad Hiſtoriam Literariam* of Mr. Van Beughem, pag. 128. of Part I; and pag. 107 of Part II.

[Mr. Duncan, who is living (this 9th of February 1726 in London, has publiſhed ſeveral other works; and among the reſt, a French piece entitled, *Avis Salutaires &c.* i. e. "Salutary Ad- "vice to the "public, con- "cerning the ill "uſe of hot ſub- "ſtances, parti- "cularly Coffee, "Tea and Cho- "colate," 8vo. Rotterdam 1705. And *Chymiæ Naturalis Speci- men* in 8vo. Amſt. 1710. *Addit. to the Amſterdam Edit.*]

CETHEGUS, a Roman Family, and a branch of the Houſe of the Cornelii, produced ſeveral perſons whoſe memory has been preſerved. I ſhall ſpeak of ſome of them. CORNELIUS CETHEGUS, created Conſul with Quintus Flamininus, diſtributed adulterated wine to the people after his election was over (*a*). Thoſe two Conſuls were obliged to reſign their office, becauſe there had been ſome irregularity in their creation. This was in the year of Rome 421 (*b*). MARCUS CORNELIUS CETHEGUS was raiſed to the office of Cenſor in the year 544, before he had been Conſul; which was contrary to cuſtom [*A*]. He obtained the Conſulſhip five years after. This perſon was a great Orator [*B*]. CAIUS

(*a*) *Invenio muſtum rutatum populo datum à Cornelio Cethego in Conſulatu collega Quintii Flaminini comitiis peractis.* Plinius, lib. 9. cap. 8. pag. m. 612.

(*b*) See Father Hardouin on this paſſage of Pliny.

[*A*] M. CORN. CETHEGUS *was . . . Cenſor . . . . before he had been Conſul; which was contrary to cuſtom.*] This is what may be gathered from the following words of Livy: *Cenſores hic annus* (1) *habuit L. Veturium Philonem, & P. Licinium Craſſum Pontificem maximum. Craſſus Licinius nec Conſul nec Prætor ante fuerat quam Cenſor eſt factus: ex ædilitate gradum ad cenſuram fecit* (2). i. e. "The Cenſors for this year "were L. Veturius Philo, and P. Licinius Craſſus who "was Pontifex Maximus. Licinius Craſſus had been "neither Conſul nor Prætor before he was made Cen- "ſor; but ſtepped at once from the Office of Ædile "to that of Cenſor." I imagine Livy would not have made this remark, if it had not been ſomething extraordinary for a man to obtain the Cenſorſhip before he had been Conſul. The year following they were obliged to proceed to the creation of other Cenſors; for one of them dying, his Collegue quitted the Office (3). M. Cornelius Cethegus, and P. Sempronius Tuditanus, who were choſen, had not yet been Conſuls. Livy takes notice of it expreſly. *Creati Cenſores ambo qui nondum Conſules fuerant, M. Cornelius Cethegus, P. Sempronius Tuditanus* (4).

(1) That is, the year 543.

(2) T. Livius, lib. 27. pag. m. 405.

(3) Idem, ibid.

(4) Idem, ibid. pag. 468.

[*B*] *. . . This perſon was a great Orator.*] Conſidering the time; for he who ſhould have compared him with the Orators of the ſubſequent ages, would have judged him barbarous. Here is what Cicero has ſaid of him: *Quem vero extet, & de quo ſit memoriæ proditum eloquentem fuiſſe & ita eſſe habitum, primus eſt M. Cornelius Cethegus: cujus eloquentiæ eſt auctor, & idoneus quidem mea ſententia, Q. Ennius, præſertim cum & ipſe eum audiverit, & ſcribat de mortuo: ex quo nulla ſuſpicio eſt, amicitiæ cauſa eſſe mentitum, eſt igitur ſic apud illum in nono, ut opinor, annali* (5). i. e. "The firſt we have an account of, "and who is recorded to have been eloquent, and "to have been ſo eſteemed, is M. Cornelius Ce- "thegus: the witneſs of whoſe eloquence, and in my "judgment a very proper one, is Q. Ennius; eſpe- "cially ſince he himſelf had been his auditor, and "wrote of him when dead: for which reaſon he can- "not be ſuſpected to have advanced a falſhood for "friendſhip's ſake. Thus therefore he writes in the "ninth Book, as I take it, of his Annals." The verſes

(5) Cicero, *in Bruto*, pag. m. 103.

Caius Cornelius Cethegus, who before he had been Ædile, was Proconsul in Spain, gained a signal victory there (c). He was made Ædile a little after in his absence, in the year 555 (d). Sigonius confounds him with Cneius Cornelius Cethegus (e), who was Consul in 556, and triumphed over the Insubrians (f). He falsly supposes that Cicero and Livy give this Consul the Prænomen of Caius: they give him that of Cneius. Let us pass on to Publius Cornelius Cethegus, who ardently espoused the party of Marius against Sylla (g), and was for that reason declared an enemy of the Roman people (h), when that party was broken. He escaped into Africa to Marius (i), and afterwards implored the mercy of Sylla, and offered to serve him in all things (k). He was received into favour; and perhaps he ought not to be distinguished from that Cethegus, who had so great interest in Rome, that nothing could be obtained without his interposition: but as he had a mistress to whom he would refuse nothing, it happened that an ill woman had the whole city at her disposal. Lucullus was obliged to make his court to this woman [C], when he had a mind to obtain the commission for carrying on the war against Mithridates; for without that he would not have obtained that glorious imploy.

(c) Titus Livius, lib. 31. *sub fin.* pag. m. 588.

(d) Idem, ibid.

(e) Sigonius, *in Fastis, ad ann.* 556.

(f) *See* Livy, lib. 32. pag. 603, and lib. 33. pag. 611.

(g) Appian. *de Bellis Civil.* lib. 1. pag. m. 204.

(h) Idem, ibid. pag. 196.

(i) Idem, ibid. pag. 197.

(k) Idem, ibid. pag. 204.

Several verses of Ennius cited by Cicero, and which I have freed from the interruptions inserted by him, are these:

Additur orator Cornelius suaviloquenti
Ore Cethegus Marcu' Tuditano Collega,
Marci filius, is dictus popularibus ollis
Qui tum vivebant homines, atque ævum agitabant,
Flos delibatus populi, suadæque medulla.

Wherein the Poet acquaints us, that Cethegus, on account of the prevailing sweetness of his tongue, was called by his contemporaries the *flower of the people*, and the *marrow of persuasion*. Cicero observes in another place, that the same Orator when he grew old took care notwithstanding to improve his talent with extreme application (6).

(6) Idem, *de Senectute*, cap. 14. pag. m. 425.

[C] *A Cethegus . . . . had a mistress to whom he could refuse nothing: . . . . Lucullus was obliged to make his court to this woman.*] To know the character of this Cethegus, we need only read the following words of Plutarch (7): *Lucullus . . . . thought that if Pompey* (8) *returned to Rome . . . . he would easily do and obtain whatever he pleased; especially since Cethegus, a very popular man both for words and actions, the chief manager of affairs in Rome, had conceived a mortal hatred against him (Lucullus), for declaiming against his debauched, insolent, and lewd life* (9): *Lucullus therefore openly set himself against him.* Plutarch adds that the government of Cilicia becoming vacant, several persons appeared Candidates for it, and *courted Cethegus, as the man best able to serve them.* Lucullus, hoping that if he obtained it, he should likewise be employed in the war against Mithridates "used all his "interest that that Province might be allotted to him, "and to none other; which put him upon a project, "not so honest and commendable, as expedient for "compassing his design, submitting to necessity against "his own inclination. There was one Præcia, a "most celebrated wit and beauty, but in other things "nothing better than an impudent harlot, who to the "charms of her person, adding the reputation of one "that loved and served her friends, by making those "who came to her, as they discoursed of the designs "and promotions of their friend, had got a great "interest. She had seduced Cethegus, the chiefest man "in esteem and authority of all the city, and enticed "him to her love, and so made all authority follow "her. For nothing of moment was done wherein "Cethegus was not concerned, nothing by Cethegus "without Præcia. This woman Lucullus gained to "his side by gifts and flattery (and great cost it was "to procure so stately and famous a dame, to be earnestly concerned for Lucullus) and presently found "Cethegus his friend, using his utmost interest to procure Cilicia for him: Which when once obtained, "there was no more need of applying himself either "to Præcia or Cethegus; for all unanimously voted "him to the Mithridatic war, by no hands likely to "be so successfully managed as his."

(7) Plut. *in Lucullo*, pag. 494. Mr. Bayle makes use of the Version of Amiot: the Translator of that of Mr. Thornburgh.

(8) He commanded then in Spain.

(9) Here is Plutarch's Greek: Κέθηγος ἐχθραν τινὰ πρὸς Λεκκιλλον εἶχε, βδελυττόμενον αυτῦ τὸν βίον, αἰσχρῶν ἐρωτων καὶ ὕβρεως καὶ πλημμελίας μεστὸν ὄντα. *Cethego simultas intercedebat cum Lucullo qui illius detestabatur vitam, infamibus amoribus lustrisque atque omni improbitate delibutam.* Plut. *in Lucullo*, pag. 494.

Is it not a deplorable thing, that an illustrious man, and so worthy to command the Roman Army against Mithridates, and who acquitted himself of the employment with so much glory, was not able to obtain that commission but by submitting to make his court to a lady of pleasure! Had there been a Juvenal in that age, would he not have found in such a state of the Commonwealth sufficient reason to satirize? Would he not have said,

Difficile est satiram non scribere, nam quis iniquæ
Tam patiens urbis, tam ferreus, ut teneat se (10)?

That is,

"'Tis hard to write, but harder to forbear.
"To view so lewd a town, and to refrain,
"What hoops of iron could my spleen contain!

Mr. Dryden.

(10) Juven. Sat. 1. ver. 30.

But the misery is, that the like disorder has been renewed a thousand and a thousand times in all countries of the world. This way of preferment has always been practised; it has raised to high fortunes those who were unworthy of them, and even those who deserved them; it has obtained success to unjust Lawsuits, and even to suits which had justice on their side, but must have failed without such protection. We wonder sometimes that certain people advance by large strides to the most eminent dignities: they do not rise to them step by step, or by degrees; but they fly from the lowest to that in the middle, and from thence to the highest. We ask ourselves, on what account, what has he done? If he has merit, he does not equal, or does not surpass such and such who continue a long while in the same posts? The solution of all this is, that a woman of unlimited power protects him by the interest she has gained, and which she preserves at the expence of her virtue. The same complaints will be made a thousand years hence, if the world lasts so long: and as a private person is not capable of reforming this abuse, mankind will be of opinion that prudence will allow him to take advantage of it, as Lucullus did; and they will blame those Embassadors who make a scruple of doing the same thing. Signor Leti, speaking of those capricious humours which may prevent an Embassador from serving his Prince well, produces two examples thereof. An Embassador of Spain at the Court of Rome under Urban VIII, having received orders to discover the intrigues of Cardinal Antonio, was told by a Roman Abbot that there was but one way of succeeding therein. He would not follow it, because he must have offered incense to a mistress of the Cardinal's, named la Cadora; and so he got but very bad information of the secret. Let us set down the terms of Signor Leti: *Ad ogni modo stimava difficile di penetrar quelle del Cardinale Antonio, e perche era ben servito da' suoi Domestici, e perche non mancava di precautioni: ma come questo Cardinale era idolatra delle Femine, che credeva potesse assai servire il mezo della Cadora gran Favorita allora del Cardinale, & acciò meglio facilitasse l' Abbate all' Ambasciatore il camino, gli mostrò i mezi per ottener da questa Cortegiana quanto si voleva. Turbossi non poco di questa proposta l' Ambasciatore, rispondendo* che questa non era propositione à farsi da un' Abbate Romano, ad un' Ambasciatore Spagnolo; che vi andava della sua conscienza, e della grandezza della Monarchia l'incensar le Puttane, e ch' era par abbracciare ogni altro mezo fuori che questo, *e cosi il Cardinale fece il fatto suo con la Francia, nè mai all' Ambasciatore venne in cognitione che la scorza de' trattati* (12). The other example is more recent; it is that of a Spanish Embassador in England under the reign of Charles II. You will find in the following words the advice which was given him, and his answer.

(11) Note, I do not say they will judge rightly.

(12) Leti, *Ceremoniale Politico*, Part 1. lib. 1. pag. 76, 77.

Several other great Lords ſubmitted to a hundred mean actions, that they might riſe to offices by the recommendation of this Cethegus; for it is of him, without doubt, that Cicero ſpeaks in one of his Paradoxes [*D*]. He has ſpoken of a Cethegus an Orator, who in all likelihood is not a different perſon from that woman's gallant [*E*]. CAIUS CORNELIUS CETHEGUS was convicted of having, in concert with Catiline, conſpired the ruin of his country, and was therefore ſtrangled in priſon (*l*). He was the moſt violent of all his accomplices [*F*], and was always of opinion that they ſhould haſten the execution.

(*l*) Salluſt. *in Bello Catilin.* pag. 173.

anſwer. *Parlando queſto con un Milord ſuo grande Amico, e d'antico tempo divoto à quella Corona, ſopra i mezi che foſſero più propri à tirare il Rè d'Inghilterra ad abbracciare all' aperta con pronti ſoccorſi la protettion della Fiandra, il Milord ſi laſciò dire,* che tutti i rimedi eran buoni, mà che ſtimava quello della Porchemouth Favorita del Rè il migliore: *l'Ambaſciatore con certe Rodomontate Spagnole che mal tal volta gli ſaltano adoſſo quaſi ſdegnato gli riſpoſe*; Milord, amarei meglio che il mio Rè perdeſſe la metà del corpo della ſua Monarchia, che di conſervarne un membro col favore d'una Cortegiana. *Il medeſimo Milord me lo riferi à me, anzi mi diſſe, che gli aggiunſe,* e per me hò riſoluto più toſto di non far niente, che molto con queſto mezo. *E veramente niente egli hà fatto: mà però il Barillon Ambaſciator Franceſe non ha laſciato di far tutto, e con qual mezo non voglio ſaperlo, ſo bene ch' egli è ſavio e prudente* (13). i. e. "This Embaſſador diſcourſing with "an Engliſh Nobleman his great friend, and of a "long time devoted to the Crown of Spain, concern- "ing the moſt proper means of inducing the King "of England openly to embrace the protection of "Flanders with ſpeedy ſuccours, that Lord happened "to ſay, *that all methods were good, but he thought "the beſt would be to apply to the Dutcheſs of Portſ- "mouth, the King's favourite miſtreſs:* the Embaſſador, "uſing certain Spaniſh Rodomontades, which ſome- "times ſeized him very unſeaſonably, anſwered with "a kind of indignation; *My Lord, I had rather the "King my Maſter ſhould loſe half his Monarchy than pre- "ſerve one limb of it by the favour of a ſtrumpet.* I had "this relation from the Lord himſelf, who told me "farther, that he added, *and for my part I am re- "ſolved rather to do nothing at all, than a great deal "by this means.* And indeed he did nothing: how- "ever the French Embaſſador Barillon has done every "thing, by what means I will not inquire; only thus "much I know, that he is wiſe and prudent."

(13) Idem, ibid. pag. 78, 79.

We ſhall ſee below (14), in a fine paſſage of Cicero, how very deplorable the calamity of thoſe times are in which juſtice is obliged to ſupport it ſelf by the intereſt of a Curtezan.

(14) In the Article CHELIDONIS, Remark [*A*].

[*D*] . . . . *Cicero ſpeaks of him in one of his Paradoxes.*] It is in that wherein he ſhews that none but wiſe men live free from ſervitude (15). He obſerves that the ambitious did things which were a real ſlavery. They ſent preſents to Cethegus, they viſited him by night, they made ſupplications to him. *Illa cupiditas (quæ videtur eſſe liberalior) honoris, imperii, provinciarum, quam dura eſt domina! quam imperioſa! quam vehemens! Cethego homini non probatiſſimo ſervire coegit eos, qui ſibi eſſe ampliſſimi videbantur; munera mittere, noctu venire domum ad eum, precari, denique ſupplicare, quæ ſervitus eſt, ſi hæc libertas exiſtimari poteſt* (16). This whole paſſage is ſo beautiful, that it could not be ſhortened without wronging the Reader.

(15) *Solum ſapientem liberum eſſe.*

(16) Cicero, *in Paradoxo V*, pag. m. 573.

[*E*] . . . . *and of one Cethegus an Orator, who in all likelihood is not a different perſon from that woman's gallant.*] Cicero ſpeaks of him in this manner: *Ejus æqualis P. Cethegus, cui de republica ſatis ſuppeditabat Oratio: totam enim tenebat eam, penituſque cognorat, itaque in Senatu conſularium autoritatem aſſequebatur, ſed in cauſis publicis nihil, privatis ſatis vetus orator videbatur* (18). i. e. "In his time lived P. "Cethegus, who ſpoke well enough in debate con- "cerning the Common-wealth: for he was thoroughly "acquainted with its management, and perfectly un- "derſtood its intereſt; for which reaſon his autho- "rity in the Senate was equal to that of thoſe of "conſular dignity: but in public cauſes he was no- "thing, tho' in private ones he ſeemed crafty and "well experienced." He is the ſame perſon, if I am not deceived, who is mentioned in the Oration for Cluentius (19), as a man who had endeavoured to diſſuade one Stalenus from meddling with the affairs of the Republic, or had, for other reaſons, given him ill counſel. Aſconius Pedianus confirms what Cicero obſerves concerning this man's credit; for he ſays that Marcus Antonius, he who obtained ſo general an authority over all the ſea coaſts, was ſupported by the Conſul Cotta, and the faction of Cethegus. *Hic eſt M. Antonius*, ſays he (20), *qui gratia Cottæ Conſulis & Cethegi factione in Senatu curationem infinitam nactus totius oræ maritimæ, &c.* I do not believe that the whole of this paſſage is true; for according to Paterculus (21), that Commiſſion was granted two years before Pompey obtained one of the ſame kind. Now Pompey obtained it in the year of Rome 686, and we find no Cotta in the Conſulſhip without going up ſo high as the year 679. Beſides, according to Paterculus, that great authority was given to Marcus Antonius the Prætor, who died in his Prætorſhip according to the Epitome of Livy (22), after having ſucceeded very ill in making war on the inhabitants of the iſle of Crete, about the year 682. Therefore, either the Chronology of Paterculus, or that of the Summaries of Livy, deceives us.

(19) Idem, *in Orat. pro Cluentio*, folio 113, *A*.

(20) Aſcon. Pedian. *in Verrin.* pag. m. 113.

(21) Vell. Paterculus, lib. 20. cap. 31.

(22) Epitome Liviana XCVII.

[*F*] CAIUS CORN. CETHEGUS *was convicted of having conſpired with Catiline. . . . He was the moſt violent of all his accomplices.*] It was he who was appointed to murder Cicero. *Cethegus Ciceronis januam obſideret, eumque vi aggrederetur. . . . Inter hæc parata atque decreta, Cethegus ſemper querebatur de ignavia ſociorum: illos, dubitando, & dies prolatando, magnas opportunitates corrumpere; facto, non conſulto, in tali periculo opus eſſe; ſeque, ſi pauci adjuvarent, languentibus aliis, impetum in curiam facturum. Natura ferox, vehemens, manu promptus erat: maximum bonum in celeritate putabat* (23). i. e. "Cethegus was to beſet "Cicero's gate, and to aſſault him by force. . . While "theſe things were preparing and reſolving on, Ce- "thegus continually complained of the ſlackneſs of "his companions; ſaying they loſt excellent opportu- "nities by raiſing doubts, and by delays; that an af- "fair of ſo perillous conſequence required deeds, and "not conſultations; and that he himſelf, if a few "would aſſiſt him, tho' the others were remiſs, would "make an attack on the Curia †. He was natu- "rally fierce, vehement, and ready for action: and "thought the greateſt advantage lay in expedition." He was in the right to think diſpatch was to be uſed; for if in almoſt all important affairs a man ſhould avoid loſing his time in deliberation, it is above all things neceſſary in a conſpiracy. On the leaſt backwardneſs to put it in execution, ſome falſe brother fails not to diſcover it, in hopes of obtaining his pardon, and an ample recompenſe. It is alſo true, on the other hand, that one may ſpoil all by precipitation. The accomplices, whom Catiline left in Rome, were not at all like one another: ſome had not flegm enough, and others had too much. Cethegus was of the firſt ſort; for which reaſon Cicero was not afraid of him. *Quem quidem ego cum ex urbe pellebam,* ſays he (24), *hoc providebam animo, Quirites, remoto Catilina, nec mihi eſſe P. Lentuli ſomnum, nec L. Caſſii adipem, nec C. Cethegi furioſam temeritatem pertimeſcendam.* i. e. "Whom when I drove out of the city, "I foreſaw this in my mind, that Catiline being re- "moved, I had nothing to fear either from P. Len- "tulus's drowſineſs, L. Caſſius's fat, or the furious "raſhneſs of C. Cethegus." Some think this Cethegus is the ſame who had recourſe to the clemency of Sylla (25); but I do not think them in the right: for if he had had a hand in the enormous diſorders and maſſacres which the faction of Marius committed in Rome, it would not have been paſſed over in ſilence, when mention was made of his journey to Spain,

(23) Salluſtius, *de Bello Catil.* pag. m. 114, 115. *See alſo* Cicer. *Orat. II. in Catilinam, & Orat. pro Sylla.*

† Where the Senate aſſembled.

(24) Cicero, *Orat. III, in Catilin.* folio 139, *A*.

(25) See the *Variorum Commentary on Salluſt*, pag. 41, 163, ed. Lugd. Bat. 1654.

cution. CETHEGUS, a Roman Senator, was beheaded for the crime of adultery, under the reign of Valentinian in the year 368 (*m*). Note that thoſe of this family affected a particular way of dreſs [G].

(*m*) Ammian. Marcellin. lib. 28. cap. 1. pag. m. 511.

Spain, and the wound of Metellus Pius. *Quis de C. Cethego, atque ejus in Hiſpaniam profectione, ac de vulnere Q. Metelli Pii cogitat; cui non ad illius pœnam carcer ædificatus eſſe videatur* (26)? i. e. "Who thinks "on C. Cethegus, and his going to Spain, and on "the wound of Q. Metellus Pius, that does not judge "the priſon to have been built for his chaſtiſement?" Cato, if I am not miſtaken, had this journey in view, when he ſaid that Cethegus, by conſpiring with Catiline, made war on his country a ſecond time (27). Whoever ſhall have read this will eaſily underſtand the following paſſage of Juvenal:

(26) Cicero, *Orat. pro Sylla*, folio 161, B.

(27) *Ignoſcite Cethegi adoleſcentiæ, niſi iterum jam patriæ bellum infert.* Salluſt. *de Bello Catil.* pag. 163.

Quis cœlum terris non miſceat, & mare cœlo,
Si ſur diſpliceat Verri, homicida Miloni,
Clodius accuſet mœchos, Catilina Cethegum (28)?

That is,

(28) Juvenal. Sat. 2. ver. 25.

"'Twould make you ſwear the Planets from their
"ſpheres,
"Should Verres peach thieves, Milo murderers,
"Clodius tax bawds, Cethegus Catiline."

Mr. Tate.

[G] *Thoſe of this family affected a particular way of dreſs.*] You will find it explained in Mr. Dacier's note on this verſe of Horace, *Fingere cinctutis non exaudita Cethegis* (29). "He here repreſents the Cethegi "as hardy and laborious men, who had retained in "their dreſs the ancient manner of their fathers, "who deſpiſing the tunic, as too cumberſome, wore "only a ſort of apron which ſerved them for drawers "from the waſte downwards; and put their gown "over it, ſo that the lappet which they threw over "the left ſhoulder, and went behind the back, came "round and girded them, and left the right arm "naked: and this is what they properly called *cinctus "Gabinus*, which was commonly uſed by the Conſuls "and Prætors when they performed their functions "(30)." That it was the peculiar faſhion of this family we learn from Silius Italicus.

(29) Horat. *de Arte Poetica*, ver. 50.

(30) Dacier, *ſur l'Art. Poetique d'Horace*, pag. 121. of the Dutch Edition.

Parebat legio audaci permiſſa Cethego
. . . . . .
Ipſe humero exertus, GENTILI MORE *parentum*,
Difficili gaudebat equo, roburque juventæ
Flexu cornipedis duro exercebat in ore (31).

(31) Silius Italicus, lib. 8. pag. m. 374.

That is,

"A Legion was by bold Cethegus led.
. . . . . .
"He, with one ſhoulder bare, the ancient guiſe
"Of his Progenitors, in pride beſtrode
"A fiery courſer, in whoſe managing
"He gave his youthful vigour exerciſe."

Dauſqueius's note may be of ſome uſe to us. *Cethegis*, ſays he (32), *amicum ex papillato brachio depugnare, notum illud Lucani,*

(32) Dauſqueius *in Silium Italic.* pag. 376.

-- Exertique manus veſana Cethegi (33).

(33) Lucan ſays this, *Phar.* lib. 2. ver. 543, ſpeaking of Catiline's Accomplice. Add what he ſays lib. 5. ver. 794, *nedique Cethegi.*

Ut enim habilius valentiuſque telum evibrarent, ſubſtrictiores erant. Inde Horat.

-- Cinctutis non exaudita Cethegis.

Ubi Porphyrio à cinctu qui tunicæ aptatus eſſet infra pectus, *Acrone melius expoſuit Horatium. Tales olim* Exſilati *dicebantur.*

That is,

"The Cethegi loved to fight with their arm bare,
"according to that known expreſſion of Lucan,

"*And mad Cethegus' naked arm....*

"For they girded themſelves up the tighter that they
"might throw their javelin with the greater eaſe and
"force. Hence Horace,

"*By the ſtrait-girt Cethegi never heard.*

"Where Porphyrio has explained Horace better than
"Acron, *from the cincture which was fitted to the
"tunic beneath the breaſt.* Such were anciently called
"*Exſilati.*"

CHABOT (PETER GAUTHIER) a learned Humaniſt, born at Sainloup in Poitou, in 1516 [*A*], was an Oilman's ſon. He ſtudied the Latin tongue at Sainloup, and afterwards went to Poitiers, at twenty four years of age, to ſtudy the Greek there; but he was ſoon recalled from thence, in order for him to teach youth in his native place. He taught there ſix years, after which he went to Paris (*a*), and there went through a courſe of Philoſophical Studies, under Omer and Talon, in the College de Prêle. Having ſpent three years and a half in ſtudy, he took his Maſter of Arts degree, and profeſſed teaching. The children of ſeveral perſons of diſtinction were committed to his care; and he acquired ſo much reputation, as a Preceptor, that Chancellor de l'Hôpital reſolved to engage him to live in his ſeat in the country, there to teach his grandſons (*b*). He got Peter Ramus and John Mercier the Regius Profeſſors, to make propoſals to him. Chabot accepted them, and lived twelve years in the Chancellor's family, viz. five years before the Chancellor died, and ſeven years after (*c*). His chief work was a Commentary on Horace [*B*], on which he exhauſted all the fruits of his ſtudies

(*a*) He went thither in October 1546.

(*b*) They were ſix in number; their father, Mr. Belesbat, was of the family of Huraut, and had married the Chancellor's daughter.

(*c*) The Chancellor died in 1573.

[*A*] *He was born in* 1516.] Boiſſard, who had been extremely intimate with him, was nevertheleſs not able to inform us exactly of the month or day of his birth. He made ſo exact an enquiry on this occaſion, that he wanted to know the very hour, in order to mark it in his Elogium, according to the German cuſtom (1). But all he could learn was, that he had heard Chabot's relations and many of his neighbours ſay, that he was born in 1516. *Fando tantum a propinquis multiſque vicinis eſt receptum, ipſius ortum ſub* 1516 *cecidiſſe* (2). I am to inform the reader, that ſome people ſay his true name was *Gualtherus* and not *Chabotius* (3). He yet is better known by the latter, which was his mother's name, than by the former, which was that of his father.

(1) Roland Des-Marets, *Epiſt. Philolog.* 25. lib. 2. blames them for it. He obſerves that ſuch things are proper to be obſerved only of Kings or eminent perſons.

(2) Boiſſard. *in Iconibus.*

(3) Draudius, *Bibliotb. Claſſ.* pag. 1088 and 1209, edition 1625; and the Epitome of Geſner's *Bibliotheque.*

[*B*] *His chief work was a Commentary on Horace.*] His Commentary is drawn up in a very uncommon method. It contains the analyſis of the text, as well according to the Rules of Grammar, as to thoſe of Rhetoric and Logic. I'll repeat here what I ſaid in my plan or ſpecimen, with reſpect to a paſſage that may be ſeen above (4), and which is pretty much confuſed. Such confuſions are frequently found in this Commentary of Petrus Gualtherus Chabotius on Horace, printed in 1615, folio. We muſt not aſcribe theſe to the author, who was a very learned man; and who not only ſpent a great number of years on this Poet, but drew up his Commentary in a very ſingular and very uſeful manner. The misfortune is this, as he lived nine or ten years after he had publiſhed his Commentary at Baſil, in 1587, he naturally collected remarks for his ſecond edition, but had not an opportunity of putting his deſign in execution. After his death, James Graiſerus being poſſeſſed of his collections, inſerted them,

(4) Remark [*G*] of the Article CASSIUS SEVERUS (TITUS) Citation (31).

ſtudies. He was extremely regular in his life and manners; and ſubmitted three times, with great patience, to the plunder of his poſſeſſions, during the fury of the civil wars. He was always fond of leading a very ſolitary life [C], and lived upwards of fourſcore years (d). He died about 1597. I learn from a good authority (e), that he had been Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Paris; and yet I doubt the truth of this, from its not being mentioned by Boiſſard.

(d) Extracted from John James Boiſſard in *Iconibus Virorum Illuſtrium.*

(e) In the Preface to the *Methodo Græcæ* of *Dom. Lancelot*, pag. 22.

to the beſt of his powet, in their reſpective places, in the edition of 1615. But not being able always to diſtinguiſh, as the author himſelf would have done, the citations from thoſe remarks which Chabot added; he has often given a reflection of Chabot, as the citation of an ancient author. Beſides, it plainly appears that the author's reflections were merely as ſo many firſt ſketches, which an author inſerts in his collections, to prevent their ſlipping his memory, and which he deſigns to reviſe before they go to preſs. But when another perſon has the ordering of theſe, he does not always perceive where any defect lies. We therefore are not to wonder to ſee poſthumous pieces, enlarged from the unfiniſh'd Memoirs of authors, ſo defective as they are found. There are too many typographical errors in this Commentary; and the French expreſſions with which the author blended it, to give his countrymen the better idea of the Text of Horace, are in moſt places diſguiſed. It is ſurprizing that Draudius ſhould not have had any knowledge, either of the analytical Explication of Horace, publiſhed by Chabot at Paris anno 1582, in 8vo, as an extract of the whole Commentary; nor of the two editions of this Commentary. He only mentions a Letter which Chabot had wrote upon his condition, and the way of life he had led (5). We alſo may wonder, that the *Theatrum* of Paulus Freherus, which gives an abridgment of Chabot's Life, ſhould mention only the little Analyſis of Horace. It is very abſurd to aſſert, that Chabot tranſcribed almoſt the whole Commentary of Torrentius on Horace (6); for Chabot was dead when that Commentary was printed, which was in 1607 (7).

(5) Draudius, *Bibliotb. Claſſica*, pag. 1088 and 1289. edit. 1625.

(6) This is nevertheleſs aſſerted in the *Decas Decadum of Albert Fabri*, num. 99. printed at Leipſic, in 1689.

(7) Valerius Andreas, *Bibl. Belgic.* pag. 610.

(8) Boiſſardus, *in Iconibus.*

(9) Idem, ibid.

(10) Idem, ibid.

[C] *He was always fond of leading a very ſolitary life.*] He was ſo extremely abſtemious, that it is literally true he eat merely to ſupport nature; and hence it was that he could never be prevailed upon, even in his youth, to partake of grand entertainments. *Tale porro temperantiæ ſtudium exſtitit illi cauſa, cur ſemper vel juvenis intereſſe ſodalitatibus epuliſque ampliſſimis pertinaciter recuſârit* (8). He was very ſeldom ſeen in places of public reſort, or in thoſe walks, where ſo many people meet, either to hear or ſpread news (9). In a word, he never indulged himſelf ever ſo little in the pleaſures of the world, he living unmarried, without ſociety; and would never divert himſelf abroad, or go to feaſts. This was not owing to a ſevere, unſociable temper, but to four bodily infirmities, viz. *crebra melendi brevitas, audiendi gravitas, mandendi imbecillitas, frequens alternatio deambulandi & conquieſcendi propter ramices inguinum* (10), i. e. "a frequent "inclination to make water, a thickneſs of hearing, a "difficulty of chewing; and his being obliged to walk "and ſit alternatively, upon account of a rupture "with which he was troubled." But he lived to upwards of fourſcore, notwithſtanding theſe infirmities.

CHALVET (MATTHEW DE) in Latin *Calventius*, Preſident of the *Enquetes* in the Parliament of Toulouſe. His article, extracted from the Elogiums of Sammarthanus (a) is inſerted in Moreri; I nevertheleſs will give it complete, becauſe I am poſſeſſed of a greater number of circumſtances. I therefore ſay that Matthew de Chalvet, *ſprung from the family of the Chalvets, of Roche-montez in upper Auvergne, was born in May* 1528. He was brought to Paris in 1539 by Mr. Lizet his uncle, at that time Advocate General in the Parliament of Paris (b), who kept him ſix years to his ſtudies under Orontius Fineus, Tuſan, Buchanan, and ſome other learned perſons. He went to Toulouſe in 1546. to learn the Civil Law, and lodged in the ſame houſe with Turnebus, Mercerus, and Govea (c). He travelled into Italy in 1550, in order to purſue his ſtudies, and was Alciat's diſciple at Pavia, and Socinus's at Bologna. Being returned to France, *he went to Toulouſe, and there compleated his courſe of Law-ſtudies, and was aſſociated with Roaldes and Bodinus, they reading Law Lectures together in the public ſchools with reputation.* Having taken his Doctor's Degree in that Univerſity, he reſolved to go to Paris, in order to make his fortune; but though this reſolution of his was ſtrengthened by ſome letters he received from Mr. Lizet, he yet did not put it in execution, he chooſing rather to ſettle in Toulouſe, where he married, in 1552, *Jane de Bernuy daughter of the Lord de Palficat, Baron of Villeneuſve.* He was admitted Counſellor in the Parliament of that City anno 1553, *afterwards created Judge of French Poeſy, and Maintainer of the Floral Sports.* He was appointed Preſident of the Inqueſts by the Parliament in 1573. *Being of an innocent and peaceable temper*, he retired to his houſe in Auvergne, *during the firſt and laſt furies of the civil wars, in order that he might not be an eye-witneſs of the confuſions, which he ſaw would break out in Toulouſe.* It was in this retirement *he ſtudied and tranſlated Seneca* [A] *to adminiſter ſome conſolation to himſelf during the wild havock that was then making, and to employ his leiſure to advantage.* Not to mention his bodily advantages, he obſerved the ſtricteſt fidelity, among his many other good qualities, to his Sovereign [B]. It was this gained him the particular eſteem of

(a) Lib. 5. pag. m. 130, & *ſeq.*

(b) He afterwards was firſt Preſident of that Parliament. See the Article LIZET.

(c) And not Goudan, as 'tis expreſſed in the piece where this Article is extracted.

[A] *He ſtudied and tranſlated Seneca.*] He dedicated this verſion to Henry IV, in 1603. It was reprinted in folio, at Paris, for William Loyſon, anno 1624; and for John Richer, in 1634. "Sammarthanus declares, that he ſhowed a great induſtry, fidelity, and application in his tranſlation of Seneca *." Huetius nevertheleſs ſays, that he did not ſubject himſelf much to his Author, nor tranſlate him literally; and whereas nothing can be dryer and more conciſe than Seneca. Chalvet's verſion, on the contrary, is very diffuſe †. This is Mr. Baillet's judgment (1).

* Sammarth. *Elogior.* lib. 5. pag. 150.

† Huetius, *de claris Interpret.* lib. 2. pag. 185.

(1) Baillet, *Jugem. des Savans*, tom. 4. pag. 535, 537.

[B] *Not to mention his bodily advantages, he obſerved the ſtricteſt fidelity (among his many other good qualities) to his Prince.*] "In the midſt of his ſtudies "during his youth, he uſed often to unbend his mind, "by the moſt polite bodily exerciſes which he had "learnt in Italy; he being a fine Horſeman, an excellent Dancer, and the beſt Player at tennis of his time. "He uſed alſo to ſoften the ſeverity of the ſtudy of "the Laws with the ſweets of Latin and French Poetry, in which he was very well ſkilled, as will appear by his Poems, in caſe his heirs do not envy "the Public what is ſo worthy their peruſal (2). . . . "He had a great number of friends, and he knew "how to cultivate them; but above all, there was a "ſingular and perfect friendſhip between Mr. du Faur "de

(2) *Summary of the Life of Matthew Chalvet*, prefixed to his *Seneca*.

of Henry IV, who, in 1603, *appointed him Counſellor of State and Privy Counſellor.* The year after, *he reſigned his dignity of Preſident to Francis Chalvet* Sieur de Fenouillet, *one of his ſons, and retired from buſineſs to devote himſelf wholly to God, and to ſpend the remainder of his days in peace, and among his books. He ſpent two years in this retirement, with ſo much ſatisfaction to himſelf, that he uſed frequently to declare to his relations, that he could not ſay he had lived during the paſt years of his life* [C] . . . . *He died in a pious and Chriſtian manner* at Toulouſe, the 20th of June 1607, being ſeventy nine years of age (*d*). Several Authors have honoured him with Elogiums [*D*].

(d) Extracted from the *Short Account of his Life*, prefixed to his Tranſlation of *Seneca.*

" de St. Iory, firſt Preſident of Toulouſe, and our " Chalvet; as well upon account of their mutual love " for learning, as of their near affinity. He was tall " and well-ſet, had a pleaſant eye, fair hair, a ſweet and " venerable aſpect; a grave, modeſt and majeſtic de- " portment; and he was vaſtly entertaining in con- " verſation (3). No one ſpoke with him but he was " immediately charmed; for he was naturally affable, " courteous, kind, ingenuous; free from hypocriſy, " ambition and avarice; employing much more pains " in other people's affairs, than in his own; fearing " God, deteſting and condemning all kinds of vice, " and eſpecially violent practices and innovations, " even in matters of Religion. He loved order, inte- " grity and peace. Amidſt the confuſions of France, " he perſevered conſtantly in obedience to his Prince, " whoſe party, as judging it the only juſt and lawful " one, he always faithfully followed. Therefore, " when the Parliament was removed from Toulouſe to " Chaſtelſarraſy, he was ſelected from the reſt, to go " and compliment, in their name, the King who was " then (1594) at Lyons; which gave his Majeſty the " higheſt ſatisfaction, as appeared by the gracious re- " ception he gave Mr. Chalvet, and the preſent he " made him; and he thought himſelf vaſtly happy, " in having been the firſt Officer of the Parliament " of Toulouſe, who waited upon the King ſince " his acceſſion to the throne, and ſince the beginning " of the reduction of Languedoc by his Majeſty's " arms. Again he was deputed in 1603 by the ſame " Parliament to that King, on ſeveral important af- " fairs; in which journey, his Majeſty, as an honoura- " ble recompence for all his ſervices, appointed him, un- " aſked by any, or even by Mr. Chalvet himſelf, " Counſellor of State and Privy Counſellor; for which " he took an oath before the Chancellor de Bellievre, " to whom he was ſome way related (4)."

(3) See, on theſe Subjects, the Latin verſes of Critton, Regius Profeſſor, prefixed to his Tranſlation of Seneca.

(4) *Summary of the Life of Mr. de Chalvet.*

[C] *He ſpent two years in this retirement, with ſo much ſatisfaction to himſelf, that he uſed frequently to declare . . . that he could not ſay he had lived, during all the paſt years of his life.*] He therefore might have compared himſelf to an illuſtrious man who was *Præfectus Prætorii* under the Emperor Adrian. The perſon I mean is Similis, who was raiſed to this employment much againſt his will, and reſigned it voluntarily; after which he retired into the country, and after ſpending ſeven years there, left the world. He would have the following inſcription fixed on his tomb. *Here lies Similis, who tho' his age was very long, yet lived but ſeven years* (5). * [This inſcription is thus imitated in a modern work.

(5) Xiphilin. *in Hadriano*, pag. m. 266.

* The PLAIN-DEALER; being ſelect Eſſays on ſeveral curious ſubjects. num. 114. London 1730. 8vo.

Should curious readers wiſh to know,
Whoſe duſt their feet are preſſing;
SIMILIS, *fam'd in war, lies low,*
His country's boaſt and bleſſing.
Long did he toil, and graſp and ſtrive,
Yet loſt his time he fears;
For tho', till ſeventy ſix, alive,
He lived but ſeven ſhort years.]

The reader will find a great many pieces on ſuch ſubjects, in Camerarius's hiſtorical Meditations, Chap. V. Book III, of Vol. I.

[*D*] *Several Authors have honoured him with Elogiums.*] I ſhall give but one inſtance, and that is a Latin Epigram, addreſſed to him by Peter le Loyer.

Cum ſua quiſque tibi culto munuſcula verſu
Offerat, & genio dedicet illa tuo,
Haud ego poſtremos inter numerabor amicos,
Et levia, at ſaltem munera grata dabo.

That is,

" Whilſt every one inſcribes his flowing verſe,
" An humble offering to thy noble genius;
" Lo I advance, (not laſt of all thy friends)
" And pay a grateful, tho' but ſlender, tribute."

This Epigram follows the French Verſes, by which the Author dedicated his Comedy intitled le Muet inſensè (the frantic dumb man) to this Preſident of Inqueſts. His encomium begins at, *Quand j'aurois autant d'or*, i. e. " . . . Tho' I had as much " gold" down to *Muſe*, incluſively. And, *Et encore mon Chalvet, cher teſte.* i. e. " And again Chaulvet, " dear man." . . . to *Prens doncque* (take then) excluſively, in the *Oeuvres & meſlanges Poëtiques de Pierre le Loyer*, folio 122 *verſo.* Paris edit. 1579.

CHAMIER (DANIEL) one of the greateſt Proteſtant Divines, was born in Dauphiné. He was many years Preacher at Montellimart (*a*), whence he went in 1612 to Montauban, to be Profeſſor of Divinity in that City, and was killed by a canon ball during the ſiege in 1621 (*b*) [*A*]. It is very ſurprizing that no one ſhould have wrote his Life; no people in the world would have been ſo negligent on ſuch an occaſion but the French. Had Chamier been of another country, his Life would have been wrote in a voluminous

(a) *Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes*, tom. 2. pag. 86. See the Remark [*D*].

(b) The 16th of October.

[*A*] *He was killed by a cannon-ball, during the ſiege of* Montauban, *in* 1621.] Some Hiſtorians relate, that he was killed under arms, that is, pike in hand, and defended with a coat of mail; and that he had three times repeated with a loud voice, in the pathetic Sermon preached by him that day, the following words -- They ſhall not enter. *Chamierus . . quamquam propugnaculo tegebatur, tormentaria pila in fruſta diſcerpitur, vix agnito unde globus, & qua immiſſus; in utrumque paratus homo audax, thorace ferreo, haſtaque ad manum venerat in hunc locum, additurus militi animos, poſtquam eademmet die concione in templo pathetico habita, de regiis loquens, finierat in hæc ipſa verba, quæ diſtincta ter voce diſtincta repetierat, Non ingredientur* (1). We don't find, by the relation of the ſiege of Montauban, that he had taken up arms, but only, *that he was carried off by a cannon-ball, at the entry of the baſtion du Paillas; and that in his Sermon, the preceding day, on the 34th verſe of chapter 37 of Iſaiah, he applied to the city of Montauban, the promiſe (in the name of the Lord) made to Jeruſalem, beſieged by Rabſhakeh, General of Sennacherib's Army*; in the following words, which he repeated with great vehemence.— *By the way that he came, by the ſame ſhall he return, and ſhall not come into this city, ſaith the Lord. Some of his friends*, adds the relation, *heard Chamier ſay, that he believed he ſhould die in that ſiege by a cannon-ball, . . . and he propheſied accidentally that Sunday morning, what happened to him in the evening. Joſſion his collegue aſking him whether it was not his turn to preach in the afternoon? By no means ſays he, it is my reſting-day* (2). The Romiſh Writers have commented in a moſt horrid manner on the death of this famous Clergyman; and thence have taken occaſion to rail againſt him as an incendiary, who not ſatisfied with preaching rebellion, took up arms and fought as a ſoldier; without conſidering, ſay theſe, that as the Laity are not allowed to aſſume any of the ſacerdotal functions, neither are Miniſters of the Goſpel permitted to draw the ſword. To theſe it is anſwered, (as in the caſe of Zuinglius) that it is lawful for them to take up arms in order to implore a bleſſing upon their cauſe, and to comfort and ſtrengthen thoſe who ſtand in need of ſuch aſſiſtance.

(1) Barthol. Gramondus, *Hiſtor. Galliæ*, lib. 10. pag. m. 592.

(2) *Siege de Montauban*, pag. m. 155.

voluminous ſize, and have had a place in every public Library, eſpecially as he left ſeveral ſons of his own profeſſion, and whoſe poſterity are Clergymen (*t*). He was as famous among the French Proteſtants for his politicks, as in his preaching. No man was ever more ſevere, inflexible, or untractable [*B*], with regard to the artifices which the Court of France employed to weaken the Proteſtants. It is ſaid that Chamier drew up the edict of Nantz [*C*]. He had the honour of being deputed on ſeveral occaſions [*D*], and preſided over ſome Synods (*d*). Though he ſpent ſo much time in negotiations, he nevertheleſs acquired a great fund of learning, of which his diſputes with father Coton [*E*], and the books [*F*] written by him are a proof. The aſſertion of thoſe who make him the

(*t*) I write this in 1694.

(*d*) Among others, to the national Synod of Gap in 1603.

[*B*] *No man was ever more ſevere and inflexible.*] The Author of the Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantz, *gives a very good deſcription* of Chamier's turn of mind. *He danced attendance to no purpoſe at Court*, ſays he (3), *whither he had been deputed by the Synod of Rochelle . . . and after ſix months ſtay in it, he could not get acceſs to his Majeſty. The King was not pleaſed with him, becauſe he was one of the hot-heads of the Synod* (4), *whom the King did not love; of that claſs of people who are inflexible; of thoſe hearts that are proof againſt fears and hopes, which are the ſtrongeſt engines the Court has to play off.* He had ſaid elſewhere (5), ſpeaking of the Deputies ſent on the affair of the Edict of Nantz, *that Chamier was one of the moſt obſtinate of them, and upon that account was ſo odious to the Court, as he was revered by the Churches.* We ſhall relate in the Remark [*B*] of the Article FERRIER, that in 1611, being in the Aſſembly of Saumur, he was at the head of thoſe who would have the Edict of Nantz obſerved in the moſt ſtrict and rigorous ſenſe. But if the reader is deſirous of knowing the humour and diſpoſition of Chamier and ſuch like men, let him read what d'Aubigné has written in a very facetious ſtyle. "Now thoſe people appeared more ſaucy, *ſays he* (6), "in the laſt treaty of Peace, and in thoſe Aſſemblies "which were held four years, wherein thoſe ſtubborn "men reſiſted, not only the moſt honourable men the "King could ſelect out of his Council of State, but "alſo the greateſt Noblemen of the Kingdom; when, "weighing the affairs of the Kingdom, they would "fain have prevailed with them to ſhew ſome civility. "One of theſe roſe up with a face of braſs, and an"ſwered freely, *Theſe propoſals don't anſwer the good "opinion which thoſe by whom we are ſent, entertain "of us.* An explanation of theſe words was deſired, "when la Valiere comes forward, and explaining it, "cries, *This, Gentlemen, may be called betraying the "Church of God.* T'other day I heard Mr. de Villeroy "tell, how that himſelf, Meſſ. de Roſny and de Thou, "and others, being at a conference with four of theſe "ill-bred men, whilſt Calignon, in the King's name, "endeavoured to ſoften their ſtubborn minds, by gentle "and perſuaſive eloquence, unweildy Chamier, throwing his cloak under his back-ſide, had brought forward his left arm to the middle of the table; paring his nails with his ſciſſors, when the clippings "flew on the Orator's beard and into his mouth; one "of them flew into Roſny's eye; and this air and "manner annulled all that could be ſaid in his favour."

(3) Tom. 1. pag. 446, 447, *ad ann.* 1607.

(4) The Author had ſaid, pag. 443. that there were certain perſons in the Synod who were called, by the Courtiers, the hotheads of the Synod; from a ſuppoſition that they were too ſtubborn, and too careful of their own ſecurity.

(5) Pag. 253.

(6) *Confeſſion Catholique de Sanci*, lib. 2. cap. 7. pag. m. 422, 423.

[*C*] *'Tis ſaid that Chamier drew up the Edict of Nantz.*] I have read this in an Epiſtle Dedicatory of Mr. de Varillas. *As the Hereticks*, ſays he (7), *will ſcarce ever obtain ſuch a ſecurity as they may think ſufficient for themſelves; the Calviniſts had obtained by their importunities, that whatever was of advantage to their party in the Edict of* Pacification, *ſhould be included in that of Nantz. Daniel Chamier, the Clergyman, who had the greateſt abilities among them, was ordered to draw it up. He had employed full three months for this purpoſe; and boaſted his not having omitted any thing which might conduce to ſtrengthen the tranquillity of his Sect.*

(7) Varill. *Epiſt. Dedic.* of tom. 1. *de l'Hiſtoire de l'Héréſie.*

[*D*] *He had the honour to be deputed on ſeveral occaſions.*] What Varillas aſſerted above, may perhaps be falſe; but it is certain that Chamier was one of the chiefs in the aſſemblies of the French Proteſtants, in which the laſt pacification with Henry IV was debated and concluded. La Trimouille, du Pleſſis, d'Aubigné, and himſelf were made choice of, "in order "to debate and conteſt ſuch matters as could not, "without creating too much confuſion, be digeſted by "the whole Aſſembly, which then conſiſted of ſeven"ty and ſometimes eighty, perſons (8)." There were as many in the Aſſembly of Saumur, anno 1611. "Chamier had the firſt vote in it, as being aſſiſtant "to the Preſident; and as he was well ſkilled in af"fairs, the concluſion depended in a great meaſure "on the turn he gave to things in voting (9). The "Author from whom I borrow theſe particulars tells "us an incident that is worthy of being told. It "was reſolved, *ſays he* (10), to bring a perſonal trou"ble upon him, in order that he might take a diſlike "to public Aſſemblies, in which he had too great "weight and authority. The Conſiſtory of Montelimar, where he was Miniſter, took the opportunity "whilſt he was abſent on a Deputation, and put ano"ther in his place. This was done without "once conſulting with, and hearing him, by I "know not what intrigues, in which it is pro"bable, that Leſdiguieres had a hand, ſince all was "done in his Province under his eye, and in a city "where he did what he pleaſed. But, to heighten the "affront ſtill more, the Conſiſtory commanded his "houſe to be ſearched; and made a great havock in "his Library, upon pretence that there were ſome "papers in it belonging to the Church. This action "of the Conſiſtory was ſo injurious, and contemptu"ous with regard to Chamier, that he was highly af"fronted at it, eſpecially as it affected his intereſt no "leſs than his honour. He complained of this to the "Aſſembly, as though it had been wounded through "his ſides; and ſeem'd upon the point of leaving "Saumur, to go and ſettle his affairs at home. This "was the very thing the Court wanted, in order that "the party might by this means be deprived of an "able man, whoſe reſiſtance it feared. But Chamier "was prevailed upon to ſtay there, by his having ju"ſtice done him; and the Aſſembly continued him "in his Church at Montelimar." I find that he had left this Church in 1606; and went to the Univerſity of * Die, and was Profeſſor of Divinity there (11). I know not what were the reaſons that engaged him to return to his former poſt.

(8) D'Aubigné, *Hiſt. Univerſ.* tom. 3. lib. 5. cap. 10. pag. m. 623.

(9) *Hiſt. de l'edit. de Nantes*, tom. 2. pag. 55.

(10) Ibid. pag. 56.

(11) Simon Goulart wrote this to Scaliger. See the French Letters written to Scaliger, lib. 3. pag. 447.

[*E*] *He . . acquired a great fund of learning, of which his diſputes with Father Coton . . . are a proof.*] Here follows what is related on this ſubject by a modern Author, a good Proteſtant. "Chamier had had a "conference at Nimes, in 1600, with this Jeſuit, each "of whom he boaſted, as uſual, his having all the ad"vantage. The truth is, this Jeſuit had dazzled the "auditors by eloquent digreſſions, whereby he ram"bled every moment from the ſubject of the diſpute; "but Chamier being a man of more ſolid learning "and better acquainted with School-Divinity, had "obliged, by his arguments, the Jeſuit to get off by "this artifice. Thoſe very perſons who have wrote the "Life of this Jeſuit, diſcover ſufficiently, that Cha"mier's dineſs would have quite diſconcerted their "Hero, had he not eluded the arguments by eloquent "diſcourſes that were nothing to the purpoſe, and "which he always had ready at hand (12)."

(12) *Hiſt. de l'edit. de Nantes*, tom. 1. pag. 447.

[*F*] *. . . And the Books written by him.*] His Treatiſe *de Oecumenico Pontifice* and his Jeſuitical Epiſtles were eſteemed by Scaliger (13). Severe complaints were made of Chamier's publiſhing the Letters of ſome Jeſuits with his own gloſſes and remarks. *If the Proteſtant Clergy are treated mildly, this is but inviting them to attempt worſe things, and give them an opportunity of turning honey into poiſon. This has been ſeen during theſe late years in the Clergy of Dauphiné, particularly in Chamier, to whom Father Coton and Father Ignatius Armand had written privately, touching ſome article of Faith, by way of conference, and always in the kindeſt terms. But what uſe did he make of them? He printed them without their privity and contrary to their intentions; and adding his own remarks to them, has made public thoſe particulars that were communicated to him only, which is a treacherous affront; for many things are written in a private way, which a man would not be*

(13) *Chamierus de Oecumenico Pontifice & Epiſtolas Jeſuiticas edidit, bona Opera!* How admirably does Chamier write the Greek tongue! and how much better than Coton! *Scaligerana*, pag. 48.

of Henry IV, who, in 1603, *appointed him Counſellor of State and Privy Counſellor.* The year after, *he reſigned his dignity of Preſident to Francis Chalvet* Sieur de Fenouillet, *one of his ſons, and retired from buſineſs to devote himſelf wholly to God, and to ſpend the remainder of his days in peace, and among his books. He ſpent two years in this retirement, with ſo much ſatisfaction to himſelf, that he uſed frequently to declare to his relations, that he could not ſay he had lived during the paſt years of his life* [C] . . . . *He died in a pious and Chriſtian manner* at Toulouſe, the 20th of June 1607, being ſeventy nine years of age (*d*). Several Authors have honoured him with Elogiums [D].

(d) Extracted from the *Short Account of his Life*, prefixed to his Tranſlation of *Seneca.*

" de St. Iory, firſt Preſident of Toulouſe, and our " Chalvet; as well upon account of their mutual love " for learning, as of their near affinity. He was tall " and well-ſet, had a pleaſant eye, fair hair, a ſweet and " venerable aſpect; a grave, modeſt and majeſtic de- " portment; and he was vaſtly entertaining in con- " verſation (3). No one ſpoke with him but he was " immediately charmed; for he was naturally affable, " courteous, kind, ingenuous; free from hypocriſy, " ambition and avarice; employing much more pains " in other people's affairs, than in his own; fearing " God, deteſting and condemning all kinds of vice, " and eſpecially violent practices and innovations, " even in matters of Religion. He loved order, inte- " grity and peace. Amidſt the confuſions of France, " he perſevered conſtantly in obedience to his Prince, " whoſe party, as judging it the only juſt and lawful " one, he always faithfully followed. Therefore, " when the Parliament was removed from Toulouſe to " Chaſtelſarraſy, he was ſelected from the reſt, to go " and compliment, in their name, the King who was " then (1594) at Lyons; which gave his Majeſty the " higheſt ſatisfaction, as appeared by the gracious re- " ception he gave Mr. Chalvet, and the preſent he " made him; and he thought himſelf vaſtly happy, " in having been the firſt Officer of the Parliament " of Toulouſe, who waited upon the King ſince " his acceſſion to the throne, and ſince the beginning " of the reduction of Languedoc by his Majeſty's " arms. Again he was deputed in 1603 by the ſame " Parliament to that King, on ſeveral important af- " fairs; in which journey, his Majeſty, as an honoura- " ble recompence for all his ſervices, appointed him, un- " aſked by any, or even by Mr. Chalvet himſelf, " Counſellor of State and Privy Counſellor; for which " he took an oath before the Chancellor de Bellievre, " to whom he was ſome way related (4)."

(3) See, on theſe Subjects, the Latin verſes of Critton, Regius Profeſſor, prefixed to his Tranſlation of Seneca.

(4) *Summary of the Life of Mr. de Chalvet.*

[C] *He ſpent two years in this retirement, with ſo much ſatisfaction to himſelf, that he uſed frequently to declare . . . that he could not ſay he had lived, during all the paſt years of his life.*] He therefore might have compared himſelf to an illuſtrious man who was *Præfectus Prætorii* under the Emperor Adrian. The perſon I mean is Similis, who was raiſed to this employment much againſt his will, and reſigned it voluntarily; after which he retired into the country, and after ſpending ſeven years there, left the world. He would have the following inſcription fixed on his tomb. *Here lies Similis, who tho' his age was very long, yet lived but ſeven years* (5). * [This inſcription is thus imitated in a modern work.

(5) Xiphilin. *in Hadriano*, pag. m. 266.

Should curious readers wiſh to know,
Whoſe duſt their feet are preſſing;
SIMILIS, *fam'd in war, lies low,*
His country's boaſt and bleſſing.
Long did he toil, and graſp and ſtrive,
Yet loſt his time he fears;
For tho', till ſeventy ſix, alive,
He lived but ſeven ſhort years.]

* The PLAIN-DEALER; being ſelect Eſſays on ſeveral curious ſubjects. num. 114. London 1730. 8vo.

The reader will find a great many pieces on ſuch ſubjects, in Camerarius's hiſtorical Meditations, Chap. V. Book III, of Vol. I.

[D] *Several Authors have honoured him with Elogiums.*] I ſhall give but one inſtance, and that is a Latin Epigram, addreſſed to him by Peter le Loyer.

Cum ſua quiſque tibi culto munuſcula verſu
Offerat, & genio dedicet illa tuo,
Haud ego poſtremos inter numerabor amicos,
Et levia, at ſaltem munera grata dabo.

That is,

" Whilſt every one inſcribes his flowing verſe,
" An humble offering to thy noble genius;
" Lo I advance, (not laſt of all thy friends)
" And pay a grateful, tho' but ſlender, tribute."

This Epigram follows the French Verſes, by which the Author dedicated his Comedy intitled le Muet inſensè (the frantic dumb man) to this Preſident of Inqueſts. His encomium begins at, *Quand j'aurois autant d'or*, i. e. " . . . Tho' I had as much " gold" down to *Muſe*, incluſively. And, *Et encore mon Chalvet, cher teſte.* i. e. " And again Chaulvet, " dear man." . . . to *Prens doncque* (take then) excluſively, in the *Oeuvres & meſlanges Poëtiques de Pierre le Loyer*, folio 122 *verſo.* Paris edit. 1579.

CHAMIER (DANIEL) one of the greateſt Proteſtant Divines, was born in Dauphiné. He was many years Preacher at Montellimart (*a*), whence he went in 1612 to Montauban, to be Profeſſor of Divinity in that City, and was killed by a canon ball during the ſiege in 1621 (*b*) [A]. It is very ſurprizing that no one ſhould have wrote his Life; no people in the world would have been ſo negligent on ſuch an occaſion but the French. Had Chamier been of another country, his Life would have been wrote in a voluminous

(a) *Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes*, tom. 2. pag. 86. See the Remark [D].

(b) The 16th of October.

[A] *He was killed by a cannon-ball, during the ſiege of* Montauban, *in* 1621.] Some Hiſtorians relate, that he was killed under arms, that is, pike in hand, and defended with a coat of mail; and that he had three times repeated with a loud voice, in the pathetic Sermon preached by him that day, the following words -- They ſhall not enter. *Chamierus . . quamquam propugnaculo tegebatur, tormentaria pila in fruſta diſcerpitur, vix agnito unde globus, & qua immiſſus; in utrumque paratus homo audax, thorace ferreo, haſtaque ad manum venerat in hunc locum, additurus militi animos, poſtquam eademmet die concione in templo pathetico habita, de regiis loquens, finierat in hæc ipſa verba, quæ diſtincta ter voce diſtincta repetierat, Non ingredientur* (1). We don't find, by the relation of the ſiege of Montauban, that he had taken up arms, but only, *that he was carried off by a cannon-ball, at the entry of the baſtion du Paillas; and that in his Sermon, the preceding day, on the* 34*th verſe of chapter* 37 *of Iſaiah, he applied to the city of Montauban, the promiſe (in the name of the Lord) made to Jeruſalem, beſieged by Rabſhakeh, General of Sennacherib's Army;* in the following words, which he repeated with great vehemence.— *By the way that he came, by the ſame ſhall he return, and ſhall not come into this city, ſaith the Lord. Some of his friends,* adds the relation, *heard Chamier ſay, that he believed he ſhould die in that ſiege by a cannon-ball, . . . and he propheſied accidentally that Sunday morning, what happened to him in the evening. Joſſion his collegue aſking him whether it was not his turn to preach in the afternoon? By no means ſays he, it is my reſting-day* (2). The Romiſh Writers have commented in a moſt horrid manner on the death of this famous Clergyman; and thence have taken occaſion to rail againſt him as an incendiary, who not ſatisfied with preaching rebellion, took up arms and fought as a ſoldier; without conſidering, ſay theſe, that as the Laity are not allowed to aſſume any of the ſacerdotal functions, neither are Miniſters of the Goſpel permitted to draw the ſword. To theſe it is anſwered, (as in the caſe of Zuinglius) that it is lawful for them to take up arms in order to implore a bleſſing upon their cauſe, and to comfort and ſtrengthen thoſe who ſtand in need of ſuch aſſiſtance.

(1) Barthol. Gramondus, *Hiſtor. Galliæ*, lib. 10. pag. m. 592.

(2) *Siege de Montauban*, pag. m. 155.

voluminous ſize, and have had a place in every public Library, eſpecially as he left ſeveral ſons of his own profeſſion, and whoſe poſterity are Clergymen (*t*). He was as famous among the French Proteſtants for his politicks, as in his preaching: No man was ever more ſevere, inflexible, or untractable [*B*], with regard to the artifices which the Court of France employed to weaken the Proteſtants. It is ſaid that Chamier drew up the edict of Nantz [*C*]. He had the honour of being deputed on ſeveral occaſions [*D*], and preſided over ſome Synods (*d*). Though he ſpent ſo much time in negotiations, he nevertheleſs acquired a great fund of learning, of which his diſputes with father Coton [*E*], and the books [*F*] written by him are a proof. The aſſertion of thoſe who make him the

(*t*) I write this in 1694.

(*d*) Among others, to the national Synod of Gap in 1603.

[*B*] *No man was ever more ſevere and inflexible.*] The Author of the Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantz, *gives a very good deſcription* of Chamier's turn of mind. *He danced attendance to no purpoſe at Court*, ſays he (3), *whither he had been deputed by the Synod of Rochelle . . . and after ſix months ſtay in it, he could not get acceſs to his Majeſty. The King was not pleaſed with him, becauſe he was one of the hot-heads of the Synod* (4), *whom the King did not love; of that claſs of people who are inflexible; of thoſe hearts that are proof againſt fears and hopes, which are the ſtrongeſt engines the Court has to play off.* He had ſaid elſewhere (5), ſpeaking of the Deputies ſent on the affair of the Edict of Nantz, *that Chamier was one of the moſt obſtinate of them, and upon that account was ſo odious to the Court, as he was revered by the Churches.* We ſhall relate in the Remark [*B*] of the Article FERRIER, that in 1611, being in the Aſſembly of Saumur, he was at the head of thoſe who would have the Edict of Nantz obſerved in the moſt ſtrict and rigorous ſenſe. But if the reader is deſirous of knowing the humour and diſpoſition of Chamier and ſuch like men, let him read what d'Aubigné has written in a very facetious ſtyle. "Now thoſe people appeared more ſaucy, *ſays he* (6), "in the laſt treaty of Peace, and in thoſe Aſſemblies "which were held four years, wherein thoſe ſtubborn "men reſiſted, not only the moſt honourable men the "King could ſelect out of his Council of State, but "alſo the greateſt Noblemen of the Kingdom; when, "weighing the affairs of the Kingdom, they would "fain have prevailed with them to ſhew ſome civility. "One of theſe roſe up with a face of braſs, and anſwered freely, *Theſe propoſals don't anſwer the good opinion which thoſe by whom we are ſent, entertain of us.* An explanation of theſe words was deſired, "when la Valiere comes forward, and explaining it, "cries, *This, Gentlemen, may be called betraying the Church of God.* T'other day I heard Mr. de Villeroy "tell, how that himſelf, Meſſ. de Roſny and de Thou, "and others, being at a conference with four of theſe "ill-bred men, whilſt Calignon, in the King's name, "endeavoured to ſoften their ſtubborn minds, by gentle "and perſuaſive eloquence, unweildy Chamier, throwing his cloak under his back-ſide, had brought forward his left arm to the middle of the table; paring his nails with his ſciſſors, when the clippings "flew on the Orator's beard and into his mouth; one "of them flew into Roſny's eye; and this air and "manner annulled all that could be ſaid in his favour."

(3) Tom. 1. pag. 446, 447, *ad ann.* 1607.

(4) The Author had ſaid, pag. 443. that there were certain perſons in the Synod who were called, by the Courtiers, the hotheads of the Synod, from a ſuppoſition that they were too ſtubborn, and too careful of their own ſecurity.

(5) Pag. 253.

(6) *Confeſſion Catholique de Sanci*, lib. 2. cap. 7. pag. m. 422, 423.

[*C*] *'Tis ſaid that Chamier drew up the Edict of Nantz.*] I have read this in an Epiſtle Dedicatory of Mr. de Varillas. *As the Hereticks*, ſays he (7), *will ſcarce ever obtain ſuch a ſecurity as they may think ſufficient for themſelves; the Calviniſts had obtained by their importunities, that whatever was of advantage to their party in the Edict of* Pacification, *ſhould be included in that of Nantz. Daniel Chamier, the Clergyman, who had the greateſt abilities among them, was ordered to draw it up. He had employed full three months for this purpoſe; and boaſted his not having omitted any thing which might conduce to ſtrengthen the tranquillity of his Sect.*

(7) Varill. *Epiſt. Dedic.* of tom. 1. *de l'Hiſtoire de l'Héréſie.*

[*D*] *He had the honour to be deputed on ſeveral occaſions.*] What Varillas aſſerted above, may perhaps be falſe; but it is certain that Chamier was one of the chiefs in the aſſemblies of the French Proteſtants, in which the laſt pacification with Henry IV was debated and concluded. La Trimouille, du Pleſſis, d'Aubigné, and himſelf were made choice of, "in order "to debate and conteſt ſuch matters as could not, "without creating too much confuſion, be digeſted by "the whole Aſſembly, which then conſiſted of ſeven-"ty and ſometimes eighty, perſons (8)." There were as many in the Aſſembly of Saumur, anno 1611. "Chamier had the firſt vote in it, as being aſſiſtant "to the Preſident; and as he was well ſkilled in af-"fairs, the concluſion depended in a great meaſure "on the turn he gave to things in voting (9). The "Author from whom I borrow theſe particulars tells "us an incident that is worthy of being told. It "was reſolved, *ſays he* (10), to bring a perſonal trou-"ble upon him, in order that he might take a diſlike "to public Aſſemblies, in which he had too great "weight and authority. The Conſiſtory of Monteli-"mar, where he was Miniſter, took the opportunity "whilſt he was abſent on a Deputation, and put ano-"ther in his place. This was done without "once conſulting with, and hearing him, by I "know not what intrigues, in which it is pro-"bable, that Leſdiguieres had a hand, ſince all was "done in his Province under his eye, and in a city "where he did what he pleaſed. But, to heighten the "affront ſtill more, the Conſiſtory commanded his "houſe to be ſearched; and made a great havock in "his Library, upon pretence that there were ſome "papers in it belonging to the Church. This action "of the Conſiſtory was ſo injurious, and contemptu-"ous with regard to Chamier, that he was highly af-"fronted at it, eſpecially as it affected his intereſt no "leſs than his honour. He complained of this to the "Aſſembly, as though it had been wounded through "his ſides; and ſeem'd upon the point of leaving "Saumur, to go and ſettle his affairs at home. Thi "was the very thing the Court wanted, in order tha "the party might by this means be deprived of an "able man, whoſe reſiſtance it feared. But Chamier "was prevailed upon to ſtay there, by his having ju-"ſtice done him; and the Aſſembly continued him "in his Church at Montelimar." I find that he had left this Church in 1606; and went to the Univerſity of * Die, and was Profeſſor of Divinity there (11). I know not what were the reaſons that engaged him to return to his former poſt.

(8) D'Aubigné, *Hiſt. Univerſ.* tom. 3. lib. 5. cap. 10. pag. m. 623.

(9) *Hiſt. de l'edit. de Nantes*, tom. 2. pag. 55.

(10) Ibid. pag. 56.

(11) Simon Goulart wrote this to Scaliger. See the French Letters written to Scaliger, lib. 3. pag. 447.

[*E*] *He . . acquired a great fund of learning, of which his diſputes with Father Coton . . . are a proof.*] Here follows what is related on this ſubject by a modern Author, a good Proteſtant. "Chamier had had a "conference at Nimes, in 1600, with this Jeſuit, each "of whom he boaſted, as uſual, his having all the ad-"vantage. The truth is, this Jeſuit had dazzled the "auditors by eloquent digreſſions, whereby he ram-"bled every moment from the ſubject of the diſpute; "but Chamier being a man of more ſolid learning "and better acquainted with School-Divinity, had "obliged, by his arguments, the Jeſuit to get off by "this artifice. Thoſe very perſons who have wrote the "Life of this Jeſuit, diſcover ſufficiently, that Cha-"mier's drineſs would have quite diſconcerted their "Hero, had he not eluded the arguments by eloquent "diſcourſes that were nothing to the purpoſe, and "which he always had ready at hand (12)."

(12) *Hiſt. de l'edit. de Nantes*, tom. 1. pag. 447.

[*F*] . . . *And the Books written by him.*] His Treatiſe *de Oecumenico Pontifice* and his Jeſuitical Epiſtles were eſteemed by Scaliger (13). Severe complaints were made of Chamier's publiſhing the Letters of ſome Jeſuits with his own gloſſes and remarks. *If the Proteſtant Clergy are treated mildly, this is but inviting them to attempt worſe things, and give them an opportunity of turning honey into poiſon. This has been ſeen during theſe late years in the Clergy of Dauphiné, particularly in Chamier, to whom Father Coton and Father Ignatius Armand had written privately, touching ſome article of Faith, by way of conference, and always in the kindeſt terms. But what uſe did he make of them? He printed them without their privity and contrary to their intentions; and adding his own remarks to them, has made public thoſe particulars that were communicated to him only, which is a treacherous affront; for many things are written in a private way, which a man would not be*

(13) *Chamierus de Oecumenico Pontifice & Epiſtolas Jeſuiticas edidit, bona Opera!* How admirably does Chamier write the Greek tongue! and how much better than Coton! *Scaligerana*, pag. 48.

the leader of a party, and of the Metaphoriſts [G], does not deſerve to be refuted. It is more abſurd than the audaciouſneſs of thoſe, who pretend that there really is ſuch a ſect as the Bezanites.

(14) Richeome, *Letter to a Gentleman of Provence*, prefixed to his *Categorical Examination of the Anti-Coton.*

he very willing to have publiſhed (14). But the moſt conſiderable work written by Chamier is, his *Panſtratia Catholica*, or, *Wars of the Lord* (15). He therein treats very learnedly the controverſies between the Proteſtants and the Roman Catholicks, and endeavours chiefly to refute Bellarmin. This work conſiſts of four volumes in folio, and yet was not finiſhed; the controverſy concerning the Church which is a vaſt field, being ſtill wanting, and would have found the fifth volume. The Author died before he had an opportunity of completing it. What follows was written from Geneva (16) concerning the *Panſtratia*, in 1606. "Mr. Chamier "beſtows great application to controverſial matters. "If he continues as he has begun, and he meets with "Printers to ſecond his diſpatch, he will write as "many volumes as Baronius in his eccleſiaſtical legends "or rather *Lugends*, which he entitles *Annals*." This body of Controverſy was printed at Geneva, in 1626 (17). Adrian Chamier, Miniſter of Montelimar, the Author's ſon, dedicated it to the National Synod of the Proteſtant Churches of France; as a work they might claim, not only as it had been written at their requeſt; but alſo becauſe they had favoured Daniel Chamier with ſeveral gifts, to encourage him to purſue that work; and that after his death they had extended their liberality to his family, and contributed to the charges of the impreſſion. Benedict Turretin, Profeſſor of Divinity in Geneva, was the editor of this *Panſtratia*, and prefixed to it a ſhort and excellent Preface. There was publiſhed at Geneva, in 1643, in one volume in folio, an Epitome (by Father Spanheim) of the *Panſtratia*, under the title of *Chamierus contractus*. Will thoſe who know that the *Panſtratia* conſiſts of four large volumes in folio, conclude that the Author of the Bibliotheque of Dauphiné, knew the ſize of the work; when he entitles it, a *Penſtratia*, or *Diſcourſes on the controverted points of the two Religions?* In this manner would a little *duodecimo* &c. be ſpoken of; ſuch, for inſtance, as that written by Chamier againſt Father Toloſain, Abbot-General of St. Anthony (18); or the *Conſiderations* he publiſhed in 1600, againſt the *Avertiſſements* of Porſan. In 1653, there was printed at Geneva, his *Corpus Theologicum*; it is a ſmall folio, and contains alſo his *Epiſtolæ Jeſuiticæ*.

(15) This is the title employed, (in citing Chamier) by Mr. Saurin, *Examen de la Theologie de Mr. Jurieu*, tom. 2. pag. 573.

(16) By Simon Goulart, to Joſeph Scaliger. See the French Letters wrote to Scaliger, lib. 3. pag. 445.

(17) In the *Catalogue of the Bodleian Library*, it is 1606, which is an error.

(18) Gualter. *Tabula Chronograph.* pag. 822.

[G] *They make him . . . chief of the Metaphoriſts.*] A Jeſuit, James Gaultier by name, than whom no man was ever leſs ſcrupulous of multiplying the Sects of the Proteſtants, enumerates ſeven in the beginning of the ſeventeenth Century. The firſt is that of the Metaphoriſts, whoſe errors he aſcribes to Daniel Chamier only. He declares, that the firſt error of the Metaphoriſts, and that which has given the name to their Sect, conſiſts in aſſerting, that Jeſus Chriſt is not properly the Word and Image of God the Father, but only in a metaphorical ſenſe. He adds, that Daniel Chamier repeated this blaſphemous aſſertion ſeveral times, in the conference he had with him James "Gaultier in the beginning of January 1601. *Hoc ſpeciatim ineunte Januario anni* 1601, *notatum fuit in Danielè Chamerio, Montilienſi miniſtro, quum illi mecum Alani eſſet diſceptatio, in qua ille non ſemel ſed multoties in pleno conſenſu hanc ipſam blaſphemiam enunciavit, dictavit ſuaque manu ſubſcripſit* (19). We have here an inſtance of what prejudice can do; for 1ſt; there never was ſuch a Sect as that of the Metaphoriſts among the Proteſtants, and their Synods never had any debates on that ſubject, nor with any perſons of ſuch principles. II. Where did this Jeſuit learn, that it is heretical and blaſphemous, to ſay that the expreſſions *Word* and *Image* are not taken in the proper but the figurative ſenſe, when they are ſpoke of Chriſt with reſpect to God the Father? In the proper ſenſe, the firſt of theſe words ſignifies only the action of a man, who ſpeaks; and the ſecond implies only a figure which repreſents a body. It is very certain that in that ſenſe nothing can be either the Word or the Image of God the Father. But does it follow from thence, that Chriſt ſhall be the Word and Image of his Father in a figurative ſenſe only? Here lies the preſſeſſion; is a perſon blinded by his prejudices, he imagines there is nothing real in Metaphors (20), and will no longer hearken to reaſon. Does not the Poet who calls two of the Scipio's, thunderbolts of war (21), aſcribe to them every thing that is moſt real, moſt active and ſolid in military bravery? It is nevertheleſs very undoubtedly true, that he made uſe of a metaphor, and that a man muſt be beſide himſelf, to aſſert, that the Scipio's are thunder, in a metaphorical or figurative ſenſe only. An Author who is mentioned in the preceding remark, aſſerts very gravely, that *Chamier was one of the chief Sectariſts of the faction of the Metaphoriſts* (22). How many people will repeat this untruth, without enquiring into it; without ſuſpecting that this faction of the Metaphoriſts is a chimera of James Gaultier's; and without knowing that themſelves, the Jeſuit in queſtion, and all perſons in general, who are moſt rigidly orthodox, are Metaphoriſts, in the ſenſe that Chamier was one? I have obſerved elſewhere (23), how ridiculous it is to ſwell the catalogue of Sects.

(19) Idem, ibid.

(20) Read but Vaugelas, Father Bouhours, Menage, &c. in their *Remarques ſur la Langue Françoiſe*, and it will appear by the difference of the proper and figurative ſenſe, that the latter is no leſs expreſſive of real objects than the former.

(21) *Gemines, duo fulmina belli, Scipiadas, cladem Libyæ.* Virgil. Æn. lib. 6. ver. 843. Ammian. Marcellin. lib. 24. cap. 6. pag. m. 409. whom he calls *Longæ loquantur ætates Sophanem, & Aminiam, & Callimachum & Cynægirum Medicorum in Græcia fulmina illa bellorum.* Lucretius, lib. 3. ver. 1047, ſuggeſted that thought to Virgil. *See* Drelincourt, *in Indice Achilleo*, pag. 44. num. 119. and pag. 46. num. 124.

(22) Allard, *Bibliotheque de Dauphiné*, pag. 62.

(23) In the article of the BEZANITES.

CHANGY (PETER of), Eſquire, lived in the ſixteenth Century. He tranſlated into French the Latin work of Ludovicus Vives, intitled *Of the Inſtitution of the Chriſtian Woman, as well in her Infancy, as in her marriage and widowhood. Likewiſe the Duty of the Huſband* (a). The edition in my poſſeſſion is not either the firſt or ſecond; but was printed at Paris by James Kerver, 1543 in 8vo, and was not known either by la Croix du Maine, or by Du Verdier Vau-Privas (b). There was afterwards added to it, a very *brief and uſeful Inſtitution of the virtue of Humility; with an Epiſtle of St. Bernard concerning the buſineſs and government of a family.* This was a poſthumous piece. He had dedicated his work to his daughter Margaret; was upwards of threeſcore when he ſet about that verſion, and was ſeverely afflicted by the gout (c). He had been a ſoldier in his youth, and made a French verſion of ſix of Pliny's books [A], amidſt the

(a) See at the end of the remark [M] of the article SAINT-ALDEGONDE Plantin's judgment on this Verſion.

(b) La Croix du Maine had not heard of any of theſe editions. Du Verdier Vau-Privas mentions only that of Poitiers in 1544, 16°, and that of Paris 1579, in 16o.

(c) See (prefixed to the work) the Latin verſes of Simonis Romyglæi *Andegavenſis.*

[A] *He made a French Verſion of ſix of Pliny's Books.*] He is made to ſpeak in the following manner, in ſome verſes (1) prefixed to his Tranſlation of Ludovicus Vives's piece.

Me miſerum (aiebat) qui bella ferocia geſſi
Pro patria, corpus dum juvenile foret.
Qui Plini bis tres in Gallica verba libellos,
Mars, verti in Caſtris, ſanguinolente, tuis

That is,

"Unhappy me! whom in the bloom of life,
"Engaged in cruel wars to ſerve my country;
"Who whilſt I fought beneath thy bloody banners
"O Mars! taught ſix of Pliny's books our lan-
"guage."

(1) Simonis Romyglæi *Andegavenſis.*

Neither la Croix du Maine, nor du Verdier Vau-Privas, make any mention of the Tranſlation of theſe ſix Books of Pliny; but they obſerve, that his Summary of the XVI firſt Books of Pliny, was printed at Lyons, by John de Tournes, anno 1551, in 16mo. It was publiſhed by Blaſius de CHANGY, one of his ſons (2). He was Rector of Deſpoyſſe, as I learn by ten verſes prefixed to the Tranſlation of Ludovicus Vives. Peter Poſſeliere, born in Auxerre, is Author of it. JAMES DE CHANGY another of our Writer's ſons, was a Counſellor; I believe that the eſtate or tract of land called Changy, is in Burgundy; for the Epiſtle Dedicatory of this Tranſlator begins thus:

(2) La Croix du Maine, *Biblioth. Françoiſe*, pag. 389.

To

the noiſe and alarms of a Camp. He had ſome ſons who were men of Letters, as I ſhall obſerve in the Note.

To my Daughter MARGARET.

Thy brother James, Doctor of Laws, brought me to Changy from the Library of the Seigneur Saint Anthot, Counſellor in our ſovereign Court at † Digeon, a Latin Book, written by an eloquent man, treating of the virtuous education of the Chriſtian woman.

† Dijon, capital of Burgundy. *Add. Rem.*

Du Verdier aſcribes to James de Changy, *Doctor of Laws and Advocate at Dijon*, a French Tranſlation of J. Ludovicus Vives's Education of the Chriſtian Woman, &c (3). He tells us, that it was printed at Lyons in 16mo for Sulpice Sabon; and that *Leys Torquet* (4) *alſo made a later Tranſlation* of the ſame Book. It is plain that he aſcribes to the ſon in page 597, what he declares to have been written by the father in page 1000. Why did he not point out to us the date of the Lyons edition?

(3) Du Verdier, *Bibliotb. Françoiſe*, pag. 597.

(4) He ſhould have ſaid *Turquet*, as in page 821.

CHARLES the Fifth, Emperor and King of Spain, born at Ghent the 24th of February (St. Matthias's day) anno 1500, was one of the greateſt men to which the illuſtrious Houſe of Auſtria gave birth. He was a warrior and politician; ſo that being poſſeſſed of ſo many Kingdoms and Provinces, he might have ſubdued all Europe, had not the valour of Francis I checked his progreſs [*A*]. There was an everlaſting ſtruggle between thoſe two Princes, on which occaſion fortune generally declared againſt France; which muſt be aſcribed, partly to the ſuperiority of the Armies of Charles V, and partly to the ill conduct of the Council of France, which committed more errors than it was poſſible for the valour of the French troops to repair. Notwithſtanding this, Charles V was frequently unſucceſsful in his expeditions againſt France. It is related, that he was one of thoſe heavy genius's, which are far from darting forth in their childhood the leaſt glimmerings of what they will one day become. It is even ſaid that this was of great advantage to him when he was elected Emperor, preferably to Francis I [*B*]. Although he had a very ſkilful Preceptor (*a*) he yet made very little progreſs in Latin (*b*), but acquired great proficiency in the living Languages. He was ſo great a maſter of the French-tongue, that he wrote his own Annals in it [*C*]. It is aſſerted nevertheleſs, that he had a greater eſteem for the Spaniſh.

(*a*) He afterwards was Pope Adrian VI.

(*b*) See the remark [*F*] of the article ADRIAN VI.

[*A*] *He might have ſubdued all Europe, had not the valour of Francis I check'd his progreſs.*] He was almoſt the only Power that ſtemm'd the flood; and, if we examine the Hiſtory of thoſe times, we ſhall find, that the Emperor had generally more Allies than Francis I; and England, ſo far from endeavouring to preſerve the balance of power between thoſe two Princes, joined very often with the Emperor. Don't we know that in 1544 Charles V and Henry VIII had already agreed upon the partition of France between them; and that the Treaty declared, that they ſhould join their armies before Paris, to plunder that great city (1)? They endeavonred, by concert, to put this plan in execution; ſince, at the ſame time that the Emperor was making an inroad into Champagne, the Engliſh made a deſcent on Picardy. This recompence did the King of France meet with for all the ill ſteps he had taken to favour the paſſion of Henry VIII for Anna Bullen. In this manner could Charles V be ſo ſupple and pliant, as to forget the affronts which were put on his repudiated aunt, and the promiſes he had made the Court of Rome (2). It is pretended, that this was one of the circumſtances with which his conſcience reproached him afterwards, and for which he abdicated the throne. *Eſſe non pauca quæ Caroli vellicarent animum pietatis omnino non ſurdum. Iciſſe fœdus cum Henrico Angliæ rege, a fidelium ſocietate, diriis pontificiis, in Caroli gratiam expuncto. In quo ille & injuriam, quam ab Henrico acceperat, repudiatâ Catharinâ uxore, Cæſaris materterâ, & conſtantiam promiſſi, nunquam ſe cum hæretico Rege, niſi is Pontificiæ dignitati ſatisfaceret, in gratiam rediturum, nimis quàm impotenter poſthabuerat, atroci inexplicabilique in Gallum indignationi* (3). i. e. "Several things tortured the mind of the Emperor Charles, who was not altogether deaf to the inſpirations of piety; his having entered into a league with Henry King of England, whom the Pope had excommunicated, purely to gratify Charles: on which occaſion his violent and implacable hatred againſt the French King, too meanly prevailed over the injury King Henry had done him, in divorcing Catherine his conſort, who was his (the Emperor's) aunt; and the firm promiſe he had made, never to reconcile himſelf to that heretical King, unleſs he made the Pope ſatisfaction." What follows is more remarkable than the reader may at firſt imagine. Charles V had a greater number of troops than Francis I; and yet by his artifices, or becauſe the other Powers did not think that his ſuperiority would be ſo dangerous to them, as that of the French Monarch; he generally concluded a greater number of alliances than his enemy. I ſhall obſerve by the way, that Brantome has ſpoke too contemptuouſly of the reſt of the Princes, who oppoſed the ambition of Charles V. *Had it not been*, ſays he (4), *for our mighty Monarch Francis I, nay for his ſhadow only, the Emperor would eaſily have compleated his deſign. And as for all the little Princes and Potentates who might have oppoſed him, he would have tipped them down like ſo many ninepins; and their power would have been as ineffectual on that occaſion, as that of the little imps and bull-beggars of Rabelais, who only ſhower down hail on cabbages and parſley: it is plain the Pope could not have reſiſted him, he having been taken priſoner in his caſtle of St. Angelo, that was ſaid to be impregnable.*

(1) Mezerai, *Abrégé Chronol.* tom. 6. pag. m. 628.

(2) The Emperor made no ſcruple to have a Prince for his Ally, who was branded with the fulminations of the Church; a mortal enemy to the holy See, and who had treated his aunt ſo ſeverely. Mezerai, *Abrege Chronol.* tom. 4. pag. 620.

(3) Famianus Strada, *de Bello Belg.* Dec. 1. lib. 1. pag. m. 19.

(4) Brantome, *Capit. Etrangers*, tom. 1. pag. 24.

[*B*] *It is ſaid he was one of thoſe heavy genius's .. and that this was of great advantage to him, when he was elected Emperor, preferably to Francis I.*] It is certain that after the death of the Emperor Maximilian, which happened the 22d of January 1519, Francis I ſet up publickly enough for one of the competitors for the Empire; and that he gave money to ſome of the Electors, who after promiſing to vote in his favour, declared for his rival. The height of glory this Monarch had attained to, was one of the reaſons for which he was excluded, "The greater merit he "ſeemed poſſeſſed of, the more it was apprehended "he would reduce the petty Princes of Germany, in "the ſame manner as his predeceſſors had reduced "thoſe of France; and that if oppreſſion was to be "feared from both thoſe Monarchs, that of Charles "did not appear ſo formidable; this competitor being "five years younger than Francis I, and in all ap-"pearance a Prince of very little abilities. In fine, "from theſe reflections, and by the aſſiſtance of three "hundred thouſand crowns, which had been ſent into "Germany the year before, and had been diſtributed "very ſeaſonably, Charles prevailed; and was elect-"ed at Frankfort the 20th of June, he being at that "time in Spain, where he had ſpent near two years "(5). This confirms what I have remarked more "than once (6), that on ſome occaſions a ſuperiori-"ty of forces and of merit, ſhall, inſtead of giving "ſucceſs to a deſign, rather render it abortive.

(5) Mezerai, *Abrege Chronol.* tom. 4. pag. 493.

(6) In the remark [*A*] of ANTHONY (MARK) ſirnamed Creticus; and the remark [X] of the article BELLARMIN, before the break.

[*C*] *He was ſo great a Maſter of the French Tongue, that he wrote his own Annals in it.*] I have read no where but in Jerom Ruſcelli, that Charles V compoſed the Memoirs of his reign in French; and this is the only Author mentioned by Valerius Andreas (7), where he ſpeaks of Charles V. I am ſurprized that theſe Memoirs were never publiſhed, ſince there were copies of them; and that William Marindo had tranſlated them into Latin, with the deſign of publiſhing them immediately. This Ruſcelli aſſures us. *Egli ſteſſo il predetta Imperator Carlo Quinto era venuta ſcrivendo in lingua Franceſe gran parte delle coſe ſue principali,*

(7) *Bibliot. Belg.* pag. 123.

Spaniſh [*D*]. He made ſpeeches on ſome occaſions, but he forgot himſelf moſt unaccountably, in the ſpeech he delivered in Spaniſh before the Pope in 1536 [*E*]. The French

(8) Ruſcelli, *Letter to Philip II*, among the *Lettere di Principi*, tom. 3. fol. 219.

pali, come già di molte delle ſue proprie fece il primo Ceſare, & che ſ'aſpetta di hora d'haverle in luce fatte Latine du Guglielmo Marindo (8). i. e. "The Empe- " ror Charles V wrote, in the French Tongue, a great " part of his principal actions, as Julius Cæſar had " anciently wrote many of his; and that a Latin " Tranſlation of this work, by William Marindo, " is expected to be publiſhed." Brantome obſerved very juſtly, that this piece muſt have ſold very well; but he ſhould not have doubted of the reality of ſuch a Tranſlation, upon account (as he imagined) that it had remained in obſcurity. He imagines that the Author cited by him, ſpoke of this verſion, as of a piece already publiſhed, and this he ſhould not have ſuppoſed. Here follow his words: *I have ſeen a Letter* (9), *printed among thoſe of Belleforeſt, tranſlated by him out of Italian into French*, which declares, that Charles V wrote a Book like that of Julius Ceſar, *and that it had been tranſlated into Latin at Venice by William Marindre, which I cannot very well believe; for in that caſe every one would have run to purchaſe it with as much eagerneſs, as to buy bread in a famine; and certainly a ſtrong deſire to poſſeſs ſo beautiful and uncommon a work would have raiſed the piece much higher than it has been at, and every one would have bought one* (10). Ghilini has ranked this Prince among Authors, and aſſerts that the work in queſtion had been printed. *Opere ſue*, ſays he (1), *che publicate, accreſcono non poca fama al ſuo per altro celebratiſſimo nome, e ſono*, Iſtoria delle coſe da lui fatte, *la qual ſcriſſe in lingua Franceſe ad imitazione di. C. Giulio Cæſare.* i. e. " He " added no ſmall luſtre to the great fame he had ac- " quired in war, by the Hiſtory of his own Actions, " that has been made public; written by himſelf in " the French Tongue, in imitation of Julius Cæſar." He then gives the titles of ſome letters and manuſcripts of that Emperor. This alſo is an error; for this Emperor uſed to have theſe kind of writings drawn up by his Secretaries. I believe that had father Bouhours recollected what Ruſcelli relates, he would have mentioned it in that part of his *Entretiens*, where he ſays; " The Emperor Charles V entertained a very advan- " tageous opinion of our language. He thought it " adapted to mighty affairs, and uſed to call it the " *State* Language, as we are aſſured by Cardinal du " Perron †. This perhaps was the reaſon, why he " made uſe of it in the moſt famous action of his life. " We are told in the Hiſtory of the Wars of Flanders *, " that he ſpoke in French to the States of Bruſſels, " when he reſigned all his Kingdoms to Philip II (12)." To thoſe words we will add theſe of Brantome: " A- " mong the ſeveral languages, he thought the French " was the moſt majeſtic; . . and uſed to take a pleaſure " in ſpeaking it, tho' he ſpoke very fluently many o- " thers (13).

(9) It is that of Ruſcelli, cited above.

(10) Brantome, *Capit. Etrangers*, tom. 1. pag. 42.

(11) Ghilini, *Teatro*, Part 2. pag. 51.

† Perroniana, under the word (*Langue*).

* Strada, *de Bello Belgico*, lib. 1.

(12) Bouhours, *Entretiens II, d'Ariſte & d'Eugene*, pag. m. 82.

(13) Brantome, *Capit. Etrang.* tom. 1. pag. 19.

[*D*] *It is aſſerted nevertheleſs, that he had a greater eſteem for the Spaniſh.*] Here follows another relation from Father Bouhours: " Were Charles V to return " again into the world, he would not be pleaſed at their " ranking the French above the Spaniſh; he who " uſed to ſay, that he would addreſs Ladies in Italian; " to men he would ſpeak French; to his horſes Ger- " man; but that if he were to ſpeak to God, he would " employ the Spaniſh Language. He ought to have " aſſerted roundly, replied Eugenius, that the Caſtil- " lian was the natural language of the Almighty, as " a learned Gentleman of that country aſſerted one " day very ſtrenuouſly, in good company, that in the " terreſtrial Paradiſe the ſerpent ſpoke Engliſh; that " the woman talk'd Italian, the men French, but " that God ſpoke in Spaniſh (14)." This is very different from what a German declared to a Spaniard, This Spaniard was Petrus Royzius, a famous Poet of that Age, and one of the King's Counſellors. The German was John Langus. Theſe two Gentlemen were extremely delighted in one another's company; and Royzius uſed to laugh at the German Tongue. Being one day at table, and Langus's ſervants who were waiting there, pronouncing their German with a very harſh, rough accent, " the Germans, *ſays Royzius*, don't ſpeak, " but they thunder; and it is my opinion that God " made uſe of their language, when he thunder'd forth " the ſentence of condemnation on Adam." Says Langus; " the Serpent employed the ſmooth inſinuat- " ing expreſſions of the Caſtillian Tongue, to delude " Eve." Theſe witty repartees made all the company laugh, and very much pleaſed the King himſelf. *Petrus Royzius Mauræus Hiſpanus, Poeta illo ſeculo celeberrimus, conſiliarius regius, & ob eruditionem Lango* (15) *acceptiſſimus; etiam in quotidiana convictu; ſed qui velut ἀναλφάβητος Germanicam linguam ridere ſolet. Itaque famulos Langi Oratoris, menſæ aliquando adſtantes, atque dura pronunciatione & accentu affectatè voces Germanicas exaſperantes, iſto ſcommate jecoſe illuſit*; Germani, *inquit*, non loquuntur, ſed fulminant. Et credo ego, mi Lange Orator, Deum ex indignatione hoc ſermonis fulmine uſum, cum primos parentes extruderet Paradiſo. *Cui Langus*; Ego rurſus, *inquit*, verifimile cenſeo, ſerpentem ſuavi & blando vocis Hiſpanicæ ſuco uſum, cum impoſuit Evæ. *Hoc argutulo Royzium & convivis & adſtantibus propinavit deridendum; quod & ipſum regem hoc audientem mirè delectavit* (16). I have lengthened this quotation, that the reader may ſee that the King of Poland himſelf was diverted with theſe waggeries. But here follows another diviſion, which does not agree entirely with Charles V, and pleaſed very much a Spaniſh Doctor. The German language is for ſoldiers, the French for women, the Italian for Princes, and the Spaniſh for God. *De præſtantia . . illarum* (linguarum) *quæ Europæis frequentiores ſunt, ſic* Tympius * *diſtinguendum putat, ut ſi quiſpiam cum Deo locuturus eſſet, Hiſpanicè deberet liqui, ob linguæ majeſtatem; ſi cum aliquo Principe, Italicè propter hujus elegantiam; ſi cum fœminis, Gallicè ob ſuavitatem; ſi cum militibus, Germanicè quod ſit omnium robuſtiſſima; ac ſic omnes ſuo encomio evexit, ſed Hiſpanicam cæteris ſuperiorem merito extollit* (27). There is ſtill a farther diviſion made, according to which, the Spaniſh tongue is fit for commanding, the Italian for perſuading, and the French for excuſing one's ſelf. Hence it was, ſaid a Spaniard, that God made uſe of the Spaniſh to prohibit the firſt man from eating a certain fruit; that the ſerpent employed Italian, to delude Eve, and that Adam ſpoke French, to juſtify his fault (18).

(14) Bouhours, *Entretien II, d'Ariſte & d'Eugene*, pag. 81.

(15) This was John Langus, Ferdinand's Embaſſador in Poland.

(16) Melch. Adam. *in Vitis Juriſc.* pag. 81.

* In *Muſa Theſſillarum* (linguarum) *quæ Europæis frequentiores ſunt, ſic* Tympius * *diſtinguendum putat, ut ſi quiſpiam cum Deo locuturus eſſet, Hiſpanicè deberet liqui, ob linguæ majeſtatem; ſi cum aliquo Principe, Italicè propter hujus elegantiam; ſi cum fœminis, Gallicè ob ſuavitatem; ſi cum militibus, Germanicè quod ſit omnium robuſtiſſima; ac ſic omnes ſuo encomio evexit, ſed Hiſpanicam cæteris ſuperiorem merito extollit* (27). There is ſtill a farther diviſion made, according to which, the Spaniſh tongue is fit for commanding, the Italian for perſuading, and the French for excuſing one's ſelf. Hence it was, ſaid a Spaniard, that God made uſe of the Spaniſh to prohibit the firſt man from eating a certain fruit; that the ſerpent employed Italian, to delude Eve, and that Adam ſpoke French, to juſtify his fault (18). *philos.* pag. 2.

(17) Gaſpar. à Reies, *Elyſio jucund. Quæſt. Campo*, Quæſt. 55. *ſub fin.* pag. 695.

(18) *See* La Mothe le Vayer, *Problemes Sceptiques*, cap. 15. pag. 259. tom. 13.

[*E*] *He forgot himſelf moſt unaccountably, in the Speech he delivered in Spaniſh before the Pope, in* 1536.] This was a great cauſe, which the Emperor himſelf was deſirous of pleading, in preſence of the Pope, the Cardinals, the foreign Embaſſadors, and ſeveral Prelates and Noblemen of high rank. He laid down very artfully whatever he thought would beſt juſtify his conduct, and condemn that of Francis I. He declared the conditions on which he was ready to conclude a Treaty of Peace with France. He ſaid, that in caſe this offer did pleaſe Francis I, he would offer him another, the anſwer to which he expected in twenty days, viz. that in order to avoid the ſhedding of blood, *they ſhould determine their quarrel perſonally, . . . by fighting either in an iſland or on a bridge; or in a boat on ſome river*; and that, *as to the weapons, they two might pitch upon ſuch as were equal; and that they would be approved by him, whether they fought with ſwords or daggers, and in their ſhirts* (19). If this method did not pleaſe, he offered a third, and that was war. He declared, that if this laſt ſhould be reſolved upon, he would take up arms, " in ſuch a manner that nothing " ſhould be able to divert him from it, till one or other " of them ſhould become the pooreſt Gentleman in his " Dominions: which misfortune he was certain would " fall upon the King; and that God would aſſiſt him " as he had hitherto done (20)." See the margin (21). He adds, that he was ſure to overcome for three reaſons. I. Becauſe he had right on his ſide. II. Becauſe the juncture was more favourable to him than might be imagined. III. Becauſe *he found his ſubjects, officers and ſoldiers ſo well inclined, bearing ſo much love and affection towards him; and ſo well ſkilled in the ſcience of war, that he could rely entirely upon them; a circumſtance which he knew to be very reverſe with regard to the King of France, whoſe ſubjects, officers and ſoldiers were ſuch wretches, that did his reſemble them, he would tie his hands, put a rope about his neck, and in this condition, would wait upon the King of*

(19) *Memoires de Guillaume du Bellai*, lib. 5. pag. m. 506.

(20) Ibid. pag. 507.

(21) *Zenocarus in Caroli vita etiam magnificentius ſcribit Carolum ad duellum Gallum provocaſſe ſeptem oblatis optionibus, ut mari vel terra, vel flumine, equo vel pedibus, colle vel planitie, inter ſe decertarent.* Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1536, num. 7. i. e. " Zenocarus, in the " Life of Charles " V. expreſſes " himſelf in " ſtill more " pompous " terms, ſaying " that the Em- " peror Charles " challenged the " K. of France " to fight him in " ſingle combat, " and gave him " the option of " ſeven methods, " viz. to fight " either at ſea, " or on land; " on a river, on " horſeback, or " on foot; upon " a hill or in a " plain."

French Court was very juſtly diſſatisfied with its Embaſſadors, who aſſiſted at this ceremony [*F*]. Several people think he was guilty of a ſtrange error, in relying on the honour of Francis I, when he paſſed through his dominions [*G*]. But a man muſt be of a very ſatyrical diſpoſition to call this an error [*H*]. The Flemiſh Hiſtorians were either very weak, or very malicious, in the relation they gave of what was tranſacted on this occaſion [*I*]. Nothing mortified him more than the raiſing of the ſiege of Mets; and

of France, and ſue for mercy (22). It is here we may aſk the queſtion which Ulyſſes put to Agamemnon:

(22) *Memoires de Guillaume du Bellai*, pag. m. 508.

Ἀτρεΐδη, ποῖόν τε ἔπος φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων (23).

(23) Iliad. lib. 4. ver. 350.

That is,

" What words are theſe (Atrides) thou haſt ſpoke!

It is here we may juſtly be ſurprized, that a ſet of words, more ſuitable to a ſtage Drawcanſir or Spaniſh Knight, than of an Emperor of Germany, ſhould have eſcaped ſo wiſe a Prince, before ſo auguſt an Aſſembly. *Sane mirati ſumus vehementiſſime cum hanc orationem legimus apud Bellaium & alios, potuiſſe ejuſmodi verba & alia quamplurima, nec minus ferocia, quæ iidem auctores recitant, excidere in tali conventu adeo ſapienti ac prudenti ab omnibus habito Principi, quæ magis Pyrgopolinici Militi glorioſo Plautino convenire videntur* (24). But, as a modern Hiſtorian obſerves, Fortune-tellers, Panegyriſts and Prophets, had all conſpired to fill the mind of the Emperor with vaſt deſigns. " Ever ſince he, " at the head of two great armies, had made Solyman " retire, and put Barbaroſſa to flight, he breathed no- " thing but war. Flatterers, who deprave the mind " of the wiſeſt Princes by their exceſſive praiſes, pro- " miſed him no leſs than the Empire of all Europe; " the Poets and Panegyriſts impudently aſſured him " of it; and Fortune-tellers and Aſtrologers, who are " as bold liars, had ſpread this belief to ſuch a de- " gree by their predictions, that they had made an " impreſſion on weak minds (25)." It was at the ſame time that the Emperor, puffed up with the victories he had juſt gained, and of thoſe he thought himſelf ſure of obtaining, ſaid to Paulus Jovius, " Get ready " a large quantity of paper and ink, for I have cut you " out work enough (26)." But never was the Providence of God ſeen to mortify more viſibly the Preſumption of the creature. Charles V, at the head of ten thouſand horſe, and upwards of forty thouſand foot, and ſupported by a ſtrong fleet commanded by the famous Andrew Doria, ruſhed upon Provence; and at the ſame time cauſed another Army of thirty thouſand men to enter Picardy (27). Here we may apply the words of Horace,

(24) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1536, num. 7.

(25) Mezerai, *Abrege Chronol.* tom. 4. pag. 591.

(26) *See* Brantome, *Diſcourſe on Catherine of Medicis*, init.

(27) Mezerai, *Abrege Chronol.* tom. 4. pag. 595.

Parturiunt montes, naſcetur ridiculus mus (28).

(28) Horat. *de Art. Poet.* ver. 139.

That is,

" The mighty mountain did bring forth -- a mouſe.

The army of Provence was carried before Marſeilles, and was reduced to a wretched condition without once giving battle; and that of Picardy miſcarried before Peronne (29).

(29) Mezerai, *Abrege Chronol.* tom. 4. pag. 595, 599.

[*F*] *The French Court were juſtly diſſatisfied with its Embaſſadors, who aſſiſted at this ceremony.*] The Biſhop of Mâcon, who was then Embaſſador from Francis I at Rome; and the Sieur de Velli, who was in the ſame quality in the Emperor's Court, were preſent at this ſpeech. The firſt could make but very little anſwer, becauſe he did not underſtand Spaniſh; and neither of them had time to ſay much. The worſt is, they did not give their maſter a faithful account of the propoſals made by Charles V; for they ſuppreſſed the challenge to fight in ſingle combat, the applauſes he had beſtowed on his own ſoldiers, and the contemptuous words in which he ſpoke of thoſe of France: all theſe particulars they ſuppreſſed at the Pope's deſire, for fear, leſt this ſhould exaſperate their maſter, and thereby delay the concluſion of the Treaty of Peace (30). Brantome deſcribes very humorouſly the whimſical poſtures of one of the Embaſſadors who was a ſoldier, during the ſpeech; and thoſe of the Sieur de Velli, a Gentleman of the Long-robe (31).

(30) *Memoires de Guillaume de Bellai*, pag. 519, 520. Brantome, *Hommes illuſtres*, tom. 1. pag. m. 246.

(31) Ibid.

[*G*] *Several people think he was guilty of a ſtrange error, in relying on the honour of Francis I, when he paſſed thro' his dominions.*] The citizens of Ghent revolted in 1539, and offered to deliver themſelves to the King of France. The King not only refuſed this offer, but gave the Emperor notice of it, who not being able to think of a better remedy to an evil, the conſequences of which might be dangerous, than to go thither in perſon, deſired leave to paſs thro' France, he looking upon every other way as long and dangerous. The Emperor's requeſt was granted, and extraordinary honours were paid him in every part of the Kingdom, eſpecially at Court. This behaviour of Francis I was certainly noble and generous; but it is ridiculous to praiſe him, for his not having made any attempt on the Emperor's liberty. Is a perſon to be applauded, becauſe he forbore to commit an action of the blackeſt perfidy?

[*H*] . . . *A man muſt be of a ſatyrical diſpoſition, to call this an error.*] Moſt of thoſe who have blamed Charles V for truſting ſo much to the generoſity of Francis I, did not thereby intend to calumniate that Emperor, but to give a horrid idea of the King of France; for if a Monarch acts repugnant to the maxims of prudence, in truſting to the word and honour of Francis I; it is a ſign that it is very probable he will commit a baſe and treacherous action whenever it is in his power. I confeſs that ſome Writers ground themſelves on the knaviſh arts, which according to them, Charles V was for ever practiſing with regard to the King of France, and they argue in the following manner. This Emperor ought naturally to have ſuſpected, that Francis I would have invented a great many ſpecious excuſes, for that he, after receiving ſo many injuries, would violate the laws of hoſpitality; and therefore, that would not be prudent in him to truſt that Monarchy. But whatever thoſe people ſay, their thoughts will reflect greater diſhonour on Francis I, than on Charles V; and it would be highly derogatory to the memory of the former, to aſſert that he had debated in his council, whether he ſhould ſeize on the perſon of Charles V. Camerarius, a German Author, does not look upon this as any way probable (32).

(32) *Meditat. Hiſtoriques*, vol. 3. lib. 3. cap. 3. I mean the firſt Tranſlation, publiſhed by Simon Goulart.

[*I*] *The Flemiſh Hiſtorians were either very weak, or very malicious, in the relation they gave of what was tranſacted on this occaſion.*] The Belgic, Germanic &c. candor of Hiſtorians is generally a mere chimæra. There is not perhaps any part of the world, where there are more equitable, and at the ſame time, more partial pens, than in that country. Their ſlander is as ſharp and wounds as deep, at that of the Italians, and beſides this, it is ſometimes grounded on very abſurd fables. I ſhall not cite all thoſe they have invented concerning the paſſage of Charles V through France, and ſhall only quote thoſe of a French annaliſt (33). *Nec ullo modo audiendus inſipidus quidam Belgicus Chronologus * dum ſcribit, Cæſarem paſquillis quibuſdam totam per urbem Lutetiam diſſeminatis præſentiſſimum ſui periculum cum vitaſſet, perniciſſimo curſu primum Cameracum, hinc Gandavum conceſſiſſe. Inſulſiora namque ſunt iſta quam ab homine mente ſobrio proferantur. Ac ſic lubet pleriſque Belgis cum de Francis agitur, fatuari & ineptire, qualia permulta apud Maierum, Maſſæum, & alios ejus generis homines reperire liceat.* i. e. " Nor " are we to give the leaſt credit to a certain inſipid " Belgic Chronologer, where he tells us, that Charles " V being laſhed by Paſquinades in every part of the " city of Paris, and having eſcaped the moſt immi- " nent danger, fled with the utmoſt ſpeed, firſt to " Cambray and afterwards to Ghent. But theſe par- " ticulars are too ſtupid for any man in his ſenſes " to write; nevertheleſs, moſt Flemings delight in " publiſhing ſuch ridiculous ſtories whenever they are " ſpeaking of Frenchmen; as is frequently ſeen in " Maierus, Maſſæus, and ſuch like Writers." The long wars that were carried on between France and the houſe of Burgundy, had exaſperated the Flemings to ſuch a degree, that ſuch as were not able to exerciſe hoſtilities ſword in hand, would war with their pens or

(33) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1540, num. 1.

* *Locri, hoc an.*

and a ſmart ſaying is aſcribed to him, with regard to the aſcendant which Henry the IId's ſtar had over him [K]. Notwithſtanding the mighty ſucceſs of his enterprizes, it is certain that his Hiſtory is a compound of good and ill fortune [L]. His abdication is a very ſingular circumſtance, and furniſhed a noble theme for thoſe who delight in making reflections. Theſe gave very different accounts of the motives which prompted him to it [M], and the manner in which he employed his ſolitude [N]; and ſome writers pretend, that Charles

or tongue. Now in theſe various ſorts of war, many perſons employ equally this maxim, *Dolus an virtus quis in hoſte requirat?* What ſort of an Hiſtorian muſt he be, who dares aſſert that Charles V fled with the utmoſt ſpeed; and who either does not know, or pretends he does not, that this Prince was accompanied to the frontiers by two Princes, (ſons to the French King) and received in all the cities thro' which he paſſed, with the ſame honours that would have been paid to the King himſelf?

[K] *A ſmart ſaying is aſcribed to him, with regard to the aſcendant which Henry the IId's ſtar had over him.*] I ſee plainly, ſays he, that fortune is like women, ſhe preferring young men to thoſe in years. Strada relates, in general terms, this reflection of Charles V (34); Scioppius cenſures him very unjuſtly on that account (35); and it is merely from a ſpirit of contradiction that he doubts, whether this Emperor ever made ſuch an aſſertion. He acts the Divine very unſeaſonably; and is miſtaken in declaring that the Emperor, by this ſaying, aſcribes all things to chance. But does blind chance make women prefer a young huſband to one in years? Nothing can be more oppoſite to fortune, than an inclination or pretenſion, whatever it be, to favour one thing more than another. In caſe the maxim of Charles V were true, it would prove infinitely better the tenet of providence, (to ſpeak in general) than it would prove the oppoſite opinion. Scioppius is more in the right, when he ſays, that this maxim is found in Machiavel; for thus the laſt mentioned Author writes in his XXVth Chapter of his Prince. *Io giudico ben queſto, che ſia meglio eſſere impetuoſo che riſpettivo, perche la Fortuna è donna: & è neceſſario volendola tener ſotta, batterla & urtarla. Et ſi vede che la ſi laſcia piu vincere da queſti, che da quelli che freddamente procedano. Et però ſempre* (come donna) *è amica dè giovanni, perchè ſon meno reſpettivi, piu feroci, è con più audacia la commandano.* i. e. "In my opinion, it is more for a perſon's "intereſt to be bold than modeſt, becauſe fortune is a "female; and thoſe who would keep her under, muſt "beat and buffet her. And experience ſhews, that "ſhe is ſooner ſubjected by thoſe who treat her in "that rough manner, than by ſuch as proceed cooly: "and indeed, as a female, ſhe is ever a friend to the "young; becauſe theſe are leſs reſpectful, more ſa-"vage, and command more imperiouſly over her.

[L] *His Hiſtory is a compound of good and ill fortune.*] He confeſſed, in the ſpeech he made when he reſigned all his dominions, *that the moſt proſperous actions he had ever been favoured with, had been branded with ſo many adverſities that he might juſtly ſay, he had ever found any content* (36). It is related, that after his abdication he uſed to ſay, that he taſted more ſatisfaction in one day of his ſolitude, than in all his triumphs put together (37).

[M] *His abdication . . . . very different accounts are given of the motives which prompted him to it.*] Strada obſerves, that the abdication of this Emperor, was made a theme for declamation in ſchools. *Non ignoro eam rem vario tunc hominum ſermone fuiſſe diſceptatam, hodieque declamatorum in ſcholis* (38), *politicorum in aulis, argumentum eſſe* CÆSAREM ABDICANTEM (39). Charles V, according to ſome Writers, not being capable, upon account of his bodily infirmities, to ſuſtain the weight of his glory, he artfully prevented the ſhame of a greater decay of his reputation. It has alſo been ſaid, that the vexation to ſee his fortune ſo much below that of ſo young a Prince as Henry II; his fortune, I ſay, which had triumphed on ſo many occaſions over that of Francis I, obliged him to reſign his Crown. I ſhall obſerve in the following Remarks, that the vexation at his loſing the Papal Throne, and a deſire of ſerving God after the Proteſtant manner, have alſo been looked upon as the cauſe of his retreat from the world. But every one has not conſidered this great action with a critical eye: for ſome perſons have aſſerted, that a private deſire of meditating on the emptineſs of all human grandeur, and the ſolid bleſſings of heaven, prompted him to fly to ſolitude; in order to expiate, by the exerciſes of penance, the evils he had brought upon the Chriſtian world; and to prepare himſelf early and uſefully for death, by devoting himſelf entirely to the care of his ſalvation. Strada (40) has given a noble deſcription of all theſe, and ſeveral other particulars.

[N] *And the manner in which he employed his ſolitude.*] He for this purpoſe, made choice of the Monaſtery of St. Juſtus, ſituated on the frontiers of Caſtile and Portugal near Placentia. The Friars of this Monaſtery are called Hieronymites. He cauſed a ſmall houſe, (contiguous to this Convent) to be built, and conſiſting of ſix or ſeven rooms; and ſecluded himſelf in it, in February 1557. He kept only a dozen ſervants and a horſe. He was not ſo entirely wrapt up in exerciſes of devotion, as to forbear all amuſements; for he uſed to ride on horſeback, would dreſs his garden, make watches, and divert himſelf with experiments in Mechanicks with a famous engineer (41). Some days before his death, he cauſed his own funeral obſequies to be ſolemnized, and aſſiſted in perſon at that occaſion (42). Some relate, that he endeavoured to ſet ſeveral clocks ſo very exactly, that they might all ſtrike at the ſame inſtant; and that this deſign was not ſo difficult to put in execution, as the notion he had formed, at the time of the *Interim*, of reconciling all Religions. He had not ſo abſolutely renounced all human affairs, as to forbear enquiring how the wars went on, and giving his opinion on them; as is manifeſt from what it is related he ſaid and did, after hearing that his ſon having won the battle of St. *Quintin*, did not make a proper advantage of his victory. The relation is as follows. "Tho' he was wholly a Friar, and half a "Saint, he yet could not forbear (as we are told was "the common report at that time) when the King "his ſon had won the battle of St. Quintin, to aſk "the inſtant the Courier had brought him the news, "whether he had purſued his victory in a proper "manner, and as far as the gates of Paris? And be-"ing told that he had not, he ſaid, that had he "been of his age, and gained ſo glorious a victory; "he would not have ſtopt in ſo noble a career, but "would have run much better; and was ſo exaſperated "at what he heard, that he would not look into the "diſpatches which the Courier brought (43)." I muſt not omit what was ſaid to him by a young Monk; "The Emperor going one morning to awake "the reſt of the Friars in his turn, he found the "youth, who had not yet put on the habit, bu-"ried in ſo deep a ſleep, that he could ſcarce awake "him. At laſt the novice riſing with very great "regret, and but half awake, could not forbear ſay-"ing to him; that he ought to be ſatisfied with hav-"in diſturbed the repoſe of thoſe who were in the "world, ſo long as he had continued in it; and not "continue to interrupt the tranquillity of thoſe who "were retired from it (44)." I have read a particular which I think worthy of being mentioned. It is the extract of a Piece, relating to the abdication of Charles V ſent from Rome to Balzac, who (45) relates the beginning as follows: *When Charles V, being grown tired of the world, reſolved to die under the Empire of his brother, and under the reign of his ſon.* The Author of the Piece, after making ſeveral moral reflections, tells us this little ſtory. "Nevertheleſs, as there is "nothing ſo clear, but ſlander will defile it; nor ſo "good, but that it may be miſinterpreted by it; ſome "have hinted, as tho' that Prince had repented his ab-"dication; and that it had brought ſo much grief "upon him, as had even diſordered his ſenſes. To "prove this aſſertion they relate the following ſtory. "The Emperor had five hundred Crowns in a black "velvet purſe, which he never would ſuffer to go out "of his hands, but always carried it to bed with him "every night. If theſe people may be believed, he "uſed to kiſs, hug and idolize that purſe: ſo that af-"ter

(34) *Quin & vulgo credebatur, Cæſaris fortunam faſtidio ac ſatietate jam captam retrocedere incepiſſe: felicemque Imperatoris hactenus invicti genium in Henricum Galliæ Regem immigraſſe. Ipſo Cæſare non diſſimulante, quem auditum ferebant, quum diceret,* Nempe FORTUNAM eſſe juvenum amicam. Strada, *de Bello Belg. Dec.* 1. pag. m. 17. He quotes a Letter of Hippolyto, Chizzala inſerted in vol. 3. of the *Lettere de Principi*, folio m. 212 *verſo*. He cites it, I ſay, for the firſt part of the paſſage.

(35) *Infam. Fam.* Strad. pag. m. 36.

(36) *Memoires de Beauvais-Nangis*, pag. 120.

(37) Camerarius, *Meditat. Hiſtor.* vol. 1. lib. 3. cap. 5.

(38) This calls to my memory the following verſes of Juvenal, Sat. 1. ver. 13. which ſhew that the ſcholars in his time uſed to declaim on the abdication of Sylla. *Et nos ergo manum ferulæ ſubduximus, & nos Conſilium dedimus Sullæ privatus ut altum Dormiret.*

(39) Strada, *de Bello Belgic.* lib. 1. Dec. 1. pag. 16.

(40) Idem, ibid.

(41) Strada, ibid. pag. 13, 14. calls him *Jannellus Turanus*, and relates ſome very ſingular particulars concerning him.

(42) *Ex* Strada, lib. 1. Dec. 1. pag. 14.

(43) Brantome, *Mem. des Capitaines Etrangers.* tom. 1. pag. 12.

(44) Saint Real *Hiſt. de Dom. Carlos*, pag. m. 21, 22.

(45) *Entretien premier*, pag. m. 10.

Charles ſoon repented the reſignation he had made of his dominions, eſpecially to a ſon who diſcovered ſo little gratitude for it [O]. He did not forget, as we are told, to ſcourge himſelf in his retirement [P], and in general ſome Authors give a very advantageous idea of his piety [Q]. According to other writers, this Prince was more ambitious than religious [R], and he profeſſed almoſt the Lutheran principles at his death;

" ter having deſpiſed the riches of Europe, Aſia, A-
" frica, and thoſe of the new found world, and
" the pearls and diamonds of ſo many crowns as
" he had wore, he became avaritious for ſo trifling a
" ſum as five hundred crowns. I was formerly told
" this ſtory by a Spaniard, but I laughed at it, and
" looked upon it as fabulous. It is much more pro-
" bable, that if the Emperor repented of any thing
" in his ſolitude, it was for his not having retired
" ſooner from the world, or, as an Italian writes,
" for not having obliged fortune to throw up the cards
" ſooner; for by that, ſaid he, he overreached that
" fickle Goddeſs, notwithſtanding her great cunning,
" and the inſidious arts ſhe employs (46).

(46) Ibid. pag. 12, 13.

[O] *Some Writers pretend, that Charles ſoon repented the reſignation he had made, eſpecially to a ſon who diſcovered ſo little gratitude for it.*] We are told an anſwer which Philip II made to Cardinal Granvelle, whence we ſhould be obliged to infer, that Charles V repented before the day after his reſignation; and that his deſire of renouncing the Empire, did not exceed the twenty four hours. *It is this day*, ſays Cardinal de Granvelle to King Phillip, *a year, ſince the Emperor reſigned all his dominions.* The King anſwered; *and it is this day, a year ſince he was ſorry for what he had done.* Writers who are not ſo malicious, ſay, that he did not begin to regret the Kingdoms he had reſigned, till travelling thro' ſeveral Provinces of Spain, in his way to Burgos, he ſaw ſo few of the Nobility wait upon him; not to mention, that upon his arrival in that city, he was obliged to ſtay a conſiderable time in it, before he could get the ſum he had reſerved to himſelf, paid him. He wanted part of it, to pay the ſalaries of ſuch of his ſervants as he intended to diſmiſs; and the payment was put off from day to day, which diſguſted him very much. Here follows a long paſſage from Strada (47), in which we ſhall find, that he does not affirm any thing with regard to the repentance in queſtion (48). *Quum in Cantabriam appulſus, ac profectus inde Burgos, raros admodum ſibi obvios vidit Hiſpanos Proceres, (quos nempe ſolus, incomitatuſque tituli ſui, Carolus non allexerat) ſenſit tum primùm nuditatem ſuam. Acceſſitque & illud, quòd ex centum nummûm aureorum millibus (quem ſibi reditum ex immenſis opibus tantummodo ſepoſuerat) quum eorum parte opus tunc eſſet, qua famulos aliquot donaret, dimitteretque, expectandum ei pluſculum, nec ſine ſtomacho Burgis fuit, dum ea videlicet ſumma aliquando redderetur. Quam ille offenſionem ſicut diſſimulanter haud tulit, ita occaſionem nonnullis forte præbuit affirmandi, Regnis vix ejuratis, cœpiſſe Carolum initi conſilii pœnitere. Quamquam alii ipſo ejurationis die mutaſſe illum ſententiam, ex eo narrant, quod aliquot poſt annis, quum Cardinalis Granvellanus ex occaſione Philippo Regi revocaſſet in mentem, anniverſarium illum eſſe diem, quo Carolus pater imperio Regniſque ceſſerat; reſponderit illico Rex; Et hunc quoque diem anniverſarium eſſe, quo illum ceſſiſſe pœnituit. Quod incerto rumore prolatum facilè percrebuit apud homines, non ſibi in tam inaudito facinore conſtantiam vel unius diei perſuadentes. Niſi fortè Philippus non putavit in parente laudandum, quod imitandum ſibi non ſtatuerit.* It is pretended that King Philip did much worſe, than his not being punctual in the payment of his penſion, viz. that he retrenched two thirds of it. Brantome writes as follows. " I have
" read in a little work compoſed in Flanders, enti-
" tled (*An Apology for the Prince of Orange*) a very
" odd particular, which I neither can nor will be-
" lieve probable, it being invented by ſome of the
" King of Spain's enemies: and yet it may poſſibly
" be true tho' I affirm nothing, except what I myſelf
" have ſeen, and know to be undoubted fact, viz.
" that the King his ſon retrenched two thirds of the
" hundred thouſand crowns, or other revenues which
" (the Emperor) he had reſerved to himſelf; ſo that
" during the greateſt part of the time, he had not
" monies ſufficient to ſubſiſt himſelf and his domeſtics;
" nor for giving of alms, or for extending his charity
" to ſuch of his old ſervants and faithful ſoldiers who
" had ſerved him ſo well; a circumſtance that grieved
" him ſo much, that it haſtened his end (49)." We may aſſert in general, that ingratitude is ſeen chiefly in children, with regard to their parents.

(47) Strada, Decad. I. lib. 1. pag. 10, 11.

(48) After the words which follow this citation, he rejects this report of his repentance, as entirely groundleſs.

(49) Brantome, *Capit. Etrang.* tom. 1. pag. 39.

[P] *He did not forget (as we are told) to ſcourge himſelf in his retirement.*] Strada affirms this in the moſt poſitive terms. *Quin etiam plexo è funiculis tormento . . . . exigere à ſeſe anteactæ vitæ pœnas perſeverè cœpit. Quos inde funiculos à Philippo Rege reverenter habitos, ab eoque morti proximo afferri ad ſe juſſos, &, ut erant cruore Caroli patris aſperſi, filio Philippo tertio traditos, inter Auſtriacæ monumenta pietatis aſſervari fama eſt* (50). i. e. " And likewiſe making a
" ſcourge of cords, he began to chaſtiſe himſelf very
" ſeverely for the errors of his paſt life. Which ſcourge
" being afterwards had in great veneration by King
" Philip; and brought to him by his command,
" when he lay on his death-bed; and delivered tinc-
" tured with the blood of the Emperor Charles his fa-
" ther, to Philip III his ſon, is ſaid to be kept
" among the monuments of the Auſtrian piety."
Strada is not the only Author, who affirms, that the ſcourge employed by Charles V, and tinctured with his blood, is preſerved as a kind of relick. What he aſſerts, viz. that King Philip II cauſed his father's ſcourge to be brought him, and gave it to his ſon, is confirmed by other Hiſtorians. This is related in the Memoirs de Chiverni (β) (51), and Brantome's Memoirs, the laſt of which I ſhall only cite. *He alſo cauſed to be taken, out of a little trunk, a whip that was bloody at the ends; and holding it up, he ſaid; this blood is from my blood, and yet not properly my blood, but that of my father, (may God abſolve him) who uſed to ſcourge himſelf with this whip. This I thought proper to declare* (52). Scioppius boaſts his having had this whip, (which was ſaid to be ſtained with the blood of Charles V) in his hand in the monaſtery of the Eſcurial. *Quod ego in monaſterio Laurentiano manibus tractavi & Car. V, ſanguine, ut aiebant, adhuc oblitum vidi.* He ſneers at Strada for obſerving, that this whip is ſtill tinctured with that Emperor's blood: ſince this is a proof that his deſcendants never made uſe of it; and conſequently never laſhed their ſhoulders with it, which Scioppius would not be offended at. What he there ſays againſt *Flagellation* is curious enough. *Vereor ne Auſtriaci Principes pietatem ſuam frigide laudatam putent, cum flagellum illud adhuc Caroli ſanguine notatum prædicetur; quod argumento eſt, id ipſos jam octoginta annos ferreatum de parietibus clavo pependiſſe, nec vel filii ejus vel nepotis ac pronepotum dorſo moleſtiæ multum creaſſe* (53).

(50) Strada, Dec. 1. lib. 1. pag. 14.

(β) All theſe incidents are extracted from a little book in 8vo, printed in 1600, at Mentz, for Zechariah Durant, intitled, *The laſt Will and Teſtament of Philip II.* REM. CRIT.

(51) Pag. 294. Paris edit. 1636, in 4to.

(52) Brantome, *Capit. Etrang.* tom. 2. pag. 105.

(53) Scioppius, *Infam. Fam. Stradæ*, pag. 19.

[Q] *Some authors give a very advantageous idea of his piety.*] William Zenocarus aſſerts, that Charles V compoſed prayers for every expedition he undertook; that he wrote them with his own hand; that they were as long as the ſeven penitential Pſalms; and that after his Confeſſors had approved them, he uſed to repeat them every day in the midſt of his army. Sometimes, when he found himſelf inſpired by ſome devout compunctions and emotions, he would withdraw to a ſolitary place, upon pretence of ſome natural call, in order that he might continue the longer in the fervor of Prayer. He uſed to give theſe Prayers to Adrian Sylvanus, enjoining him, at the ſame time, to tear them to pieces, and throw them away, in caſe any evil accident ſhould happen to him. Several perſons having obſerved the long time this Prince uſed to ſpend in prayer, ſaid that he ſpoke oftner to God than to men (54).

(54) Guill. Zenocarus, lib. 5. *de Vita Caroli V, apud* Matthiam Caſtritium *de Virtutibus Principum Germaniæ*, lib. 1. cap. 34.

[R] *According to other Writers, this Prince was more ambitious than religious.*] Thoſe aſſert, that a deſire of aggrandizing himſelf in prejudice of Francis I, was the cauſe why he ſuffered Soliman to take Belgrade and Rhodes; and did not make uſe of thoſe favourable opportunities which God indulged him againſt the Turks, both in Hungary and in Africa. It was a greater pleaſure to him, to march and make a wild havock in France, than to make uſe of the advantages which

death [S]; the former of which is more probable than the latter. The apology for the Prince

which he gained over the Infidels. He is accuſed of favouring the Lutheran Principles, which he might eaſily have extirpated. He found his account in the diviſions which that Sect occaſioned; and he for ever made his advantage of them, ſometimes againſt the Pope, ſometimes againſt France, and at other times againſt the Empire itſelf. He rejected (as we are told) the offers the Proteſtants made him, of fighting under his Enſigns againſt the Turks, provided he would grant them liberty of conſcience; but he indulged it them in its utmoſt latitude, the inſtant they promiſed to break off their alliance with France (55). If this be true, it cannot be denied but that this is an example of what was obſerved above (56) concerning *the Religion of Kings*. As men, they are zealous for the Religion they profeſs; they offer up their prayers to God, and go very devoutly to Church; but the inſtant they conſider themſelves as inveſted with the regal character, they then bend all their thoughts to the vanquiſhing of their enemies; and attack with the greateſt vigor, not that Monarch who differs moſt from them in belief; but him for whom they have the greateſt averſion, either from fear or jealouſy, tho' he ſhould be the greateſt ſupport of their Religion. By the way, the following great falſity has been related in the Life of the Emperor Charles V (57). "This Monarch being obliged to fly "from Duke Maurice, he being accompanied only by "ſix horſemen, the Princes of Germany made him "the following offer; that provided he would only "give an order to have diſputations made on their "opinions, they then would furniſh him an hundred "thouſand men, to oppoſe the Grand Signior who "was going to invade Hungary; and that they would "maintain them, till ſuch time as he ſhould poſſeſs "himſelf of Conſtantinople. But that the Emperor "anſwered, he would not purchaſe Kingdoms at ſo "dear a rate, nor even Europe itſelf on ſuch a condi"tion; and that he deſired nothing but CHRIST "JESUS (58)." It is univerſally known, that after this flight of Charles V from Duke Maurice, the Proteſtants were indulged almoſt every thing they deſired. Read Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Lutheraniſm (59). I refer to this Book, becauſe it is infinitely ſooner met with than Sleidan, Thuanus and Chytreus, cited by Maimbourg.

[S] *That he profeſſed almoſt the Lutheran principles at his death.*] The firſt Author I will cite is Brantome. "This Book (60) ſays much more, viz. that it was "once decreed by the Inquiſition of Spain, (the King "his ſon being preſent, and conſenting to it) to take "his body out of the tomb, and burn it as an here"tick, (how horrid was this cruelty!) for having for"merly ſaid ſome ſlighting things of Religion; and "therefore that he was unworthy of being buried in "conſecrated ground, but ought to be burnt as an "heretic; and alſo that he had adhered too much to "the opinions and perſuaſions of the Archbiſhop of "Toledo, who was look'd upon as an heretic; and "for that reaſon had been a long time impriſoned in "the Inquiſition, and deprived of his Biſhoprick, the "yearly revenue of which is an hundred or an hundred "and twenty thouſand crowns. This indeed was the "true way to make him be conſidered as an heretic, "and to have his eſtate (61)." The Author I ſhall now cite, gives a more curious account of theſe particulars. *Among the reports which had been ſpread*, ſays he (62), *with regard to the Emperor's retreat from the world, the ſtrangeſt of all was, that his perpetual intercourſe with the Proteſtants of Germany, had inclined him a little to their ſentiments; and that the reaſon of his withdrawing to a ſolitude was, to have the liberty to end his days in ſuch exerciſes of piety as were agreeable to his ſecret diſpoſitions. He made choice of perſons who were all ſuſpected of hereſy, to be his ſpiritual guides, as of Dr. Cacalla his Chaplain in ordinary; of the Archbiſhop of Toledo, and eſpecially of Conſtantine Pontius, Biſhop of Droſſen, and his ghoſtly Father. It was known after his death, that his cell where he died, in the Monaſtery of St. Juſtus, was filled on all ſides with writings in his own hand, on Juſtification and Grace; and in ſuch a manner as agreed almoſt with the doctrine of the Proteſtants* (63). *But no circumſtance confirmed this opinion ſo much as his Will. There was ſcarce one pious donation, nor any ſums left for prayers; and it was drawn up in ſo different a manner from thoſe of zealous Catholicks, that the Inquiſitors of Spain thought they might be juſtly offended at it. However they did not dare to take any notice of it till the King was arrived; but this Prince having ſignalized his arrival in that country, by putting to death all who adhered to the new opinions; the Inquiſitors emboldned by the example he ſet them, attacked firſt the Archbiſhop of Toledo, afterwards the Emperor's Chaplain in ordinary, and at laſt Conſtantine Pontius. The King having impriſoned them all three, the common people conſidered his patience, as the maſterpiece of his zeal for the true Religion; but all the reſt of Europe ſaw with horror, the Confeſſor of the Emperor Charles V (in whoſe arms that Prince had breathed his laſt, and who had received, as it were, that great ſoul in his boſom) delivered up to the moſt cruel and moſt ignominious of all puniſhments, and that too by the hands of the King his ſon. And indeed, in the courſe of the proſecution, the Inquiſitors thinking proper to impeach the three great perſons in queſtion, for having had a hand in the Emperor's Will; they had the boldneſs to ſentence them together with the Will to the flames. The King hearing of this ſentence, was waked as by a clap of thunder. At firſt, the jealouſy he entertained at his father's glory, made him feel a kind of pleaſure, in ſeeing his memory expoſed to this affront; but afterwards, having reflected on the conſequences of this inſolent attempt, he prevented the effects of it by the gentleſt and moſt ſecret methods, in order to ſave the honour of the Inquiſition, and not to leſſen its authority. . . Nevertheleſs, Doctor Cacalla was burnt alive, with the effigy of Conſtantine Pontius, who died ſome days before in priſon. The King was obliged to wink at theſe executions, in order that the Inquiſitors might be prevailed upon to permit the Archbiſhop of Toledo to appeal to Rome, and that no farther mention might be made of the Emperor's will.* In caſe theſe particulars are true, the Emperor muſt either have been an arch hypocrite, or the Hiſtorians who ſpeak of his devotions, (64), and the hatred he bore the hereticks (65), muſt have been arrant impoſtors. It is pretended that Charles V ranked among the number of his crimes, his not burning Luther, notwithſtanding he had granted him a ſafe conduct (66).

If the reader will read the remarks of the article CARRANZA, he will there meet with ſeveral particulars relating to this ſubject. What follows may ſerve as a ſupplement, and will point out ſome errors in the Hiſtory of Don Carlos. I. The Spaniſh Hiſtorians do not allow, that Conſtantine Pontius (67) was Charles Vth's Director or Confeſſor; and only ſay, that he had been his Preacher or Chaplain in ordinary. II. He was not Biſhop of Droſſen. I don't find any Biſhoprick in Spain, or in any other country, that is ſo called. Thuanus indeed ſpeaks of an *Epiſcopus Droſſenſis* (68) (which doubtleſs led the Author of Don Carlos into an error;) but he does not ſay that Conſtantine Pontius was Biſhop there; he being a Preacher of Seville, and his name, Giles, who held the ſame opinions, and met with the ſame fortune as Conſtantine Pontius; for both died before the *Auto da fe* was held, and were both burnt in effigy (69). This Giles was nominated Biſhop of Tortoſa by the Emperor (70). III. It is falſe to aſſert, that the Inquiſitors waited till Philip was arrived in Spain, before they proſecuted Dr. Cacalla and Conſtantine Pontius; that King did not arrive in that Kingdom till the beginning of September 1559; and theſe two men were impriſoned by the Inquiſitors before Charles Vth's death, which, as every one knows, happened the 21ſt of September 1558. The Count de la Roca relates what this Emperor ſaid with regard to Cacalla's ſentence (71), and Conſtantine's impriſonment (72). Another Hiſtorian (73) relates, that Cacalla, in whoſe houſe the Proteſtant Aſſemblies in Valladolid were held, was executed whilſt Philip was ſtill in the Netherlands, the 21ſt of May 1559. IV. Since Conſtantine Pontius was impriſoned in the Inquiſition in the life-time of Charles V; he conſequently did not aſſiſt that Monarch when on his death-bed, ſo far was he from *receiving that great ſoul into his boſom*. Thuanus led the Author of Don Carlos's Hiſtory into an error. *Conſtantius, qui a ſacris confeſſionibus diu Cæſari, eique in ſolitudine ſua poſt impe-*

(55) *See* la Mothe le Vayer, tom. 2. pag. 113, 114, 115. edit. in 12mo 1681. *See alſo* Maimbourg, *Hiſt. du Lutheraniſme*, tom. 1. pag. 247, 248. and tom. 2. pag. 159.

(56) In the remark [H] of the Article AGESILAUS II; and in the Remark [C] of the Article ARISTIDES.

(57) Written by John Anthony de Vera & Figuerva, Count de la Roca.

(58) Count de la Roca's *Hiſtory of Charles V*, pag. 335. Bruſſells edit. 1663, in 12mo.

(59) Tom. 2. pag. 158. *ad ann.* 1552.

(60) That is, *The Apology for the Prince of Orange.* I do not find this in my edition, which is, of 1581; nor what is cited above, in the note [O], citation (49). See the remark [T].

(61) Brantome, *Capit. Etrang.* tom. 1. pag 39.

(62) Abbot St. Real in his *Hiſtory of Don Carlos.* He cites Thuanus, Aubigne, &c.

(63) Apply here a circumſtance, whether true or falſe I ſhall not determine, related by Melanchthon, in cap. 25. Matthieu, pag. m. 558. *Carolus quintus juſſit amoveri monachos à conjuge moritura, & juſſit præceptorem filii ſui proponere conſolationes de Chriſto.* i. e. "Charles V "gave orders to "have the "Monks put away from his "conſort, when "ſhe was dying, "and commanded his ſon's "Preceptor, to "adminiſter "ſpiritual comfolation to "her."

(64) *See* Strada, Decad. 1. lib. 1. pag. 14, 15.

(65) *See* Count de la Roca, pag. 334.

(66) *See* La Mothe le Vayer, tom. 2. pag. 199. edit. in 12mo.

(67) His true name was not *Pontius*, as I obſerved in citation (20) of the Article CARRANZA. See alſo the beginning of the Article PONTIUS.

(68) Thuan. lib. 23. pag. 470. *ad ann.* 1559.

(69) Idem, ibid.

(70) He therefore ſhould have called him *Epiſcopus Tortoſenſis*, or *Dortoſenſis*, or rather *Dertuſenſis.*

(71) *Hiſt. de Charles Quint*, pag. 334.

(72) Idem, pag. 335.

(73) Herrera, *Hiſtoria General.* lib. 6. cap. 16. pag. m. 400.

CRITIQUE of Abbot St. Real.

Prince of Orange is very improperly cited on this occaſion [T]. Charles V was not exempt from human frailty with regard to the fair-ſex, and was much more ſober than chaſte.

rii ac regnorum abdicationem, ac poſtremo animam agenti ſemper præſto fuerat, ad idem mox tribunal raptus &c. i. e. "Conſtantine, who was a long time Confeſſor "to the Emperor, and was in that quality in this "Monarch's ſolitude, after his abdication; and laſtly "in his expiring moments, was ſeized ſoon after by "that Tribunal (74)." Which may ſerve as a warning to all Authors, not to truſt blindly to any one. If a Writer miſtakes in following Thuanus, into what errors may he not be led, when he follows paltry Hiſtorians. V. Every injurious reflection caſt on Philip, upon pretence of his granting leave for the impriſoning of Cacalla and Conſtantine, after his return to Spain, is entirely groundleſs; for both of them were impriſoned before the Emperor's death. VI. Some Hiſtorians aſſert (75), that Cacalla repented; and that he endeavoured, but all in vain, to convert one of his accomplices, who nevertheleſs was ſo obſtinate, that he choſe rather to be burnt alive. This is aſſerting plainly enough, that Cacalla was not burnt till after his death. VII. However this be, *he was not burnt alive, with an effigy repreſenting Conſtantine Pontius*; for Cacalla was executed at the *Auto da fé*, held the 21ſt of March 1559 at Valladolid; and Conſtantine Pontius was executed in an another *Auto da fé* held at Seville (76). VIII. The King did not oblige *the Inquiſition, to permit the Archbiſhop of Toledo to appeal to Rome*; for I, this Archbiſhop's cauſe was not removed by appeal to the Court of Rome, but was ordered thither; and the Pope, who would have had the Spaniſh Inquiſitors ſend the priſoners immediately to him, and found himſelf obliged to allow this Tribunal to carry on its proſecution; reſerved to himſelf the pronouncing of the definitive ſentence (77). II. King Philip was ſo far from deſiring Carranza to appeal to Rome, that he a long time reſiſted the intreaties made by the Pope, to have the Archbiſhop tried by him. The Fathers of the Council of Trent complained ſeveral times to the Legates, of the Spaniſh Inquiſitors treatment of Carranza; the Legates wrote to the Pope on that ſubject; the Pope charged his Nuncios to exert themſelves with vigor; and we find by Pallavicini (78), that thoſe who ſhould imagine, his Holineſs did not act with as much vigor as he ought to have done in this affair, muſt not conſider the neceſſity he was under, of yielding from prudential motives, to the oppoſitions made by Philip.

(74) Thuan. lib. 23. pag. 470. *ad ann.* 1559.

(75) Herrera, *Hiſtor. General. ubi ſupra.*

(76) Herrera, ibid.

(77) Palavicin. *Hiſt. Conc. Trident.* lib. 21. cap. 7. num. 7.

(78) Ibid.

We do not meet with any of theſe remarks in the *Sentiments d'un homme d'Eſprit ſur la Nouvelle intitulée Don Carlos* (79). i. e. "The thoughts of a man of "wit, on the novel entitled *Don Carlos*;" and nevertheleſs this man of wit endeavours to the utmoſt of his power, to cenſure this Novel on all occaſions. This circumſtance ſurprizes me; for ought a man to ſet up publicly for the Cenſor of a Book, without enquiring whether it claſhes with Hiſtory?

(79) The edition cited by me, is of Amſterdam 1674.

[T] *The Apology for the Prince of Orange is improperly cited on this occaſion.*] Brantome boaſts that he had there read, that King Philip II conſented to have the corps of Charles V taken out of the ground and burnt *as an heretic*. But he is miſtaken; and I perhaps have not ill accounted for his error. My conjecture is, that he had read this Apology bound up with little pieces, which had been written againſt Philip II, in favour of Prince William. He fancied, either that all theſe pieces were parts of the Apology, or elſe did not call to mind, in which of thoſe pieces it was that he had met with the particulars related by him; and as the Apology had made the greateſt impreſſion on him, he imagined that he had read this ſtrange incident in the Apology in queſtion. The truth is, this reproach is not met with there (80); but is found in an anonymous piece publiſhed anno 1582, under the following title: *Diſcours ſur la Bleſſure de Monſigneur le Prince d'Orange.* i. e. "A Diſcourſe on the wound of "his Royal Highneſs the Prince of Orange:" and we there find the following words: *Can there have been a more execrable creature among men, than a ſon, ſo ungrateful and ſo unnatural towards a father of ſo illuſtrious a character as the Emperor Charles V; an Emperor ſo highly renowned and of ſuch prodigious authority, who, in his life-time, had laviſhed ſuch vaſt treaſures to his wretch of a ſon; reſerving to himſelf only the yearly income of two hundred thouſand ducats, in Spain; and yet was not paid any part of it, after the reſignation of his Kingdoms? A ſon, I ſay, who ſuffer'd ſuch a father to ſpend the remainder of his days among Friars; and to ſubſiſt himſelf merely by the ſale of the rings he had left, and of his moveables, which he was forced to pawn and ſell upon that account? This ungrateful ſon had ſuffered the Inquiſitors to debate, whether they ſhould cauſe his father's bones to be taken up and burnt, as of an heretic; for having confeſſed, in his expiring moments, by the advice of the Archbiſhop of Toledo, that he relied wholly on the merits of* CHRIST JESUS, *and that theſe were his only hope. An unnatural ſon, who ſeized upon all the poſſeſſions of this excellent Archbiſhop, for having attended on the Emperor till he died, and for having inſtructed him in the way of ſalvation; and who detained him in priſon, till ſuch time as he was forced to permit him to go to Rome, where, after this good Archbiſhop had gained his cauſe, he was poiſoned by the Miniſters of that King, to prevent his being reſtored to his archiepiſcopal See of Toledo, the annual revenue of which amounts to two hundred thouſand ducats.* Had this been related in the Apology for the Prince of Orange, a Writer would have ſome reaſon to introduce it in a Hiſtory; for the name of ſo great a Prince, and the authorities by which he ſupported his Manifeſto, are teſtimonies ſufficient; but as for the numberleſs multitude of Pamphlets which were diſperſed at that time, without the name either of the Author or Printer, they as little deſerve being quoted, as thoſe which overſpread Europe within theſe thirty or 40 years, and were printed for Pierre Marteau. It is not that theſe ſort of pieces (whether they firſt began to be in vogue in the time of the Duke of Alba, during the remainder of the ſixteenth Century; or whether they began firſt to be ſpread in our time) are abſolutely falſe in every article; but after all, when a perſon does not know where they come from, it will be prudent in him not to regard them; much leſs ought a grave Author to quote them, and rely on their authority. Theſe Books are generally the refuſe of Duck-Lane. As thoſe who write them are ſure of never being called to account, they advance with the utmoſt boldneſs whatever things they hear. We here ſee an evident falſity advanced with regard to the Archbiſhop of Toledo. He did not gain his cauſe, he was obliged to abjure, he was ſuſpended during five years (81), and he was ſeventy three years of age. Could any one imagine that he would live five years after being ſo long impriſoned? Be this as it will, they would not have made away with him, till the five years were near expiring.

(80) We may obſerve that the ſilence of this Prince is a mark that he did not think there was any grounds for ſuch a report; he not ſparing Philip II in any manner, but reproaches him with the commiſſion of very horrid crimes; and therefore would have objected this to him with as much freedom as he did the reſt, had he thought it true.

(81) *See* Varillas's Preface to vol. 5. of *l'Hiſtoire de l'Hereſie.*

(α) It may even be affirmed, that all the aſſertions advanced in the Apology for the Prince of Orange are falſe. Grotius aſſures us, that the Writer who drew it up, as well as he who drew up the Decree which proſcribed this Prince, intermixed truth with falſhood in their digreſſions (82). *Adverſus novi moris edictum, Arauſionenſis apud Ordines Belgicos & Chriſtianos principes libello ſe defendit, adjuvante Petro Villerio* (83), *homine Gallo, qui ſubactum rebus forenſibus ingenium, ad religionem docendam, & hinc ad intima Arauſionenſis conſilia tranſtulerat. Extat ſcriptum utrumque pari acerbitate, qua poſt crimina ad cauſam pertinentia, hinc animum ingratum & perduellem, inde ſævam ac perfidam dominationem,* VERIS FALSISQUE NARRATIONIBUS PERMIXTIS, *porro ad alia, rixantium more, prolabebantur.* i. e. "In oppoſition to this new ſort of Edict, "the Prince of Orange defended himſelf to the "States of Holland and the Chriſtian Princes, in a "little Book, partly written by Petrus Villerius a na-"tive of France, who having laid aſide the Law, had "applied himſelf to the teaching of Religion; and "thence had gained the intimate confidence of the "Prince of Orange. There are extant the two pieces "written on each ſide, both equally filled with ran-"cour, in which, after expoſing the ſeveral accuſa-"tions that are pertinent to the ſubject, as ingratitude "and a rebellious ſpirit on one ſide, and on the other "a cruel and perfidious thirſt of power, THE WHOLE "INTERMIXED

(82) Grot. *Annal. Belgic.* lib. 3. *ſub fin.* pag. m. 99, 100.

(83) We ſhall obſerve in the remark [E] of the Article LANGUET, that it was thought that this *Apology for the Prince of Orange*, was wrote by Languet.

chaſte [U]. He died the 21ſt of September 1558, in the monaſtery of the Hieronymites, which he had made choice of for his retirement. His corps was depoſited here till the arrival of Philip II into Spain; and he was interred with very great magnificence ſome time after. The funeral honours paid him at Bruſſels in St. Gudula's church, were infinitely pompous. Not a ſingle exploit of this Emperor was omitted in the inſcriptions with which the Church was embelliſhed (c); and I believe no Prince in the world ever had ſo many titles beſtowed on him, as were laviſhed on the Emperor Charles at that time. If the ſubject was great, the imagination and rhetoric of the Spaniards was equal to it; and it is certain that the Hiſtorians of that Nation would have done greater honour to his memory, had they been leſs extravagant in their encomiums. A ſingle page in Thuanus (d) is preferable to a volume of Sandoval; becauſe Thuanus, a Frenchman of honour, is not ſuſpected of flattery. Writers did not fail to obſerve, that ſeveral preſages foretold this Emperor's death (e). It is even ſaid, that his corps did not rot [X]. His Life was publiſhed in Italian, anno 1559, by one Alfonſo Ulloa a Spaniard; and ſince

(c) *See* Brantome, *Memoires de Capit. Etranges*, tom. 1. pag. 44.

(d) It is 430 of Book 21. of the Frankfort edit. 1625.

(e) See on this ſubject, the *Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes*, pag. 265; and alſo pag. 279 and 294.

" INTERMIXED WITH TRUTH AND FALSHOOD, they " then, (according to the cuſtom of thoſe who are " quarrelling) proceed to other matters."

[U] *He was much more ſober than chaſte.*] " It " is related . . . that he always drunk three times at " dinner and ſupper; and was very ſober in his eating " and drinking. Whenever he went to bed to a fair La- " dy, (for he was ſo fond of the ſex, that it did the gout " with which he was afflicted no ſervice) he never left " her till after he had enjoyed her three times (84)." We here have a great inequality in the ſame number; three draughts of wine at table, and the ſame number of love, in the amorous dalliance, cannot be put in parallel; the former is an account of moderation, the laſt of exceſs. However by this means he would ſecure himſelf from the following reproach,

Inachia langues minus ac me.
Inachiam ter nocte potes: mihi ſemper ad unum
Mollis opus (85).

That is,

" Inachia's dearer far to you than I.
" Inachia thrice you every night embrace;
" Once is too much for me ———

(84) Brantome, *Capit. Etrang.* tom. 1. pag. 18, 19.

(85) Horat. lib. Epod. Od. 12. ver. 14.

To give my readers ſome little exerciſe, by examining whether Brantome is more worthy of credit than the reſt, I ſhall obſerve, that William Zenocarus not only applauds the frugality of Charles V, but likewiſe his chaſtity. This Emperor, ſaid he (86), uſed often to ſhut his windows himſelf, when he ſaw any beautiful women coming forward, or knew that ſuch were to come. The Author, who informs us of this (87), ſays, that the Emperor acted in this manner whilſt the Empreſs lived. Others have obſerved, that he did not violate the nuptial bed (88), and did his utmoſt endeavours to conceal his intrigues (89); *Si non caſtè, ſaltem cautè.*

(86) Zenocarus, *in vita Caroli V.* lib. 3. *apud* Caſtritium, *de virtutibus Princip. Germaniæ*, pag. 224.

(87) Idem, lib. 5. *apud eundem.*

(88) *Ea* (conjuge) *vivente ſervaſſe Carolum perquam ſanctè conjugalem fidem fama eſt.* Strada Dec. 1. lib. 10. pag. m. 612.

(89) Thuan. lib. 21. pag. 431.

It is generally ſaid, that he had but two illegitimate children, Margaret Ducheſs of Parma, and Don John of Auſtria; but Imhof tells us, that Bernard Juſtiniani, in his Hiſtory of Spain, declares he had two more, viz. Priam Conrad of Auſtria, and another John of Auſtria, who died in 1530, at ſeven years of age (90). I fancy this Priam Conrad is the ſame with a certain Priamus Conrad whom I mentioned above (91), who was look'd upon as half-brother (by the mother's ſide) to Don John of Auſtria. I am to obſerve, that it was reported Charles V had the foul diſeaſe. *Imperator, ut nonnulli confirmant, ex morbo Gallico laborat. Accedit ad morbum hujus belli (Turcici) impendentis metus. Hanc ego in malis voluptatem capio, quod eum qui in nos tam crudelis fuit, non ſolum corpore ægrotare, verum etiam animo angi videre mihi videor* (92). i. e. " It is affirmed by ſome, that the Empe- " ror has the foul diſeaſe, and is at the ſame time a- " fraid of the Grand Signior's arms. It is a pleaſure " to me in the midſt of theſe evils, that the Monarch, " who exerciſed ſo much cruelty towards us, is not on- " ly ſick in body, but alſo tortured in mind." We find theſe words in a Letter of Bunel, dated from Venice in June 1532; and here follows Graverol's note on this paſſage. *An illud (*ex morbo Gallico*) κατὰ πόδα, an in ſenſu myſtico intelligendum ſit, diſquirunt multi: ſane quæ ſequuntur, Imperatorem ex morbo venereo laboraſſe confirmant: utatur quiſque hac in re judicio ſuo. Hoc unum ſcio, non omnes qui gravioris ſunt ſupercilii, rigidæ virtutis eſſe ſequaces: amavit Franciſcus I, amavit & Carolus V, & ne quid tam ſtrenuo rivali in ludo amatorio exprobaret, morbo vitium Gallico laboravit. Felix! & nimium felix, ſi graviori non laboraſſet, ſed norunt Hiſpani quid ſit* el remedio de Carlos quinto.

(90) Jacobus Wilhelmus Imhofius, *Notitia Germaniæ Procerum*, pag. 2. edit. Tubing. 1693.

(91) In the remark [C] of the article AUSTRIA (John of).

(92) Bunellus, Epiſt. 28. pag. 111, 112. edit. Toloſ. 1687.

[X] *It is pretended that his corpſe did not rot.*] Some Spaniſh Authors pretend that it was preſerved entire (93); and as it had not been embalmed, they aſcribe its continuing in this manner, free from putrefaction, to the ſanctity of his manners, and the purity and candor, which, according to them, ſhone forth in the conduct of this Prince. *Cum nullis balſamis aut medicamentis pollinctum fuerit regale cadaver, quæ à corruptione præſervare potuiſſent, ipſo Imperatore ſic ante obitum jubente; quid aliud dicere poſſumus, niſi eximium illius animi candorem & virtutis ſplendorem, cujus * ingens ſemper dedit ſpecimen, poſteris Deum oſtendere voluiſſe? cujus adhuc multo antea certiſſima indicia præſtolatus fuerat: nam cum anno 14 ab illius obitu, in cœnobio S. Juſti corpus exhumaretur, non ſolum integrum & incorruptum inventum eſt, ſed thymi quoque ramuſculi, quibus monachorum more reſperſum fuerat, virides & optimum odorem adhuc ſpirantes apparuerunt* (94). . . . *Anno* 1556, *cùm potentiſſimi Regis noſtræ Philippi juſſu anteceſſorum ſuorum regia cadavera ad inſigne illud Pantheonis monumentum traducerentur, invictiſſimi Imperatoris Caroli V cadaver adhuc incorruptum repertum eſt, labe nullâ, nullâ temporis edacitate, aut putredinis carie infectum; ſpectaculum ſanè mirificum, & planè admirandum poſt annos* 96 *incorruptum permanſiſſe, ut tradit P. F. Franciſcus de los Sanctos* in Deſcriptione Fabricæ D. Laurentii & Pantheonis (95). i. e. " Since the " royal corpſe was not embalmed, to preſerve it from " putrefaction, according to the Emperor's deſire be- " fore his death; what can we conclude, but that " God was deſirous of ſhewing to poſterity the native " candor of his mind, and that bright aſſemblage of " virtues, which were always ſo greatly conſpicuous " in him; and of this we have a ſignal example; for " when fourteen years after his death, his corpſe was " buried in the monaſtery of St. Juſtus, it was found " not only entire and without the leaſt putrefaction; " but even the ſprigs of thyme, which were ſtrewed " over it, according to the practice of the Monks, ap- " peared green, and diffuſed a moſt grateful odour . . , " *Anno* 1656, *by the command of our moſt potent King* " *Philip, the bodies of his royal predeceſſors were remov-* " *ed to that famous ſepulchral edifice, of Pantheon, the* " *corpſe of our invincible Emperor Charles V was found* " *unputrified, ſound and uninjured by time; a ſurprizing* " *ſpectacle, and worthy of admiration, that a corpſe* " *ſhould not rot in any manner during the courſe of* 96 *years* " *as Franciſcus de los Sanctos relates, in his* Deſcription " of the Fabricks of St. Laurence and Pantheon." * [The latter is a chapel in the Eſcurial in Spain, and is ſo called, becauſe it is built in a circular form like the Pantheon at Rome. It is thirty five foot in diameter, and thirty eight in height. The inſide of it is all of black marble, the Covers excepted, and a few ornaments made of jaſper ſtone and red marble. The black marble is enriched with various ornaments of architecture, which have a very beautiful aſpect. There are eight arches or vaults in this chapel. In one of theſe is the gate, and the altar in that oppoſite to it; and in the other ſix are the urns for the bodies of the Kings and Queens. There is place but for twenty ſix bodies, and there are * yet but eight depoſited in them.] Addit. by the Tranſl.

(93) See the citation (95).

* It is *ingentem* in the edition I tranſlate from, but it ſhould be *ingens*.

(94) Gaſpar. à Reies, *in Elyſio jucundar. Quæſt. Campo. Quæſt.* 34. num. 26. pag. m. 413.

(95) Idem, ibid.

* I write this in 1736.

ſince that time, this noble theme has exerciſed a great many pens [*Y*]. I forgot to obſerve, that it is ſaid Charles V aſpired to the Papal Throne, purely that he might experience every ſpecies of ſuperiority [*Z*]. Had he himſelf, when in that quality, met with the treatment he had exerciſed towards Clement VII, he would have been extremely ſorry that his prayers had been heard. It is pretended, that all the wild havock of Alaric and Totila, and in general all the cruelties exerciſed by the moſt barbarous Nations in Rome, fall greatly ſhort of the dreadful hoſtilities which this army of Charles V exerciſed in that city. There was a remarkable circumſtance on that occaſion. This Prince went into mourning for this victory; he forbid the ringing of the bells (*f*); and commanded proceſſions to be made, and prayers to be offered up in all Churches for the deliverance of the Pope his priſoner (*g*); and yet did not inflict the leaſt puniſhment on thoſe who treated the Pope and the City of Rome in ſo inhuman a manner (*h*). Theſe artifices of the moſt profound policy have been as much taken notice of, as thoſe he employed in the rebellion of Naples [*AA*]. Thoſe who declare this *Emperor to be ſuperior to the greateſt Monarchs that have lived ſince the Romans* (*i*), flatter him; for what did he complete? Did not the war which he raiſed in the Empire for the ſake of the Roman Catholick Religion, end to the advantage of the Proteſtants? and ſo far from making any conqueſt over France, he was not able to recover thoſe places which the French King had conquered. If his Succeſſor won back the greateſt part of them, it was by vertue of a treaty of peace in which the French ſuffered themſelves to be ſhamefully overreached and betrayed.

(*f*) La Mothe le Vayer, tom. 2. pag. 178.

(*g*) Maimb. *Hiſt. du Luther.* tom. 1. pag. 163.

(*h*) Le Mothe le Vayer, tom. 2. pag. 178.

(*i*) Bautru did this. *See* St. Evremont, *Oeuvres Melées*, tom. 1. on the word *Vaſt*, pag. 103. Dutch edit. tom. 4. pag. 21. Dutch edit. of 1726.

The Hiſtorians of the Emperor Charles V have imitated the Poets too much; and frequently crouded together a great number of prodigies, which, as they pretend, preceded his victories. This they have done eſpecially with reſpect to the battle of Mulberg, won by that Monarch the 24th of April 1547. They relate, that the Sun ſtood ſtill [*BB*]; and

[*Y*] *His Life . . . was publiſhed anno* 1559, *by . . Alfonſo Ulloa . . . and ſince that time, this noble theme has exerciſed a great many pens.*] Ludovico Dolce wrote the Hiſtory of that Emperor. It was alſo compoſed by William Zenocarus of Schawenburgh (96). *La Vida del Emperador Carlos V, por Don Antonio Figueroa*, was printed at Bruſſels in 4to, anno 1656. *La Vida y Hechos del Emperador Charles V, por Prudencio de Sandoval* was publiſhed at Pampelona, anno 1614, in two volumes, folio (97). I omit moſt of the reſt; for were I to enumerate all thoſe who have wrote on ſome parts of this Hiſtory, I ſhould never have done (98). I ſhall only mention William Godelevæus, who has drawn up the Hiſtory of the Abdication. But I muſt not paſs over James Maſenius, a German Jeſuit, who publiſhed at Colen, anno 1672, in 4to, *Anima Hiſtoriæ hujus temporis in junctо Caroli V & Ferdinandi I fratrum imperio repræſentata*. This work was worthy of being mentioned by the Jeſuit who continued Alegambe.

(96) In Latin, printed at Antwerp in 1596, folio.

(97) They had been printed before, one after the other, at Valladolid; the firſt in 1604, and the ſecond in 1606.

(98) Michael Hertzius, *in Biblioth. Germanica*, printed at Erfort in 1679, num. 811, *& ſeq.*

[*Z*] *It is ſaid that Charles V aſpired to the Papal Throne.*] Brantome, whom I have already cited very often, is the only Author who mentions this circumſtance. *Could he have accompliſhed*, ſays he (99), *the deſign he had of raiſing himſelf to the Papal Throne, he would have enlightened the world ſtill better, as he was all divine; but he could not obtain this by the ſuffrages of the Cardinals, as Duke Amadeus of Savoy did, who was elected, after which he withdrew to his Monaſtery at Ripaille, as the Emperor did to his. Nevertheleſs I have heard ſay, that had he then been as ſtrong in body as in mind, he would have marched to Rome with a powerful army, and have got himſelf elected Pope either by affection or by force of arms. But he attempted this deſign too late, he not being ſo vigorous as formerly; and indeed God would not permit it, for he would have made the Papal Throne hereditary (an unheard of attempt) in the Houſe of Auſtria. What a deſign was this! and how ambitious muſt this man have been! Not being able therefore to get himſelf elected Pope, he turned Friar, which was ſtooping very low. Could he, (like the Duke abovementioned) have had ſome experience of the Papal power, 'twould have been ſo much the better for him; and he then might have ſaid in his expiring moments, that he had paſſed through all the gradations of good fortune, and enjoyed the ſeveral orders of human grandeur.* Chancellor de Chiverni obſerves (100), that it was thought Philip II would reſign his crown, and procure himſelf a Cardinal's hat, in order that he might be elected Pope the firſt opportunity that offered.

(99) *Capit. Etrangers*, tom. 1. pag. 36.

(100) *Memoires*, pag. 293.

[*AA*] *He employed artifices . . . in the rebellion of Naples.*] He rewarded the chiefs of the rebels, but gave no recompence to thoſe who had ſerved him faithfully. *Omnes qui Cæſarem adjuvarunt, qui bona, qui vitam pro eo depoſuerunt, irrenumerati remanſerunt, qui adverſæ factionis hoſtes illius nati ſunt, quia arma contra illum tulerunt, omnes fuerunt optime & ſecundum vota ſua expediti.* i. e. "All thoſe who had aſſiſted the "Emperor, who had ſpent their eſtates and laid down "their lives to ſerve him, went unrewarded; whilſt all "who were of an oppoſite faction to, and bore arms a-"gainſt him, were gratified to the utmoſt of their wiſhes." This we find in Agrippa's Letters (101). Such a conduct ſeems imprudent at firſt ſight, as it ſerves only to diſguſt good ſubjects; and to embolden the factious. Nevertheleſs, experience muſt have thought the contrary, ſince the greateſt Princes have, and ſtill do, make uſe of this method. They neglect thoſe they think themſelves ſecure of, and endeavour chiefly to win over thoſe they ſuſpect. Complaints, like thoſe of the prodigal ſon, are often heard among the faithful part of ſubjects, after the commotions are appeaſed. In the time of Henry IV, the Partizans of the League were favoured with many more poſts and employments (a), than his old ſervants (102). This is a political maxim that remedies the preſent evil, which is the very thing the Monarch wants. He runs a hazard with regard to future times, but hopes that God will then order every thing in his favour; and, at the worſt, this is not a certain evil.

(101) In the 10th Letter of Book 7. pag. 1010. It was written to Agrippa by a Friend, and is dated from Ratiſbon the 17th of July 1532.

(102) See the *Apology for this Prince*, aſcribed to the Ducheſs de Rohan. It is printed with the *Journal of Henry III*, edition of 1693. I ſpeak of this in the Article PARTHENAI (Catherine of) Remark [*E*]. See alſo the Remark [*P*] of the Article HENRY IV.

a. §. Let us add what John Nerizan * has obſerved on the ſame ſubject: *Quandoque*, ſays this facetious Writer, *Princeps ut inimicum vincat obſequio . . . eum plus extollit ſervitore ſuo, adeò quod quandoque boni ſervitores indignati dicant, ſi quiſpiam à Principe noſtro velit quicquam obtinere, oportet quod in eum aliquam committat proditionem.* i. e. "Sometimes too a Prince "overcomes his enemy by ſoothing methods . . extols "him more than he does his own ſervant; ſo that good "ſervants may ſometimes ſay out of indignation, if "any perſon wants to obtain any thing from our So-"vereign, he muſt betray him." La Ruffia, in his Diſcourſe ſeems to have had an eye to theſe words.

* L. IV. n. 152. of the *Forêt Nuptiale.*

† L. I. chap. 5. of the *Confeſſ. de Sancy.*

[*BB*] *His Hiſtorians . . . . . croud together a great number of prodigies. . . . They relate that the Sun ſtood ſtill.*] I have not the Spaniſh original of d'Avila's relation, but here follows the Latin Tranſlation of it (103). The Author ſpeaks as tho' he had been an eye-witneſs to it. *Frederico etiam futura clades evidenti prodigio denunciata eſt. Sol enim velut ſanguinolentus apparuit, &, quod mirabilius eſt, perinde ac ſi curſum tardaſſet, ſpatiumque diei addidiſſet, quum intentius intueremur, altior, quàm pro horarum ratione ferri viſus eſt. Conſtans omnium hac de re optime eſt, nec ego certè refellere auſim* (104). i. e. "The impending de-"feat of Frederic was foretold by a manifeſt prodigy: "for the Sun appeared as tho' it had been bloody; "and, what is more wonderful, as tho' it had retard-"ed

(103) By Gulielmus Malinæus.

(104) Ludovic. ab Avila & Zuniga, *Comment. de Bello Germanic.* lib. 2. folio 126. edit. Antwerp. 1550.

and that God to favour his Catholic Majesty, wrought the same miracle as he had done for Joshua. A prophecy was spread abroad, which assured this Emperor, that he would defeat the French and the Turks; conquer Palestine, &c. [*CC*]. We shall take some notice

" ed its course and lengthened the day, it seemed, " when we surveyed it nearer, to be higher than was " natural. This event is believed by every one, nor " dare I disprove it." Florimond de Remond relates the same passage (105) according to the French Translation published of this Spanish piece. He has also cited the very words (in Italian) of Baptista Gribaldi, who had been present in the engagement; and the Spanish words of Gonçalo de Illescas, extracted from the second part of his Pontifical History, and the Latin verses of an anonymous Writer; and endeavours to prove this incident true. He has taken advantage, among other things, of this, viz. that tho' Sleidan appears very much exasperated against Lewis d'Avila, he yet does not refute him with regard to this *stopping of the Sun*. But Father Maimbourg has justly laughed at this Spanish Dream, as well as some others which relate to the same battle, and has combated them by some arguments (106). He did not forget to relate, " that the Duke of Alva, a man of great solidity, " and who was far from being amused with trifles, " shewed plainly that he did not give any credit to " any thing that was related concerning this pretend- " ed miracle; when being come into France, there to " espouse (in the name of King Philip) Princess Eli- " zabeth, daughter to Henry II, he replied pleasantly " to that Prince who put some questions to him about " it; that he was so much employed that day, about " what was doing upon earth, that he did not take no- " tice of what was doing in heaven." Florimond de Remond relates this answer of the Duke of Alva, and informs his readers, that he had been told it " by a " Biscayan Gentleman, Governor of Acqs, who " spake and lived after the ancient fashion in that " time, very privately, and in great favour, with the " King (107)." This we should take particular notice of; this Historian had not read this particular in any book, but had heard it from a Gentleman who was then at the Court of Henry II. He perhaps is the first Author who has published it, and from whom all the rest took it; and perhaps had he not spoke of it, we should not have found it in the History of the Duke of Alva (108), which was published not long since in French, as the translation of a Latin book printed at Salamanca in 1669, under the title of *Vita Ferdinandi Toletani Ducis Albani*. The translator of this work assures us, *that he has done it with all the accuracy possible; that he has not introduced any thoughts or expressions of his own into it, and has not suppressed any part of the body of the History, nor of the Incidents.*

[*CC*] *A prophecy was spread abroad, which assured this Emperor, that he would defeat the French, the Turks; conquer Palestine &c.*] Antonius Pontius, who had carried arms in the expedition of Tunis under Charles V, writ an account of it, which was not published till a year since (109). He says in his Proem, that to raise the courage of the soldiers, he will relate two things; the first is an old Prophecy; the second is a discourse of an apparition, which revealed it self at the time of Odet de Foix's expedition into the Kingdom of Naples. But we will leave what relates to the apparition, and only relate what concerns the Prophecy. *Duo hæc ante prælibentur, non quod Historiæ inserviunt, sed ut animi nostrorum militum alacres nunc his auditis ad arma fiant alacriores. Quorum illud unum imprimis subvenit, & ut vulgatissimum ita quoque antiquissimum vatis illius, quæ Prophetia dicitur, verbum divinum, quod quidem tale circumfertur; Carolum Philippi filium ex natione Lilii, ut ejus verba præstringam, post Gallos Hispanosque domitos Romam quoque & Florentiam congregato magno exercitu Regem Græcorum vocari, indeque post victos Turcas, Chaldæos, Palestinosque, sanctam Hierusalem recuperaturum, atque inibi a Dei nuncio coronatum in summi principis sinu vitam expiraturum, facietque prius edictum, ut qui sanctæ crucis signum non adoraverit morte puniatur* (110). i. e. " I shall first present the Reader with " the two following incidents, not as tho' they were " absolutely necessary to the History, but in order " that they may enflame still more the courage of our " valiant soldiers. The first that occurs, is that well- " known and very ancient Prophecy, which is as fol- " lows; viz. that the son of Charles Philip, of the nati- " on of the Lilly (to use the Prophet's words) after hav- " ing overcome the French and Spaniards as also " Rome and Florence, assembling a mighty army, " would be called King of the Greeks; and that af- " ter subduing the Turks, and the inhabitants of " Chaldea and Palestine, he would recover the Holy " Jerusalem, and being there crowned by the messen- " ger of God, would expire in the bosom of the " supreme Prince; but he should first publish an edict " or decree, that whoever did not adore the sign of " the Holy Cross, should be put to death." Compare this with a Prophecy, which David Pareus inserted in his Commentary on the Revelations anno 1598, and you will there see a specimen of the frauds which are committed on those occasions. Comiers relates (111), that being in Orange in 1660, he borrowed this book of Pareus, printed at Heidelberg; and that in page 930, he there read a Prophecy which the Author had found in the house of an Officer, (*in ædibus Præpositi Saleziani*), and contained the following words: *Surget Rex ex natione illustrissimi Lilii, habens frontem longam, supercilia alta, oculos longos, nasumque Aquilinum: Is congregabit exercitum magnum, & omnes tyrannos Regni sui destruet, & morte percutiet omnes fugientes montibus, & cavernis sese abscondentes à facie ejus. Nam ut Sponsus Sponsæ, ita erit justitia ei associata, cum illis usque ad quadragesimum annum deducet bellum subjugando Insulanos, Hispanos, & Italos. Romam & Florentiam destruet & comburet, poteritque sal seminari super terram illam. Clericos qui sedem Petri invaserunt morte percutiet: eodemque anno duplicem coronam obtinebit. Postremum mare transiens cum exercitu magno, intrabit Græciam, & Rex Græcorum vocabitur. Turcas & Barbaros subjugabit, faciendo edictum*; Quicunque Crucifixum non adoraverit, morte morietur. *Et non erit qui resistere poterit ei, quia brachium sanctum à Domino semper cum eo erit, & Dominium Terræ possidebit. His factis Sanctorum requies Christianorum vocabitur* &c. i. e. " A Monarch shall arise out of the nation of the most " illustrious Lilly, having a long forehead, lofty eye- " brows, large eyes, a Roman nose: This King shall " assemble a mighty army, and extirpate all the ty- " rants of his Kingdoms; and shall kill all who fly " to the mountains, and hide themselves in caverns " from his face. For as a bridegroom is united to " his bride, so shall justice be to him; and with them " he shall carry on war to that fortieth year, subduing " the Islanders, the Spaniards and Italians. He shall " burn and destroy Rome and Florence, so that salt " may be sowed on the spot where they stand. He " shall kill such of the Clergy as have usurped St. " Peter's chair, and the same year shall obtain a dou- " ble crown. Lastly, crossing the sea with a great " army, he shall enter Greece, and be called King " of the Greeks. He shall subdue the Turks and " Barbarians, publishing a decree, *that whoever* " *does not worship the crucified Saviour shall be put to* " *death*. And no one will be able to resist him; " because the holy arm of the Lord will be always " with him, and he shall possess the Sovereignty of " the earth. These things being done, he shall be " called the rest of the Holy Christians or Saints, " &c." Comiers gives a French version of this, both in prose and verse, and adds (112) *that he had met with the same Prophecy, but expressed in other words, in the ninth volume of St. Austin's works, in the middle of the Treatise of Antichrist* (113), *page* 454; *printed at Lyons, in* 1586; and I am to observe, that he applies both these Prophecies to Lewis XIV. *As the world*, says he (114), *cannot be conquered in one day; we ought at least to hope, that next year* (1666) *our mighty Monarch will lay the first foundations of that universal Empire.* But consider still more attentively the fraudulent conduct of the flatterers of Charles V; they laid hold of the first of these two predictions; and in order to make them suit this Emperor, they curtailed one part, and enlarged another part of it. They foisted in his name and that of his father, as also the conquest of France; they took away the Roman nose,

(105) Flor. de Remond, *Hist. l'Heresie*, lib. 3. cap. 16. pag. m. 362.

(106) Maimbourg, *Hist. du Lutheran.* tom. 2. pag. 55, & *seq.* Dutch edit. See also the *Pensées diverses sur les Cometes*, pag. 274, 275.

(107) Flor. de Remond, *Hist. de l'Heresie*, lib. 3. cap. 16. pag. m. 362.

(108) Cap. 10. of lib. 3. pag. 218. Paris edit. for John Guignard 1696.

(109) At Leyden 1698, in the *Veteris ævi Analecta* of Matthæus.

(110) Anton. Pontius Consentinus, in *Hariadeno Barbarossa*, pag. 2.

(111) Claude Comiers, Priest, Provost or Superior of the Collegiate Church of Ternan, and Canon in the Cathedral of Ambrun, *de la Nature & presage des Cometes*, pag. 469, edit. de Lion. 1665.

(112) Ibid. pag. 478.

(113) See concerning this Treatise, Audigier, *de l'Origine des Francois & de leur Empire*, tom. 2. pag. 465, & *seq.*

(114) Comiers, *de la Nature des Comètes*, p. 480.

(115) I write this in 1699.

tice of a lilly which this Emperor had ſet in the garden of his ſolitude [*DD*]. I know not whether any one has reflected on a remarkable circumſtance that happened during the ſiege of Mets. Charles V had not formed any enterprize that was more juſt than this, and which at the ſame time was more unfortunate [*EE*]. I muſt not omit the obſervation he made to Francis I. *We both*, ſays he, *command over Nations of ſo headſtrong, ſo turbulent and fiery a nature, that in caſe we did not now and then engage in ſome wars to amuſe them, and to weaken their warlike impetuoſity; our own ſubjects will turn their arms againſt us, which will be much worſe* (*k*). He left his ſon ſome inſtructions, wherein, among other counſels, he gives him the following: "to lower the ſails when the ſtorm "is too violent; not to oppoſe the wrath of the Fates; to ſhun thoſe blows by artifice "which cannot be eluded otherwiſe; to ſuffer them to paſs; to remove on one ſide, and "watch for ſome favourable revolution, and for better times (*l*)." He himſelf put this counſel in practice *at the battle of Paſſaw, which would have reflected ſhame on the Empire, had not the Emperor been obliged to this more out of neceſſity than inclination. He practiſed it at the peace of Soiſſons, in which the ſucceſs of his arms was interrupted by his want of money; and he was obliged to offer himſelf as an hoſtage to the Germans, who otherwiſe had deſigned to ſeize his perſon* (*m*). Himſelf and his ſon imagined themſelves very capable of ſnatching opportunities, this being one of their common expreſſions, *Yo y el tiempos para dos otrõs* (*n*). The Author now cited by me (*o*), relates a particular which proves the great fondneſs this Emperor had for Aſtronomy, and his intrepidity

(*k*) Matthieu, *Hiſt. de la Paix*, lib. 1. Narrat. 2. pag. m. 66, 67.

(*l*) Silhon, *Miniſtre d'Etat.* tom. 1. lib. 3. cap. 9. pag. m. 361.

(*m*) Ibid.

(*n*) Ibid.

(*o*) *See* Melchior Adam, in the *Life of Philippus Apianus*, pag. 349 of *Vitæ Germanorum Philoſophorum.*

and ſome other features of the face. I my ſelf have met with ſome credulous people, infatuated with Prophecies, who during the laſt war (115), applied, as well as they could, all this pretended oracle to his Britannic Majeſty King William. To conclude, obſerve what Pontus confeſſes, viz. that the Motive of his publiſhing that Prophecy, was to enflame the courage of Charles the Vth's ſoldiers; and be aſſured, that moſt of the inventors and encouragers of Predictions, have no other deſign but merely to amuſe the common people, and to fire them with ſuch paſſions as may ſuit their purpoſe; and to ſucceed the better in their deſigns, they ſuppreſs truths and advance falſities.

(115) I write this in 1699.

[*DD*] *We ſhall take ſome notice of a Lilly the Emperor had ſet in the garden of his Solitude.*] He ſet it at the end of Auguſt 1558, and died the 21ſt of February following. *In the moment when he expired, the root of this Lilly ſhot forth on a ſudden a ſtalk or ſtem two cubits in length, with a wonderful flower, as full blown and as fragrant as thoſe flowers are in Spain, in their uſual ſeaſon.* I borrow the expreſſions which were employed by the ſuperior of the fathers of the Oratory at Paris in his ſpeech to the Queen of Spain, an. 1679 (116). I ſhall omit the ridiculous omen which he finds in this vegetation (117); but muſt obſerve, that Count de la Roca does not relate this incident with the ſame circumſtances. His words are theſe. "An impartial Author relates, that he had there ſeen "the root of a Lilly in a little garden, into which "the windows of one of the Emperor's apartments "looked, which, in the beginning of Spring, threw "out two ſtems, one whereof burſt its films, diſcloſed "its flower, diffuſed a grateful odour, and at laſt died; "whilſt the other, tho' ſet at the ſame time, and "not ſo forward, continued ſtill in the bud; at "which many wondered, becauſe it did not want "either water or ſun; and the very night that the "ſoul of this Emperor, left the priſon of its body, "this beautiful flower opened its beauties, was cropt "with reſpect and admiration, and placed on the "high altar (118)." The greateſt part of the *marvellous* in the harangue made by the ſuperior of the Fathers of the Oratory vaniſhes, when we examine with attention the relation of the Spaniſh Hiſtorian. I do not know this *impartial Author*, who is cited; but I imagine, that either he or Count de la Roca were copied by Famianus Strada. This the reader well eaſily believe, if he compares the Count's words with the following Latin paſſage. *Nec illud admiratione caruit. In Caroli, quem dicebam hortulo, bini eodem tempore ſtyli emiſerat candens lilium. Alter Majo menſe, uti aſſolet, calice delucente floruit; alter quamvis eadem cultura provocatus, tumorem tamen ac partus ſigna vere toto atque æſtate ſuſtinuit; eademque demùm nocte, quâ Caroli animus integumento ſeſe corporis evolvit, ille explicato repente folliculo, intempeſtivâ nempe atque inſperatâ germinatione promiſit florem. Id verò & obſervatum ab omnibus, & lilio ſuper aram templi maximâ ad ſpectandum propoſito, fauſti candidique ominis loco acceptum eſt* (119). i. e. "Nor did what "follows paſs unadmired. In Charles's little garden, "a white lilly threw out two ſtems at the ſame time. "The one, as is uſual, appeared in bloom in the "month of May; whilſt the other, tho' raiſed at "the ſame time and in the ſame manner, it never-"theleſs ſwelled and ſeemed as tho' it were going to "bloſſom, during all the ſpring and ſummer following; "at laſt, the ſame night in which the ſoul of Charles "diveſted itſelf of its tabernacle of the body; this ſtem "burſting on a ſudden its films, and budding forth "immaturely and unexpectedly, promiſed a flower. "This was taken notice of by every one; and the "Lilly being placed on the high altar ſo as to be "ſeen, was conſidered as a propitious omen." I here call to mind an obſervation which I read in a Work of Mrs. Schurman. She tells us (120), that at the time that du Lignon, one of Labadie's diſciples, was endeavouring to ſettle his ſect in Herford, there happened three prodigies. The firſt was, that the trunk of a tree which had been withered four years ſhot forth on a ſudden ſome boughs four or five foot long, all cloathed with leaves. This happened in autumn, and in a covered ſpot of ground, near the Church, which was afterwards made uſe of by the Labadiſts. The ſecond Prodigy was, that all the trees in the Princeſs's garden were in bloom in autumn, when ſhe promiſed to protect their little Church. The third was, that a ſwarm of bees came and ſettled in the ſame garden, and that no body knew whence they came. Now all this, according to this ſyſtem or hypotheſis of omens, ſhould naturally have promiſed a long and glorious eſtabliſhment; and yet this ſect was ſoon forced to leave Herford.

(116) His whole ſpeech is inſerted in Part 2. of the *Mercure Galant*, for October 1679. See the *Penſées ſur les Cometes*, pag. 294.

(117) See *Penſées ſur les Cometes*, ibid.

(118) Count de la Roca's *Hiſtory of Charles V*, pag. m. 349, 350.

(119) Famian. Strada, *de Bello Belgico*, Decad. 1. lib. 1. pag. m. 16.

(120) Anna Maria à Schurman, in cap. 2. Part. 2. Euclerias.

[*EE*] *Charles V had not formed any enterprize more juſt . . . than* the ſiege of Metz, *. . . and which at the ſame time was more unfortunate.*] Henry II, in conjunction with ſome Princes of Germany, had been declared protector of the liberties of Germany (121); and he boaſted his never having acted but as ſuch (122). Nevertheleſs, he ſeized upon Metz, an Imperial city: he took away its liberties, and that by the moſt flagrant treachery. No one can read without horror, the pretended ſtratagem that was employed to ſubject this little Republic, who looked upon this Monarch no otherwiſe than as its guardian and defender. It was then people had juſt reaſon to cry out, who will watch the guardians; *Sed quis cuſtodiet ipſos cuſtodes* (123)? Thus, Charles V was juſtly authorized to reunite, to the body of the Empire, a city which had been ſevered from it ſo ignominiouſly. He employed the fineſt of his forces for that purpoſe, and yet miſcarried ſhamefully (124), inſomuch that at laſt, at the peace of Munſter, the Empire was forced to reſign all claim to that City, and give it up to France. Now this Emperor had been vaſtly ſucceſsful, in ſuch enterprizes as were altogether unjuſt.

(121) Mezerai, *Abregé Chron.* tom. 4. pag. 670, *ad ann.* 1552.

(122) *See* Sleidan, lib. 24. fol. m. 695.

(123) Juven. Sat. 6. ver. 345.

(124) There were ſpread at that time a thouſand pieces both in proſe and verſe, as glorious to the French, as they were injurious to the Emperor; and malicious people took occaſion from thence to change his motto *plus ultra*, to *plus citra*. *Hiſtoire du Duc d'Albe*, lib. 3. cap. 24. pag. 284.

dity at the same time. I must not forget the magnificent reception he met with from the Fuggers, when he lodged at their house in his way through Augsburg [*FF*].

(125) In the article FUGGER, remark [*A*].

(126) *Journal des Savans, for* 8 *Jan.* 1685. p. m. 12. in the Extract of the 4th Part of *Entretiens sur les Vies & Ouvrages des Peintres.*

[*FF*] *I must not forget the magnificent reception he met with from the Fuggers.*] We shall speak of their riches below (125); here follows a noble specimen of it. "Felibien (126) relates a very pretty incident relating to "the Fuggers, those famous German Merchants, who, "to shew their gratitude to the Emperor Charles V, "who, at his return from Tunis, had done them the "honour to lodge at their house as he passed thro' "Ausburg; among other magnificent things with "which they regaled him, caused a faggot of Cin-"namon, (a commodity of very great price) to be "put into the chimney, and set fire to it, the Em-"peror having promised them a very considerable sum "of money (127)."

(127) See the article HADRIAN or ADRIAN, the Emperor, citation (22)

CHARLTON or CHARLETON (WALTER), an eminent Physician and Author [*A*] in the 17th Century, was descended of an antient family, and son of Walter Charlton M. A. Vicar of Ilminster, and afterwards Rector of Shipton-Mallet in Somersetshire. He was born at Shipton-Mallet February the 2d 1619, and was entered a Commoner of Magdalen Hall in the University of Oxford in Lent-Term 1637, under the tuition of Mr. John Wilkins, afterwards Bishop of Chester, by whose instruction he made a progress in Logic and Philosophy beyond his years (*a*). But his genius soon after inclined him to the study of Physic, in which he made such great advances, that by the favour of King Charles I he was actually created Doctor of that Faculty in February 1642, as Mr. Wood tells us in his *Athenæ Oxonienses* (*b*), or January the 16th as the same Writer affirms in his *Fasti* (*c*). About the same time he was made one of the Physicians in ordinary to his Majesty, "he being then, says Mr. Wood (*d*), observed by "those, that knew him, to set an high value upon his own worth and parts, as he al-"ways afterwards did." Upon the declining of the King's cause he retired to London, where

(*a*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 1112. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*b*) *Ubi supra.*

(*c*) Col. 28.

(*d*) *Athen. Oxon, ubi supra.*

[*A*] *An eminent . . . Author.*] We shall give a Catalogue of his Works as follows: I. *Spiritus Gorgonicus vi suâ saxipartâ exutus, sive de causis, signis, & sanatione Lithiasews.* Leyden 1650 in 8vo. This Book is usually called *De Lithiasi Diatriba* (1). II. *The darkness of Atheism discovered by the light of nature. A Physico-Theological Treatise.* London 1651 in 4to. III. *The Ephesian and Cimmerian Matrons, two remarkable examples of the power of Love and Wit.* London 1653 and 1658 in 8vo. IV. Physiologia Epicuro-Gassendo-Charltoniana: or *a Fabric of natural Science erected upon the most ancient Hypothesis of Atoms.* London 1654 in fol. V. *The Immortality of the human Soul demonstrated by Reasons natural.* London 1657 in 4to. VI. *Oeconomia Animalis novis Anatomicorum inventis, indeque desumptis modernorum Medicorum Hypothesibus Physicis superstructa & mechanicè explicata.* London 1658 in 12mo. Amsterdam 1659 in 12mo. Leyden 1678 in 12mo. Hague 1681 in 12mo. It is likewise added to the last edition of *Gulielmi Cole de secretione animali cogitata* (2). VII. *Natural History of Nutrition, Life, and voluntary motion containing all the new discoveries of Anatomists* &c. London 1658 in 4to. VIII. *Exercitationes Physico-Anatomicæ de Oeconomiâ Animali.* London 1659 in 8vo. Printed afterwards several times beyond sea (3). This Book is omitted in Father Niceron's Catalogue of our Author's Works in his *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Hommes Illustres*, Tom. XVIII (4). IX. *Exercitationes Pathologicæ in quibus morborum pænè omnium Natura, generatio, & causæ ex novis Anatomicorum inventis sedulò inquiruntur.* London 1660, and 1661 in 4to. X. *Character of his most sacred Majesty Charles II. King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland.* London 1660 in about one sheet in 4to. XI. *Disquisitiones duæ Anatomico-Physicæ; altera Anatome pueri de cælo tacti, altera de Proprietatibus Cerebri humani.* London 1664 in 8vo. XII. Chorea Gigantum, *or the most famous Antiquity of Great Britain, vulgarly called* Stone-henge, *standing on Salisbury-Plain, restored to the Danes.* London 1663 in nine sheets in 4to. Inigo Jones Esq; Surveyor-General of the Works to King James I. Queen Anne, Prince Henry, and Christian IV King of Denmark, and afterwards to King Charles I, drew up at the command of King James I in 1620 a discourse concerning Stone-henge, wherein he concludes, that it was a Temple built by the Romans while in Britain, and dedicated by them to *Cælus* or *Cælum*, from whom the Antients imagined all things derived their origin. This discourse being left imperfect at his death in the year 1652, it came into the hands of Mr. John Webb of Burleigh in Somersetshire, who compleated and published it with this title, *The most notable Antiquity of Great Britain, vulgarly called* Stone-henge *on Salisbury Plain restored.* London 1655, in fifteen sheets in fol. Dr. Charlton being not at all satisfied with that discourse, sent a copy of it to *Olaus Wormius*, a celebrated Antiquarian in Denmark, who writing his sentiments upon it in several letters to Dr. Charlton, he compiled the Book abovementioned, with the assistance of the Books of Wormius and other Danish Authors. *This Book*, says Mr. Wood (5), *tho' exploded by most persons when it was published, yet some of the most noted Antiquaries of this nation, particularly Sir William Dugdale, did applaud it, and hath said in my hearing more than once, that he verily believed that Dr. Charlton was in the right in what he delivered in the said* Chorea Gigantum. But Mr. Webb undertook the defence of Mr. Inigo Jones's Book in his *Vindication of* Stone-henge restored, *in which the orders and rules of Architecture observed by the Romans are discussed* &c. London 1665 in fol. XIII. *Onomasticon Zoicon, plerorumque Animalium differentias & nomina propria pluribus linguis exponens. Cui accedunt Mantissa Anatomite, & quædam de variis Fossilium generibus.* London 1668 and 1671 in 4to. Oxon 1677 in fol. XIV. *Two Philosophical Discourses; the first concerning the different wits of men; the second concerning the Mystery of Vintners, or a Discourse of the various sicknesses of wines, and their respective remedies at this day commonly used* &c. London 1668, 1675, 1692 in 8vo. XV. *De Scorbuto Liber singularis, Cui accessit Epiphonema in Medicastros.* London 1671 in 8vo. Leyden 1672 in 12°. This Book contains several remarkable things (6). XVI. *Natural History of the Passions.* London 1674 in 8vo. XVII. *Enquiries into humane Nature in six Anatomy-Prelections in the new Theatre of the Royal College of Physicians in London.* London 1680 in 4to. XVIII. *Oratio Anniversaria habita in Theatro inclyti Collegii Medicorum Londinensis 5to Augusti 1680. in Commemorationem Beneficiorum a Doctore Harvey aliisque præstitorum.* London 1680 in 4to. XIX. *The harmony of natural and positive Divine Laws.* London 1682 in 8vo. XX. *Three Anatomic Lectures concerning, 1. The motion of the blood through the veins and arteries. 2. The organic structure of the heart. 3. The efficient cause of the heart's pulsation. Read in the 19th, 20th, and 21st day of March 1682 in the Anatomic Theatre of his Majesty's Royal College of Physicians in London.* London 1683 in 4to. XXI. *Inquisitio Physica de causis Catameniorum, & Uteri Rheumatismo, in quo probatur sanguinem in animali fermentescere nunquam.* London 1685 in 8vo. XXII. *Gulielmi Ducis Novicastrensis vita.* London 1668 in fol. This is a translation from the English original written by Margaret, the 2d wife of William D. of Newcastle, and printed at London 1667 in fol. under the following title; *The Life of the thrice noble, high, and puissant Prince, William Cavendishe, Duke, Marquis, and Earl of Newcastle,* &c. *written by the thrice noble, illustrious, and excellent Princess, Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle,*

(1) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 1112. 2d edit. London 1721.

(2) Niceron, *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Hommes Illustres*, tom. 18. pag. 112. edit. de Paris 1732.

(3) Wood, *ubi supra.*

(4) Pag. 111, & *seq.*

(5) *Ubi supra*, pag. 1113.

(6) Niceron, *ubi supra.*

where he practiſed Phyſic, and became one of the College of Phyſicians. After the Reſtoration he was appointed Phyſician in ordinary to King Charles II, and was choſen Fellow of the Royal Society. September the 30th 1689 he was elected Preſident of the College of Phyſicians, in which ſtation he continued till the year 1691. He retired afterwards to the Iſle of Jerſey (*e*); and died very aged. Mr. Wood ſaid of him during his life (*f*), "that he was a learned but unhappy man, aged and grave, yet too much given to "romances;" and that he wrote many books; *but great part of them collected from other Authors.*

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

(*f*) Ibid.

Newcaſtle, his wife. XXIII. *A Ternary of Paradoxes, of the magnetic cure of wounds, Nativity of Tartar in Wine, and Image of God in Man.* London 1650 in 4to. This was tranſlated from the Latin original of John Baptiſt Van Helmont. XXIV. *The errors of Phyſicians concerning defluxions called* Deliramenta Catarrhi. London 1650 in 4to. This was likewiſe tranſlated from Van Helmont, and printed with the *Ternary of Paradoxes.* XXV. *The Morals.* London 1655 in 4to. *written,* ſays Mr. Wood (6), *by Epicurus,* but Father Niceron (7) obſerves that this is a miſtake; ſince that Philoſopher left no work behind him; but that it was probably extracted from Diogenes Laertius and other Writers of the ſame kind, like the Baron *des Coutures*'s Book, which was publiſhed ſeveral years after under the ſame title. XXXVI. *The Life of Marcellus,* tranſlated from Plutarch, and printed in the *ſecond Volume of Plutarch's Lives, tranſlated from the Greek by ſeveral hands*; London 1684 in 8vo. T.

(6) *Ubi ſupra,* col. 1114.

(7) *Ubi ſupra,* pag. 1174.

CHARNACE (*a*) (BARON DE) executed ſeveral embaſſies very ſucceſsfully under Lewis XIII [*A*]. He was as brave in the field as ſkilful in negotiations; and he was, in Holland, at the ſame time, Embaſſador and Colonel. He was killed in the latter capacity, at the laſt ſiege of Breda in 1637 [*B*]. The ſtory told in the *Mercure Galant* [*C*] relating to the unhappy accident which the wife occaſioned in him, is entirely falſe.

(*a*) He was baptized *Hercules.*

[*A*] *He executed ſeveral Embaſſies very ſucceſsfully, under Lewis XIII.*] "He had been nominated by "Cardinal Richelieu, a circumſtance that makes us "entertain, at firſt ſight, a favourable opinion of the "Embaſſador. But he of whom I ſpeak, had no oc"caſion for ſuch an advantage. The negotiations he "has carried on with Guſtavus Adolphus King of "Sweden, which gave riſe to the treaty of Berwalde, "concluded the 23d of January 1631, and which had "ſo great an effect in Germany, are very convincing "proofs, tho' there had been no other. It was he "who occaſioned the Swedes to march into Germany; "and who laid the firſt foundation of the alliance, "that has been ſo advantageous as well as glorious "to the two Crowns, and which is ſtill ſo to the "Crown of Sweden. He continued to negotiate with "the ſame King, and with the Chancellor Oxenſtern, "till after the battle of Lutzen, which obliged him "to retire to France. He alſo had negotiated with "the Elector of Bavaria at Munich, but with little "ſucceſs, which was owing to the moroſeneſs of St. "Etienne (1), a relation of father Joſeph; who be"ing jealous to ſee a man of greater abilities than "himſelf at this Court, traverſed all his negotiations "to the great prejudice of their Sovereign. It was "*Charnaſſe,* who ſigned the 25th of April 1634, the "treaty of the Hague, after which it was thought "proper, to conclude that of the 8th of January fol"lowing, where he bore the title of one of his Ma"jeſty's commiſſaries. By the treaty of 1634, the "King promiſed to raiſe, and keep in pay, in the "ſervice of the States, a regiment of foot and horſe, "the command of which was given to *Charnaſſé,* "who being a military officer as well as an Embaſ"ſador, was reſolved to act in both characters; "and going to the laſt ſiege at Breda, he was killed "in the trenches (2)." As we do not find in Wicquefort, the ſubject of Charnace's embaſſy to Holland, we muſt look for it elſewhere. In peruſing the life of Cardinal de Richelieu, we here find that the motive of Charnace's journey to Holland, was to divert the States from liſtning to the propoſals of a truce which the Spaniards made them; *He directed ſo artfully the inclination of the* Directors and Deputies of the States; *and ſet the artifices and evil deſigns of the Spaniards in ſo ſtrong a light, . . . that they at laſt reſolved . . . to prefer as much out of neceſſity as from reaſon, the carrying the war to the concluding of a truce. To which the order given Charnace did not contribute a little, viz. not only to ſollicite the Prince of Orange, whoſe intereſt it was (as was well known) to prolong the war; but alſo to offer the States a ſuccour of ten or twelve thouſand Swedes, a warlike nation, and in alliance with France; who had made a very advantageous uſe of it within theſe three years, or thereabouts, when Guſtavus Adolphus King of Sweden had made an inroad into Germany, and filled that great Empire with terror* (3).

(1) Wicquefort, p. 780. of tom. 1. of the *Traité de l'Ambaſſadeur,* ſays as follows: Charnace and St. Etienne being at the Bavarian Court, on the part of France, in 1632, carried matters to ſuch great lengths, that they were going to fight a duel; ſo that quarrelling in this manner, they did no good at the Elector's Court.

(2) Idem, tom. 2. pag. 442.

(3) Auberi, *Hiſt. du Cardinal de Richelieu,* lib. 4. cap. 42. pag. m. 390, 391.

[*B*] *He was killed, acting in his poſt as Colonel, at the laſt ſiege of Breda in* 1637.] We have ſeen in the preceding remark, what Mr. de Wicquefort ſaid on this head; let us now add the words of another Author (4). "Monſieur de Charnace did all that "lay in his power, to engage the Prince of Orange to "beſiege another town, of greater importance to the "common advantage of the Allies, than Breda, in "which this Embaſſador had greater concern than "he imagined, ſince that ſiege was to be fatal to "him, he having been ſhot in the head by a muſket"ball, as he was attacking a horn-work. He was "very much regretted by the Court, as well for the "good qualities he poſſeſt, and for the great ſervices "he did his country, as for his being related to Mar"ſhal de Brezé, by Jane de Brezé his wife. His "heart was brought into France, and lies in the "Carmelite Church at Antwerp, with an epitaph over "it, which fixes his death to the firſt of Septem"ber."

(4) Ibid. lib. 5. cap. 52. pag. 596, 597.

[*C*] *The ſtory told in the* Mercure Galant, *relating to the unhappy effect which the news of the death of Baron de Charnace's wife produced on him, is entirely falſe.*] Abbé Deſlandes, chief Archdeacon and Canon of Treguier, ſent a letter to the *Mercure Galant* (5), in which he aſſerts, that *Charnace being in Germany with Guſtavus,* was ſo affected with the news that was brought of the death of his wife, who was of the houſe of Brezé, that he was ſtruck dumb, and never recovered his ſpeech afterwards. It is plain to every one that this is an untruth. Guſtavus loſt his life in the battle of Lutzen, anno 1632; and Charnacé diſplayed all the maſter-ſtrokes of his rhetoric, in 1634, to prevent the concluding of a truce with Spain. Now could a dumb man do this? It is not poſſible to rectify this fiction, by changing the time and place where Charnacé heard of his wife's death; for we have ſeen, that he endeavoured to diſſuade the Prince of Orange, not from beſieging Breda but another town, the taking of which might be more diſadvantageous to Spain. His advice was ineffectual; Breda was beſieged, and Charnacé loſt his life at it. Where then ſhall we find the time when he was dumb? We ſhall take notice in another place (6), that Abbot Deſlandes has related a ſtory equally as falſe, with regard to Fernelius.

(5) In November 1693.

(6) In the remark [*G*] of the article of FERNELIUS.

(*a*) Thuanus, lib. 53. pag. m. 1092, col. 2.

CHARPENTIER in Latin *Carpentarius,* was born at Toulouſe (*a*) in the ſixteenth Century, and was of the Reformed Religion, but he publiſhed a Pamphlet which made him be

be reputed one of the most bitter enemies of the Protestants [*A*]. He taught the civil Law for some time at Geneva (*b*), and left that City with great discontent, and without taking leave of his creditors, as appears from a Letter which Beza wrote to him April the 1st 1570 (*c*); it appears from the same Letter that he had a wife and children. He published some

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

(*c*) It is the 52d of Beza's Letters.

[*A*] *He published a Pamphlet, which made him be reputed one of the most bitter enemies of the Protestants.*] This piece was buried in oblivion; but a Benedictine Monk (1) having inserted it in his *Entretiens touchant l'Entreprise du Prince d'Orange sur l'Angleterre*. i. e. "Dialogues concerning the Prince of Orange's invasion of England;" printed at Paris in 1689, this has been the occasion why that piece has often been mentioned since. Mr. Jurieu thought that the best method to sink the reputation of this piece, was to publish what Thuanus had said both of this Pamphlet and of the Author of it; and as this was judged to be a very proper method, I shall transcribe Thuanus's account here (2). "One Peter Charpentier, a native "of Toulouse, who had taught the Law publickly at "Geneva, being very intimate with Bellievre, took "sanctuary at his house during the massacre of the "Protestants, with several other persons of a lower "rank; for it would have been too dangerous for a "Courtier to shelter persons of distinction on such an "occasion. Charpentier, who was a time-server, and "whose temper was such, that he always chose to sup"port that party, which it was his interest to follow, "began to exclaim very bitterly, not against the au"thors of the massacre, nor against the horrid slaugh"ter they had committed, but against what he called "the cause; that is, the Faction of the Protestants, "against whom he shewed a great hatred, and said, "that God had justly punish'd them for all the dis"turbances they had occasioned in the State, because "they had made Religion serve as a cloak to cover "their spirit of sedition and rebellion; that the pre"tended devout people amongst them had raised with "fire and sword against their own countrymen, when "they should have employed no other arms but their "tears, prayers and fasting; that they seized upon se"veral cities of the Kingdom; that they had put to "death an infinite number of persons, and carried "their audaciousness so far as to make open war a"gainst their Sovereign. He said, that their Assem"blies, in which formerly they only used to pray, "were now become Conventicles, and seditious meet"ings, in which neither piety, nor the mysteries of "religion, nor the reformation of manners were ever "mentioned, but in which they treated only of rais"ing money, gathering forces together secretly in the "several Provinces, and settling a correspondence "with foreign Princes. He added that they kept "seditious persons in every city of the Kingdom, in "order to disturb the public tranquillity, which had "been procured by the peace the King had granted "out of his own good-will to his Protestant Subjects, "and that nothing but the sword of God, which "Princes wear, could repress their arrogance. *He ac*"*knowledged* that it was God himself, who had inspir"ed a King, who was naturally of a very meek tem"per, with a design of curbing their pride by the "most severe method. At first Charpentier used to "talk after this manner only in his private and fami"liar conversations with Bellievre; but as it was ob"served that he afterwards held the same discourses "abroad, he was thought a proper person for the de"sign which the King and Queen had of justifying "the massacre as much as lay in their power. He "took the task very willingly upon himself; and to "encourage him they gave him a sum of money, and "promised to prefer him to very great employments, "which promise was afterwards religiously kept, tho' "he was very unworthy of it. With his money and "his expectations he set out from Paris with Bellievre, "whom he left in Switzerland and retired to Strasburg, "where he had formerly read Lectures: he chose that "city because from thence he would very easily spread "what reports he pleased over all Germany. As soon "as he was arrived at Strasburg, he wrote a Letter "to Francis Portes (3) of the Island of Candia, a man "very well skilled in the Greek Tongue, and who "had been formerly educated in the Family of Renée "Princess of Ferrara. In this Letter, which was dat"ed September the 15th, he said, that there were two "parties amongst the Protestants; the one consisting "of peaceable persons, who acted with sincerity and "from a religious principle, and who followed the "maxims of the Religion they professed: the other "consisting of persons, who acted from a spirit of fac"tion, and were seditious men, and enemies of the "public peace and tranquillity: that each of these "parties had their Pastors; that at the head of the "former were d'Espina, Sorel (*In Charpentier's Letter published by F. de Sainte Marthe we read* Des Rosiers "(4) *instead of* Sorel) Albrai, Capel, la Haye, Mer"cure; but that the other Ministers could not bear the "moderation of these, who were odious particularly "to Beza, whom he calls the Trumpet of Seba (*a*), "and against whom he exclaims most bitterly in his "book. He not only excuses the slaughter; but also "proves at length and in a very artful manner, that it "was very just, and necessary in order to subdue an "impious faction, which had no other view, but to o"verthrow the authority of the King, to draw the chief "Cities of the Kingdom from the allegiance they owed "to their Sovereign, and to disturb the public tran"quillity; a faction which seemed to have been form"ed for the ruin of the Protestant Religion itself, by "some seditious persons, who were enemies of their "country. There was an Answer to this Letter pub"lished under the name of Portes, and dated March "the 1st of the following year. This Answer was "full of very sharp expressions. *Thuanus adds*, that "Francis Baudouin a Civilian, who having formerly "embraced the Protestant Religion, suffered himself to "be prevailed upon by the moderate counsels of Cas"sander, and returned into the Pale of the Roman "Church, and was then teaching the Law at Angers, "was very strongly pressed by the Duke of Anjou, "to labour the same point with Charpentier, *that is to* "*say, to vindicate the massacre*. But this Civilian mo"destly declined the task, alledging, that considering "the controversies, in which he had been engaged "with those of Geneva, his authority upon this sub"ject would be of no weight at all; but the true "reason why he would not vindicate the massacre, was, "that he abhorred it from his heart, and that having "read Charpentier's Letter, he had observed several "oversights, and even very great blunders in what he "related from ancient history."

(1) Called *F. Denis de Sainte Marthe.*

(2) Thuanus, *Historiæ*, lib. 53. pag. m. 1092. *ad ann.* 1572. I follow Mr. Jurieu's Translation of this passage, in his book concerning the *Religion of the Jesuits* (*De la Religion des Jesuits*) printed at the Hague 1689, pag. 129, &c.

(3) He should have said *Portus*. Mr. Jurieu had committed a very gross blunder in pag. 81. where he mentioned a *Letter of one Charpentier to Candiot against the Protestants*. He took Candiot to be a proper name, whereas it signifies one born in the Island of Candia.

(4) You will find in the Article ROSIERS that F. De Sainte Marthe and Thuanus say the same, so that this parenthesis is to no purpose, or should have contained something else. Mr. Bayle means, probably, that Mr. Jurieu should have observed, that Des Rosiers's name was Sureau, which Thuanus renders *Sorellus*.

The Benedictine Monk published another part of his *Entretiens*, in which he endeavoured to evade as much as he could Thuanus's testimony (5).

You will find the substance of the same Letter of Charpentier in the third volume (6) of Mezerai's large History. This Historian asserts, that this Letter was a Reply to Wolfgangus Prishrachius (*b*) a Polander, who had wrote a very sharp Answer to Bellievre's Oration (7). D'Aubigné (8) says on the contrary, that Wolfgang Prisbrach and Portus of Candia, *whom Charpentier quoted for his vouchers* (9), wrote against Bellievre and Charpentier. But he expresses himself inaccurately; he should have said that Portus wrote against the latter, and Prisbrach against the former. It does not appear that Charpentier intended to answer the work of Portus; I believe therefore, that Mezerai was mistaken. Charpentier's Letter served as an episode to a Roman Catholic Writer (10) to adorn the Preface of a Book of Controversy, which he published in the year 1585 (11). He inserted the greatest part of it in his Preface, and gave his readers notice of it in another work (12). I must also observe, that this Letter is printed in the first volume of the *Memoires de l'Etat de France sous Charles IX* (13). i. e. "Memoirs concerning the con"dition of France under Charles IXth;" with a French Translation of Portus's Latin Answer to that Letter. This Answer contains a great many particulars of Charpentier's Life, which are not much to his honour, not to say, that they are very dishonourable to him.

(5) See the *Journal des Savans* for November the 12th 1691, pag. 651. of the Dutch edition.

(6) Page 264.

(7) Made before the Assembly of the Cantons of Switzerland at Baden, to justify the massacre on St. Bartholomew's day.

(8) D'Aubigné, *Histoire Universelle*, tom. 2. ch. 7. pag. 565, under the year 1572.

(9) He ought to have said, that Charpentier addressed his Letter to Portus.

(10) Cornelius Schultingius.

(11) See the Preface of the 4th vol. of his *Confessio Hieronymiana*.

(12) See his *Biblioth. Catholica*, tom. 4. pag. 256.

(13) Pag. m. 600, &c.

(*a*) *The Trumpet of Seba.*] This is the anagram of Beza's name, and is an allusion to Seba (or Sheba, as we spell it) that seditious man, of whom it is said in

ſome other books [*B*], and was alive in the year 1584, being then the King's Advocate in the Great Council (*d*). Rivetus, who was ſo well acquainted with all ſorts of Authors, had but little knowledge of this Writer [*C*].

(*d*) La Croix du Maine, *Bibl. Franc.* pag. 389.

* Chap. xx. ver. 1.

the ſecond book of Samuel *, that *he blew the trumpet* to raiſe a ſedition againſt David. Let us obſerve here, that Charpentier's Letter dated September the 15th 1572, Francis Portus's Anſwer, and an Extract from Francis Baudouin's Obſervations upon Charpentier's Letter are inſerted in the *Memoirs de l'Etat de France ſous Charles IX* Tom I. folio 322 — 368 of the edition printed in 1579. CRIT. REM.]

(β) *Wolfangus Priſsbrachius.*] We read *Priſsbach* in the *Memoires de l'Etat de France, &c.* Tom. II. *fol.* 20 *verſo*, where that piece is inſerted. CRIT. REM.]

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſome other Books.*] According to la Croix du Maine, *he wrote ſeveral Books both in Latin and in French, moſt of which have been printed. But I doubt whether he would acknowledge for his all thoſe which are publiſhed under his name; for ſeveral perſons have fathered upon him ſome Books of which he was not the Author. . . I have ſeen a Latin Treatiſe of his concerning the bearing of Arms; but I cannot tell whether he be the Author of the French Tranſlation of it. It was printed at Paris in both languages* (14). This work of Charpentier is entitled, *Pium & Chriſtianum de Armis Conſilium*; i. e. "A pious and Chriſtian advice concerning the bearing of Arms," and was printed at Paris in 1575. I have mentioned in another place (15) an Anſwer that was wrote againſt it.

(14) La Croix, du Maine, pag. 389.

(15) Num. 18. of the Diſſertation upon JUNIUS BRUTUS printed at the end of Mr. Bayle's Dictionary.

[*C*] *Rivetus . . . had but little knowledge of this Writer.*] The Roman Controverſiſts are continually reproaching the Proteſtants with the civil wars of France, as a thing, which had been approved by their Miniſters, and quote ſometimes Charpentier's authority for it (16). The Jeſuit Petra Sancta publiſhed a Book againſt du Moulin, in which he had the confidence to aſſert, that they had took meaſures at Geneva to deſtroy at once Francis II, Catherine de Medicis his mother, Mary Stuart his conſort, his brothers &c (17). He quotes *Surius l.* 4. *ad ann.* 1561. *Petrus Carpentarius, Genebrardus in Chronol.* Rivetus, who anſwered the Jeſuit's Book, ſaid amongſt other things, that theſe three witneſſes were of no credit; that Baronius had convicted Surius of calumny, in abuſing Victorinus Biſhop of Poitiers (18), and that Charpentier and Genebrard being two obſtinate Leaguers had drawn the King's diſpleaſure upon themſelves. *Carpentarius & Genebrardus qui inter Regis perduelles vixerunt, & juſtam ejus indignationem incurrerunt, inter eos qui ultimi ſteterunt in adverſis partibus, an digni ſunt, quorum teſtimonio contra tales habeatur fides* (19)? i. e. "Do "Charpentier and Genebrard deſerve to be credited a-"gainſt ſuch men; ſince they lived amongſt the re-"bels, and juſtly drew the King's indignation upon "themſelves, becauſe they continued to the laſt in the "enemy's party?" If Rivetus had known, that the Author quoted againſt him was the ſame Peter Charpentier, who wrote an Apology for the ſlaughter commited on St. Bartholomew's day, and whom Thuanus had marked with a hot iron, if I may ſay ſo, would he have paſſed all this unobſerved? I imagine, that he was miſled by the undetermined quotation of that Author, and that he expreſſed himſelf but faintly, becauſe he durſt not take the Carpentarius, quoted by the Jeſuit, for that Lawyer, who was broke upon the wheel for his correſpondence with Spain about the year 1596 (20), and who was the ſon of Jacobus Carpentarius, Ramus's great antagoniſt.

(16) *See* Breſleius, *Apolog. Proteſtantium pro Romana Eccleſia*, pag. 642.

(17) Sylveſter Petra Sancta *Notis Epiſt. Pet. Molinæi ad Balzaiam*, pag. 102.

(18) Baron. tom. 3. an. 324, num. 226. *apud* Rivet. *Operum* tom. 3. pag. 538.

(19) Rivetus, *in Jeſuita vapulante*, cap. 13. num. 12. p. 538. tom. 3. *Operum.*

(20) *See* Mezeray's *Large Hiſtory*, tom. 3. pag. 1189.

CHARRON (PETER) Author of a Book which made much noiſe, and is intitled OF WISDOM, was born at Paris in the year 1541, where he made a great progreſs in School-learning and Philoſophy. He afterwards ſtudied the Civil and Canon Law at Orleans and at Bourges, and had the Degree of Doctor in that faculty conferred on him in the laſt of thoſe two Univerſities. He then returned to Paris, and having been admitted an Advocate in the Parliament, he attended the bar with a great deal of diligence for five or ſix years; but as he foreſaw it would be difficult for him to advance himſelf that way, becauſe he found himſelf incapable of ſubmitting to make his court to the Attornies and Sollicitors, he applied himſelf in good earneſt to the ſtudy of Divinity, and to the Pulpit, and became ſo great a Preacher, that ſeveral Biſhops were very deſirous of drawing him into their Dioceſe. Arnold de Pontac, Biſhop of Bazas, having heard him preach in St. Paul's Church in the year 1571, conceived a great affection for him, *and took him with him to Xaintes, to Bourdeaux, and into his Biſhoprick, and to other places of Gaſcony and Languedoc* (*a*). Charron acquired ſo great a reputation by his eloquence, *that he was courted every where, and the Biſhops of ſeveral Dioceſes where he had preached, very generouſly offered him the Divinity Canonſhips of their Churches, and other dignities and benefices, and made him ſeveral . . . preſents.* He was *ſucceſſively Theologal of Bazas, Acqs, Lethoure, Agen, Cahors, and Condom, Canon and School-maſter in the Church of Bourdeaux, and Chanter in the Church of Condom. Queen Margaret retained him for her Preacher in ordinary . . . . He was alſo in the retinue of Cardinal d'Armagnac* Legate of Avignon. He affected neither the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, nor that of Licentiate, or Doctor, or Profeſſor of that Science; he was contented with the *character of Prieſthood.* He was ſeventeen or eighteen years abſent from Paris, and when he returned thither in the year 1588, he had a mind to end his days among the Carthuſians. He had made a vow to embrace their Order, and diſcovered his intention to the Prior of the Charter-houſe (*b*). They had ſome reaſons not to receive him [*A*]: he addreſſed himſelf to the Prior of the Celeſtines,

(*a*) I ſet down the very words of the ELOGY which I ſhall cite below, Citation (1).

(*b*) His name was John Michel; he died Prior General of the great Monaſtery of the Carthuſians in Dauphiné.

[*A*] *They had ſome reaſons not to receive him:*] Leſt it might be thought that theſe reaſons were founded on any defect of Peter Charron, or that he renounced his vow too lightly, I muſt comment on the Text of this Remark by the following words: *He preſented himſelf to the Prior of the Charter-houſe near Paris. . . . But he could not be received there, whatever ardent prayer and earneſt application he made for that purpoſe, and this merely becauſe he was too far advanced in years; for he was then about* 47 *or* 48 *years old; and they excuſed themſelves by repreſenting the neceſſity there was that a man ſhould be accuſtomed from his youth to undergo the auſterity of that religious order. On this refuſal he addreſſed himſelf to the Provincial of the Celeſtines of the ſame city, to be in the like manner received into their order, where he met with the ſame difficulty, impediment, and refuſal. So that having done all that in him lay, and it being no fault of his that his vow was not performed, he was aſſured by Meſſieurs Faber, Dean of the Sorbonne, Tyrius a Scottiſh Jeſuit, and Feuardent a Franciſcan, very learned Divines, that he was in conſcience diſcharged from ſuch vow, and might freely continue in the world as a Secular, and that he was not obliged to enter into any other religious order* (1).

(1) The Elogy of Peter Charron, by G. M. D. R; (*that is*, George Michael de Rochemaillet) *prefixed to his Books of* Wiſdom, *of the Paris Edition*, 1604.

Celeſtines, and met with the ſame obſtacles; after which certain Caſuiſts declared him free from his vow (c). For which reaſon he reſolved to finiſh his days under the character of a ſecular Prieſt. He preached a courſe of Lent Sermons at Angers in the year 1589, and then he went to Bourdeaux, where he contracted a very ſtrict friendſhip with Michael de Montagne [B]. He publiſhed there his Book of the three Truths, in the year 1594 [C]: which obtained him the dignity of Grand Vicar of the Biſhop of Cahors, with the Divinity Canonſhip. He was deputed to the General Aſſembly of the Clergy in the year 1595 (d), and was choſen firſt Secretary of that Aſſembly. Being returned to Cahors, he continued there till the year 1600, and there compoſed, among other Works, the three Books OF WISDOM. He printed his Chriſtian Diſcourſes at Bourdeaux in 1600 [D]. He had then quitted Cahors, and was already ſettled at Condom, where he had accepted the Divinity Canonſhip and the dignity of Chanter which the Biſhop had offered him. He publiſhed the Treatiſe of Wiſdom at Bourdeaux in the year 1601. Two years afterwards he took a journey to Paris, to return thanks to a Biſhop who had offered him the Divinity Canonſhip of his Church [E], [and to publiſh in that city a new Edition of his ſaid Treatiſe. He lived to ſee no more than three or four ſheets reprinted: for he died ſuddenly in the ſtreet the 16th of November 1603. The impreſſion of the Work was finiſhed, notwithſtanding the almoſt infinite obſtacles which were to be ſurmounted (e) [F]; for as the Author had ſaid a good many things according to the light of

(c) See the Remark [A].

(d) It was held at Paris.

(e) Extracted from the *Elogy of Peter Charron*, before the Book of *Wiſdom*.

[B] *He contracted a very ſtrict friendſhip with Michael de Montagne.*] Charron *had a wonderful eſteem* for that Author's Eſſays, and adopted ſeveral of his maxims. We may believe, without raſhneſs, that of theſe two friends the perſon who ought to have inſtructed the other, was his ſcholar, and that the Divine learned more from the Gentleman, than the latter did from the Divine. There are in the Books of Wiſdom an infinite number of thoughts which had appeared in the Eſſays of Montagne. This docility of Charron contributed very much, no doubt, to the particular affection which Montagne had for him, and which induced him *to permit him* by his will *to bear the full arms of his noble family, after his own deceaſe, becauſe he left no heirs male* (2). Charron ſhewed a real gratitude by his will; for he left 500 crowns *to Mrs. Leonora de Montagne the wife of the Sieur Camein, Counſellor in the Parliament of Bourdeaux, the good ſiſter of the late Sieur de Montagne Knight of the King's Order, and his Goſſip*, and he conſtituted *the ſaid Sieur de Camein his ſole and univerſal heir, he paying and diſcharging the legacies bequeathed by his Will, amounting to near the ſum of* 15000 *livres tournois* (3).

(2) Ibid.

(3) Ibid.

[C] *He publiſhed his Book of the three Truths, at Bourdeaux in the year* 1594.] He did not ſet his name to it. Theſe three Truths are the following: I, that there is a God, and a true Religion: II, that of all Religions the Chriſtian is the only true one: III, that of all the Chriſtian Communions the Roman Catholic is the only true Church. By the firſt, he combates the Atheiſts; by the ſecond, the Pagans, Jews, and Mahometans; and by the third, the Heretics and Schiſmatics. This work is very methodical. He attacked, in the laſt part, the Treatiſe of the Church which Monſr. du Pleſſis Mornai had publiſhed ſixteen years before. A Proteſtant Writer ſoon printed, at Rochelle, an Anſwer (4) in defence of the Treatiſe of du Pleſſis. The Work of the three Truths was applauded by the Catholics: it was printed twice or thrice at Paris, from the Edition of Bourdeaux, and afterwards it was publiſhed in Flanders under the name of Benedict Vaillant Advocate of the holy Faith (5). The publication of this Work made Charron known *to Meſſire Antony d'Ebrard de S. Sulpice, Biſhop and Count of Caors, who without having ſeen the ſaid Sieur Charron, merely becauſe he liked his Book, ſent for him, and made him his Vicar-General, and gave him the Divinity Canonſhip of his Church, which he accepted; and while he was there, he cauſed his book to be printed a ſecond time at Bourdeaux, in the year* 1595, *putting his name to it, and augmenting it with a Reply to the Anſwer, which had been printed at Rochelle, to his third Truth* (6). Francis du Jon, or Junius, Profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden, compoſed an Anſwer (7) to his ſecond Edition of the three Truths, and publiſhed it in French in the year 1599. He inſerted therein the entire Work of his Adverſary. Take notice that Charron had reviſed it, *and greatly enlarged it ſince the edition of* 1595, and had made *another Reply to the ſecond Anſwer to the third Truth* (8). All this was found in his ſtudy, ready for the preſs, after his death. Some hopes were given that his univerſal heir would publiſh this manuſcript, and dedicate it to the Cardinal de Joieuſe (9).

(4) Which was reprinted at Geneva, by Gabriel Cartier, in the year 1595, in 8vo.

(5) Elogy of Peter Charron.

(6) Ibid.

(7) It is a large Quarto.

(8) Elogy of Peter Charron.

(9) Ibid.

[D] *He publiſhed his Chriſtian Diſcourſes . . in* 1600.] They are ſixteen in number: the eight firſt treat of the Euchariſt; the reſt relate to the knowledge and providence of God, the Redemption of the world, and the Communion of Saints (10).

(10) Ibid.

[E] *He took a journey to Paris, to return thanks to a Biſhop who had offered him the Divinity Canonſhip of his Church.*] Claudius Dormi Biſhop of Boulogne on the Sea, and Prior of St. Martin in the fields at Paris, was the perſon whom he had to thank: he had received very obliging Letters from him, which ſhewed that his Books *were very much to* that Prelate's taſte, and that he would do him a pleaſure if he would accept the place of Theologal of his Cathedral (11). Obſerve that this Biſhop's approbation related to the three Books of Wiſdom, as well as to the ſixteen Diſcourſes. He did not accept this offer, and he ſaid *to an intimate friend of his*, that he would *willingly have accepted that Divinity Canonſhip for ſome years, but that the air and coldneſs of the climate, which was damp and near the ſea, was not only unpleaſant and diſagreeable to his humour and temper, but unwholſome, and apt to occaſion colds, and rheumatiſms; that he was wholly influenced by the Sun, which was his ſenſible God, as God was his inſenſible Sun, for which reaſon he feared he ſhould never be able to live at Boulogne with either health or pleaſure, or indeed at all* (12). He is not the only man of letters to whom cold and moiſt climates are diſagreeable, and to whom the Sun *is a ſenſible God.*

(11) Ibid.

(12) Ibid.

[F] *The impreſſion of* the Books of Wiſdom *was finiſhed notwithſtanding the infinite obſtacles which were to be ſurmounted.*] Let us make uſe of the narrative which is to be found in his Elogy. He had *affectionately* recommended this Work and the Chriſtian Diſcourſes to one of his moſt intimate friends, an Advocate of the Parliament (13). This friend took ſo much care of them, that they were at length publiſhed "notwithſtanding the traverſes and impediments which "were laid in his way by malicious or ſuperſtitious "men, of mean, weak, and ordinary underſtandings, "who were like owls, *perquam ſimiles Noctuis, quarum "oculi tantum ſplendorem ferre non poterant, & ad illius Solis lumen caligabant*, not being able to ſupport "the brightneſs and piercing luſtre of that rare, vigorous, marvelouſly elevated and divine wit. For "there was a deſign to hinder the impreſſion of his "Books of Wiſdom in particular, and for that end "they made uſe of the authority of the Rector of the "Univerſity, and certain Doctors of the Sorbonne, "and even of ſome of the King's Counſel, as well "in the Parliament as at the Châtelet, and moreover "Simon Millanges, a Printer of Bourdeaux, was "made a party in the affair, as concerned in intereſt; "complaints were made of it in divers places, at the "Châtelet, in the Court of Green-Cloth, in the Court "of Parliament, and in the Privy Council, and they "even reached the King's ear; the ſheets which were "printed off, and the Author's copy were ſeized three "ſeveral times. But becauſe this faithful friend had

(13) Named *George Michael de Rochemaillet.*

of Philoſophy, he could not attack popular and ſuperſtitious opinions, without advancing ſome maxims which ſeemed to claſh with the truths of Religion. For which reaſon there were ſeveral people who roſe up againſt his book, and decried it as a nurſery of impiety. But ſome perſons of ſuperior underſtanding were found who oppoſed this perſecution, and who diſtinguiſhed things as they ought. Happily for the memory of Charron, and for his Book, there were ſome Stateſmen, as illuſtrious on account of the ſtrength of their genius, as of their authority, who interpoſed in the affair: without which he would have been cenſured with ignominy, and his Work would have been ſuppreſſed. Wherefore he had always wiſhed to have perſons of that character for his judges [G]: he hoped not to meet with the ſame equitable treatment from thoſe who are engaged by their profeſſion to act with too much paſſion, and thence contract a habit of condemning precipitately whatever agrees not with their prejudices. Some think it glorious for France, to have permitted the publication of that Book, in ſpite of the oppoſitions and murmurs of a number of people. It thereby appeared that men of ſenſe did not approve of the tyrannical yoke which ſo many perſons endeavoured to put on men's underſtanding, and that they approved of the liberty of philoſophizing when it kept within certain bounds. The moſt violent Declaimer who appeared againſt this Book of Wiſdom was a Jeſuit named Garaſſe. He has put Charron into the Catalogue of the moſt dangerous and wicked Atheiſts [H]. He was too much poſſeſſed by the loweſt prejudices (f), to be able to perceive that a great difference muſt be made between what a man believes by the efficacy of faith, and what he ingenuouſly acknowledges reaſon ſuggeſts to him concerning

(f) My friend Garaſſe, *quæ ſupra nos nihil ad nos*; the Books of Charron are a little too much above the reach of ſuch low and popular underſtandings as yours. Ogier, *Jugement & Cenſure de la Doctrine Curieuſe*, pag. 155.

" two or three copies of the Work, and was deſirous " to make appear by convincing proofs that the friend- " ſhip he had born to the deceaſed Sieur Charron did " not end with his life, he took ſuch unwearied pains " that at laſt all the Books were printed; but before " they could be ſold, ſeveral proſecutions were to be " defended in different places, and finally the Chan- " cellor and the King's Attorney General cauſed them " to be peruſed by two Doctors of the Sorbonne, who " gave in writing what objections they had to thoſe " Books, which diſcourſed of nothing but human " Wiſdom, morally and philoſophically treated. And " the whole was put into the hands of the Preſident " Jeannin Counſellor of State, one of the moſt judici- " ous and experienced perſons of that time, who hav- " ing ſeen and examined them, ſaid plainly and " clearly, that thoſe Books were not for the common " and lower claſs of mankind, and that it belonged " only to underſtandings of the greateſt force and elevati- " on to make a judgment of them, and that they were re- " ally Books of State, and having made his report to the " Privy Council, the Bookſeller who had printed them " was permitted to ſell them, and he obtained an entire " diſcharge of all ſeiſures which had been made of " them: After it had been repreſented and proved " that his Books had been corrected and enlarged by " the Author ſince the firſt impreſſion made at Bour- " deaux, in the year 1601, and that by thoſe Additi- " ons and Corrections he had explained and confirmed, " and in ſome places ſoftened his diſcourſes without al- " tering any thing of the ſenſe or ſubſtance, which " he had done to ſtop the mouths of the malicious, " and to ſatisfy the ſimple; that he had ſhewed them " to ſome of his beſt friends, perſons clear-ſighted and " no ways pedantic, who were much edified and pleaſ- " ed therewith, which they would not otherwiſe have " been; and that above all things he ſubmitted him- " ſelf and his books to the cenſure and judgment of " the Catholic, Apoſtolic, and Roman Church."

You will eaſily perceive by this Narrative, that the Paris Edition of 1604 is not conformable in all reſpects to the Edition of Bourdeaux 1601. The latter contained ſome things which in the other were either ſuppreſſed, or ſoftened, and rectified. This made the Bourdeaux Edition the more ſought after by the curious; and thence it came to paſs that the Bookſellers reprinted the Book *in divers places, according to* that Edition (14), which induced a Bookſeller of Paris to procure an edition to which he ſubjoined all the paſſages of the firſt which had been ſtruck out, or corrected, and all thoſe which the Preſident Jeannin, *appointed by the Chancellor to cenſure and examine that Book, had judged to want alteration* (15). This Edition, which is of Paris 1607, has been followed in the reimpreſſion of the work at Roan in 1622, and elſewhere: it is without doubt preferable to the firſt; for there the Book appears entirely as the Author had corrected and enlarged it for the ſecond Edition, and beſides it contains what was peculiar to the Edition of Bourdeaux, apart. All the proceedings were by this means rendred perfectly uſeleſs.

(14) See the *Adverteſſement to the Readers* before the Paris Edition of 1607.

(15) Ibid.

[G] . . . *Some perſons of ſuperior underſtanding . . . . interpoſed in the affair . . . he had always wiſhed to have perſons of that character for his judges.*] " He was " plainly ſenſible and foreſaw in his life-time, that " his Book of Wiſdom, among others, would not be " welcome to weak and ſuperſtitious minds, and that " it would be cenſured by the preſumptuous, the ar- " rogant, the poſitive and peremptory, the head- " ſtrong, the opinionated, and the obſtinate, who think " they know every thing, and imagine themſelves the " wiſeſt and moſt diſcreet perſons in the world, tho' " they be generally the moſt ſilly and ignorant, ſome " of whom are alſo touched by a diſeaſe almoſt in- " curable and without remedy. Wherefore a few months " before his death, he drew up a ſmall Treatiſe of " Wiſdom, containing a Summary of his Book, and " an Apology and Anſwer to the complaints and ob- " jections made againſt it; which was printed ſepa- " rately in the year 1606, together with ſome Chri- " ſtian Diſcourſes, by David le Clerc, Maſter Printer, " and he deſired the ſame might be dedicated to Monſ. " de Harlay firſt Preſident of the Parliament of Paris, " well knowing that for the defence of his Books, " and to have them judged of without paſſion, he " had need of ſuch men as the aforeſaid Lord, that is, " of a bold, ſtrong, generous, and elevated mind, " neither ſuperſtitious nor addicted to popular opinions; " which was done according to his deſire and inten- " tion (16)."

(16) Elogy of Peter Charron.

[H] Garaſſe *has put Charron into the Catalogue of the moſt dangerous and wicked Atheiſts.*] Never was ſuch raging malice as his ſeen: it would make a Book ſhould one copy all the abuſive language which he has uttered againſt Charron in his *Somme Theologique*, in his *Doctrine Curieuſe &c.* Let us content our ſelves with the following paſſage: *I have defined*, ſays he (17), *the brutal, drowſy, or melancholy Atheiſm, to be a certain fantaſtic humour, which has transferred Diogeniſm into the Chriſtian Religion, by which humour a mind beſotted with its own languid and ſluggiſh melancholy, laughs at every thing, thro' a gloomy, ridiculous, and pedantic gravity. Thoſe who have read the Book of Wiſdom and the three Truths, will eaſily underſtand what I mean by theſe words: for the humour of that Writer is there naturally repreſented. . . In our time, the Devil, the author of Atheiſm, and the ape of God's works, has raiſed up two prophane wits, Chriſtians in appearance, and Atheiſts in effect, to compoſe a Book of* WISDOM *in imitation of Solomon, the one a Milaneſe* (18), *who wrote in Latin; and the other a Pariſian, who wrote in his mother-tongue; both equally pernicious, and great enemies of* JESUS CHRIST, *and of good morals, as we ſhall ſee in a proper place, when we come to report and examine their wicked propoſitions. That is to ſay, in one word, theſe two prevaricators have endeavoured to ſhew that true Wiſdom conſiſts in the deſpiſing of*

(17) Garaſſe, *Somme Theologique*, pag. 66, 67. In his *Apology againſt the Prior Ogier*, pag. 261, 262, he ſays, *Charron is more dangerous to youth and to ſecular who are but moderately learned, than the Books of Theophile & Lucilio Vanini, foraſmuch as he ſays more abominable things than they, and expreſſes them with ſome little decency, that is, ſo much the more dangerouſly, as he keeps himſelf on his guard, and his Wiſdom is read as a Book of devotion.*

(18) That is, Cardan.

ing the doctrines of Religion. One of the things which that Jeſuit has cenſured in the moſt arrogant and malicious manner, is at the bottom very reaſonable; and if a man reads it with attention, he cannot help thinking it ſo, or avoid being offended either at the ignorance, or inſincerity of the Caviller. This relates to a certain degree of ſtrength which Peter Charron attributes to thoſe who entirely ſhake off the belief of the being of a God [*I*]. His

of Religion, and good manners. . . . Tertullian in the fourteenth chapter of his Apologetic has a notable ſaying which may ſerve me here for an authority; for ſpeaking of Marcus Varro, who was eſteemed the Wiſdom of the Romans, he ſhews that in his writings, which by good luck and God be thanked are loſt, he was a greater Atheiſt and more a Cynic than Menippus or Diogenes, foraſmuch as he had written Atheiſtical Diſcourſes with ſome ſort of modeſty, reſerve, and probability, whereas others, having written impious pieces, have rendred them ſuſpected merely by their manner of writing. I ſay the ſame of theſe melancholy and languid Writers, who under the name of Wiſdom, Truths, and Catholic Diſcourſes, have underhand deſtroyed all ſenſe of piety. The Abbot de Saint Cyran did not abandon Charron's honour to the venomous calumnies of this Critic: he took his part, when he expoſed the faults of Garaſſe's *Somme Theologique* (19). I remember, among other things, that he complains of the injuſtice of this Cenſurer, who taking advantage of an error of the preſs, had carried his invectives to a ſtrange length. The whole ſequel of Charron's diſcourſe ſhewed that he intended to ſay that God acts *temporally*; but the Printers, inſtead of *temporellement*, put *temerairement* i. e. *raſhly*. See what will be cited below from the Prior Ogier.

(19) See the 2d tome of *La Somme des Fautes & fauſſetez capitales contenues dans la Somme Theologique du Pere Garaſſe*, pag. 346, &c.

[*I*] . . . *This relates to a certain degree of ſtrength which Peter Charron attributes to thoſe who entirely ſhake off the belief of the being of a God.*] To judge well of his doctrine on this point, all his words ſhould be weighed, and nothing that he has ſaid ſuppreſſed. Here then follows the paſſage as intire as is neceſſary. " This firſt, eminent, ſyſtematical, and univerſal kind of " Atheiſm (20) can only lodge in a ſoul extremely ſtrong " and daring;

(20) *That is*, of thoſe who flatly deny the Deity, and pretend to prove by reaſoning that there is no God.

" *Illi robur & æs triplex*
" *Circa pectus erat,*

" Sure he . . . . .
" In harden'd oak his heart did hide,
" And ribs of iron arm'd his ſide!
Dryden.

" It muſt be raging and maniac. It is certainly very " reaſonable to think that as great, and (perhaps) " a greater degree of ſtrength and ſtiffneſs of ſoul is " neceſſary to reject and reſolutely to caſt off the ap" prehenſion and belief of a God, than to adhere con" ſtantly and firmly to him: which are the two op" poſite extremes, very rare and difficult; but the " firſt the more ſo. Whatever lies between them, is " of a middle ſtrength and power, which conſiſts in " being unable to get rid of God, and yet adhering " to him faintly and negligently. And this is the caſe " of almoſt all men, either more or leſs, in an infi" nite number of degrees. . . . To adhere firmly and " inviolably to God, requires a very great force and " attention of ſoul, always fixed and intent, a moſt " excellent and ſpecial divine favour and grace, and " a continual aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit. On the " contrary, to get looſe from and entirely to reject the " ſenſe and apprehenſion of a Deity, a thing which " cleaves to the marrow of our bones, a monſtrous " and inraged force of ſoul is neceſſary, and ſuch as " is very hard to find; altho' the utmoſt ſtudy and " efforts were uſed to acquire it by thoſe grand and " notorious Atheiſts, who through an exceſſive and " daring preſumption have endeavoured to ſhake off " the Deity, and to free themſelves from all ſuperio" rity. But the moſt able who have ſtrove to do it, " could never compaſs their deſign. For though when " at their eaſe, and maſters of their own diſcourſe, " they ſeemed to have gained this point by mocking at " all thoughts of God and Religion; yet when they " came to be cloſely preſſed, they yielded like little " children. If there happened any great and ſud" den prodigy, a terrible inſtance of God's wrath, they " became more frighted and pale than others, hiding " themſelves at a clap of thunder, or at a ſtorm. Being " thus unwilling to confeſs a Deity leſt they ſhould " fear him, the fear of the leaſt things forced them to " confeſs it (21)." Let us now ſee the words of the Cenſurer (22): *He lays it down for a maxim, that the firſt and moſt eminent kind of Atheiſm can only lodge in a ſoul extremely ſtrong and daring*, and that a greater degree of ſtrength and ſtiffneſs of ſoul is neceſſary to reject and reſolutely caſt off the apprehenſion and belief of a God, than to adhere conſtantly and firmly to him. *And though he endeavours to ſoften this propoſition by treacherous expreſſions; I ſay nevertheleſs that it is wicked and dangerous, becauſe it holds up the chin of ſeveral young debauchees, who float between two opinions, and are not yet mad enough to rid themſelves entirely of the belief and fear of the Deity. For as there is no man who is not naturally tickled with the deſire of being thought a ſtrong and mighty wit, if young perſons who are inconſiderate and already wavering happen to fall upon this propoſition, as they do but too frequently, of libertines they become violent Atheiſts. Charron's whole diſcourſe incites the mind of his readers to this furious madneſs of ſhaking off the belief of God, which however is but a ſtupid cowardiſe, as is verified in all Atheiſts, who die either diſtracted or towards; as we have ſeen in the inſtances of Fontanier and Vanini, who after having inſolently braved the Deity, could never ſatisfy themſelves, when in priſon, with making feigned and ſacrilegious confeſſions, that they might appear good men.* Obſerve that Garaſſe, in his *Somme Theologique*, a later Book than the Apology which I have juſt now cited, beſtows a whole ſection (23) on the refutation of this opinion of Charron. He alledges the example of ſome Fathers of the Church who ſhewed an unſhaken courage: he maintains that Atheiſm proceeds only from cowardiſe, he maintains it, I ſay, by conſidering things in another light, and according to different views which do not directly contradict Charron's notions; and he returns to the timorous diſſimulation of the two Atheiſts who had been put to death ſome time before. This refutation is not a ſolid one, ſince Charron had plainly and preciſely owned, I, that to continue firm in the true faith of God, a very great ſtrength of ſoul is requiſite; II, that the grand and notorious Atheiſts, *when they come to be cloſely preſſed, yielded like little children.* Garaſſe, therefore, may be ſaid to have fought with his own ſhadow; he has proved what his adverſary did not deny, and what Charron formally acknowledged. Wherefore let us take our leaves of this chapter of the *Somme Theologique*, and the laſt part of the paſſage which I have tranſcribed; and let us conſider only the other half of that paſſage.

(21) Charron, in the 3d chap. of the *three Truths*, pag. m. 15, and 14.

(22) Garaſſe, *Apolog.* chap. 21. pag. m. 263, &c.

(23) It is the 3d Section of the 2d Part of the firſt Book, pag. 48, &c.

I find ſeveral faults in it; for, in the firſt place, the Jeſuit has ſuppreſſed every thing which makes Charron's Orthodoxy to appear, every thing which may be of uſe to unfold the true ſenſe, or may remove the ill impreſſions which the maxim propoſed in general, and in a crude manner, might be capable of making. In the ſecond place, he calls all this *treacherous expreſſions*; now this is a behaviour ſo baſe and unfair, that it ought to be taken cognizance of by the Criminal Judge, and a moſt ſevere Tribunal ought to be eſtabliſhed againſt Authors, who by ſuch ſtrokes of perfidy blaſt a Writer's honour, reputation, and memory. You ſuppoſe a thing, and yet call it *treacherous*. It ſhould have been here quoted entire, and then you ſhould have given it a name; but you found it more for your purpoſe to ſurprize the readers, by interpoſing your own judgment on a fact which you did not ſhew them, and which you was well aſſured moſt of them would not ſearch after. I ſay in the third place, that Garaſſe builds on a bad foundation: for he relies on this principle; *That though Atheiſm were truly the effect of a great force of mind, yet this ſhould not be owned; that a truth of that kind ought either to be ſuppreſſed, or the contrary opinion boldly maintained, leſt preſumptuous men be tempted to fall into a condition which*

His Cenſurers did not mind the cautions which he had given, and which were ſo *is the characteriſtic of a ſtrong ſoul.* It is manifeſt from this Jeſuit's opinion, that he reaſons in this manner (24). Now I leave every equitable perſon to conſider whether this be candid dealing; and whether it be not to introduce into Religion mere human policy, and the great ſecret of the art military? In a word, whether this be not to lay it down for a rule, that provided Orthodoxy triumphs, it matters not how or by what means? Should not a man think it ſufficient to behave in this manner himſelf? Muſt he alſo further require of every Author that he tread in the ſame path? Shall not Peter Charron be permitted to prefer ſincerity to utility? Let us go a little farther, and ſay that he followed the ideas of ſtrict honeſty, without expoſing the uſeful part to any danger. Did he not aſſert that Atheiſm required a ſtrong ſoul, *raging and Maniac*; and that this ſtrength was *monſtrous and raging*, and an *exceſſive and daring preſumption*? Is there any thing here to tempt a man's ambition? and if this be capable of enticing any one, muſt it not be the moſt ill-contrived underſtanding in the world, and a ſoul depraved in the higheſt degree? Do ſuch profligate, ſuch corrupted, and ſuch incorrigible people deſerve that for their ſakes things ſhould not be ſpoken of according to thoſe ideas which ſeem the moſt juſt? When Cicero owned that Mark Antony was poſſeſſed of great ſtrength of body (25), when Tacitus acknowledged the ſame quality in a grandſon of Auguſtus (26), had they any reaſon to fear leſt their readers ſhould wiſh to acquire the like ſtrength? Was it not characterized in ſuch a manner as to create diſguſt? Now I aſk you whether Charron has not made uſe of a corrective yet more proper to inſpire, I will not ſay diſguſt, but horror? Take notice here of St. Auguſtin's maxim, that the greateſt piety and the greateſt impiety are equally rare. *Inſania iſta paucorum eſt; ſicut enim magna pietas paucorum eſt, ita & magna impietas nihilo minus paucorum eſt* (27). This amounts very near to one of the propoſitions of Peter Charron.

(24) Compare with this *l'Addition aux Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes*, pag. 83, 84. of the Edition of 1694. See alſo pag. 74, 75.

(25) *Tu iſtis faucibus, iſtis lateribus, iſta gladiatoria totius corporis firmitate.* i. e. "You with "thoſe jaws, "thoſe ſides, "and that gladiatorial "ſtrength of "the whole body." Cicero, *Philipp. II*, pag. m. 738.

(26) *Ruidem ſane bonarum artium, & robore corporis ſtolide ferocem.* i. e. "Unskilled, "indeed, in the "politer arts, "and in ſtrength "of body bruſtiſhly fierce." Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 1. cap. 3.

(27) Auguſtinus, *Sermone X de Verbis Domini.*

REMARKABLE differences of the Force of the Soul, and Obſervations thereupon.

It will be thought, perhaps, that he has contradicted himſelf, having acknowledged in Atheiſts both a very great force of mind, and a childiſh weakneſs: but ſurely he has done this without falling into a contradiction, ſince he has conſidered them under different circumſtances. He believed them ſtrong in time of proſperity, and weak in adverſity: ſo that the contrary qualities which he attributes to them are two things which ſucceed one another. It is therefore no contradiction to admit them in the ſame ſubject: for a contradiction ſuppoſes the two terms to ſubſiſt together at the ſame time. It requires alſo that they be affirmed of the ſame ſubject according to the ſame notion; and thence it follows that one may affirm, without departing from the rules of contradictory propoſitions, that the ſame perſons are fearful and bold at the ſame time, fearful with regard to certain objects, and bold with regard to others. This is ſeen every day. There are ſome people of extraordinary intrepidity, who would not for all the world lie in a room, if they were told it was haunted. Others would lie there alone without any fear, tho' they be ſuch rank cowards as to ſhiver at a naked ſword. The uneaſineſs which diſturbs the former on account of a trifle which they may have taken for an ill omen; that uneaſineſs, I ſay, which no reaſoning can diſpel, will not hinder them from fighting like lions. The latter, who laugh at all evil preſages, will run away like a hare if they ſee themſelves attacked by an equal number. He who has not the courage to ſee a man let blood, or to kill a chicken, endures the moſt cruel pains with a heroic conſtancy. Another, who is cool and unconcerned in the midſt of the moſt terrible dangers of war, trembles for fear when a Phyſician tells him he muſt die. That ſtrength of ſoul which has been deſcribed, when it has been ſaid that a ſteady man is neither moved at the menaces of a tyrant, nor at the danger of ſhipwreck, nor at thunder, or lightning, and that the ruins of the world would fall on him without ſtriking him with fear:

Juſtum, & tenacem propoſiti virum,
Non civium ardor prava jubentium,
Non vultus inſtantis tyranni
Mente quatit ſolida: neque Auſter,
Dux inquieti turbidus Adriæ,
Nec fulminantis magna Jovis manus:
Si fractus illabatur orbis,
Impavidum ferient ruinæ (28).

(28) Horat. Od. 3. lib. 3.

That is,

"An honeſt mind, to virtue's precepts true,
"Contemns the fury of a lawleſs crew;
"Firm as a rock, he to his purpoſe ſtands,
"And thinks a Tyrant's frowns as weak as his commands:
"Him loudeſt ſtorms can't from his center move,
"He braves th' Almighty thunder even of Jove;
"If all the heav'nly orbs, confus'dly hurl'd,
"Should daſh in pieces, and ſhould cruſh the world,
"Undaunted he the mighty cruſh would hear,
"Nor in his breaſt admit a thought of fear.

This ſtrength of mind, I ſay, is no where found in its full extent; it is hardly ſeen but by parcels. There are ſome noble ſouls, which no promiſe, no flattery, could induce to deviate from the path of virtue; but they are not proof againſt the menaces of a dungeon, or the like ill treatment. There are ſome who form the moſt noble and magnanimous reſolutions for the good of their country. In their ideas every thing is grand, every thing ſhews generoſity and fortitude; but they would never be capable of putting them in execution: they would do their duty very ill in a beſieged town, if they were poſted in the breach; an involuntary fear would ſeize them, and make them fly before they diſtinctly perceived it. The body ſeconds not the ſoul in theſe people; a certain diſpoſition of the organs, which mechanically produces fear, dejects the ſuperior part, and puts it out of countenance (29). There is, doubtleſs, a boldneſs, or an intrepidity of mind which is ſometimes attended with a great timorouſneſs of body. The courage and force of Mr. Hobbes regarded only matters of ſpeculation. There was ſcarce any Propoſition or Paradox which embarraſſed him, or to which the ſcruples of his conſcience gave way; but the leaſt bodily danger put him in a fright. Montagne, who ſeemed ſo much above prejudices, and ſo well ſtocked with the pretended force of incredulity, had a ſoftneſs of ſoul which permitted him not to ſee *a chicken's throat cut without uneaſineſs*, or to hear with patience *the cries of a hare under the teeth of his dogs* (30). Theſe varieties depend on conſtitution: let us not wonder then that a perſon who has the ſtrength to ſhake off the moſt general and ſacred opinions, has the weakneſs to tremble at the ſight of an Executioner, and to have recourſe to a thouſand diſguiſes to avoid the pains of the rack. The ſtrength of his ſoul is not directed towards the objects of the body, but towards the objects of the mind. A mean ſoul, capable of all kinds of baſe and villanous actions, a ſlave of Cappadocia (31), the greateſt coward and the greateſt raſcal in the world, has ſometimes a ſurprizing fortitude in ſupporting pain: the ſharpeſt torture both ordinary and extraordinary makes him confeſs nothing; but how many men of virtue and of admirable probity are there, who would rather accuſe themſelves falſly, than expoſe themſelves to the rack? How many perſons have there been who had a real attachment to their Religion, and yet had recourſe to all ſorts of diſſembling and equivocation, and practiſed every ſhift in the priſons of the Inquiſition (32)? The fear of puniſhment diſconcerted their ſoul, and ſuſpended the whole ſtrength of their piety. Thus do the laws of the union of ſoul and body diverſify mankind.

(29) One may ſay of them, as of immoderate eating and drinking: *Quin corpus onuſtum Heſternis vitiis animum queque prægravat una, Atque affigit humi divinæ particulam auræ.* Horat. Sat. 2. lib. 2.

(30) Montagne, *Eſſais*, liv. 2. chap. 11. pag. m. 171.

(31) See above the Article of CAPPADOCIA, Citation (19).

I obſerve all theſe things, in order to reconcile Peter Charron with Mr. de la Bruyere. *Do the men of ſtrong ſouls*, (les eſprits forts), ſays the latter (33), *know that they are called ſo by way of irony? What greater weakneſs can there be, than to be uncertain what is the principle of one's exiſtence, one's life, one's ſenſes, and one's knowledge, and what is to be the end of them? What greater diſcouragement than to doubt whether one's ſoul be not meer matter, as ſtones, and reptiles, and whether it be not corruptible like thoſe vile creatures? Is there not more ſtrength and true greatneſs in receiving into*

(32) *I uſe this word here to ſignify all Tribunals in general which have condemned men to death on account of Religion.*

(33) La Bruyere, *Charactéres de ce Siecle*, pag. 666. of the Paris Edition 1694. See alſo the *Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes*, pag. 412.

ſo proper to prevent their paſſing raſh judgments [*K*]. However that be, Charron's Morals were irreproachable, and it is eaſy to prove, as well by his Writings as by his Actions, that he doubted not of the Truths of Chriſtianity [*L*]. The great miſchief and diſorder is, that of a hundred thouſand Readers, there are ſcarce three in any age which

into our mind the idea of a Being ſuperior to all other Beings? &c. They are both in the right; and their diſagreement lies only in the different applications of the word ſtrength: and I do not think Mr. de la Bruyere would have denied to Charron, that Atheiſts have ſtrength in the ſame ſenſe as that dæmoniac who broke all the chains with which he was loaded, and whom no man could tame (34). As to the reſt, the precaution which Garaſſe would have had obſerved could be of no great ſervice; for it is not eaſy to correct the ideas by which mankind judge, that ſince it is a weakneſs to be frighted at the overturning of a ſaltſeller, it therefore requires ſome ſtrength to ſurmount that fear, and ſo from one degree to another. People could never be corrected in this point. tho' all Authors in general ſhould carefully forbear giving the name of ſtrength to the turn of mind we are ſpeaking of. The Infidels would appeal to their Patriarch Lucretius.

(34) Mark v. 4.

Humana ante oculos fœde cum vita jaceret
In terris oppreſſa gravi ſub relligione;
. . . . . .
Primum Graius homo mortalis tollere contra
Eſt oculos auſus, primuſque obſiſtere contra:
Quem nec fama Deûm, nec fulmina, nec minitanti
Murmure compreſſit Cœlum, ſed eo magis acrem
Virtutem irritat animi, confringere ut arcta
Naturæ primus portarum clauſtra cupiret.
. . . . . .
Quare relligio pedibus ſubjecta viciſſim
Obteritur, nos exæquat victoria cœlo (35).

(35) Lucret. lib. 1. ver. 63.

That is,

" Long time men lay oppreſs'd with ſlaviſh fear;
" Religion's tyranny did domineer.
" . . . . . .
" At length a mighty man of Greece began
" T' aſſert the nat'ral liberty of man,
" By ſenſeleſs terrors, and vain fancies led
" To ſlav'ry: ſtrait the conquer'd fantom fled!
" Not the fam'd ſtories of the Deity,
" Not all the thunder of the threat'ning Sky,
" Could ſtop his riſing ſoul; thro' all he paſt,
" The ſtrongeſt bounds that pow'rful nature caſt:
" . . . . . .
" Thus by his conqueſt we our right regain;
" Religion he ſubdu'd, and We now reign.

Creech.

[*K*] *His cenſurers did not mind the cautions which he had given, and which were ſo proper to prevent their paſſing raſh judgments.*] As Charron is not the only man whom it concerns to make the critics ſenſible of what they ought to diſtinguiſh, if they will be equitable, I ſhall tranſcribe the advice he gave them word for word. " I deſire to advertiſe the Reader who ſhall " undertake to judge of this work, that he take " care not to fall into any of theſe ſeven miſtakes, " as ſome have done with reſpect to the firſt edition; " which are, to take that for a matter of right and " a duty, which is only a matter of fact: to take that " for acting, which is only judging: to take that for " a reſolution and a determination, which is only pro- " poſed, diſcuſſed, and diſputed problematically and " academically: to impute that to me and my opi- " nions which is really another's and is only reported: " to refer that to the external ſtate, profeſſion, and con- " dition, which relates to the mind and internal ca- " pacity: to refer that to Religion and divine belief, " which is only humane opinion: to impute that to " grace and ſupernatural operation, which proceeds " only from virtue and from natural and moral action. " All paſſion and preoccupation removed, he will find " in theſe ſeven points, when well underſtood, where- " with to reſolve his doubts, wherewith to anſwer " all objections which he himſelf or others may make, " and to gain a perfect inſight into my intention in " this work. Yet if after all he is not ſatisfied, " and diſapproves it, let him attack it boldly and vi- " gorouſly (for to give ill language only, to bite, and " mangle a man's good name, is eaſy enough, but " too baſe and pedantic) and he ſhall ſoon have ei- " ther a franc confeſſion and acquieſcence, (for this " Book glories and prides itſelf in ſincerity and in- " genuity;) or an examination of his impertinence " and folly (36)." What he had ſaid juſt before is too excellent not to be inſerted in this Remark: a great number of Readers will learn their duty thence; they will there ſee what diſpoſition of mind they ought to put on when they go about to judge of a Book which is not written according to the general taſte, or according to the prejudices of the multitude, that is to ſay, wherein the Author repreſents the thoughts which ariſe in his mind, without dogmatizing, or ſeeking to form a ſect. *Some find,* it is Charron who ſpeaks (37), *this Book too bold and free in contradicting the common opinions, and take offence at it. I return them this anſwer in four or five words. Firſt, that the wiſdom which is not common or popular, has this peculiar liberty and authority*; jure ſuo ſingulari, *to judge of every thing (it is the privilege of the ſpiritual wiſe man,* Spiritualis omnia dijudicat, & a nemine judicatur †) *and in judging, to cenſure, and condemn the common and popular opinions, as being for the moſt part erroneous. Who ſhall do it then? Now in doing this, ſhe cannot avoid incurring the diſpleaſure and envy of the world. Beſides, I complain of them, and reproach them with that popular weakneſs, and womaniſh niceneſs, as unworthy and too tender to hear any thing valuable, and utterly incapable of wiſdom: the ſtrongeſt and boldeſt propoſitions are the moſt becoming to a ſtrong and elevated mind, and there is nothing ſtrange to him who knows what the world is. It is a weakneſs to be amazed at any thing, we ſhould confirm our courage, fortify our ſoul, harden and ſteel it, to enjoy, know, underſtand, and judge of all things, let them ſeem ever ſo ſtrange: there is nothing but what is ſuitable to, and within the reach of the mind, but let it not be wanting to itſelf: however, it ought neither to do, nor conſent to any thing but what is right and decent, though all the world ſhould talk of it. The wiſe man ſhews his courage equally in both: but thoſe nice people are capable neither of the one, nor of the other; they are weak in both. Thirdly, in whatever I propoſe, I do not pretend to oblige any body to be of my opinion; I only offer things, and expoſe them to public view. I am not at all angry if my word is not taken; let pedants behave in that manner. Paſſion argues the abſence of reaſon, and he who eſpouſes an opinion for the ſake of the one, cannot eſpouſe it for the ſake of the other. But why are they angry? is it becauſe I am not of their mind in every thing? I am not angry becauſe they differ from me: is it becauſe I ſay ſome things which hit not their taſte, nor that of the vulgar? It is for that reaſon that I ſay them. I advance nothing without a reaſon; if they are capable of perceiving and taſting it, if they have a better which deſtroys mine, I ſhall hear it with pleaſure, and think myſelf obliged to him who produces it.* I exhort all my Readers ſeriouſly to meditate on theſe two paſſages.

(36) Charron, Preface to the ſecond edition of his Books of *Wiſdom*. See alſo the Preface to his ſmall *Treatiſe of Wiſdom*; where you will find the ſame words. The Prior *Ogier* in his *Cenſure* of the *Doctrine Curieuſe* of Father Garaſſe, pag. 151, 152, alledges them in juſtification of Charron.

(37) Ibid. *folio B verſo.*

† *He that is ſpiritual judgeth all things, yet he himſelf is judged of no man.* 1 Cor. ii. 15.

[*L*] *It is eaſy to prove, as well by his writings as by his actions, that he doubted not of the truths of Chriſtianity.*] " His innocence, the ſimplicity and can- " dor of his manners, his worth and probity, have " at length overcome and ſurmounted the calumnies " and ſlanders of his adverſaries." It is thus that the Author of the Elogy ſpeaks (38). *As to his morals,* adds he, *his converſation in life, and his actions, as well in private as in public, nothing more ſhall be ſaid here, than that he wholly conformed himſelf to the rules and duties contained in the 12 chapters of his ſecond Book of Wiſdom, and practiſed them very exactly: And what his religion and belief were, ſufficiently appears from his Book of the three Truths . . . and in his Chriſtian Diſcourſes, which have been printed ſince his deceaſe, and make a moderate volume. . . . His good conſcience appears likewiſe* in the manner of his poſſeſſing, and quitting his benefices. His piety ſhines in *the Will which he wrote with his own hand the 30th of January*

(38) *The Elogy of Charron*: See alſo the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the ſmall *Treatiſe of Wiſdom.*

which can be pitched upon, who are capable of making due distinctions when they are to judge of a Book wherein the ideas of an exact and metaphysical reasoning are opposed to the most common opinions. I wonder Moreri has taken Charron's part [*M*]; for he might have found himself involved in the criticism which the Cut before the Book of Wisdom exposes to the eyes of the public. It seems to be an Emblem in favour of the Sceptics [*N*]. We should say something of what the Sieur Sorel observes concerning our Author [*O*]; which will afford a very natural opportunity of transcribing two passages

nuary 1602, ... *whereby, after having returned most humble thanks to God for the good things which he had received from him in his life-time, having most earnestly besought him for the sake of his infinite and incomprehensible goodness, and through the mercy of his well-beloved Son our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and all his merits multiplied and diffused through all his members, the Holy Elect, to grant him pardon, remission, and forgiveness of his offences, and that he would be pleased to take and hold him for his, to assist and guide him by his Holy Spirit, so long as he should continue in this world, to preserve and grant him to persevere with a sound understanding in his love and service, and at the hour of death to take his spirit to himself, and receive it into the company and rest of his well-beloved, and to inspire all his Holy Elect to pray and intercede for him: he bequeaths, among other things,* 200 *livres to the Church of Condom, if he should be buried there, on condition that on the day of his decease yearly a High Mass should be said for him, and an absolution pronounced over his grave: Moreover he gives to poor Scholars, and maids who wanted husbands,* 2400 *crowns, the income whereof should be annually distributed for ever, one moiety to three or four Scholars, and the other moiety to three, four, or five poor maids.* Add to this, 1, the ardent desire he had to confine himself in a Monastery according to the vow which he had made so to do: 2, his precaution in having the decision of three Casuists, before he held himself discharged from that vow (39). Is it not amazing that such a person should be defamed as an enemy to Christianity, and an Atheist? Is not this a visible and deplorable effect, either of the malignity, or of the weakness of the mind of man? Here follow some verses of the Prior Ogier's against Father Garasse in favour of Charron:

(39) See the Remark [*A*].

Damnatur sic Charro PIUS *doctusque Garasso*
Execratore, atque puer cunabula fandi
Vix habet, & primæ lallat documenta Minervæ,
Quamvis sancta ejus tot adhuc Ecclesia verbis
Personet eloquii, Verique in triplice libro
Fortiter hæreticæ frangat mendacia sectæ (40).

That is,

" Thus learn'd and PIOUS Charron is condemn'd
" By rude Garasse, as a meer child in speaking,
" Scarce in the rudiments of grammar skill'd;
" While yet the Church his eloquence resounds,
" And while his threefold Truth the lies of heresy
" confounds.

(40) See the *Jugement & Censure de la Doctrine Curieuse*, printed at Paris 1623, pag. 169.

This Writer's prose is yet more to the honour of Peter Charron. Read the 11th Chap. of his Judgment on the *Doctrine Curieuse*; where you will find the refutation of Garasse with respect to the pretended proofs of Atheism against the Theologal of Condom. Read also Garasse's Reply (41): it will serve, as much as any thing else, to shew his rashness; but whatever he quotes from Charron is either true, or unfaithfully cited, or may bear a good sense.

(41) That is his *Apology against the Author of the Censure of* la Doctrine Curieuse, chap. xxi, and xxii, pag. 259, &c.

But, some will say, has not this man declared that all men boast without foundation of having a Religion which comes from God? Here are his words: *All* Religions *must necessarily be conveyed and delivered by extraordinary and celestial revelation, taken and received by divine inspiration, and as coming from heaven. Wherefore all make use of the same jargon, saying they hold and believe it not from men or any creature, but from God. Yet to speak the truth, without flattery or disguise, there is nothing in it. Religions are received from human hands and means, whatever may be said to the contrary* (42). I answer, that in the second Edition he excepted the true Religion. *This*, continues he, *is every way true of the false Religions, which are merely human or diabolical inventions: the true Religions, as they fall under another consideration, are also received and taken from another hand; however, a distinction ought to be made. As to their reception, the first and general publication and establishment of them was* Domino cooperante, sermonem confirmante sequentibus signis †, *divine and miraculous.* Had he not said a little before that the *misbelievers and irreligious* are such *because they consult and hearken too much to their own judgment, being desirous of examining and judging of matters of religion, according to their own reach and capacity, and to scan it by their own natural faculties. A man must be simple, obedient, and meek to be qualified to receive Religion, he must believe and keep up to the laws by reverence and obedience, submitting his judgment, and suffering himself to be led and conducted by public authority:* Captivantes intellectum ad obsequium fidei (43)? These words may serve him for a shield against all the darts of his enemies; for if you object to him that he makes some Remarks which strike at Religion, and shew that he was more fully persuaded of the force of his Remarks, than of the truths which they attack, he may return you this answer, *I should be such a one as you say, if I governed my self according to the feeble light of my reason; but I trust not such a guide, I submit my self to God's authority, and captivate my understanding to the obedience of faith.*

(42) Charron, *de la Sagesse*, liv. 2. chap. v. pag. m. 386.

† Mark xvi. 20.

(43) Ibid. pag. 385.

[*M*] *I wonder Moreri has taken Charron's part.*] He has done it with some warmth, and so far as to say that Dupleix *is brutishly passionate* (44) *according to his custom.* This expression, methinks, is too harsh: Dupleix, speaking of the Begards †, says (45), *they believed a man could not miscarry by following nature* " *and* " *that in his youth he had been familiarly acquainted* " *with* Peter Charron Theologal of Condon, *who was* " *prepossessed by the like errors, and preached them in his* " *Sermons, and that he held several other dangerous* " *opinions, some of which he had slipped in among the* " *follies of his libertine* Wisdom." *Here this Author highly injures Charron. Perhaps there had been some quarrel between them, which made him speak with so much animosity.* These are the words of Sorel (46): he likewise is too warm, not perceiving that the design of Dupleix was rather to advance an Antithesis, and play with words, than to give very offensive language. Take notice that Moreri gives a very bad account of what relates to Charron's desire of becoming a Carthusian. He does not explain why the age of forty seven was an obstacle thereto, and he supposes that Charron did not consecrate himself to the Ecclesiastical state till after the fruitless vow of turning Monk. This is most false.

(44) This expression has been, with good reason, struck out of the Dutch Edition of Moreri.

† A Sect which arose in Germany and the Low-Countries about the end of the 13th Century, and held several pernicious opinions. ADD. REM.

(45) Sorel, *Biblioth. Franc.* pag. 94. citing the *History of France by Dupleix*, under Charles the Fair.

(46) It is from him that Moreri has taken almost all the Article of Charron.

[*N*] *The Cut before his Book of Wisdom seems to be an Emblem in favour of Scepticism.*] Charron, in the frontispiece of his Book, caused Wisdom to be represented *by a beautiful woman stark naked . . with a healthy, masculine, and chearful countenance . . . standing with her feet close joined on a cube: she has on her head a crown of laurel and olive, which signifies victory and peace; a space or void around her, which signifies liberty. On her right hand are these words,* I KNOW NOT, *which is her motto, and on her left these other words,* PEACE AND LITTLE, *which is the Author's motto. . . . Below there are four little, ill favoured, despicable, wrinkled women, chained, and whose chains reach and are fastened to the Cube which is under the feet of Wisdom, who despises, condemns and tramples on them; two of them are on the right hand of the Title, viz. Passion and Opinion. Passion is meagre, with a disordered countenance; Opinion with wild looks, fickle, heedless, supported by a number of people, that is, the mob. The two others are on the opposite side of the title; viz. Superstition with an appalled countenance, and her hands joined, like a servant who trembles for fear: And false science, artificial, acquired, and pedantic virtue or sufficiency, a slave to laws and customs, with a swollen, proud, and arrogant countenance, and lofty eyebrows, who reads in a book wherein there is written,* YES, NO (47).

(47) Taken from the Explication of the Frontispiece, at the end of the Preface to the Book of *Wisdom*.

[*O*] *We should say something of what the Sieur Sorel observes*

ſages which cauſed the greateſt clamours againſt our Theologal: one concerns the immortality of the Soul, and the other relates ſimply to Religion. I think I may ſay, that the ſincerity, with which this learned man repreſented the whole force of the Objections, ſtrongly contributed to the doubts which were raiſed as to his Chriſtianity. It is certain that he did not weaken the difficulties of the Libertines. I ſhall give an inſtance of it, which relates to the diviſions among Chriſtians [P], and the hatred which they bear to one another. It

obſerves concerning our Author.] He ſays, among other things, that there are ſome people who *aſſert that Charron is more dangerous than Montagne, who was a Cavalier, becauſe he being a Doctor of Divinity and a Preacher, his Book is read as a piece proper for Chriſtian inſtruction, and that nevertheleſs he has very bad notions of Religion* (48). Sorel mentions two; but as he abridges the words of the Original too much, I ſhall give them at full length at the end of this Remark. *To this it is anſwered*, proceeds he, *that Charron openly profeſſed to ſpeak freely according to his own thoughts, and that if his words are all interpreted in an ill ſenſe, when his intention was good, the fault ought not to be imputed to him.* Let us obſerve, by the way, that a Lay-Writer, who is diſtinguiſhed by no character, ought to enjoy a greater liberty of ſpeaking whatever he thinks, than a Doctor in Divinity, a Preacher, or a Profeſſor; for it is preſumed that ſuch perſons advance nothing but what is deſigned for inſtruction, and that they would have their ſentiments embraced. In conſequence whereof, it is ſuppoſed that they have thoroughly examined their doctrines; and when a man conſiders their character, he eaſily ſuffers himſelf to be drawn away by the weight of authority. But if it be conſidered that it is a lay-man, dignified by no character, who ſpeaks, his arguments make no great impreſſion; his particular opinions are looked upon as advanced at a venture, and therefore his Scepticiſm is of no great conſequence. From whence it follows, that the venom which might be in Montagne's Writings, would be incomparably leſs dangerous than that which might be found in the Books of Charron. I have elſewhere mentioned a particular which Sorel has taken notice of, that a Phyſician named Chanet maintained againſt Charron that brutes do not reaſon. He adds, that *ſomebody* (49) *has ſaid that Charron was no more than the Amanuenſis of Montagne and du Vair. And indeed, Charron has taken a great many Philoſophical ſentences word for word out of Montagne's Eſſays, and his deſcription of the paſſions is wholly Mr. du Vair's.* He obſerves that *a great many perſons of honour and probity have taken Charron's part* (50). *The learned* Naudé *has ſaid in his* Bibliographia, "*That he eſteemed him ſo highly, that he preferred him to Socrates: That Socrates had only ſpoken to his diſciples confuſedly, and as occaſion required; Whereas Charron had reduced Wiſdom to an Art, which was a divine performance, and that if in ſome places he ſpoke like Seneca and Plutarch, he always carried their thoughts farther than they would have done.*" *In a word, it is not to be believed that a man of good morals, of an unblemiſhed life and exemplary modeſty, as Charron was, had any ill intention in his Writings.* This concluſion is infinitely better than the Tranſlation of Gabriel Naudé's Latin. See the Margin (51).

Let us now tranſcribe the two Paſſages which I have promiſed. "We muſt ſometimes legitimate and authoriſe not only things which are not good, but even thoſe which are bad; as though to be good, it were neceſſary to have ſome tincture of evil. And this is ſeen not only in matters of government and juſtice, but even in Religion; which plainly ſhews that the whole human frame and conduct is compoſed and made up of crazy pieces." This is the firſt paſſage: you will find it in the fourth Chapter of the Iſt Book of Wiſdom, page 25 of the Bourdeaux Edition of 1601. The Author ſtruck out the laſt lines in the Paris Edition of 1604. He ſtopped after having ſaid (52) *and this is ſeen every where, in government, juſtice, truth, and religion.* But take notice that he retrenched nothing of what he had advanced to prove his theſis. He had ſaid, *after all, what diſcovers human weakneſs better than Religion?* He had proved this from Scripture and by evident notions. This whole paſſage was preſerved in the Edition which he corrected, and which was examined after his deceaſe. Whence we may conclude that on many occaſions a man appears a heretic only by his manner of expreſſing himſelf. Take away certain words which ſeem too harſh, and make uſe of others which ſignify the ſame thing, but are not quite ſo rough, and inſtead of being reputed a heretic, you will paſs for a true believer: the impreſſion of your work will be no longer prohibited, and the ſale of it will be allowed. In the main, this theſis of our Theologal proved, and explained in the manner it appears in his Book, is moſt true. Now follows the ſecond paſſage: "The immortality of the ſoul is a thing the "moſt univerſally, religiouſly, and plauſibly received "by all the world (I mean by an external and pub- * Book II, "lic profeſſion, not by an internal, ſerious, and ſin- chap. v. "cere belief, which will be ſpoken of hereafter *,) "the moſt uſefully believed, and the moſt weakly "proved, and eſtabliſhed by human means and argu- "ments." Theſe words are to be read in the XVth Chapter of the Iſt Book of Wiſdom, of the Edition of Bourdeaux: they were corrected in the following manner. *The Immortality of the Soul is a thing the moſt univerſally, religiouſly (for it is the principal foundation of all Religion,) and plauſibly entertained by all the world: I mean with an external and public profeſſion; but not ſo much with a ſerious, internal, and ſincere one; witneſs ſo many Epicureans, Libertines, and Scoffers: however the Sadducees, who were the men of greateſt quality among the Jews, made no ſcruple to deny it: the moſt uſefully believed, and ſomewhat tolerably proved by divers natural and human reaſons, but properly and better eſtabliſhed by the authority of Religion than by any other means* (53). After this correction, no fair pretenee for murmuring was left; for it would be very unjuſt to blame a man who ſhould declare that the ſtrongeſt arguments which convince him of the immortality of the Soul, are thoſe which he draws from the word of God. This is what I ſhall amply treat of in the article of POMPONATIUS. Before the correction, the only complaint which could be juſtly made was of the prejudice which ſuch a conceſſion might occaſion, not in reſpect to the ſimple, whoſe faith as to this doctrine is founded ſolely on Revelation (54), but in reſpect to Libertines, who might take advantage of the authority of ſo famous an Eccleſiaſtic. It ſeems, after all, that this prejudice was not much to be feared; for the Libertines who have any learning care very little for a Divine's acknowledging that the philoſophical proofs of the Immortality of the Soul are not ſtrong. They are not ignorant that ſuch a confeſſion will do them no ſervice ſo long as the proofs drawn from Scripture are ſo demonſtrative as they are. They know very well that Ariſtotle's Hypotheſes (55) concerning the mortality and materiality of the ſouls of brutes, and the real diſtinction between matter and extenſion (56) weaken all the natural reaſons for the ſpirituality of our ſouls. Whether this be owned or not, they do not think the thing the leſs clear for that. Even at this day they perſiſt in their prejudices, becauſe they ſee the ſtrong proofs which the new Philoſophy has afforded of the Immortality of the Soul lead to either the one or the other of theſe two concluſions which ſeem equally abſurd, either that the ſoul of brutes is immortal, or that brutes are meer machines.

[P] *He did not weaken the difficulties of the Libertines. I ſhall give an inſtance of it which relates to the diviſions among Chriſtians.*] "It is indeed a ſtrange "thing that the Chriſtian Religion, which being the "only true Religion in the world, and revealed by "God, ought to be preciſely one, and indiviſible, ſince "there is but one God and one truth, ſhould yet be "rent into ſo many parts, and divided into ſo many "contrary opinions and ſects; ſo that there is not a "ſingle article of faith, or point of doctrine, which "has not been differently debated and diſcuſſed, and "concerning which there have not been contrary "ſects and hereſies. And what makes it ſeem yet "more ſtrange is, that in the other falſe and ſpurious "Religions, the Gentile, the Pagan, the Jewiſh, and

(48) Sorel, *Biblioth. Franç.* pag. 92.

(49) It is *Balzac*, if we believe Moreri in the Article of *Peter Charron*.

(50) Sorel, *Biblioth. Françoiſe*, pag. 95, 96.

(51) Here are the Words of Naudé, pag. m. 13, of his *Bibliographia Politica. Petrus Charondas vel hoc ipſo Socrate ſapientior æſtimandus venit, quod ſapientiæ ipſius præcepta primus, quod ſciam, admirabili prorſus methodo, doctrina, judicio in artem reduxerit. Sane ejus liber, & Ariſtotelem nobis exhibet & Senecam, & Plutarchum, ac divinius etiam aliquid præ ſe fert, quam Antiquioribus cunctis & recentioribus fuerit conceſſum.*
It is evident that Sorel has perverted Naudé's thought.

(52) In the 38th chapter of the 1ſt Book, pag. m. 188.

(53) Charron, *de la Sageſſe*, liv. 1. chap. 7. Ed. Paris 1604; it is page 63 of the Edition of Roan, 1623.

(54) The common people are not acquainted with the philoſophical arguments for the immortality of the Soul.

(55) As they were explained in the time of Charron in the Catholic and Proteſtant Univerſities, they admitted the Categories of Ariſtotle; they thought therefore that Quantity was diſtinct from Matter, as the Accident is diſtinct from the Subſtance.

(56) The Proteſtant Peripatetics have indeed maintained actual Quantity to be inſeparable from Matter, but not to be the Eſſence of it.

It is remarkable, that in the year 1607 (*g*), there remained no male poſterity of Thibaud Charron (*b*), the father of him who is the ſubject of this Article, though he had five and twenty children; four by his firſt wife, and one and twenty by his (*i*) ſecond (*k*).

(*g*) *Elogy of Charron*, at the beginning.
(*b*) He was a Bookſeller of Paris.
(*i*) This was the mother of Peter Charron.
(*k*) *Elogy of Peter Charron*, at the beginning.

" the Mahometan, ſuch diviſions or partialities are " not found. For the diviſions in them are either " few in number, light, and of ſmall importance, as " in the Jewiſh and Mahometan Religions; or if they " have been numerous, as in the Gentile Religion, " and among the Philoſophers, at leaſt they have not " produced very great and ſignal effects or commotions " in the world, and are nothing in reſpect of the great " and pernicious diviſions, which have been among the " profeſſors of the Chriſtian Religion from the very " beginning, and have continued ever ſince. For if " we conſider the effects which the diviſions of Chri- " ſtians have produced, it is a terrible thing. Firſt " as to government and the State, they have frequent- " ly occaſioned changes and ſubverſions of Common- " wealths, Kingdoms, and families, the diviſions of " Empires, and even an univerſal diſturbance of the " world, with cruel, furious, and more than bloody " deeds, to the very great ſcandal, ſhame, and re- " proach of Chriſtendom; where, under the name of " zeal and affection for Religion, each party mortally " hates all the reſt, and deems it lawful to commit " all kinds of hoſtilities. A thing which is not ſeen " in other Religions. Chriſtians alone are allowed to " be murderers, perfidious, treacherous, and recipro- " cally to commit all ſorts of cruelty againſt the " living, and the dead, againſt men's honour, life, " memory, minds, ſepulchers, and aſhes, by fire, ſword, " abuſive libels, curſes, baniſhments from heaven and " earth, taking up dead bodies out of their graves, " burning of bones, and removing of altars: and this " without accepting any compoſition, and with ſuch " fury, that all conſideration of kindred, affinity, " friendſhip, merit, and obligation are caſt off: and " he who was yeſterday extolled to the ſkies, and de- " clared to be great, wiſe, virtuous, and prudent, if " he change ſides to day, is preached, written, and " cried down as an ignorant, wretched fellow. Here- " in are zeal and warmth for one's Religion ſhewn: " this excepted, in all other reſpects, there is nothing " in the practice of Religion but coldneſs. Thoſe " who behave themſelves with moderation and cau- " tion in this point, are noted and ſuſpected as luke- " warm, and wanting zeal: it is an abominable fault, " to look kindly on, or to treat friendly thoſe of the " contrary party. Some are ſcandalized at all this, " as if the Chriſtian Religion taught men to hate and " perſecute one another, and ſerved us for a Broker " to exerciſe and improve our paſſions of ambition, " avarice, revenge, hatred, malice, cruelty, rebellion, " and ſedition: which elſewhere keep holiday, and " are not ſo violent, as when excited by Religion (57)."

This great ſcandal might at this day be eaſily repreſented in more elegant terms; but I defy our beſt writers to expreſs it with more force, or to expoſe the ſhamefulneſs of it more effectually. Charron employs his utmoſt ſkill to remove it; and he ſpares no pains: a man would be as much in the wrong to charge him with any prevarication in this reſpect, as Gataſſe is to bring that charge againſt him with regard to another point. Let us cite that Jeſuit's words: they are exceedingly unjuſt (58). " In the ſame place (59) he " openly declares, tho', according to his uſual cuſtom, " with a treacherous and ſmooth train of words, " *That Religion is a wiſe invention of men, to retain* " *the populace in their duty:* and tho' he ſeems to put " it into the mouth of the Atheiſts, yet he acts like " Lucilio Vanini, or rather the latter acts like the for- " mer; he betrays his cauſe: for he ſets down the full " ſtrength of their reaſons, explains them, comments " upon them, puts them in order, and ſo leaves them. " A baſe prevarication, but common with thoſe two " Writers (60)." It is moſt falſe to ſay Charron does this; for after having faithfully propoſed the Objections of the Atheiſts, he refutes them with a great deal of application and ſolidity. But this is what diſpleaſes vulgar Authors who have more wit and learning than ſincerity. They would have the enemies of the good cauſe always ſhewn in a languid and ridiculous equipage, or at leaſt their ſtrong objections oppoſed by an anſwer yet ſtronger. Sincerity is againſt the firſt method; and the nature of the ſubject ſometimes renders the other impoſſible. I have long been ſurprized to ſee thoſe looked on as prevaricators who propoſe to themſelves great difficulties, and refute them weakly. What! do you expect to have the Anſwers of a Divine concerning myſteries which ſurpaſs reaſon, be as clear as the Objections of a Philoſopher? Nay from this very thing, that a doctrine is myſterious, and almoſt utterly incomprehenſible to the weakneſs of human underſtanding, it neceſſarily follows that our reaſon will oppoſe it with very ſtrong arguments, and can find out no other good ſolution than the Authority of God. However it be, Charron flattered not his own ſide: he had a penetrating wit, he diſcovered a long way off the ſhifts and doubles of an Adverſary who either attacks, or is attacked. He took his meaſures accordingly, he explained himſelf ingenuouſly, and uſed no cunning to get the better. But he ſuffered for it: for the world likes not ſuch candor.

I ſhall give elſewhere (61) another inſtance of his ſincerity in diſplaying difficulties.

(57) Charron, in the 1ſt Chapter of the 3d Book of the *three Truths*.
(58) Ibid.
(59) That is, in the firſt Book of the *three Truths*.
(60) Gataſſe, *Apologie contre la Cenſure de la Doctrine Curieuſe*, pag. 266.
(61) In the Remark [*G*] of the Article SIMONIDES.

CHASTEL. (JOHN) the ſon of a Woollen-draper at Paris, attempted to kill Henry IV December the 27th 1594. This Prince having took a journey to the borders of the Province of Artois, was returned to Paris that very day; *he was in the Chamber of his Miſtreſs* (*a*), *who lived then at the Hotel de Bouchage, and as he was going to embrace Montigni, he was ſtruck in his under lip with a knife which broke a tooth in his mouth* (*b*). John Chaſtel, who gave him that blow, and deſigned to cut his throat (*c*), was then but eighteen or nineteen years old. *He had no ſooner given the blow, but he dropt his knife and hid himſelf in the crowd. Every body ſtood amazed, being puzzled whom to charge with the villany; and the wicked young wolf was like to eſcape . . . . but ſome body happened to caſt an eye upon him, and he was taken at a venture* (*d*); *his wild look betrayed him* (*e*). *The King commanded the Captain of his Guards, who had ſeized him, . . . to let him go, ſaying, that he pardoned him. But hearing that he was a diſciple of the Jeſuits, he cried out,* Muſt then the Jeſuits be convicted from my own mouth (*f*)? *This parricide being carried to the priſon* (*g*) called *For-l'Eveque*, was there examined by the great Provoſt or ordinary Judge of the King's Houſhold, and declared the reaſons which determined him to ſuch a deſperate attempt [*A*]. The next day he was brought to

(*a*) Gabriella d'Eſtrée.
(*b*) Mezerai, *Abrégé Chronol.* edit. of Amſt. by Wolfgang in 1676, tom. 6. pag. 127.
(*c*) Cayet, *Chronol. Novenaire*, under the year 1594, folio 432 *verſo*.
(*d*) Paſquier, *Catéchiſme des Jeſuites*, liv. 3. chap. 8. pag. m. 375.
(*e*) Mezerai, *Abrégé Chronol.* tom. 6. pag. 127.
(*f*) Cayet, *Chronol. Novenaire*, under the year 1594, fol. 432 *verſo*.
(*g*) Ibid.

[*A*] *He attempted to kill Henry IV . . . and declared the reaſons which determined him to ſuch a deſperate attempt.*] I cannot quote any Author, whoſe authority ought to be leſs ſuſpected, than that of the Hiſtorian, whoſe words I ſhall tranſcribe. " This parricide, *ſays* " *he* (1), being conducted to the priſon of For-l'Evê- " que, confeſſed, that it was a long while ſince he was " deliberating with himſelf to attempt that murther, " and that having miſſed his aim, he would endeavour " it again if it were in his power, being perſuaded, " that it would be very much to the advantage of Re- " ligion. That within a week he had again begun to " think

(1) Cayet, *Chronol. Novenaire*, under the year 1594, folio 432 *verſo*.

to the *jail belonging to the Parliament*, and repeated the ſame declaration he had made in his former examination (*b*), and was ſentenced to death by a decree of the Parliament December the 29th 1594 [*B*], which ſentence was executed upon him the ſame day by the light of Flambeaux. By the ſame Decree all the Jeſuits were baniſhed out of France (*i*). John Chaſtel's father, and the Jeſuit Gueret, under whom the murtherer was then ſtudying Philoſophy, were tried the 10th of January following (*k*). We ſhall relate below the ſentence that was paſſed upon them [*C*]; we ſhall alſo give a ſhort account

(*b*) Ibid. fol. 423 *verſo*.

(*i*) See the laſt Remark of the Article GUIGNARD.

(*k*) Thuanus, lib. 112. pag. m. 653.

" think of this undertaking, and that about eleven " of the clock that morning, he took the reſolution to " do what he had done, having provided himſelf with " a kniſe, which he took out of the ſide-board at his " father's houſe, and carried it into his cloſet, whence " he came down again to dine with his father and with " ſome other perſons. Being examined concerning his " qualifications, and aſked where he had ſtudied, he " anſwered, that he ſtudied chiefly under the Jeſuits, " with whom he had lived three years, and that he " made his laſt courſe under Father John Gueret a " Jeſuit; that he had ſeen the ſaid Father Gueret on " Friday or Saturday before he made his attempt, hav- " ing been conducted to that Jeſuit by his Father Peter " Chaſtel, to conſult him concerning a caſe of conſci- " ence, which was, that the great ſins he had committed " made him deſpair of God's mercy; that he had of- " ten had a mind to commit very heinous unnatural " crimes, which deſign he had ſeveral times confeſſed " to a Prieſt; that in order to atone for his crimes, he " thought he was obliged to perform ſome great acti- " on; that he often had a mind to murther the King, " and mentioned this fancy to his father, who an- " ſwered him, that it would be an evil action." This is what he anſwered, when he was examined before the Judge of the King's houſhold; here follows what he anſwered the next day before the Officers of the Parliament. " Being aſked " what that great action was, which he thought " he was obliged to perform, in order to atone " for the great crimes, which lay heavy upon his " conſcience, he ſaid, . . . That thinking he was for- " ſaken by God, and being perſuaded, that he ſhould " be damned like Antichriſt, he would of two evils " avoid the worſt, and that ſince he muſt be damned, " he choſe rather to be damned *ut quatuor* than *ut octo*: " (That is, to ſuffer but four degrees of pain, rather " than eight). Being aſked, whether in this deſpe- " rate condition he thought to loſe or to ſave his ſoul " by that wicked action? he anſwered, that this action " of his would leſſen his puniſhment, being perſuaded, " that he would be more ſeverely puniſhed, if he di- " ed without having attempted to murther the King, " and that he would be ſeverely puniſhed, if he en- " deavoured to put him to death; ſo that in his opi- " nion a leſſer puniſhment was a kind of ſalvation, if " compared with the moſt intolerable torments. To " the queſtion whence he had this new Theology, he " replied, from the ſtudy of Philoſophy. Being aſk- " ed, whether he ſtudied Philoſophy in the College of " the Jeſuits? he anſwered, yes, and that he ſtudied " two years and a half under Father Gueret. Being " aſked, whether he never was in the *Meditation-* " *Chamber*, in which are the pictures of ſeveral De- " vils, and a great many ſtrange figures, and in which " the Jeſuits introduce the greateſt ſinners, with a pre- " tence to reclaim them from their wicked lives, but in " reality to diſturb their minds, and to frighten them " by ſuch apparitions into a reſolution to commit ſome " bold action? He anſwered, that he had often been " in that *Meditation-Chamber*. Being aſked, who it " was, that perſuaded him to murther the King? his " anſwer was, That he heard in ſeveral places, it was " an unqueſtionable maxim, that it is lawful to kill " the King, and that they who ſaid it, called him a " Tyrant. Then they aſked him, whether it was not " cuſtomary with the Jeſuits to talk of killing the " King? To which he replied, that he had heard " them ſay, that it was lawful to kill the King, that " he was without the pale of the Church, and that " one ought not to obey him, nor to acknowledge him " for a King, till he had obtained the Pope's appro- " bation. Being again examined in the *Grand-Cham-* " *bre*, the Preſidents, Counſellors, and the *Tournelle* * " being met, he made the ſame anſwers, and particu- " larly aſſerted and maintained the following propoſi- " tion. *It was lawful to kill Kings, even the King* " *now reigning, who was no member of the Church*, as " he ſaid, *becauſe he was not approved by the Pope* (2).

(2) Cayet, *Chronol. Novenaire*, folio 433 *verſo*, &c.

* A Court for criminal Cauſes, belonging to the Parliament of Paris.

[*B*] *He was ſentenced to death by a Decree of the Parliament, December the 29th, 1594.*] They, who want to know a particular account of the ſufferings to which he was condemned, muſt read the following paſſage. *The Court has condemned and does condemn the ſaid John Chaſtel to make honourable amends before the chief door of the Church of Paris, ſtripped to his ſhirt, holding in his hand a lighted wax-taper of two pound weight, and there to ſay and declare on his knees, that he had wickedly and treacherouſly attempted to commit this moſt inhuman and moſt abominable murther, and had wounded the King in the face with a kniſe; and that having been taught a falſe and damnable doctrine, he ſaid on his trial, that it was lawful to kill the King, and that King Henry the IVth now reigning, was not a member of the Church, till he had obtained the Pope's approbation; of which he (the ſaid John Chaſtel) repents, and for which he begs pardon of God, of the King, and of the Court. This done, he is to be carried in a tumbrel to the place of execution †, and there to have the fleſh of his arms and thighs torn off with red-hot pincers; and his right hand, in which he is to hold the knife, with which he endeavoured to commit the murther, cut off; afterwards his body to be drawn and quartered by four horſes pulling ſeveral ways, and his members and corps to be thrown into the fire, and burnt to aſhes, and the aſhes thrown up into the air. The Court alſo has declared and does declare all his goods and chattels forfeited to the King. Before this ſentence be executed upon him, he ſhall alſo be put to the rack and ſuffer the ordinary and extraordinary torture, to force him to declare his accomplices, and ſome other circumſtances relating to his ſaid trial* (3).

† In French *la Place de Greve*, which anſwers to what we call Tyburn.

Let us obſerve, that this ſentence of the Parliament of Paris, was put at Rome in the Index expurgatory, or of prohibited Books. The Author of the *Anticoton* did not let this circumſtance paſs unobſerved; but here follows the anſwer, that was made him. " As for " what he adds, that the ſentence againſt Chaſtel was " cenſured at Rome, we anſwer, that it is falſe, if " taken thus abſolutely without any reſtriction; for " they anſwered from Rome to the late King, that " they anſwered only, what is *de jure*, and not what " is *de facto*, aſſuring him at the ſame time, that " they abhorred Chaſtel's abominable attempt as much " as France herſelf did. But that there was in that " ſentence a clauſe by which a certain propoſition was " declared to be heretical, which they thought fell " under the cognizance of the Church only, and that " this had been the ſubject of the cenſure (4)." One of thoſe, who wrote againſt the *Myſtere d'Iniquité* (5) (the Myſtery of Injuſtice) made uſe of the ſame diſtinction. Rivetus, who anſwered him, admitted it; but maintained that notwithſtanding this, the cenſure was to be blamed (6). Let us alſo obſerve, that the Jeſuits *publiſhed in Flanders, both at Douay and in ſeveral other places an Advertiſement to the Catholicks concerning the Decree which had been made againſt their ſociety*. This Advertiſement in Latin and in French *was diſperſed through all the Kingdoms of Chriſtendom* (7); and there was an Anſwer publiſhed againſt it. You will find in Cayet (8) the chief heads contained in theſe two pieces.

(3) Cayet, *Chronol. Novenaire*, under the year 1594, folio 434 *verſo*.

(4) *Réponſe Apologétique à l'Anticoton*, pag. 45. of the 2d edition in 1611. See alſo Richeome, *Examen Catégorique de l'Anticoton*, pag. 170.

(5) It is a book written by Mr. Du-Pleſſis-Mornai.

(6) Rivet, *Défenſe des deux Epitres, & de la Préface du Myſtére d'iniquité contre les Cavillations & Calomnies de Pelletier & du Bray*, pag. 23, 24.

(7) Cayet, *Chronol. Novenaire*, under the year 1594, folio 437 *verſo*.

(8) Ibid. folio 438, &c.

[*C*] *John Chaſtel's father and the Jeſuit Gueret . . . were tried . . . we ſhall relate . . . the ſentence, that was paſſed upon them.*] " The Court has baniſhed " and does hereby baniſh the ſaid Gueret and Peter " Chaſtel out of the Kingdom of France; namely, " the ſaid Gueret for ever, and the ſaid Chaſtel for " the time and term of nine years, and for ever " out of the city and ſuburbs of Paris; and they are " charged to keep their baniſhment upon pain of be- " ing hanged and ſtrangled, without any further trial. " The Court has alſo declared, and does hereby de- " clare all the goods and chattels of the ſaid Gueret " to

account of a book that was publiſhed ſome time after, with this title, *Apologie pour Jehan Chaſtel*, i. e. "A Defence of John Chaſtel [D]." The Author of this Book relates, that they cauſed a Lay-man to diſguiſe himſelf in the habit of a Prieſt, and that they ſent

"to be forfeited to the King; and has fined, and "condemned and does hereby condemn the ſaid Peter "Chaſtel to pay a fine of two thouſand Crowns, to "be applied towards buying bread for the priſoners "in the Parliament's Jail; the ſaid Chaſtel is to be "kept in priſon till he has fully paid the ſaid ſum, "and the time of his baniſhment to begin only from "the day on which the payment ſhall have been com-"pleated. The Court alſo orders, that the houſe in "which the ſaid Peter Chaſtel lived, be entirely de-"moliſhed and laid even with the ground, and the "ſpot on which it ſtands applied to the uſe of the "public, and that no other houſe be ever built upon "it; but that a high Pillar of free ſtone be ſet up "there for a perpetual monument, for that moſt wick-"ed and abominable murder attempted on the King's "perſon; and that on the ſaid pillar be engraved an "inſcription containing the reaſons for which the "houſe was demoliſhed, and the pillar erected, the "charges of all this to be paid with the money ac-"cruing from the ſale of the materials of the ſaid "houſe (9)." The Hiſtorian from whom I have tranſcribed this, adds, *This ſentence was executed, and the houſe demoliſhed, inſtead of which a pillar was put up, with a table of black marble on each ſide, with inſcriptions in golden letters; on one ſide was John Chaſtel's ſentence, and on the three others, there were verſes and other inſcriptions relating to the ſame ſubject. This pillar has been ſince taken down, and they have cauſed a ſpring to run there inſtead of it, as we ſhall obſerve in the following part of this Hiſtory of the Peace* (10).

(9) Ibid. folio 437.

(10) Ibid. folio 437 *verſo*.

This Writer has omitted a circumſtance, which he ought to have mentioned, namely, that Gueret was put to the rack, and made no confeſſion.

[D] *We ſhall give a ſhort account of a Book .... intitled a* Defence of John Chaſtel.] The whole title is as follows. *Apologie pour Jehan Chaſtel Pariſien, executé à mort, & pour les Péres & Eſcholiers de la Societé de Jeſus, bannis du Royaume de France, contre l'Arrêt du Parlement donné contre eux à Paris le 29 de Decembre, Anno* 1594, *Diviſée en cinq Parties. Par François de Veronne Conſtantin.* i. e. "A Defence of John "Chaſtel of Paris, who was executed, and of the fa-"thers and ſcholars of the Society of Jeſus, againſt "the decree of the Parliament given againſt them at "Paris, December the 29th, 1594. Divided into "five parts; By Francis de Veronne Conſtantin."

The firſt part contains ſeven chapters, in which the Author deſigns to undeceive thoſe, who judge of things only by the outward reſemblance, which there is often between good and evil. If a man minds only the outward appearance of John Chaſtel's action, and conſiders only the perſons concerned, he will conclude that Chaſtel was guilty of the moſt abominable parricide; for he will think, that a private perſon attempted to murther his lawful Prince. *But*, adds this Author (11), *a man who conſiders what things really are, rather than what is ſaid of them, and who has a regard for the judgment, not of paſſionate people, but of the Church, and of the State, who obſerves what the Laws are both human and divine, the fundamental laws of the Kingdom, which have always been received, publiſhed, revered, practiſed and admitted in France, namely, that an excommunicated perſon, an heretic, a relapſe, a profaner of ſacred things, a man declared to be a public enemy, a perſecutor, an oppreſſor of Religion, does as ſuch* ipſo facto *forfeit his right of ſucceeding to the Crown, and conſequently is a tyrant and not a King, an uſurper and not a natural Lord, a criminal and not a lawful ſovereign; a man*, I ſay, who conſiders this, *(unleſs he be mad, and loſt to all ſenſe of humanity, and of love towards God, towards the Church and toward his Country) will forbear ſaying otherwiſe, but that to endeavour to rid the world of ſuch a monſter, is a generous, virtuous, and heroical action, worthy to be compared with the greateſt and moſt commendable actions recorded in ancient Hiſtory either ſacred or profane. One thing only can be blamed in John Chaſtel, and that is, that he did not accompliſh his deſign, by ſending the wicked* to his own place, *like Judas whoſe followers he ſupports, and theſe are the Calviniſts. And as his deſign miſcarried, ſome will ſay*, that it was evidently a bleſſing from heaven, and that they who doubt of it are atheiſts (*as ſome ſcribler wrote it*) *whereas others will ſay with much more reaſon, that it is a proof, not of God's favour, but of his anger, not of his mercy, but of his indignation againſt his people, from whom he would not yet take off the rod of Aſſur (whom yet he has curſed)* nor break the yoke of his burthen, *nor* the ſtaff of his ſhoulder, *nor* the rod of his oppreſſor, as in the day of Midian *. *And as for the tyrant himſelf, it is not ſo much a preſervation of him, as a delay for a better time, till the hour, appointed by God, is come; then he ſhall be puniſhed more ſeverely in the next world, when his malice ſhall be completed, and the people ſhall have been ſufficiently puniſhed.* Obſerve, that in the XIIth Chapter of the Vth Part, page 249, he gives his readers hopes, that another murderer will ſucceed better. *If of late*, ſays he, *the firſt blow, which the Prince of the Beggars* (he means William Prince of Orange) *received, hit only his jaw-bone, the ſecond was more ſucceſsful. And as the former was an omen of the latter, ſo the ſame will happen to him, who has now been ſtruck only in his face.* The Reader may underſtand by the paſſages, which I have quoted, that this writer grounds his vindication or apology upon the ſuppoſition, that Henry IV was not a King, but a Tyrant and an Uſurper.

(11) *Apologie pour Jehan Chaſtel*, 1 Part chap. 7. pag. m. 21.

* Iſaiah ix. 4.

He undertakes to prove in the ſecond part, *that Chaſtel's action is lawful.* He grants, that *Kings are ſacred perſons* (21), but then he aſſerts, *that Chaſtel's intention was not to wound or to kill a King, but only one who called himſelf King, and who only reſembled a King, if not by his gravity or perſonal merit, at leaſt becauſe he is of the blood of the Kings of France, and is waited on as a King; tho' otherwiſe he be no more a King, than he is an heir to the faith, virtue and merit of the Kings of France. And having been for this reaſon, that is, for his impiety and hereſy, moſt juſtly excluded from the throne, he can only be a King* de facto, *and not* de jure, *which is downright tyranny, and tyranny with a witneſs* (13). He ſays, that the pretended converſion of Henry IV cannot entitle him to the Crown (14), conſidering his *Excommunication both* de jure *and* de facto, *ſtill keeps him bound and continues to have its natural effect, namely, to deprive him of the Kingdom* (15). He even aſſerts (16), that the Pope's abſolution would not be ſufficient, to re-eſtabliſh a man, *who had been condemned not only by the Church, but even by the States; for the Pope can indeed acquit a perſon from the ſpiritual puniſhments, but not from the temporal* (17). He goes farther ſtill, and even brings his right to the Crown into queſtion (18); he quotes ſeveral inſtances to prove, that even in France they have often excluded the neareſt heir to the Crown, that they might have an opportunity to inſiſt upon their right of election in favour of a more remote inheritor. *And as to the particular regulations concerning the right of ſucceſſion*, continues he (19), *ſince the learned agree, that a man can no longer claim a right of conſanguinity beyond the tenth degree, we may judge from thence how weak and ill-grounded his claim muſt be, who is in the twenty ſecond degree of conſanguinity.* He reckons otherwiſe than Mr. de Perefixe, who ſuppoſes but ten or eleven degrees of kindred between Henry III and Henry IV (20), as I have obſerved in another place (21). He ſays in Chapter the XIth, that we ought to prefer the moſt important commandments before thoſe that are leſs important, *and that according to this rule*, if murther be unlawful generally ſpeaking, *yet it is lawful to kill ſome ſort of perſons, and amongſt others theſe two ſorts*, viz. *Heretics and Tyrants* (22), for which he quotes ſome paſſages from the Scriptures and from Canon-Law; and in the XIth Chapter he aſſerts, that heretics *muſt be put to death by private perſons, if it cannot be done otherwiſe.* He alledges (23) a decree of the Parliament of Paris made in the year 1560, and pronounced *by the late Preſident le Maiſtre againſt heretics, and which made it lawful for any one to kill them. This decree was grounded on very weighty reaſons, ſince no beaſt is more dangerous than that, which devours the ſoul, no robber more dreadful than he who robs men of their Faith and Religion, no aſp more venomous*

(12) *Apologie pour Jehan Chaſtel*, 2 Part. chap. 2.

(13) Ibid. chap. 3 pag. 31.

(14) Ibid. chap 4.

(15) Ibid. chap. 5. pag. 38.

(16) Ibid. chap. 8.

(17) Ibid. pag. 55.

(18) Ibid. chap. 9.

(19) Ibid. pag. 71.

(20) We find but ten or eleven degrees between Robert of France, the Stock of the Bourbons, who was the fixth ſon of St. Lewis (the common anceſtor of Henry III. and Henry IV) and this latter. Robert was born in 1256, and Henry IV in 1553: but the difference between Mr. De Perefixe's account and that of the Author of *Chaſtel's Apology*, comes from thence, that the degrees of kindred are reckoned otherwiſe in the Civil Law, than they are in the Common-Law.

(21) In the Remark [E] of the Article of HENRY IV.

(22) *Apologie pour Jehan Chaſtel*, Part 2. chap. 13. pag. 75.

(23) Ibid. chap. 12. pag. 81.

sent him as a Father Confeſſor to John Chaſtel, in order to diſcover by this artifice the whole myſtery of this affair; but that the pretended Confeſſor did not know how to act his

nomous than that, which whilſt it fauns upon you, ſtings you thro' the heart; and no poiſoner more pernicious, than he who poiſons the waters of Jacob's wells * *(which is the word of God or the Scripture) as the Philiſtines did formerly.* In the XIIIth Chapter he tranſcribes what ſeveral Authors have ſaid, namely, that the killing of Tyrants is a lawful and commendable action. He ſays, that *Lyranus* †, *Cajetanus*, *Soto*, *Sylveſter*, *Fumus*, *and others after St. Thomas*, . . *Fernandus Vaſquius*, *Covarruvias* ‡, *and others unanimouſly aſſert*, even without ſpeaking of Religion, "That when a Tyrant by force of arms, or by other wicked means, uſurps an unlawful authority, to which he has no right, and no recourſe can be had to a ſuperior judge to bring the tyrant to juſtice, and his tyranny cannot otherwiſe be ſuppreſſed, in ſuch a caſe, it is lawful for every private perſon amongſt the people to kill the uſurper; *even as Cajetanus adds*, with poiſon, and in a treacherous manner. *And St. Thomas vindicates Cicero's ſaying upon this ſubject, which we have quoted above from his Offices*, and adds the following argument; as a Tyrant makes an unjuſt war againſt all the people in general, and againſt every private perſon, and on the contrary they all are juſtly at war with him, they may employ againſt him all that the laws of war allow againſt a real enemy; ſo that if he be killed it is by a public and not a private authority (24). Even the heretics, adds he (25), have filled their Books with theſe maxims, tho' they talk differently according as their affairs charge, or as they live under a Prince, who favours or oppoſes them. This appears from the Author of the queſtions under the name of Junius Brutus, from George Buchanan in his Book *de jure Regni &c.* in which *he places tyrants amongſt the ſavage beaſts, and ſays they ought to be treated alike*; from Bodin in his Republick, where he ſays that a tyrant who employs violent means, muſt undergo the penalty of the *Lex Valeria* (or Valerian Law) by which it is ordered, that ſuch men be put to death without any tryal. To this muſt be aſcribed the murthers of ſo many Noblemen in France, Scotland, England and Germany, whom they have ſlaughtered by their Miniſter's advice, under colour that they were Tyrants, becauſe they were Catholics. Hence alſo the murther of ſeveral Kings, as that of Charles IX; we may likewiſe quote Beza's Panegyric, in which he canonizes Poltrot and makes a Saint of him, becauſe he had killed the great Francis of Lorrain Duke of Guiſe, whom they above all ſtiled a Tyrant. In this reſpect the only difference there is between them (the heretics) and us, is this, *viz.* who muſt or muſt not be called a Tyrant." He finiſhes this ſecond part with a particular account of the ſeveral advantages which accrue from John Chaſtel's attempt, and on this occaſion he abuſes Henry IV in a moſt bitter and outragious manner.

In the third part he aſſerts, that *John Chaſtel's action is heroical*; he extols him above Ehud, Phineas, and Mattathias (26); nor does he forget to compare his courage with that of the Prince of Orange's two murtherers (27), and to that of James Clement. Nor does he omit *the Godly Poet Cornelius Muſius* (38), who ſuffered martyrdom in Holland as he calls it, adding, that *De Lumay, who was his executioner, was afterwards rewarded as he deſerved, having been torn to pieces and devoured by his own dogs.* Our apologiſt deſcribes at large Chaſtel's courage and reſolution at his confeſſion, at his examination, upon the rack, when he made honourable amends, and at his execution. When he made honourable amends *he was earneſtly preſſed to declare, that he repented, and begged pardon of God*; but *tho' he was quite maimed by his ſufferings upon the rack*, yet he ſaid, "that he begged God's mercy for the "ſins he had committed during the whole courſe of "his life, and eſpecially, that he had not accompliſhed "what he attempted to rid the world of the moſt "dangerous enemy the Church had upon the whole face "of the earth (29)." It is a deplorable thing, that a parricide like this ſhould ſhew as much reſolution as the moſt illuſtrious Martyrs of the primitive Church.

In the fourth part he criticizes upon the decree of the Parliament of Paris againſt John Chaſtel; he pretends to obſerve ſeveral notorious falſities in it; and even a downright hereſy and great abſurdities in the condemnation of Chaſtel's action, in that part of the ſentence which related to the honourable amends, and in their *prohibiting ever to utter John Chaſtel's maxims*, which he maintains, are neither ſcandalous, nor ſeditious, nor contrary to the word of God.

His deſign in the fifth part is to expoſe the *defects and abſurdities* with which the ſentence pronounced againſt the Jeſuits abounded, according to him. Here he inveighs moſt paſſionately againſt Achilles de Harlai the firſt Preſident, and againſt Servin Advocate General in the Parliament of Paris. He aſſerts that this ſentence contains ſeveral calumnies and aſperſions, and enlarges upon the praiſes of the Jeſuits; he alſo anſwers Anthony Arnauld's plea, and labours to juſtify the two Jeſuits, one of whom had been put to the rack (30) and the other hanged (31); he makes a Martyr of the latter, and in the cloſe of his Book he exhorts his Readers very earneſtly to exterminate the enemy of God and of the Church.

This apology for John Chaſtel was firſt printed in 1595; it was afterwards reprinted in 1610 after the tragical death of Henry IV; they added four ſmall pieces to it. I. The firſt had been printed at Paris in 1589 for Nicholas Nivelle, in St. James's ſtreet, at the two Pillars, and Rolin Thierry, in the Engliſh ſtreet (*ruë des Anglois*) near Maubert's Square (*la Place Maubert*,) Bookſeller and Printer to the Holy Union *; it is intitled, *Effects épouvantables de l'excommunication de* HENRY DE VALOIS et de HENRY DE NAVARRE, *où eſt contenue au vray l'Hiſtoire de la mort de* Henry de Valois, *& que* Henry de Navarre *eſt incapable de la Couronne de France*. i. e. "An account of the dreadful effects of the Excommunication of HENRY DE "VALOIS, and of HENRY DE NAVARRE, containing alſo the true Hiſtory of *Henry of Valois's* death, "and proving that *Henry de Navarre* cannot lawfully "inherit the Crown of France." II. The ſecond is "intitled; *Lettre de l'illuſtriſſime Cardinal de Montalte écrite par le commandement de notre S. Pere le Pape au Conſeil general de la Sainte Union*. i. e. "A letter "of the moſt illuſtrious Cardinal de Montalte written "by the Pope's command to the general Council of "the Holy Union." This letter has been printed at Paris with a licence in 1589 by the ſame Booksellers, who publiſhed the former piece. III. The third is intitled, *Diſcours par lequel il eſt montré qu'il n'eſt loiſible au Subject de médire de ſon Roy, & encor moins d'attenter à ſa perſonne*. i. e. "A diſcourſe, in which "it is proved, that it is not lawful for a ſubject to re"vile his King, much leſs to attempt upon his perſon." IV. The fourth is intitled, *Les ſoupirs de la France ſur la mort de ſon Roy Henry IV, & la fidelité des François*. i. e. "The ſighs of France upon the death of "her King Henry IV, and the loyalty of the French." The collection of all theſe pieces contains 323 pages in 8vo, whereof the apology for John Chaſtel takes up the firſt 256. Notwithſtanding this ſecond Edition the Book is become very ſcarce, ſo that I thought the Readers would not be diſpleaſed to find a ſhort account of it in this place.

The perſon, who cauſed it to be reprinted in 1610 owns, that the chief reaſon which induced him to republiſh it, *was amongſt others, that the world might be convinced, it is from the Jeſuit's ſchool that ſuch parricides, as Ravaillac, are ſent abroad.* He ſays, that this murtherer *had been encouraged to aſſaſſinate his King, among other things, by the damnable doctrine which is taught in this apology for John Chaſtel, in which it is impudently aſſerted, that* Henry IV could not be a King, tho' he had been abſolved, and *in which it is expreſly declared*, that heretics and their abettors, and eſpecially the relapſe, being *ipſo facto* ſentenced to death by all the laws both human and divine, may lawfully be killed by every private perſon, if it cannot be done otherwiſe, *as the Reader may ſee in the ſecond part of that Apology, Chapter the 8th, &c.* (32). He obſerves, that *the Jeſuits thought fit to hide and ſuppreſs this Apology, not becauſe they were aſhamed and repented*

* Gen. xxvi.

† Lyr. in xxxi Num.

‡ Covarruv. *Diſp. de Matrim.* num. 6. *Fumus in Armil. Cajet.* 2. 2. q. 64. Art. 3. Th. 2. Sent. Diſt ult. q. 2. Art. 2. ad ult.

(24) *Apol. pour J. Chaſtel.* Part 2. pag. 84, 85.

(25) Ibid. pag. 85, 86.

(26) Ibid. Part III. chap. 1. pag. 117.

(27) The firſt was John Jaureguy, a native of Biſcay, about 18 years old, who ſhot the Prince with a piſtol in the jaw-bone, March 18, 1582. The other was Balthazar Gerard a Gentleman of Burgundy, aged 34 years, who ſhot the Prince dead on the ſpot with a piſtol charged with three bullets at Delft in Holland, July 10, 1584. *Apologie pour J. Chaſtel*, pag. 119.

(28) Ibid. pag. 120.

(29) Ibid. pag. 143.

(30) John Guet.

(31) JOHN GUIGNARD. See his Article.

* That is to ſay the *League*.

(32) *Apologie pour Jean Chaſtel*, folio A 3 *verſo*.

his part [*E*]. It is a matter of ſurpriſe, that the ſeveral accounts of this horrid attempt ſhould

of their wickedneſs, and of ſuch abominable murthers, but only becauſe they feared, leſt Kings and Princes, taking notice of that apology, ſhould entertain ſuch an averſion for them, as not to ſuffer them any longer at Court and in their Councils, there to perform the Pope's commands (33). The Author of the Anticoton aſſerted, that John Chaſtel's apology was a work of the Jeſuits (34); but they always maintained that this was an impoſture, and *that no Jeſuit had ever a hand in it* (35). *All the world knows*, ſays Richeome (36), *that the Jeſuits are not the Authors of the Book intitled* de Juſta Henrici tertii abdicatione, i. e. *Of the lawful depoſition of Henry III*, nor of Veron Conſtantin's apology for John Chaſtel; *and the late King* (37), *who was entirely perſuaded of our innocence, diſcountenanced all theſe ſlanderers, who charged us with it before his Majeſty.*

(33) Ibid. folio A 2 *verſo.*

(34) *Anticoton*, pag. 18.

(35) *Réponſe Apologetique à l'Anticoton*, pag. 45.

(36) Richeome's *Examen categorique de l'Anticoton*, pag. 185.

(37) He means Henry IV.

It is very probable, that theſe two Books were written by John Boucher, who as we have obſerved in his article (38) was the moſt ſeditious and the moſt unruly Preacher, that ever endeavoured to inſpire the minds of the people with a ſpirit of rebellion againſt their lawful Sovereign.

(38) See the Remark [*B*] in the Article BOUCHER.

[*E*] . . . . *The Author of this Book relates, that they cauſed a Layman to diſguiſe himſelf in the habit of a Prieſt, and that they ſent him as a Father Confeſſor to John Chaſtel . . . .; but that the pretended Confeſſor did not know how to act his part.*] Here follow the apologiſt's own words. " To mention now the artifices, Lieutenant Lugoly, who played his part ſo " well, knows in his conſcience how the affair went, " as well as they, who had a ſhare in the ſacrilege " he committed, when he diſguiſed himſelf in the habit of a Prieſt, and perſonated a Father Confeſſor, " in order to pump ſomething out of Chaſtel by way " of a ſacramental confeſſion, or at leaſt, to feign " he had heard ſomething from him, whence they " might take an advantage againſt him, and againſt " thoſe, who were partakers of his martyrdom (39). " . . . How well did they towards this penitent in this " ſhameful impoſture? The hook was too weak to " catch ſo large a fiſh: it was a childiſh trick, and " too coarſe a device; ſuch a thin cobweb will not " hold ſo large a fly. Such hares are not catched at " the noiſe of this drum, nor ſuch birds at the ſight " of the net. To play ſuch a part well a man muſt " ſtudy it a little before hand; but the poor man did " not know what it was to hear one's confeſſion, for " he never partook of that Sacrament, *but for form " ſake, once in three years* (as the Engliſhman ſaid of " himſelf, after the betraying of Paris.) Since therefore " he was not ſo well ſkilled in this, as in the querks of " the law, and in the means to debauch girls and women, he was ſoon diſcovered, and tho' it was dark " and he diſſembled as much as he could, yet Chaſtell, who knew what it was to receive one's confeſſion, and was perfectly well acquainted with all " the circumſtances of this ceremony, found him " out immediately: for this Reverend Father in God, " newly made, forgot to recite the uſual Prayer and " Benediction, which the Confeſſor ſays, before he receives the penitent's confeſſion; thus Chaſtel diſcovered that he was not a Prieſt, as the rat is known " by the noiſe he makes, and the aſs by his braying; " for he was as proper for this buſineſs as a child is " to perſonate Hercules, or a fool to act the Philoſopher; he wanted a Prompter, like the Players at " the *Hotel de Bourgogne*. The Mine having thus taken " vent, before it was ſet on fire, the whole artifice " came to nothing, and the miſerable wretch was " loaded with ſhame and infamy, as his impious ignorance, and ignorant impiety deſerved. Except that " he had recourſe to another artifice, which was to " ſpread with the utmoſt impudence, ſuch reports and " calumnies, as we have related above, againſt him " from whoſe mouth he heard nothing but a very " ſevere reproof, and an abhorrence of his ſacrilege " (40)." The Apologiſt exclaims very bitterly againſt ſuch an abuſe of the Sacrament of Penitence; he calls it an impiety and ſacrilege, and pretends that it cannot be juſtified by the precedents that are alledged. " It is true, ſays he, that the like had been done be-

(39) *Apologie pour J. Chaſtel*, Part 3. chap. 3. pag. 127, 128.

" fore by two other perſons of the ſame faction, the " one an open enemy and an heretic, the other a " traitor and a hypocrite. The former was one Santour a native of Champagne, who impoſed upon " Mauclerc a Doctor and Preacher, whom he took on " the road as he was returning to Paris from Troyes, " where he had preached during Lent in the year 1589. " After he frightened him with preſent death to ſuch " a degree that he made him beg for a Confeſſor, he " impoſed a Layman inſtead of a Prieſt upon him. " The other was Marins, a Gaſcoon, nephew to the " Sieur de Belin, one of the contrivers of the treaſon " of Paris *, in which city he was left for that pur- " poſe; he impoſed upon a Surgeon, who was a ſer- " vant to the Sieur le Bailleur, in the year 1594, " not long before the treaſon; it was in order to " find a ring, which had been loſt in the houſe of " a wicked woman, who is but too much known, " and with whom he had a criminal converſation, as " he had with ſeveral other women, and even with " his neareſt relations: as he ſuſpected that the Surgeon, who was come to that houſe to dreſs him, " had taken the ring, he firſt had his thumbs ſqueezed " to pieces, in order to make him confeſs where the " ring was; and after ſeveral other outrages, he carried him hoodwinkt to the river, with a deſign to " throw him into it, finally, as the poor wretch prayed for a Confeſſor, he impoſed upon him, and perſonated the Prieſt himſelf. The next day the ring " was brought back to the Lady by one of her lovers, " who took it only in a joke (41). . . . But if this be- " comes a rambler, a robber, and an heretic, (as it is " really a device found out by heretics, in a bawdy- " houſe, in order to impoſe upon women, and to ridicule the Church) is it worthy of a Judge, a Deputy or Provoſt of the King's Houſhould, a man of " the long Robe, and who with his Caſſock and Chaplet perſonates a Jeſuit? If hereſy joined with arms, " and the boldneſs and fury of Mars with the lewdneſs of Venus have produced this ſacrilege, why " ſhould the wiſdom and diſcretion of thoſe, who " are ſtiled Gods, and who call themſelves Catholics, " ingage them to commit the ſame crime, and to " be guilty of ſo heinous an impiety? What reſemblance is there between war, which hearkens to " no laws, and the Majeſty of the State, and of thoſe " who mention the Laws? or between the cruelty " and licentiouſneſs of arms and the awfulneſs of juſtice? To ſuppoſe thus a ſacred perſon, &c. (42)." He alſo confutes thoſe, who might ſay, that *they had followed the example of the heads of the Parliament, who at the general and extraordinary ſeſſion at Poitiers, appointed the Prieſts who were to hear confeſſions, forbidding expreſly to confeſs to any others but thoſe, from whom it was required upon pain of death, that they ſhould declare, what they heard in the people's confeſſion, which they have continued ſince; and it ſeems they intend to continue it ſtill, by their practice of naming the Confeſſors, alledging that it is for the public good, that juſtice might be adminiſtered impartially, that the guilty may not eſcape, and the innocent be not puniſhed; thus making this practice become by degrees cuſtomary, and aſſerting that it is lawful. Oh ridiculous hypocriſy and damnable impiety* (43)! " He aſſerts, that the Prieſts ought never to declare what is confeſſed to them, *on what occaſion ſoever it be, and notwithſtanding the moſt expreſs commands*, and that they are bound rather to ſuffer death, which will *juſtly intitle them to the honour of martyrdom* (44); and on this occaſion he commends Anthony Antoninus Temermans a Dominican born at Dunkirk, who was hanged at Antwerp in the year 1582, becauſe he refuſed to reveal Jaureguy's confeſſion (45).

* Thus he calls the ſurrendring of the City to Henry IV.

(41) *Apologie pour J. Chaſtel*, Part 3. chap. 3. pag. 128, 129.

(42) Ibid. chap. 3. pag. 230.

(43) Ibid. chap. 4. pag. 131.

(44) Ibid. 133.

(45) Who murthered the Prince of Orange.

The fact is not related as it is above in the account, which I ſhall quote in the following remark; it ſuppoſes, that John Chaſtel having been apprehended, ſome of the chief perſons at Court employed all poſſible means to make him declare, at whoſe inſtigation he had attempted that parricide; that they threw him down upon the ground, put a dagger to his throat, and threatned to ſtab him, if he would not declare the truth; that he anſwered, that he had

(40) Ibid. chap. 6. pag. 137, 138.

not

ſhould differ ſo widely [*F*], nor is this the leſs ſhocking circumſtance of this ſtory. Dupleix ought not to have ſaid, that John Chaſtel anſwered the Judges, that the Devil prompted him to this attempt (*l*).

(*l*) Dupleix, *Hiſt. d'Henri IV*, pag. m. 163.

not been induced by any perſon in the world to commit that action, and that he aſked for a Prieſt to whom he might confeſs; that they granted him this favour, but that they bribed a Layman, who diſguiſing himſelf in the habit of a Prieſt went to Chaſtel to hear his confeſſion; that Chaſtel repreſented to this falſe Prieſt, that he laboured under ſuch a perturbation of mind, that he could not remember his ſins, and deſired that a paper might be reſtored to him, in which he had wrote his general confeſſion ſome days before; that this paper was found at his father's houſe, but contained not the leaſt hint of any perſon's inſtigation. See the margin (46), where you will find an account very different from this, with regard to the paper, in which the murtherer had wrote his general confeſſion.

(46) Thuanus ſays (lib. 112. pag. m. 652), that they who were ſent to J. Chaſtel's father's houſe, by ſearching in every corner, found the paper, in which this wicked wretch had wrote his general Confeſſion; he did not diſown this writing, in which he owned himſelf guilty of Sodomy, and confeſſed, that he once would commit an inceſt with his own ſiſter.

I am very far from believing on the authority of the apologiſt, that they endeavoured to diſcover Chaſtel's ſecret by a pretended Confeſſor; but I don't know whether it muſt be abſolutely denied; for ſince in an ordinary trial, which is of very little importance, the Judges think it lawful to employ a thouſand lies in order to make either the accuſed perſon or the witneſſes own the truth, why ſhould we believe, that the Judges would have ſcrupled to make uſe of the confeſſion, when Henry the IVth's life, on which the public ſecurity then depended, was concerned? They knew that the ſame weakneſs of mind, which occaſions a man to be eaſily perſuaded to attempt ſuch a parricide, makes him at the ſame time capable of an extraordinary courage and intrepidity. They who under colour of procuring the good of the Church, inſpire him with a deſign to kill a Prince, fill him at the ſame time with a firm reſolution to ſuffer all kind of torments, in hope of obtaining the glory of Martyrdom; they perſuade him that if he declares his accomplices, he will loſe thereby the whole merit of his action; whereas if he has courage enough to keep his tongue, his conſtancy will procure him a thouſand bleſſings in this world, and a very high degree of glory in the next. The Judges therefore could not but believe, that John Chaſtel would not be induced to declare any thing by his ſufferings upon the rack; and that therefore the only means to diſcover whence thoſe fatal and pernicious counſels aroſe, which expoſed the King's life to ſo many wicked attempts, was by bribing a pretended Confeſſor. If the paper which was found at his father's houſe, had contained what they expected, they would certainly have conſidered it as one of thoſe convincing proofs, upon which a ſentence of condemnation may juſtly be grounded. The Judges of the Lady de Brinvilliers acted thus (47), without any regard to the arguments of her Council. See Mr. Nicolle's caſe in favour of this Lady (48),

(47) But obſerve, that they had ſeveral other proofs againſt her, beſides thoſe that were taken from the writing, in which ſhe had ſet down her ſins, in order to confeſs them.

(48) Printed at Paris in 1676.

[*F*] *It is a matter of ſurprize, that the ſeveral accounts of this horrid attempt ſhould differ ſo widely.*] The Reader has ſeen in the foregoing Remark an account which I borrowed from a Latin relation, which was printed at Straſburg in the year 1595, and of which James Gretzer gave an extract at the end of his Latin tranſlation (49) of Francis des Montagnes's (50) anſwer to Anthony Arnauld's plea. This extract differs very much, with regard to the pretended Confeſſor, from the account of John Chaſtel's apologiſt, nor does it any ways agree with what Thuanus ſays concerning this parricide's general confeſſion which was found written on paper. Here follows another difference. The perſon who publiſhed that extract did not omit any thing that could ſerve to clear the Jeſuits, but he concealed all the circumſtances which were againſt them. He does inſiſt continually upon this particular, that Chaſtel did not ſay that any perſon inſpired him with the deſign to kill Henry IV, nor does that Author ſay one word of thoſe circumſtances, which I have related in the Remark [*A*], and which were found very proper to raiſe ſuſpicions againſt the Jeſuits. Common honeſty does not allow of ſuch dealings, and there is in all this a very ſcandalous artifice. Richeome was obliged whether he would or not to enter into a ſtrict examination of John Chaſtel's anſwers to his Judges (51); this was a very hard taſk for the Jeſuit, tho' for the reſt he made the beſt advantage of every circumſtance in Chaſtel's trial, upon which he could put a conſtruction favourable to his ſociety (52). Let us obſerve, that he undertakes to prove that the account of Cayet's examination (53), which I have tranſcribed from Cayet (54), is falſe, and that he does it in a Book, in which he pretends to confute a Writer, who had expreſſed himſelf as follows. Theſe are the very words of Chaſtel's examination, of which your Majeſty may ſtill ſee the original, which will be certified to be true by "above thirty Gentlemen Preſidents or Counſellors in "the Parliament, who are a thouſand times more "credible, than all that the parties concerned can "aſſert in favour of their own cauſe." *Being aſked where he learned this new theology, he anſwered, he had it from the ſtudy of Philoſophy, &c.*

(49) Printed at Ingolſtadt in 1596, 8vo.

(50) It is a falſe name under which the Jeſuit Richeome diſguiſed himſelf. *See* Alegambe, pag. 302.

(51) See his *Plainte Apologétique*, num. 41. pag. m. 157, &c.

(52) See the ſame book, num. 38, &c. and his *Anſwer* under the name of *René de la Fon*, to the *Sieur Marion's Plea*, chap. 14.

(53) Richéome, *Reponſe Apologet. à l'Anticoton*, num. 38. pag. 149.

(54) In the remark [*A*]

CHASTELAIN (GEORGE) in Latin *Caſtellanus*, a Flemiſh Gentleman (*a*), underſtood the French tongue very well, and wrote ſome Treatiſes [*A*], which have not been ſo much eſteemed, as Olivier de la Marche foretold they would be [*B*]. Chaſtelain died

(*a*) *Eques Gandenſis.* Valerius Andreas, *Bibliotheca Belgicæ*, pag. 262.

[*A*] *He wrote ſome Treatiſes. . . .*] He wrote (1) in French verſe *Recueil des choſes marveilleuſes advenues de ſon tems.* i. e. "A collection of the wonderful things, "which happened in his time." Printed with the Works of John Moulinet, his diſciple (2). *Le Temple de la ruine d'aucuns Nobles malheureux, tant de France, que d'autres nations éſtrangéres, à l'imitation de Bocace.* i. e. "The temple of the downfal of ſome unhappy "Noblemen both French and Foreigners; in imita-"tion of Bocace;" Printed at Paris, for Caliot du Pré, in the year 1570. *L'inſtruction du jeune Prince, contenant huit Chapitres.* i. e. "The inſtruction of a "young Prince in eight Chapters." Printed with his other Works (3). *Les Epitaphes d'Hector & d'Achilles, avec le jugement d'Alexandre le Grand.* i. e. "The "Epitaphs of Hector and Achilles, with the judg-"ment of Alexander the Great." Printed at Paris in 1525, 8vo (4). *L'Hiſtoire de Jaques de Lalain Chevalier de la Toiſon d'or.* "The Hiſtory of James "de Lalain Knight of the Golden Fleece." Printed at Bruſſels in 4to, in the year 1634, and ſeveral other Works, which are kept in manuſcript in the Abbey of St. Vaſt at Arras (5). He wrote in French the Life of Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy; but I do not think it was ever printed. Pontus Heuterus had read it, and borrowed ſome things from it (6).

(1) La Croix du Maine, pag. 118.

(2) Valer. Andreas, *Bibl. Belg.* pag. 263.

(3) La Croix du Maine, pag. 118.

(4) Du Verdier, *Bibl. Franç.* pag. 447.

(5) Val. Andr. *Bibl. Belg.* pag. 262.

(6) Pontus Heuterus, *Rerum Burgund.* lib. 4. pag. m. 151.

[*B*] . . . . *Which have not been ſo much eſteemed, as Olivier de la Marche foretold they would be.*] Here follow his own words. "I am extremely vexed, that "I cannot come up to the ſtyle and accuracy of the "late *Meſſire* George Chaſtlelain, a Knight of my ac-"quaintance, who tho' a Fleming by birth, uſed yet "to write in French, and has performed in my time "ſo many fine and uſeful things, that his works, his "actions, and his elaborate ſtile will gain him more "reputation and glory a hundred years hence, than "they do now (7)." This Prophecy proved falſe; The memory of this Writer became every day more and more obliterated, and few perſons knew him by his Works half a Century after his death. Olivier de la Marche ſtiles him the *Pearl and the Star, that is the moſt eminent of all the Hiſtoriographers, who either in his time or before employed pen, ink and paper* (8). John le Fevre Lord of St. Remi had alſo great hopes, that the Works of this Author would be immortal. He declares, that having *digeſted and writ down ſome ſhort notes and memoires*, he ſent them to *that noble Orator* George Chaſtelain, *that he might make uſe of them according to his prudence and diſcretion, in his noble Hiſtories and Chronicles, tho' theſe Memoirs be but very inconſiderable if compared with his Works. . . . I ſhall mention the great and noble actions of the Duke and of the Knights of his Order; but not by far ſo much at length, as that celebrated Orator George le Chaſtelain has done* (9).

(7) Olivier de la Marche in the Preface to his *Memoirs*, pag. m. 3.

(8) Ibid. in the Preface to the 1ſt book, pag. m. 74.

(9) Jean le Fevre Seigneur de St. Remi, *au Prologue de l'Hiſtoire de Charles VI*, publiſhed by Mr. Le Laboureur, at the end of the *Hiſtory of the Monk of St. Denys.*

died in the year 1475 (*b*). He had been educated in the family of the Dukes of Burgundy (*c*).

(*b*) *Obiit eo ipso tempore, quo Carolus Audax Novesium obsidebat*, i. e. "He died "when Charles "the Terrible "besieg'd Nuys." Valerius Andreas, *Bibliothecæ Belgicæ*, pag. 263.

(*c*) La Croix du Maine, *Biblioth. Françoise*, pag. 118.

CHASTELUX (CLAUDIUS Lord of) Viscount of Avalon, Baron of Quarré, Counsellor of State and Chamberlain to the Duke of Burgundy, was created a Marshal of France June the 2d 1418. He was sent into Guienne in the year 1419, and deprived of his post of Marshal January the 22d 1421. He stood out the siege of Crevant against the Constable of Scotland in the year 1423, which procured him a very extraordinary privilege in the City of Auxerre [*A*]. In 1431 the Duke of Burgundy sent him to the Assembly which was held in that same City, to negociate a treaty of peace with the Embassadors of the Kings of France and England: he died in the year 1453 (*a*). He was of a very ancient and noble family, which is not yet extinct [*B*].

(*a*) Taken from Father Anselme, *Hist. des Grands Officiers*, pag. 140, 141.

[*A*] *He stood out the siege of Crevant, . . . which procured him a very extraordinary privilege in the City of Auxerre.*] Let us quote Mr. de Vize's words. "You "cannot but know, *says he* (1), what privilege this "Family enjoys in the Cathedral Church of Auxerre. "Claudius Lord of Chastelux obtained it towards the "latter end of the 14th Century (2), as a reward for "his generosity, because at his own expence he stood "out the siege of the city of Crevant, which belongs "to the Chapter, against the Scots, whom he vanquished and expelled the country, having taken "himself their General the Earl of Doukan Constable "of Scotland, prisoner. And as he generously returned the church-lands to the Chapter of Auxerre, "they granted him in return, by a juridical Deed, . . "for himself and his heirs male who should possess "the Manour of Chastelux" the privilege we speak of; and which was, *to have the first seat in the Choir, to sit there in a soldier's dress, with a surplice over it, a belt, an amuce on his arm, and a hawk on his fist; with the right to sit and to vote deliberatively in the Chapter, and to partake of the* Distributions * (*a*), *like a Canon.*

(1) *Mercure Galant*, for Sept. 1701, pag. 364, &c.

(2) Or rather after the beginning of the 15th Century.

* (*a*) The *Distributions* in the Chapters are some small sums of money, left by the Founders, for those Canons only, who are present at some *Obits* and other offices of the Church. ADD. REM.]

[*B*] *He was of an ancient and noble Family; his posterity is not yet extinct.*] Father Anselme does not carry the Genealogy of this Family higher up, than to the Father of our Claude de Chastelux (3); but Mr. de Vizé asserts, that *this is one of the most ancient Families in the Kingdom* (of France), that it *has no other name and no other origine but Chastelux*, and that *from the end of the tenth Century, from which time we begin to know the successions of that family in a direct line, to this time, the Count de Chastelux*, who died in September 1701, *is the twentieth in a direct line from father to son*; and that *his Ancestors have enjoyed all the military employments in the State; you will find amongst them some Marshals of France, some Admirals, some Governors of Provinces, some Lieutenants-General, some Gentlemen of the King's Bedchamber, some Chamberlains to the Dukes of Burgundy, some pages * to the Kings, some Captains of Companies consisting of an hundred* Gendarmes (*β*), *at a time when these Companies were very considerable* (4).

(3) Anselme, *Histoire de Grands Officiers*, pag. 141.

* They are generally Noblemen's children.

(4) *Mercure Galant*, for September 1701, pag. 363.

Let us add, what the same Author relates concerning the present state of that Family. He says (5) that PHILIBERT PAUL Count of CHASTELUX, who was killed in the attack of Chiari in Italy, September the first 1701, in the thirty third year of his age, "had "three brothers and three sisters; the eldest of his "brothers served in the armies in Germany, where "he died; ANDREW DE CHASTELUX, who is now "the eldest, is Ensign of a Man of War. WILLIAM "ANTHONY, who is the youngest, is an Abbot. The "eldest sister is BONNE DE CHASTELUX, married to "Francis Count de Saint Chamans, and Marquis de "Mery. The second sister is JUDITH DE CHASTE-"LUX, Lady and Canoness of Pousnagy in Cham-"pagne. The youngest is ANN DE CHASTELUX "married to Charles de Vienne, Count de Comma-"rain in Burgundy, the head of the illustrious family "of the *Viennes* (6)." The father of these seven children was CÆSAR PHILIP DE CHASTELUX, Captain-Lieutenant of the Company of Gendarmes belonging to the Prince (of Condé) (7). His widow, who is still alive (8), is Judith de Barillon, daughter to John James de Barillon, President in the Parliament of Paris. This Cæsar Philip, the nineteenth Baron or Count of Chastelux, had three brothers, who all died in the King's service. *The eldest was killed in the battle of Norlingen, where he was* Marshal de Camp. *The second had been killed some time before in Roussillon, by a cannon-ball, having been commanded to prevent the landing of the Spaniards. The third, who was Knight of Malta, died also in the King's service* (9). Observe, that the other branches of this Family were extinct by the death of Philip de Chastelux, Baron of Coulanges, *Marshal de Camp*, who was killed in the battle of Sintzheim in Germany, in the year 1614 (10).

(5) Ibid. pag. 358.

(6) Ibid. pag. 362.

(7) Ibid. pag. 359, &c.

(8) That is to say in September 1701.

(9) *Mercure Galant*, for September 1701, pag. 161.

(10) Ibid.

* (*β*) *Gendarmes.*] We make use of that word, to express, what the French called formerly *Hommes d'Armes*. These companies consisted of fifty or of an hundred Gentlemen, or Noblemen compleatly armed, and who used to fight with a lance or spear. ADD. REM.]

* Furetiere's Dictionary under the word ORDONNANCES (COMPAGNIES D').

CHATEAU-BRIAND (the Countess of) spouse of the Count of that name, daughter of Phœbus of Foix, and sister of Lautrec, and of the Marshal of Foix, had been Francis the First's mistress, according to some Authors [*A*]. Monsieur de Varillas has related

[*A*] *She had been Francis I.'s Mistress, according to some Authors.*] Brantome relates very remarkable circumstances of this intrigue. "I have been told, *says* "*he* (1), and have it from very good hands, that when "Francis I had forsaken the Lady de Chateau-Briand, "his most beloved Mistress, for Madam d'Estampes . . "as one nail drives another, Madam d'Estampes de-"sired the King to take back from the Chateau-"Briand all the fine jewels of which he had made "her a present, not for the sake of their value, or "fineness, for jewels were not then so much in fashion, "as they have been since; but for the sake of the in-"genious posies, which were worked, engraved, and "stamped on them, and which were invented and "contrived by his sister the Queen of Navarre, who "had a great genius for these things." Brantome adds, that when the Gentleman, whom the King sent to the Countess of Chateau-Briand, asked her for these jewels, *she pretended to be taken ill of a sudden*, and put him off *for three days*, and in the mean time, she *out of spite* caused them all to be melted, and when the Gentleman came back, returned them to him in lumps, and desired him to tell the King, that she could not suffer, that another should have the pleasure to read these posies. The King returned her the lumps, (for he desired the jewels *only for the sake of the posies*) and said, *she had shewed more constancy and greatness of soul, than I thought a woman was capable of.* Brantome adds his own reflection to that of the King; *The heart of a generous woman*, says he, *thus scorned and provoked, is capable of very great things.* He asserts in another place of his Memoirs (2), that *the Count of Chateau-Briand gave his fine house called Chateau-Briand* to the Duke of Montmorenci High Constable of France, *to be made a Knight of the Holy Ghost*; upon which Mr. Le Laboureur observes (3), *that it was, to obtain the Government of Britany, as also to put a stop to the persecution, which was carried on against him for the murther of his wife, with which he was charged.*

(1) Brantome, *Memoires des Dames Galantes*, tom. 2. pag. 394.

(2) In the *Discours du Connétable de Montmorenci.*

(3) *Additions aux Mémoires de Castelnau*, tom. 1. pag. 346.

The Author of the *Galantaries des Rois de France* (the

related the History of this amorous intrigue more at length than any other writer, nor did he forget to observe, that the Count put his wife to death. Others pretend that this whole

(4) In the year 1664.

(5) Tom. I. pag. m. 192.

* From Spain, whither he had been conducted a prisoner after the battle of Pavia.

(α) Quotation (a).

(β) *Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres*; for January 1686, Art. 2. pag. 15, &c. of the second edition.

(γ) Written by Mr. Varillas.

(δ) Matth. xxiii. 29.

(the Amours of the Kings of France) printed of late (4) in several places, relates Francis I's intrigue with the Countess of Chateau-Briand, after the same manner as Monsieur de Varillas does, and concludes his account thus (5). "Some Critics pretend, that Mr. de Varil- " las, from whom I have extracted these Memoirs, " was ill informed, that the Countess of Chateau- " Briand was reconciled with her husband, and did " not die till ten years after the King's return *. " But Mr. de Varillas has confuted this so effectually, " that I thought the tragical death of the Countess " must be admitted as a matter of fact, wherefore I did " not in the least scruple to follow word for word that " celebrated Historian's account." Take this for an imposture: I desired a friend of mine to inquire about this answer of Mr. Varillas, and here follow the very words which he wrote to me in a Letter dated from Paris June the 10th, 1695,

" Notwithstanding all that the Author of the *In-* " *trigues of the French Kings* may say, we have not " seen here any thing published by Mr. Varillas in " answer to what the late Monsieur Hevin, Advocate " in the Parliament of Rennes, wrote against him, " concerning the Countess of Chateau-Briand; and " Mr. d'Hosier told me upon this, that Mr. de Cau- " martin, one of our six *Intendants of the Finances*, " has in his Library the Case, which the Constable " Ann de Montmorenci caused to be published against " the Count de Chateau-Briand's heirs, to vindicate " the Donation or Grant, which had been made to " him of that Manor, and that the Case begins with " these words. *The misfortunes which attended the whole* " *life of Mr. de Chateau-Briand are so well known in* " *France, that it is needless to relate them here.*

☞ The work to which Mr. Bayle refers us in the text of this article (α), being now very scarce, and written in a language, which is not understood by those, for whom this Translation is particularly designed, we think it would be acceptable to them, if they were to find here the account, to which Mr. Bayle refers us, we shall therefore give a translation of it.

" The more difficult and uncommon it is, says Mr. " Bayle (β), for a beautiful woman to walk constantly " in the paths of virtue, when she lives at a Court, " where wickedness prevails, the more reasonable is it, " to vindicate the reputation of such Ladies, who have " kept their chastity untainted amongst such great " dangers. It is therefore proper .... to insert here " an Apology for the Countess of Chateau-Briand, " whose reputation has been extremely branded in the " VIth Book of the *History of Francis I* (γ). Nay it " is so much the more necessary to vindicate her cha- " racter, as most persons will think it probable, that " a very beautiful Lady could move the' heart of this " Prince, and that having gained his love, she yielded " afterwards to his desires. Let us see therefore what " arguments are quoted for her character; but we must " relate first, what Mr. Varillas found in *a Writing* " *taken from the Records of Chateau-Briand by the late* " *President Ferrand.*

" This Countess, daughter of Phœbus de Grailly, " a younger son of the Family of Foix, had been mar- " ried very young to the Count de Chateau-Briand, " and lived retired in a corner of Britany, by her " spouse's command. But as she was the most beau- " tiful woman of her time, Francis I, who had *in-* " *troduced all the Ladies at Court, where they did not* " *appear before but on solemn occasions*, could not forget " our Countess. He entreated her spouse to bring her " to Court; but the Count desired to be excused, al- " ledging *the odd temper of his Lady, and representing* " *her as a savage beauty, whom it was impossible to* " *tame.* And as he foresaw that the King, who did " not give much credit to such a Discourse, would " continue his intreaties, he resolves to confine him- " self at home, the better to guard his treasure: But " an unexpected affair having obliged him to go to " Court, he was forced to employ all possible means " against the King's sollicitations; and indeed the " means he employed were very extraordinary, but " yet they proved ineffectual; he was obliged to yield " to the artifices that were made use of in order to en- " tice this young Lady to Paris. She was no sooner " arrived there, but her spouse, who was now persuad- " ed he was catched, *set out immediately for Britany,* " *that he might not be a witness of his own shame. The* " *Countess did all that could be expected from a virtu-* " *ous woman, who had not yet been put to the trial, I* " *mean that she resisted for some time, and at last* " *yielded to the King's amorous addresses. She had for* " *a long while a great power over this Prince: She pro-* " *cured great employments* for her three brothers, Lau- " trec, the Marshal de Foix, and the Lord d'Aspraut, " *three of the bravest men of their time; she support-* " *ed them in their posts notwithstanding their misfortunes* " *and their ill conduct. Her husband would have been* " *raised to the highest dignities, had he been inclined* " *to prefer the advantages of ambition, before his own* " *reputation.* But he refused them; *nor would he hear* " *of his spouse on any account whatsoever. Notwith-* " *standing his inflexibility*, his spouse begged now and " then his pardon for a crime, which she could no " longer forbear to commit. The King being taken " prisoner at Pavia, this Lady *was exposed to the re-* " *sentment of the Queen Regent, and to the revenge of* " *her incensed husband.* He received her indeed at " Chateau-Briand, where she was forced to take sanc- " tuary, but without the least reconciliation. He sent " her up into a room *all furnished with black*, and at " the end of six months, *he went up to her with six* " *men armed, and two Surgeons, who opened the veins* " *of her arms and legs, and let her thus bleed to death.* " *The King designed at first to punish the murtherers in* " *an exemplary manner; but a new inclination made* " *him soon forget his former mistress.* The Count went " into a voluntary exile, in order to avoid being pro- " secuted, till the House of Foix was no more in a " condition to prosecute him. After his return he pro- " posed to the Constable of Montmorenci *to make him* " *over by deed the manor of Chateau-Briand, on condi-* " *tion, that the Constable should get him out of trouble.* " The Constable, *who chose rather to have that manor* " *this way, than by a confiscation, which would have* " *exposed him to everlasting disputes with the Family of* " *the Lavals, of which the Count was*, procured him " a pardon from the King. *The marks of the Countess's* " *blood were still to be seen in the room where she was* " *murthered, when Henry the third was killed at St.* " *Cloud.*"

" This is what is found in the writing quoted by " Mr. Varillas as taken from the Records of Chateau- " Briand. Yet the Apologist for the Countess says " this is a mere story, and grounds his assertions up- " on such arguments, as may serve at least to favour " historical Scepticism. He alledges the Tomb and " Epitaph, which the Count caused to be made for his " spouse; nor does he fear that this argument will be " confuted by that which Jesus Christ alledged; who to " convince the Jewish Nation, that they had put their " Prophets to death, said that they built them tombs " (δ). But let us quote the words of a Letter, which " has been written to us from Paris.

" An Extract from a Letter written from Paris to " the Author of the *Nouvelles de la Republiques des* " *Lettres*, December the 7th, 1685, to vindicate the " character of the Countess of Chateau-Briand accused " of having committed adultery with King Francis I.

" *There is in Mr. Varillas's History of Francis I a fact* " *concerning the Countess of Chateau-Briand, which is* " *absolutely false, and calculated to disgrace two illu-* " *strious Families, that of Foix, of which the Countess* " *was, and that of Laval, of which the Count was.* " *All Britany exclaims against this story, and desires that* " *a confutation of it be inserted in your* Nouvelles. " *There is a Case published to this effect, whence I have* " *transcribed the following Epitaph, which confutes in* " *the most authentic manner the story of this Lady's in-* " *trigue with Francis I, and of the murther committed* " *on her person by her spouse in* 1525. The Epitaph is " as follows:

whole Hiſtory is a mere fable, and have publiſhed an Apology for the Counteſs againſt Monſieur Varillas. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (a).

(a) For January 1686, Art. II.

PEU DE TELLES
Sous ce Tumbeau gît Françoiſe de Foix,
De qui tout bien chacun ſouloit en dire,
Et le diſant onc une ſeule voix
Ne s'avança d'y vouloir contredire.
De grand beauté, de grace qui attire,
De bon ſavoir, d'intelligence prompte,
De biens, d'honneurs, & mieux que ne raconte
Dieu Eternel richement l'étoffa.
O Viateur, pour t'abreger le conte,
Cy gît un rien là on' tout triomfa.
Décéda le 16 d'Oct. l'an 1537.
PROU DES MOINS — POINT DE PLUS

That is,

" In this Tomb lies Frances de Foix, of whom as all " the world ſpoke well, ſo not one perſon dared to ſay " the contrary. God had abundantly favoured her " with a great deal of beauty, attractive charms, ſound " learning, a quick underſtanding, riches, honours, " more than I can expreſs. She died Oct. 16, 1537."

The words about the Epitaph ſignifie, that a great many women had leſs merit than her, few had as much, and none had more.

" *This Epitaph with her Monument in marble are* " *ſtill to be ſeen in the Church of the Mathurins at Cha-* " *teau-Briand; her huſband cauſed that monument to be* " *erected, which he moſt certainly would not have done,* " *if he had put her to death for adultery.*

" *When the Viſcount de Lautra the Counteſs's eldeſt* " *brother died, in* 1528, *he left his only daughter Claude* " *de Foix under the guardianſhip of the Count of Cha-* " *teau-Briand, which it a proof of the good underſtand-* " *ing there was between their two Families, which* " *would not have been, had the Count been the mur-* " *therer of the Viſcount's ſiſter, and had he fled his coun-* " *try for fear of being proſecuted.*

" *This Claude de Foix was married in* 1531 *to the* " *young Count de Laval, ſon to the Count de Laval Go-* " *vernor of Britany, and ſecond couſin to the Count de* " *Chateau-Briand; which is another proof of the friend-* " *ſhip there was between theſe two Families.*

" *Mr. Varillas ſays, that the Count de Chateau-* " *Briand made a Grant of that Manour to the Conſta-* " *ble of Montmorency, in order to obtain the King's par-* " *don, and that the Conſtable choſe rather to get the* " *County or Manour of Chateau-Briand by way of do-* " *nation, than by a confiſcation: But Mr. Varillas ought* " *to have known, that the confiſcation or forfeiting of* " *lands is not in uſe in Britany, and that if the Count* " *had been condemned for the murther of hit ſpouſe, his* " *lands could not have been forfeited but to his natural* " *heirs.*" ADD. REM.

CHATEL (PETER DU) Great Almoner of France under Henry II. See CASTELLANUS.

CHATEL (TANNAQUIL DU) a Nobleman of Britany, was one of the brave men in the fifteenth Century. He commanded in Italy the forces of Lewis of Anjou King of Sicily, and in 1409 he defeated the army of Ladiſlaus King of Naples. He was afterwards made Provoſt of Paris; and in 1419 and 1420 he ſtiled himſelf *Marechal des Guerres* (Marſhal of the Armies), of the Dauphin Regent of the Kingdom (a). He did this Prince (b) a great many ſervices [A], and rid him of his moſt formidable enemy, who was John Duke of Burgundy [B]; but this action was attended with a notorious perfidiouſneſs. I wonder that F. Anſelme did not mention it (c); his ſilence has occaſioned that of Moreri. Tanaquil du Chatel was not only guilty of the murther of the Duke of Burgundy, but he alſo killed the Dauphin of Auvergne [C] in the year 1424, even

(a) Anſelme, *Hiſtoire des Grands Officiers*, pag. 142.

(b) He was afterwards King Charles VII.

(c) Anſelme, *Hiſt. des Grands Officiers*, pag. 142.

[A] *He did the Dauphin a great many ſervices.*] The Faction of Burgundy ſeized upon the City of Paris May the 28th, 1418, in the night-time, and would have taken the Dauphin himſelf priſoner, had not Tannaquil du Chatel (1) *run with all ſpeed to him, took him out of his bed, and wrapping him up in his night-gown, conducted him ſafe to the Baſtille, and from thence to Melun* (2). We ſhall ſee in the following remark, with how much ſincerity he acted againſt this Prince's enemy upon the bridge of Montereau-faut-Yonne.

(1) He was at that time Provoſt of Paris.

(2) Mezerai, *Abregé Chronol.* tom. 3. pag. 202.

[B] ... *And rid him of his moſt formidable enemy.. John Duke of Burgundy.*] If the French Monarchy was brought upon the brink of ruin under the reigns of Charles VI and Charles VII, it was owing to the Princes of the Blood, to the exceſſive ambition of the Houſe of Burgundy, a Branch of the Royal Family of France; and ſince that time, the Houſe of Burgundy had no more friendſhip for the Blood from whence it ſprung, than for the Ottoman Family. That Houſe has always been united with the greateſt enemies of the French till the male line of it was extinct, in the time of Princeſs Mary, the only heir of that Family, who tranſmitted this hatred to her deſcendants. John Duke of Burgundy not only cauſed the Duke of Orleans, Charles VIth's brother to be aſſaſſinated (3), he was alſo guilty of ſeveral other wicked attempts; but at laſt he periſhed himſelf in the year 1419. The Duke of Orleans's friends, and particularly our Tannaquil du Chatel and the Preſident Louvet negotiated an interview between the Duke of Burgundy and the Dauphin, with a deſign to murther the former, which they really did upon the bridge of Montereau-faut-Yonne, where theſe two Princes had agreed to confer together. " As the Duke John advanced, *ſays Pa-* " *quier* (4), Tannaquil du Chatel picked a quarrel " with him, ſaying, that he did not pay the Dauphin " all the honour he ought to have paid him, and gave " him ſuch a blow on the head with an axe, that he " died of it."

(3) In 1407.

(4) Paſquier, *Recherch. de la France*, liv. 6. chap. 3. pag. 452.

[C] *He alſo killed the Dauphin of Auvergne.*] I ſhall quote Paquier's words again (5). " The two " chief inſtruments of Charles VIIth's actions, and " perhaps the authors of his ruin, were Tannaquil du " Chatel and Louvet a Preſident in the Parliament " of Provence; for they were both the authors of " Duke John's death. They had for a long while a " great power over him (Charles VII) and eſpecially " Tannaquil du Chatel who governed him with an " exceſſive arrogance, and abuſing his maſter's eaſy " temper, dared to kill the Dauphin of Auvergne in " 1424, even in the King's preſence, and in a full " Council, at which the Princes and great Lords of " the Court were extremely exaſperated, ſo that they, " with the Queen of Sicily the King's mother-in-law, " the Conſtable of Richmond, and ſeveral other emi- " nent Lords, abandoned the King. For which reaſon " Tannaquil was obliged to reſign his place, ſo that " Louvet alone continued in his poſt. But even he, " ſeeing he was expoſed to the ſame hatred, and was " not able to make head againſt the great Lords, retired " to Avignon; and neither of them was ever ſeen " afterwards." Mezerai ſays, that Charles VIIth promiſed to baniſh from Court all thoſe, who had been concerned in the murther of the Duke of Burgundy; that he promiſed this, I ſay, when in 1424 he made the Earl of Richmond Conſtable, after this Lord had abandoned the party of the King of England; and that hereupon *Tannaquil making a generous ſacrifice of his own intereſt to the King's ſervice, deſired no other reward for his paſt labours but leave to retire* (6). Varillas pretends, that by the Treaty of Arras Charles VIIth was forced to abandon Chatel, who fled into his own country, and did not return to Court, till he found that none of

(5) Ibid. chap. 4. pag. 453.

(6) Mezerai, *Abrege Chronol.* tom. 3. pag. 236.

even in the King's preſence, and in a full Council. This action alienated ſeveral perſons of the higheſt rank from King Charles VII, and Du Chatel was obliged to retire from Court, whither he did not return, according to ſome Authors. But others aſſert that he went to Court again [*D*], where he underwent a ſecond diſgrace, notwithſtanding which he took care of Charles VII's funeral [*E*], which the Courtiers had entirely neglected. He

of this Prince's friends took care of his funerals (7). According to this account he did not leave the Court till the year 1435. We ſhall obſerve immediately, which is the moſt probable account, and we ſhall borrow what we have to relate, from an Hiſtorian (8), who having confined his inquiries to what regards Britany, deſerves more credit when he ſpeaks of Tannaquil du Chatel, an eminent man and a native of Britany, than thoſe who mention him only in general hiſtories. I except all that ſavours of Apology; for in this reſpect the Writers of a hiſtory of a particular Province are more to be ſuſpected than the others; ſo that I do not much mind what Bertrand d'Argentré ſays (9), concerning Tannaquil du Chatel's innocence with regard to the murther of the Duke of Burgundy; but let us hear what he relates concerning other facts.

(7) Varillas, *Hiſt. de Charles IX*, liv. 1. pag. 4.

(8) Bertrand d'Argentré, *Hiſt. de Bretagne*, liv. 10. chap. 30.

(9) Ibid. pag. m. 531.

He aſſerts, that the Earl of Richmond having been made Conſtable March the 7th, 1425, was ſent into Britany to raiſe ſoldiers. Du Chatel was ſent thither at the ſame time as Embaſſador from King Charles VII, to aſk the Duke of Britany's leave to raiſe ſoldiers in his Dominions. This was then the condition of the Kings of France; they were ſurrounded with ſeveral petty Sovereigns, *who played them a thouſand tricks*. It is therefore a great miſtake to pretend, that the Engliſh did formerly almoſt conquer France. We ſhould ſay, that with the aſſiſtance of the largeſt and moſt conſiderable Provinces of France, they were like to ſubdue the reſt. But this by the by. Du Chatel received no other anſwer, but that the King would be aſſiſted, when he ſhould have removed from Court thoſe perſons, whoſe baniſhment had been required of him. Du Chatel himſelf was one of thoſe, and he reſolved to go into a voluntary exile, without making an advantage of the inclination the King had to keep him at Court. "Sir, *ſaid he to the King*, I am a Gentle- "man, and I have ſerved your Majeſty; but it is not "reaſonable that you ſhould loſe the advantages, which "you may reap from ſo many great men, who can "ſerve you againſt your enemies, for the ſake of ſuch "inconſiderable perſons as we are, tho' their ſuſpicions "againſt us be very ill grounded. However it be, you "ought not to ſuffer for it, and ſince it is ſo, I "hope our Majeſty will make ſome proviſions for "my old age, which is come upon me in your ſervice, "and that you will furniſh me wherewithal to paſs "the remainder of my days without want. This "done, God forbid, that you ſhould be ſo unhappy, "as for my ſake to remove thoſe friends and relations, "for whom you have at preſent a preſſing occa- "ſion. The King was obliged to yield, tho' very "much againſt his will, and told him, My good fa- "ther and friend, I ſhall always conſider you as a fa- "ther. I know that you have been ſuch to me for "a long time, and I will for ever remember it, as well "the ſervices you have done to me in particular, as well "as to the whole Kingdom. It is againſt my will and "my heart's deſire, that I ſuffer you to part from me: "but ſince my affairs are come to this paſs, that I muſt "ſubmit to other people's will, I beg of you, to ſuffer "this misfortune patiently, to which I am forced to con- "ſent; this black cloud will be diſpelled, and I ſhall ſee, "whether they who would leave me on your account, "will act in ſuch a manner, as to make amends for "the friend they deprive me of. I have conſidered "all this; in the mean time, go you to Beaucaire; "I make you Senechal of that place: and you will "alſo keep your poſt of Provoſt of Paris, without any "detriment in the profits of it; and you will have "ſuch penſions and ſo well paid, that you need not "fear the leaſt want: and for the ſecurity of your "perſon, you will have a guard of fifteen Archers, "and I ſhall take care that they be well paid. If "you ſhould ſuffer any harm, give me notice of it, "and I ſhall do you juſtice, and alſo take hold of the "firſt opportunity which I can find, to ſee you again. "Thus Meſſire Tannaquil retired to Beaucaire; but "yet he made ſeveral journeys to Paris (10)."

(10) Bertrand d'Argentré, *Hiſtoire de Bretagne*, liv. 10. chap. 30. pag. 531, under the year 1425.

I think we may infer from this paſſage, that all thoſe Authors are miſtaken, who do not place Tannaquil du Chatel's removal from Court under the year 1425, or who ſay, he never returned to Court, or who make him go Embaſſador to the Pope, or pretend that he was made Maſter of the Horſe, or Marſhal of France, or who ſuppoſe that he had the generoſity to bury Charles the VIIth. They miſtake the nephew for the uncle; for they both bore the name of Tannaquil du Chatel. But if it were true, that the uncle was ſent Embaſſador beyond the Alps in 1446 and 1448, as Father Anſelme ſays in the paſſage we ſhall quote below, d'Argentré would have been guilty of an inexcuſable neglect, ſince he does not mention it here, and when he ſpeaks (11) of the Embaſſy ſent to Rome, he does not ſay, whether Tannaquil du Chatel, who was one of the Embaſſadors, was the ſame with him who retired from Court in 1425.

(11) Liv. 10. chap. 4. pag. m. 562, under the year 1448.

We read in the Hiſtory of Marſeilles (12), that in 1431 the latter was one of thoſe, who negotiated a Truce between the inhabitants of Marſeilles and thoſe of Catalonia. He was then Captain-General of the Militia of Provence.

(12) Ruffi, *Hiſtoire de la Ville de Marſeille*, liv. 6. chap. 9.

[*D*] *He was obliged to retire from Court, whither he did not return according to ſome Authors. But others aſſert that he went to Court again.*] Father Anſelme, having ſaid that *Tannaquil retired from Court, in the year* 1435, *for the advantage of Charles VIIth's affairs* (13), continues thus. *Since that time he was made Senechal of Provence, and was ſent to Genoa in* 1446, *in order to negotiate the conditions under which that City was to ſubmit to the King, whom the Genoeſe deſired to have for their Lord; and in* 1448 *he was ſent Embaſſador to Rome, with the Archbiſhop of Rheims, the Biſhop of Alet, and others, to pay filial obedience to Pope Nicholas V, according to Berri Heraut* (14). *He died ſome time after, without leaving any children by his wife Iſabella le Vayer.* Moreri tranſlated nothing of all this, becauſe he thought that Tannaquil du Chatel took care of Charles the VIIth's funeral. If Father Anſelme had been of the ſame opinion, he would not have ſaid, that Tannaquil du Chatel died *ſoon after* his Embaſſy in the year 1448. This circumſtance is inconſiſtent with what other Hiſtorians relate, viz. that he paid all the expences of his King's funeral, who died in 1461. They are therefore miſtaken.

(13) Anſelme, *Hiſt. des Grands Officiers*, pag. 142.

(14) *Les Chroniques de France par* Belleforet, *tirées de Monſtrelet, de Nicole Gilles &c.* ſay the ſame.

[*E*] *Others pretend . . . that he took care of Charles the VIIth's funeral.*] Some Authors ſay, that Tannaquil was out of favour when Charles the VIIth died; but others aſſert that he was then actually Maſter of the Horſe. *Funus ſuis ſumptibus curavit Tanneguius Caſtellus, ſummus regiorum equorum Magiſter; nam cæteri Caroli domeſtici metu Ludovici filii ſe diverſi ſubduxerant* (15). i. e. "Tannaquil du Chatel Maſter "of the Horſe had the (King's) funeral performed at "his own expence; for Charles's other ſervants were "retired to ſeveral places, out of fear of his ſon Lewis "XI." In the firſt caſe his action would have been more praiſe-worthy, but even in the ſecond it was very commendable. It is always a noble thing for a man to continue faithful, when all others neglect their duty and to advance his own money to perform the funeral of his King. It is ſaid, that Lewis XI was a great many years before he returned to Tannaquil the ſums he had advanced (16). This latter muſt have been very old when his Maſter died, if it be true that he was a General in Italy in the year 1409. The money he advanced amounted to thirty thouſand Crowns, according to Thuanus (17). He does not agree with Beaucaire concerning Tannaquil's poſt, for he ſuppoſes him to have been Great Chamberlain, and is one of thoſe, who think he was out of favour. *Chaſtellus is: per illuſtri in Armorica prognatus gente cubiculariorum Nobilium Princeps ſub Carolo VII fuerat; & quamvis optime de Rege ac Regno meritus, domum relegatus eſſet, mortuo Hero ſtatim in Aulam accurrit, & in funus regium ab omnibus neglectum de ſua pecunia* 30 *millia aureorum*

(15) Belcarius, lib. 1. num. 1.

(16) *Quam quidem pecuniam non ſtatim repræſentavit Ludovicus, ſed multis poſt annis Caſtilioni, Paciacique fundi atque aliorum aliquot venditione diſſolvit.* Ibid. Lib. 29. num. 10. *he ſays that the money was paid ſoon after*, non multo poſt.

(17) Mezerai, *Hiſt. de François II*, tom. 3. pag. 40. in folio ſays 300 thouſand Livres. Varillas, *Hiſt. de Charles IX*, pag. 4. ſays 168 thouſand Livres. Argentre, *Hiſt. de Bretagne*, liv. 12. chap. 17. ſays above 50 thouſand Livres.

He had a nephew called TANAQUIL DU CHATEL [*F*], who made a great figure at the French Court under Lewis XI. Some Writers miſtook him for the perſon who killed the Duke of Burgundy [*G*], which is a very great blunder. An Italian Author has alſo been

reorum egregio grati animi exemplo dependit (18). i. e. "This du Chatel, a man of a very noble family in "Britany, had been Great Chamberlan under Charles "VII; and tho' he had been baniſhed into his own "Provinces, notwithſtanding his great ſervices to the "King and the Kingdom, yet no ſooner was his "Maſter dead, but he returned immediately to Court, "and ſpent thirty thouſand Crowns in the King's fu-"neral, which was neglected by all the Courtiers. A "noble inſtance of a grateful heart!" We ſhall have recourſe below to the Sieur d'Argentré, the better to know the circumſtances of all this. See the Remark [*G*], towards the end.

(18) Thuanus, lib. 25. pag. 524.

[*F*] *He had a Nephew called* TANNAQUIL DU CHATEL.] This nephew had been educated in his uncle's houſe at the Court of France, and was a man of judgment. He attached himſelf to the Duke of Britany's ſervice, and was made High-Steward of his Houſhold. In the year 1464 he gave very good advice in a very dangerous circumſtance; for it was to avoid the ſnares laid before him by King Lewis XI (19). He was alſo a man of probity, who did not flatter his Maſter with regard to his amorous intrigues. The Duke of Britany, at the age of thirty, had not much eſteem for his conſort, who was the King of Scotland's daughter, and carried every where with him a Miſtreſs, with whom he was paſſionately in love. Her name was Antoinette de Maillezé, and ſhe was the Lord de Villequier's wife. Tannaquil often and freely repreſented to the Duke thoſe puniſhments, which the juſtice of God inflicts upon lewd and adulterous Princes; but this only drew his Maſter's hatred upon him; which as ſoon as he perceived, he would no longer expoſe himſelf to the Duke's reſentment, and retired to his own houſe. The Lady de Villequier ſent him word, that ſhe would reſtore him to his Maſter's favour, if he would promiſe not to admoniſh him any more. But he would not accept the propoſal, and tho' this Lady employed her credit rather to prefer men of merit, than to be revenged of the injuries ſhe received, yet he dreaded her (20). Lewis XI being acquainted with du Chatel's circumſtances, proffered him ſome high poſts, which he accepted, and thus our Tannaquil du Chatel entered into the ſervice of the French Court (21). He was made Governor of Cerdanna and Rouſſillon. We ſhall ſee very ſoon, that a Civilian who did not want learning, miſtook the County of Cerdanna for the Iſland of Sardinia. In 1475 Tannaquil du Chatel was employed to negotiate the nine year's truce (22). He was killed at the ſiege of Bouchain in 1478 (23). If we may credit Peter Matthieu (24), the perſon, who took care of Charles the VIIth's funeral, was the ſame Tannaquil du Chatel, who preached up chaſtity to the Duke of Britany with ſuch a Chriſtian zeal; he was nephew to Tannaquil, who killed the Duke of Burgundy; and out of ſpite, that his charges in the funeral of Charles the VIIth were not reimburſed, he went over to the Duke of Britany. This deſerves to be examined.

(19) *See* Beaucaire, lib. 1. num. 15. *and* Varillas, *Hiſt. de Louis XI*, liv. 3. pag. 188.

(20) This does not agree with what we ſhall quote from d'Argentré in the following Remark.

(21) Beaucaire, lib. 2. num. 12. Varillas, *Hiſt. de Louis XI*, liv. 4. pag. 289.

(22) Matthieu, *Hiſt. de Louis XI*, liv. 11. pag. m. 747.

(23) Mezerai, *Hiſt. de France*, tom. 2. pag. 747.

(24) Matthieu, *Hiſt. de Louis XI*, l. 2. pag. 87.

[*G*] *Some Writers miſtook him for the perſon who killed the Duke of Burgundy.*] I have found this blunder in Forcatulus, with ſome other facts concerning Tannaquil du Chatel the nephew, which deſerve to be related here. Forcatulus ſays (25), that Tannaquil was one of the thirty ſix Knights of the Order of St. Michael, when that order was firſt inſtituted by Lewis XI (26). He deſerved it, continues Forcatulus, ſince he had behaved himſelf with ſo much prudence and conduct in his Government of Paris under the Reign of Charles VI. Here lies the miſtake. Tannaquil du Chatel, Knight of the Order of St. Michael, and Governor of Rouſſillon in 1469, negotiated a truce in 1475; he is not therefore the ſame perſon, who was Provoſt of Paris under Charles the ſixth; for the latter commanded an army in Italy in 1409, which ſhews, that he was then at leaſt thirty years old; whence it follows that he was born about the year 1380. If he had been plenipotentiary at the age of fourſcore and fifteen, would no Hiſtorian have taken notice of a man, whoſe ſtrength of mind laſted ſo long; which is a thing much more uncommon than to ſee a perſon an hundred years old? We have obſerved above (27), that in 1425 Tannaquil looked upon himſelf as an old man; he was therefore above thirty, and at leaſt forty or forty five when he commanded in Italy. Forcatulus obſerves, that Tannaquil was one of Cardinal Balue's Judges, and that the King gave him the Cardinal's furniture, and fine hangings; he gave a very favourable account of the order, which Tannaquil eſtabliſhed in the Province of Rouſſillon (28); nor does he omit his journey to the Monaſtery of Ronceraux, nor his excellent exhortations to the Monks, nor the queſtion he aſked them, after he had ſeen their library, *viz.* whether they had a piece of Orpheus's harp or of his head. If I be aſked, why this Civilian ſpeaks at large of Tannaquil du Chatel's journey, I ſhall anſwer, it is becauſe his great grand-father was very much in favour with the Governor of Rouſſillon; but not ſo much as a Gentleman named Polerme, deſcended from the family of the Grammonts, and who was Tannaquil's Lieutenant in Cerdanna. On which occaſion Forcatulus tranſcribes ſome verſes from Claudian and Martial, which give an account of the bad air of the Iſland of Sardinia, and aſſerts, that Polerme being well acquainted with the diſturbances to which that Iſland was continually expoſed, accepted the government of it very much againſt his will (29). This is what I promiſed to obſerve in the preceding Remark.

(25) Forcatul. *De Gallor. Imperio, & Philoſophia*, lib. 7. pag. m. 1111, & *ſeq.*

(26) In the year 1469.

(27) Remark [*C*], Quotation (10).

(28) He did not accept that government but with ſome reluctancy. *Dubitans ne non Hiſpanica gens imperium ſuum ferre poſſet, aut ipſe mores ejus aut licentiam.* i. e. "He fear-"ed, that the "Spaniards "would not rea-"dily ſubmit to "his authority, "or that he "himſelf would "not be able to "bear with their "manners and "licentiouſneſs." Forcatul. *de Gall. Imp. & Philoſ.* pag. 1112. d'Argentré, *Hiſt. de Bretagne*, liv. 10. chap. 30. agrees in ſeveral things with Forcatulus.

* The different accounts, which I have laid before the Readers, may make them ſenſible how neglectful and inaccurate moſt Hiſtorians are in the circumſtances they relate. Their different accounts make it almoſt impoſſible for us to know exactly, at what time Tannaquil du Chatel retired from the Court of Charles VII; whether he returned thither after this Prince's death; whether he was Maſter of the Horſe, or Lord Chamberlain; what ſum of money he ſpent in the funeral of his Maſter; whether he, who killed the Duke of Burgundy was the ſame with him who buried Charles VII; whether he, who reproved the Duke of Britany for his unlawful amours, did really retire from the Court of France, becauſe they did not repay him the money he had ſpent for the funeral of that Prince. We meet with a thouſand differences of the ſame nature in the lives of all the eminent men; which is really ſurprizing, ſince it would be very eaſy to diſtinguiſh every fact and circumſtance in Hiſtory in ſuch a manner, that even the leaſt penetrating genius might not miſtake them.

* THE uncertainty, in which the Hiſtorians leave us.

Here follows another paſſage from d'Argentré (30), which will clear up this matter a little. *The Officers ſeeing that King Charles drew near his end, and knowing, that they would ſoon live under a very diſtruſtful Prince, they all one after another left Charles before his death, ſo that he had ſcarce people enough about him, to wait upon him. Only one faithful and conſtant friend continued with him; who was Tannaquil du Chatel Maſter of the Horſe, who at all adventures attended him to the laſt, there being not one perſon in France, who would contribute any money or do the leaſt thing, to have the King decently buried. Du Chatel undertook it; he made at his own expence all the neceſſary preparations, to have his Maſter buried after the manner uſual to the Kings of France, tho' there was then no likelihood that he would ever be reimburſed; he ſpent in that funeral above fifty thouſand livres of his own money, and was not paid but ten years after; when it happened lucklily for him, that the Caſtles and Lordſhips of Chatillon upon the river Andely, Pacy, Oyſy and Nonancourt in Normandy were aſſigned him for his payments, and have been ſince taken from his heirs to be annexed to the Crown-Lands. After his Maſter's death he found no ſupport nor favour at his Succeſſor's Court, ſo that he retired into Britany, where he was very kindly received by the Duke, who made him Lord Steward of his Houſhold, and Captain of Nantes, and made a match between him and the ſecond daughter of the Count de Maletroit, the Marſhal de Rieux having married the eldeſt. But tho' he was very worthy of this favour, yet it did not laſt long, as we ſhall obſerve hereafter.* Theſe laſt words relate to Tannaquil's diſgrace, which the Author mentions in pages 603 and 608, and ſeems to

(29) *Audierat vero Polermus Inſulam crebra dominorum mutatione, impacatam, & turbis deditam.* Forcatulus, *de Imp. Gall. & Philoſ.* pag. 1120.

(30) *Hiſt. de Bretagne*, liv. 12. chap. 3. pag. 592.

been guilty here of very groſs errors [*H*], as will appear by the laſt Remark.

to contradict himſelf. In pag. 603 he ſays, that during the journey, which the Duke of Britany made to Normandy againſt Tannaquil's advice, this latter had leave to go and ſee his wife; that the Duke finding that the ſuſpicions, which Tannaquil endeavoured to raiſe in his mind, were but too well grounded, he thought Tannaquil was concerned in the plot, ſo that *he would never ſee him again.* But in page 608 he tells us, that Tannaquil bore with indignation the life which the Duke led with the Lady de Villequier, *for which reaſon ſhe began to hate him mortally*, and he *to ſave his life fled into France*. Lewis XI received him very well, and loaded him with honours, and made him Governor of Rouſſillon (31). Obſerve, that it was after the journey to Normandy in 1465, that the Duke debauched the Lady de Villequier (32); whence it follows, that Tannaquil appeared at Court after that journey, for if he had been then out of favour, what could he have done againſt the Lady de Villequier?

(31) Ibid. pag. 612.

(32) Ibid. pag. 603.

However it be, we may be certain from Bernard d'Argentré's account, I. That Tannaquil du Chatel, who buried Charles VII, is not the ſame who killed the Duke of Burgundy: II. That he is the ſame, who retired from Britany into France under the reign of Lewis XI, and who was Governor of Rouſſillon. III. That he did not return from his houſe to Court, in order to take care of the King's funeral, but that he was actually Maſter of the Horſe, and in favour with Charles VII, when that Prince died.

There are few Articles in this Dictionary, which in proportion to their length, are a rhapſody of more different pieces tacked together than this; and yet, I am perſuaded, it will furniſh the Reader with an eaſy method for diſtinguiſhing the two *Tannaquil's* DU CHATEL.

[*H*] *An Italian Author has been guilty here of very groſs errors.*] See a Book, printed at Rome in 1646, intitled *Ritratti e Elogii di Capitani illuſtri*. You will find there (33) that Tannaquil du Chatel Provoſt of Paris, and afterwards Lieutenant to the Dauphin was magnificently adorned with military rewards by Lewis XI and Charles VIII, and one of the firſt Knights of the Order of St. Michael, and that he died in 1468. The Iſt error is, not to diſtinguiſh the uncle from the nephew; for the Leiutenant of the Dauphin, and the Provoſt of Paris is not the ſame perſon with the Knight of St. Michael. II. The Knight of St. Michael did not die in 1468, ſince in 1475 he was employed in the negotiation of a truce for nine years (34), and was preſent at a ſiege (35) in 1478. III. If he had died in 1468, he could not have been preferred to any poſt, nor received any reward from King Charles VIII, who did not begin his reign till 1483.

(33) Pag. 144, 145.

(34) Matthieu, *Hiſt. de Louis XI*, pag. m. 747.

(35) At that of Bouchain, at which he was killed.

☞ CHAUCER (GEOFFREY), an eminent Engliſh Poet in the fourteenth Century, is ſaid by ſome Writers to have been born in Berkſhire, by others in Oxfordſhire, but by others, with much greater probability, at London [*A*]. He was deſcended from a good family [*B*], and born in the ſecond year of the reign of King Edward III, A. D. 1328 (*a*). His firſt ſtudies were in the Univerſity of Cambridge, where he was in the eighteenth year of his age (*b*), when he wrote his *Court of Love* (*c*), and was at thoſe early years no indifferent Poet, having before written ſeveral pieces (*d*). But of what College he was is uncertain, there being no footſteps of him in the Records of that Univerſity. It is not improbable that he was of that Hall, where he lays the ſtory of the *Miller* of Trompington [*C*], ſo exactly deſcribing the place, and humours, and northern dialect of his Fellow-Collegians (*e*). How long he continued there is not known; it is certain he removed from thence to compleat his ſtudies at Oxford;

(*a*) *Life of Chaucer*, prefixed to Mr. John Urry's edition of his *Works*, London 1721 in fol. The pages in that Life are not numbered.

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) See the *Court of Love*, ver. 45 and 911, &c.

(*d*) Ibid. ver. 897, &c.

(*e*) *Life of Chaucer, ubi ſupra.*

[*A*] *Said by ſome Writers to have been born in Berkſhire, by others in Oxfordſhire, but by others, with much greater probability, at London.*] Leland (1) tells us, that he was induced by ſome reaſons to believe that Oxfordſhire or Berkſhire produced our Poet. *Nam quibuſdam argumentis adducor ut credam Iſiacam vel Berochenſem provinciam illius natale ſolum fuiſſe.* What thoſe reaſons were, Leland has not informed us; and there appears at preſent no other, but that the ſeats of his family were in thoſe counties. Pits (2) aſſerts that he was born at Woodſtock near Oxford. Dr. Fuller (3) obſerves, that tho' ſome affirm him to have been born in Berkſhire, others in Oxfordſhire, yet *the moſt and trueſt in London*; and before him Camden, tho' he mentions the claim of Woodſtock (4), evidently gives no credit to it; for ſpeaking of Spenſer, whom all allow to be born in London, he calls him fellow-citizen to Chaucer (5). In ſhort he himſelf ſeems to point out the place of his nativity to be the city of *London* in his TESTAMENT OF LOVE (6), where he writes as follows. *Alſo in the cytye of London, that is to me ſo dere and ſwete, in which I was forth growen, and more kindely love have I to that place, than to any other in yerth, as every kindly creature hath full appetite to that place of his kindly Engendrure, and to wilne reſte and pece in that ſtede to abyde: tbilke pece ſhould thus there have been broken, and of al wiſe it is commanded and defired.*

(1) *Comment. de Scriptor. Britannic.* tom. 2. cap. DV. pag. 419, 420. edit. Oxon. 1709 in 8vo.

(2) *De illuſtribus Angliæ Scriptoribus, ad ann.* 1400, pag. 572.

(3) *Church Hiſtory of Britain*, B. 4. pag. 151. edit. London 1656.

(4) In his *Britannia, in Oxfordſhire.*

(5) Camden, *Elizabeth.* ed. Hearne, p. 783. *ad ann.* 1598.

(6) Pag. 486. a. Urry's edit. of his Works at London 1721.

[*B*] *Deſcended from a good family.*] Leland (7) that he was *nobili loco natus*; and Pits (8) aſſerts, that he was born of a family of good quality, and that his father was a Knight. *Claris parentibus natus, patrem habuit Equeſtris Ordinis virum.* Mr. Thomas Speght (9) thinks that one Richard Chaucer, a Vintner of London, was his father, and Elizabeth Chaucer, a nun of St. Helen's, in the ſecond year of Richard the IId, might have been his ſiſter, or of his kindred. But the Author of the *Life* of our Poet prefixed to Mr. Urry's Edition of his Works (10), ſhews the improbability of that conjecture; and obſerves, that the name of *Chaucer*, or *Chaucier*, *Chaucieris*, *Chauſſier*, *Chauſſir* &c. is originally French, ſignifying a Shoemaker; but that the family, which he deſcended from, had long enjoyed an honourable name in England, the founder being a Chief attending the Duke of Normandy in his expedition to England, as appears by the Roll of Battle-Abbey. And as the original ſeems to have been a perſon of honour, ſo ſeveral of the name, who may reaſonably be ſuppoſed to be deſcended from him, are mentioned in Records; but the deſcent of our Author is no where particularly deſcribed. The ſame Writer tells us, that tho' he cannot implicitly believe with Pits, that his father was a Knight, yet it is likely his parents were ſomething ſuperior to a common employ; and that it is highly probable that John Chaucer, who attended upon Edward the IIId and Queen Philippa in their expedition to Flanders and Cologne, and who had the King's protection to go over ſea (11) in the twelfth year of his reign, was the father of our Geoffrey; which is the more probable, becauſe Chaucer's firſt application, after leaving the Univerſity and Inns of Law, was to the Court, where it is not unlikely the ſervices of his father ſhould recommend the ſon.

(7) Pag. 419.

(8) Pag. 572.

(9) In his *Life of Chaucer*, prefixed to his edition of that Poet's Works at London 1602. *See likewiſe* Fuller, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 152.

(10) London 1721 in fol.

(11) See *Rymer's Fœdera*, vol. 5. pag. 51.

[*C*] *It is not improbable, that he was of that Hall, where he lays the ſtory of the* Miller *of* Trompington.] This Hall in all the Editions of Chaucer before Mr. Speght's in 1602 is called *Soler* or *Solere*; and tho' that Editor retained *Solere* in the text of the Edition of 1598, yet in his notes he directs it to be read *Scholar's-Hall*, "that is, ſays he, the Univerſity-Hall "founded by the Chancellor and Maſters of the Uni- "verſity, ann. 1326, but ſince united to the founda- "tion of the Lady Elizabeth de Burgo, Counteſs of "Clare, and called *Clare-Hall*." The Author of his Gloſſary at the end of Mr. Urry's Edition of Chaucer obſerves (12), that if *Scholars* or *Scholler's Hall* be the true reading, it may perhaps mean a College founded by Edward III, by the name of *Aula Scolarium Regis*, now part of *Trinity-College*. See Rymer's *Fœdera*, *Vol. VII. p.* 239.

(12) *Gloſſary*, pag. 61.

ford; but in what College is as uncertain as the former. Mr. Thomas Speght (*f*) fixes upon *Canterbury* or *Merton* College. The former, now part of *Chriſt-Church-College*, is unlikely to be the place, ſince it was not founded till the year 1363, at which time Chaucer muſt be five and thirty years of age, and had been for ſome time launched into the world of buſineſs. *Merton* College is the more likely; for though his name does not appear among the celebrated members of it at that time, yet we find moſt of his Contemporaries, as *Strode*, *Occleve*, &c. were of that College, where one of his ſons was likewiſe educated (*g*). After a conſiderable ſtay here, and a ſtrict application to the public Lectures of the Univerſity, "he became, ſays Leland (*h*), an acute Logician, a "ſmooth Rhetorician, a pleaſant Poet, a grave Philoſopher, an ingenious Mathemati-"cian, and an holy Divine." That he was a great Maſter in Aſtronomy, (though he modeſtly pleads ignorance in it) (*i*) is plain from his Diſcourſes of the *Aſtrolabe*; that he was verſed in the Hermetic Philoſophy, (which prevailed much at that time) appears by his *Tale of the Chanon's Yeoman*: his knowledge in Divinity is evident from his *Parſon's Tale*; and his Philoſophy from the *Teſtament of Love*. After he had left the Univerſity he travelled into France, Holland, and other countries, where he ſpent part of his younger years (*k*). Upon his return he entered himſelf in the Inner Temple [*D*], where he ſtudied the Municipal Laws of England (*l*). But he had not long followed theſe ſtudies, before his ſingular accompliſhments were diſcovered by ſome perſons at Court, whither he next made his approaches; nor was the beauty of his perſon of ſmall ſervice in introducing him there. His firſt ſtation at Court was probably that of page to King Edward III, a place of honour and eſteem; but this was only his firſt ſtep to preferment, as the King himſelf intimates; and therefore by his Letters Patents dated in the forty firſt year of his reign he grants to him for his good ſervices, by the title of *dilectus Valettus noſter* [*E*], an annuity of twenty marks *per ann.* payable out of the Exchequer, till he could otherwiſe provide for him. Not long after we find him Gentleman of the King's Privy Chamber, and by that title the King granted to him by Letters Patents dated in the forty fifth year of his reign the further ſum of twenty marks *per ann.* during life. The next year he was made Shield-bearer to the King [*F*]. Being thus placed near the King, he found reſpect and encouragement from all the chief perſons of the Court, particularly Queen Philippa; John of Gaunt Duke of Lancaſter, upon whoſe account he wrote the *Book of the Ducheſs* or the *Dreme of Chaucer*, the *Complaint of the Black Knight, and the Dreame*; *Blanch*, wife to the Duke; and the Lady Margaret, the King's daughter, and Counteſs of Pembroke (*m*). Thus beloved, eſteemed, and honoured, he ſpent his younger years in a conſtant attendance upon the Court, and for the moſt part living near it when reſiding at Woodſtock, in a ſquare ſtone houſe near the Park-Gate, ſtill called Chaucer's Houſe (*n*). Blanch Ducheſs of Lancaſter entertained in her ſervice one Katherine Rouet, daughter of Sir Payn or Pagan Rouet, a native of Hainault, and Guien King at Arms for that country, who was afterwards married to Sir Hugh Swynford a Knight of Lincoln. He dying not long after their marriage, the Duke of Lancaſter and his Ducheſs continued her as Guardian to their children. This Lady had a younger ſiſter, named Philippa, whom the Duke and Ducheſs recommended to our Poet for a wife, and he married her about the thirty ſecond year of his age. Being thus fixed by marriage, the King began to employ him in more public and advantageous places; for in the forty ſixth year of his reign we find him in commiſſion with others to treat with the Doge and Senate of Genoa; and now he began every day to riſe in greatneſs, having the Duke of Lancaſter for his Patron, who had ſeveral reaſons for eſpouſing his intereſt, particularly out of regard to the Lady Katherine Swynford, who was the Duke's miſtreſs, and becauſe his ambition required all the aſſiſtance of learned men to give it a plauſible appearance (*o*). About this time (perhaps for his ſervices at Genoa) the King granted him by Letters Patents dated at Windſor in the forty eighth year of his reign, by the title of *Armiger noſter*, one *Pycher* of Wine daily in the Port of London, and ſoon after made him *Comptroller of the Cuſtoms* in that Port of Wool, Woolfells, and Hides, with a particular Proviſo, that he ſhould perſonally execute that office, and write the accounts relating to it with his own hand (*p*). The King likewiſe granted him ſeveral other favours [*G*]; by which means he grew exceedingly rich, having at one time almoſt

(*f*) In his *Life of Chaucer*, publiſhed in his edition of that Poet's Works at London 1602.

(*g*) *Life of Chaucer* prefixed to his Works, edit. London 1721.

(*h*) *Commentarius de Scriptoribus Britannicis*, tom. 2. cap. DV. pag. 420. edit. Oxon. 1709, in 8vo.

(*i*) See *The Houſe of Fame*, lib. 1.

(*k*) Leland, *ubi ſupra*; Balæus, *Scriptor. illuſtr. Majar. Brytanniæ Catal.* Cent. 7. cap. 24. pag. 525. edit. Baſil. 1557; and Speght's *Life of Chaucer*, *ubi ſupra*.

(*l*) Leland, *ubi ſupra*.

(*m*) Speght's *Life of Chaucer*, *ubi ſupra*, and the *Life of Chaucer*, in the edition at London 1721.

(*n*) *Life of Chaucer*.

(*o*) Speght, *ubi ſupra*, and *Life of Chaucer*, *ubi ſupra*.

(*p*) Pat. 48. Ed. 3. pag. 1. m. 7.

[*D*] *Upon his return, he entered himſelf in the Inner-Temple.*] To prove this Mr. Speght mentions a record ſeen by Mr. Buckley in that houſe, where Geoffrey Chaucer was fined two ſhillings for beating a Franciſcan Fryar in Fleetſtreet. Leland (13) intimates, that he proſecuted his ſtudies in the Law towards the latter end of his Life, which the Author of *Chaucer's Life* in Mr. Urry's Edition ſhews to be improbable for ſeveral reaſons; and obſerves, that it is much more likely, that he acquired the knowledge of our Laws in his youth, in order to qualify him for public affairs, in which he was afterwards concerned.

(13) Pag. 420.

[*E*] *By the title of* dilectus Valettus noſter.] Mr. Selden (14) tells us, that this poſt of *Valettus* or *Valectus* was conferred upon young heirs deſigned to be Knighted, or young Gentlemen of great deſcent or quality. Mr. Camden takes *Valectus Hoſpitii* to ſignify a Gentleman of the Privy-Chamber; and by this name of *Valectus* the King before had entitled the Lord Abergavenny (15).

(14) *Titles of Honour*, Part 2. cap. 5. § 47.

(15) Speght, *ubi ſupra*.

[*F*] *He was made Shield-bearer to the King.*] This title of *Scutifer Regis*, tho' now extinct, was at that time of great honour, ſuch perſons being always next the King's perſon, and generally upon ſignal victories rewarded with military honours (16).

(16) *Life of Chaucer*, prefixed to Mr. Urry's edition.

[*G*] *The King granted him ſeveral other favours.*] In the forty ninth year of his reign, and the forty ſeventh of Chaucer's age, he granted to him the lands and

almoſt a thouſand pounds *per. ann.* (q), a vaſt eſtate for thoſe times. But as he was thus advanced to higher places of truſt, ſo he became more entangled in the affairs of State, the conſequence of which proved of the utmoſt prejudice to him. The Duke of Lancaſter, who had been the chief inſtrument of his riſe, expected the fruits of thoſe favours in a ready compliance with him in all his deſigns. The Duke to promote his ambitious views eſpouſed the party of Wickliffe, and endeavoured to expoſe the Clergy, who were averſe to his deſigns, to the indignation of the people; in which Chaucer had no ſmall hand by his public intereſt and his writings [*H*]. But the King perceiving the aims of the Duke, declared Richard, ſon of Edward the Black Prince, heir to the Crown, which was a prodigious mortification to the Duke, who from that time was never eaſy, nor free from the jealouſies and ſuſpicions of the Prince upon the Throne, in which his friends bore a ſhare (r). However in the laſt year of King Edward IIId's reign our Poet was employed in a commiſſion to treat with the French [*I*]; and in the beginning of King Richard IId's reign he was in ſome degree of favour at Court, as appears from the grants made to him [*K*]. The Duke of Lancaſter at laſt finding his hopes of greatneſs checked and his life in perpetual danger from the King, began to abandon Wickliffe's party; upon which Chaucer likewiſe, how much ſoever he had eſpouſed that Divine's opinions, thought it prudent to conceal them more than he had done; though it doth not appear that at any time he had gone all the lengths of that party [*L*]. With the Duke's intereſt, that of Chaucer entirely ſunk; and the former paſſing over Sea, his friends felt all the malice of the oppoſite party; which put them upon calling in a number of the populace to their aſſiſtance; by which means ſeveral popular commotions enſued, and particularly one in the City of London. As in this affair our Poet was no unartful prompter behind the curtain [*M*], ſo he felt the conſequences of it in his ruin; being

(q) Speght, *ubi ſupra.*

(r) *Life of Chaucer.*

and body of Sir Edmond Staplegate, ſon of Sir Edmond Staplegate in the county of Kent, in Ward, who afterwards paid him one hundred and four pounds for the ſame (17); and the year following he granted to him, by the title of *dilectus Armiger noſter*, the ſum of ſeventy one pounds four ſhillings and ſix pence ariſing from a certain quantity of wool therein mentioned, which was forfeited by one John Kent of London for non-payment of Cuſtoms (18).

(17) Speght, *ubi ſupra.*

(18) Pat. 50. Ed. III. p. 1. m. 5.

[*H*] *Endeavoured to expoſe the Clergy, who were averſe to his deſigns, to the indignation of the people; in which* Chaucer *had no ſmall hand by his public intereſt and his Writings.*] The Author of the *Life* of him printed in Mr. *Urry*'s Edition of his Works informs us of this, but obſerves, that he cannot go ſo far as to ſuppoſe, that our Poet ſcurrilouſly reviled the eſtabliſhed Religion of thoſe times; and therefore cannot think, that either the *Plow-man's tale* or *Jack Upland* were written by him. However that Author tells us, that he was a favourer of the *Lollards* (as were likewiſe moſt of his friends, and particularly *Occleve*,) as is evident from ſeveral places of his Writings, wherein he bitterly inveighs againſt the Prieſts and Friars. Not that he diſliked all of that Order, for he mentions Friar *John Some* and Friar *Nicholas Lenne* or *Lynne* (19), with reſpect, ſtiling them *reverent Clerkes* (20), and expreſſes his regard for the ſecular Clergy, who lived up to their profeſſion, in his deſcription of the Parſon. Nor was he diſeſteemed by the Clergy of thoſe times; *Lidgate*, who was a Monk of St. Edmondſbury, and ſeveral others entertaining a great reverence for him, and ſpeaking of him with the utmoſt reſpect. Nor was he leſs eſteemed by Sir John Gower, tho' a violent Bigot to the Church of Rome, and a perpetual exclaimer againſt Wickliffe and his followers.

(19) Leland tells us, pag. 420. that Chaucer was inſtructed in the Mathematics by thoſe two Fryars.

(20) *Aſtrolabe*, pag. 440.

[*I*] *Employed in a Commiſſion to treat with the French.*] The French, notwithſtanding a truce, which had been made with them, having diſturbed our coaſt, the King endeavoured to prolong the truce; for which purpoſe he ſent Chaucer and other Commiſſioners to treat with thoſe appointed by the French King, before the Pope's Legates; but nothing being concluded, the Legates propoſed a match between the Lady Mary, daughter to the King of France, and Richard Prince of Wales. Whereupon the King ſent Sir Guiſcard Dangle, Knight of the Garter and afterwards Earl of Huntington, Sir Richard Sturry a noted Wickliffiſt, and our Chaucer, Embaſſadors to Monſtreuil; but this Embaſſy had no other effect, than the prolonging of the truce with France till the firſt of May following (21).

(21) *Life of Chaucer, ubi ſupra.*

[*K*] *The grants made to him.*] In the firſt year of the King's reign, by Letters Patents under the Great Seal, bearing date March the 23d the King confirmed to him, by the title of *Dilectus Armiger noſter*, the grant made by the late King of twenty marks *per ann.* and by other Letters Patents bearing date the 18th of April in the ſame year he confirmed the other grant of the late King for a *Pycher* of wine to be delivered him daily in the port of London. In the ſecond year of his reign King Richard took Chaucer and all his lands into his protection; which Mr. Speght (22) believes was occaſioned by ſome trouble, into which he was fallen by ſiding with the common people. But he does not ſeem to have been involved in that trouble till ſome time after, and therefore it is more likely, that this protection was to ſecure him from his creditors, as was likewiſe another protection granted by the ſame Prince. It does not appear by what means he was reduced to ſuch low circumſtances, unleſs it was by the loſs of his intereſt at Court and of advantages, which he enjoyed under his Maſter and Patron the late King. Mr. Speght ſuppoſes, that he ſpent moſt of his wealth in foreign embaſſies; but it ſhould ſeem, that they were the means whereby he acquired it, he being generally well rewarded. This King in the fourth year of his reign confirmed the grants made to Chaucer and Philippa his wife of the ſeveral annuities granted to them (22).

(22) *Ubi ſupra.*

[*L*] *It doth not appear, that at any time he had gone all the lengths of that party.*] His reſentments were chiefly againſt the perſonal vices of the Clergy, not their doctrines; for the Pilgrimage of Canterbury is ſpoken of with reverence, and he calls Becket the *holy bliſsful Martyr* (24). And the *Parſon*, though he would not *ren to St. Powles* (25) to procure livings, makes one in the expedition to Canterbury. *This I ſay*, continues the Author of the Life of Chaucer, *not as if that journey was real; but Chaucer would never have been guilty of ſo great an impropriety as to make perſons act contrary to their opinions. Nor did even the leaders of that party ſcruple the ceremonies then uſed. They oppoſed them in opinion, but ſeldom differed from them in practice. Even Wickliffe himſelf always conformed, and held his living of Lutterworth without interruption, and died in a fit of the palſy, which ſeized him while he was ſaying Maſs. But Chaucer differed much from them even in opinion; for in his* Teſtament of Love *(q) he confeſſes the Real Preſence (r). . . . . In the* Houſe of Fame *(s) we find him again going on pilgrimage. We may gather his opinion of the Invocation of Saints from his* Priere de Nôtre Dame, *his Ballad in commendation of our Lady, and ſeveral other pieces. But however Chaucer might deſpiſe ſome extravagancies of the Church of Rome, yet that he died a Member of it, ſeems plainly by his* Retractation. We ſhall conſider the authority of that *Retractation* in Note [*Y*].

(23) *Life of Chaucer, ubi ſupra.*

(24) Prol. ver. 17.

(25) Ibid. ver. 511.

(q) Pag. 492. b.

(r) Mr. Fox ſeems to be of a contrary opinion, *Acts and Mon.* vol. 2. pag. 42. edit. 1684.

(s) In the beginning of the firſt book.

[*M*] *In this affair our Poet was no unartful Prompter behind the curtain.*] This we are informed of by the

being obliged to fly to Hainault, whence his neceſſities forced him to return to England [*N*], where he was arreſted by order from the King, and impriſoned, as it is probable, in the Tower of London. At laſt he made a frank confeſſion of the whole affair [*O*], which though it expoſed him to the reſentments of the people, procured him the King's pardon. Theſe misfortunes occaſioned his writing that excellent Treatiſe called *The Teſtament of Love* [*P*]. He did not for ſome time recover the ſhock which this gave him, and his circumſtances being reduced to the loweſt degree of poverty, and his intereſt at Court ruined, he retired to Woodſtock, to enjoy the calm pleaſures of a ſtudious ſafety, which produced his admirable Treatiſe of the *Aſtrolabe* [*Q*]. The Duke of Lancaſter at laſt ſurmounting his troubles, his party gathered new life; and about the 20th year of the King he married the Lady Katherine Swynford, ſiſter to Chaucer's wife, and procured his children by her [*R*] to be legitimated; ſo that Thomas Chaucer, our Poet's ſon, became allied to moſt of the Nobility, and to ſeveral of the Kings of England. And now the Sun began again to ſhine upon Chaucer with an Evening-ray; for he had ſome grants conferred upon him by the King [*S*]; by means of which and the influence which he

the Author of his *Life* in Mr. Urry's edition of his works, who obſerves, that John of Northampton, a creature of the Duke of Lancaſter, was at the head of the diſturbances in London, who having been Lord Mayor the year before, made ſtrong intereſt to be again choſen, and therefore oppoſed the following election, ſecuring to his party moſt of the Citizens, and crying out upon the miſmanagement of the City, ſuggeſting that there was no poſſible way of ſecuring them from ruin but by re-electing him. This occaſioned inſurrections; and our Poet being then Comptroller of the Cuſtoms in that Port, and joined in party with Northampton, as being both in the Duke's intereſt, encouraged them. But this diſorder did not continue long; for upon Sir Robert Knolles's beheading one of the rioters, it was ſuppreſſed, and Northampton taken into cuſtody. Strict ſearch was made for Chaucer, but he made his eſcape into Hainault, and afterwards into France, and finding the King reſolved to get him if poſſible into his hands, as the fitteſt perſon to diſcover the abettors of thoſe commotions, he fled thence into Hainault, with this intent chiefly, as he ſays (26) *their privitie to concele*. The Author above quoted tells us, that the Records are ſilent as to the reaſon of Chaucer's falling under the diſpleaſure of the Government; but his ſhare in the commotions of the City is frequently alluded to in his *Teſtament of Lere*, where he ſays (27), that he *was drawe to be aſſentaunt, and in* his *mightes helping to certain conjuracions, and other grete matters of rulynge of Citezins*.

(26) *Teſtament of Love*, pag. 488, a.

(27) Pag. 485, b.

[*N*] *Whence his neceſſities forced him to return to England.*] Several of his accomplices had been ſupported by him in their exile, while the chief ringleaders (except Northampton, who was condemned at Reading upon the evidence of his Clerk) had at London made their peace, by acknowledging their crime, and making ſubmiſſion, and had now forgot the honour and integrity of Chaucer, who ſuffered exile to ſecure their ſecrets. Nay they proved ſo ungrateful, that they wiſhed his death, and endeavoured it by keeping all ſupplies of money from him. And while he ſpent his fortune in removing from place to place, and in aſſiſting his fellow-exiles, he was ſo far from receiving any aſſiſtance at home, that his apartments were let, and the money received for rent was never accounted for to him; nor could he recover any from thoſe, who owed it him, they being fully perſuaded it was impoſſible for him ever to return to England. The Government ſtill purſuing their reſentment againſt him and his friends, they were conſtrained to leave Zealand; and Chaucer having no poſſible means left of ſtruggling longer with the difficulties of exile and poverty, and finding no ſecurity wherever he fled, choſe to ſubmit his life to the Laws of his Country, rather than loſe it thro' hunger and want in foreign parts, and returned into England (28).

(28) *Life of Chaucer.*

[*O*] *At laſt he made a frank confeſſion of the whole affair.*] The Government thinking, that by his means they might make a full diſcovery of the late Rebellion, ſent for him, and told him, that the only way to obtain mercy would be to confeſs the ſecrets of his treaſon, and diſcover the confederates in it; deſiring him to propoſe in what manner thoſe differences might be compoſed (29). But he for a long time refuſed, being unwilling to bring the malice of ſo powerful a party upon him by betraying their ſecrets, which he ſays (30) he concealed longer than he ought. But *the King and his Princes* (to uſe his words) having obliged him upon oath to declare what he knew, and with *huge words and grete* (31) urged him to confeſs, and watching his words ſtrictly and narrowly to catch him, if they could, varying in his confeſſion, he very freely diſcloſed all he knew, and impeached the perſons concerned with him; and not only ſo, but, according to the cuſtom of trials at that time, offered to prove the truth of his confeſſion by combat (32).

(29) *Teſtament of Love*, pag. 486, a.

(30) Ibid. pag. 488, a.

(31) Ibid. pag. 495, b.

(32) Ibid. pag. 487, a. See the *Life of Chaucer*, in Mr. Urry's edition of his *Works*.

[*P*] *Theſe misfortunes occaſioned his writing that excellent Treatiſe, called*, The Teſtament of Love.] This Book is an imitation of Boethius *de Conſolatione Philoſophiæ*. In the beginning of it he thus reflects upon his former glory and his preſent miſery (33). *Alas! Fortune! alas! I that ſome tyme in delicious houres was wont to enjoy bliſsful ſtoundes, am nowe dryve by unhappy hevineſſe to bewaile my ſondrie yvels in tene. . . Mirth is chaunged into tene. . Thus witleſſe, thoughtfull, ſightleſſe lokynge, I endure my penaunce in this darke priſonne, caitifned fro frendſhippe and acquaintaunce, and forſaken of al that any worde dare ſpeke.* And a little further (34); *O! where art thou nowe Frendſhip, that ſometyme with laugh ande chere madeſt bothe face and countenance to me wardes?* And in another place (35); *How am I now caſt out of al ſwetenes of Bliſſe, and miſchevouſly ſtongen by paſſed joye? Sorrowfully muſt I bewaile, and live as a wretche. Every of tho joyes is turned into his contrary. For richeſſe now have I povertie; for dignitie now am I enpriſoned; in ſtede of power wretchedneſſe I ſuffre; and for glory of renome I am now diſpiſed and fouliche hated. Thus hath farne fortune, that ſodainly am I overthrowen, and out of all welth diſpoiled.*

(33) Pag. 479.

(34) Pag. 480, a.

(35) Pag. 502, a.

[*Q*] *His admirable Treatiſe of the Aſtrolabe.*] This was written in the year 1391 (36). It is calculated for the latitude of Woodſtock, being a ſmall matter different, as he ſays (37), from that of Oxford. It is ſo exact, that the learned are of opinion it cannot be corrected.

(36) See pag. 442, b. and pag. 443, a. of Urry's edition of his Works.

[*R*] *The Duke's children by her.*] I. *John Beaufort*, Earl of Somerſet. II. *Henry Beaufort*, Cardinal of St. Euſebius, at firſt Biſhop of Lincoln, and afterwards of Wincheſter, and ſeveral times Chancellor of England. III. *Thomas Beaufort*, Duke of Exeter and Earl of Dorſet. IV. *Joan*, Counteſs of Weſtmorland.

(37) Pag. 447, a.

[*S*] *He had now ſeveral Grants conferred upon him by the King.*] In the ſixty fourth or ſixty fifth year of his age, the King granted to him, by the title of *Dilectus Armiger noſter*, an annuity of twenty marks *per ann.* during life, as a compenſation for his former penſion granted to him by Edward III, which by his miſconduct he had been obliged to part with. But that, how ſufficient ſoever it might be for a preſent ſupport, could not diſcharge the many debts, in which he was engaged; and the King willing to ſkreen him till he ſhould recover himſelf, granted him his Protection dated at Weſtminſter May 14th in the 21ſt year of his reign, ſetting forth that the King had occaſion to employ him in ſeveral affairs of moment. The year following he granted him by the title of *Armiger noſter*, by Letters Patents dated at Weſtminſter Octob. 13th, in compenſation of the *Pycher* of wine daily, one pipe of wine annually in the port of London, to be delivered to him by his chief Butler, which office was that year granted to his ſon Thomas. In the 22d year of his reign the King confirmed again to him the Grant of the pipe of wine annually (38).

(38) *Life of Chaucer.*

he recovered by the Duke of Lancaſter's marriage, he again grew to a conſiderable ſhare of wealth. But being now near ſeventy years of age, he thought proper to retire to Dunnington Caſtle near Newbury, where he ſpent the two laſt years of his life. He had not long enjoyed this retirement before he loſt his patron and brother-in-law, the Duke of Lancaſter, who died in 1399; ſoon after which that revolution happened in England, wherein Richard II was depoſed, and Henry IV, ſon of the Duke of Lancaſter, aſſumed the Crown; and in the firſt year of his reign gave our Poet ſome marks of his favour [*T*]. But how pleaſing ſoever the change of Government might be to him at firſt, he afterwards found no ſmall inconveniences attending it. The meaſures and grants of the late King were annulled, and the Acts of Parliament for a whole year, (i. e. the twenty firſt of his reign) totally repealed; upon which Chaucer, in order to procure freſh grants of his penſions, left his retirement, and applied to Court; where though he gained a confirmation of ſome grants (*s*), yet the fatigue of attendance and his great age prevented him by death from enjoying them; not that he had any view of further honour or deſire of public employments, for, as Leland ſays (*t*), he found age burthenſome, and while he followed his cauſes at London fell ſick, and with a truly Roman courage, and at the ſame time with a calm and Chriſtian reſignation, ended his days in the ſeventy ſecond year of his age, and left the world as though he deſpiſed it, as appears from his Song of *Flie from the Preſe &c.* which he wrote in his laſt hours [*V*]. He died October the 25th 1400, and was interred in Weſtminſter-Abbey [*W*]. By his wife Philippa he had two ſons, *Thomas* and *Lewis* [*X*]. With regard to his temper, he had a mixture of the gay, the modeſt and the grave. The ſprightlineſs of his humour was more diſtinguiſhed by his writings than appearance, which gave occaſion to Margaret Counteſs of Pembroke often to rally him upon his ſilent modeſty in company, telling him, that his

(*s*) See Note [*T*].

(*t*) Pag. 425.

[*T*] *Gave our Poet ſome marks of his favour.*] He confirmed to him the Grants of the pipe of wine and of the annuity, (which had been accidentally loſt,) by an exemplification of the former Patents of Richard II. Nor did he think this ſufficient to ſhew his eſteem for his father's friend and brother, but in the ſame year granted to him an annuity of forty marks *per ann.* during life (39).

(39) Ibid.

[*V*] *His Song of the* Flie fro the Preſe, *which he wrote in his laſt hours.*] In a manuſcript in the Cotton Library (40) theſe words are inſerted before that ſong: *A Balade made by Geffrey Chaucyer upon his dethe bedde lying in his grete Anguyſſe.* The Song is as follows:

(40) Otho. A. xviii.

Flie fro the Preſe, and dwell with ſothfaſtneſſe,
Suffiſe unto thy gode though it be ſmall,
For horde hath hate, and climbyng tikilneſſe,
Prece hath envy, and wele it brent o'er all.
Savour no more then the behovin ſhall.
Rede well thy ſelf, that other folke canſt rede,
And Trouthe The ſhall delivir, it is no drede,

Paine The not eche crokid to redreſſe,
In truſt of her that tournith as a Balle;
Grete Reſt ſtandith in litil Buſineſſe.
Beware alſo to ſpurne again a nalle:
Strive not as doith a Crocke with a Walle.
Demith thy ſelf, that demiſt othir's dede,
And Trouthe The ſhal delivir, it is no drede.

That The is ſent, receve in buxomneſſe;
The wraſtling of this World aſkith a Fall,
Here is no Home, here is but Wildirneſſe.
Forthe, Pilgrim, forthe, beſt out of thy ſtall.
Look up on high, and thanke thy God of all.
Weivith thy luſte, and let thy Ghoſt The lede,
And Trouthe the ſhall delivir, it is no drede.

[*W*] *Was interred in Weſtminſter-Abbey.*] Leland (41) tells us, that theſe two verſes,

(41) Pag. 425.

Galfridus Chaucer, *vates, & fama Poeſis*
Maternæ, *hac ſacrâ ſum tumulatus humo,*

were put upon his tomb by Caxton the Printer, at whoſe requeſt Stephen Surigonus of Milan made a copy of verſes upon Chaucer's Death, out of which theſe two verſes are taken. But about the year 1555 (42) or 1556 (43), Mr. Nicholas Brigham, a Gentleman of Oxford, at his own charge erected a handſome monument for him in that Abbey; upon which he cauſed Chaucer's picture to be painted, with the following Inſcription which ſtill remains:

(42) Weaver's *Funeral Monuments*, pag. 489.

(43) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 130. 2d edit. London 1721.

M. S.
Qui fuit Anglorum vates ter maximus olim
Galfridus Chaucer *conditur hoc tumulo.*
Annum ſi quæras Domini, ſi tempora Vitæ,
Ecce notæ ſubſunt, quæ tibi cuncta notant.
25 Octobris 1400.
Ærumnarum requies mors.
N. Brigham *hoc fecit Muſarum nomine ſumptus.*
1556.

About the ledge of the tomb were theſe verſes now quite worn out (44):

(44) Speght, *ubi ſupra*, and Weaver, *ubi ſupra.*

Si rogites quis eram, forſan te fama docebit;
Quod ſi fama negat, mundi quia gloria tranſit,
Hæc monumenta lege.

[*X*] *He had two ſons,* Thomas *and* Lewis.] Speght (45) tells us, that ſome perſons, (he knew not upon what grounds) were of opinion, that Thomas Chaucer was not the ſon of our Poet, but rather ſome Kinſman of his, whom he brought up; but he rejects this opinion upon the authority of Mr. Glover, Somerſet Herald, who in the Pedigree makes him his ſon. This Thomas was born about the 38th or 39th year of Edward III (46); and married one of the greateſt Fortunes in England, Maud, daughter and heir of Sir John Burgſherſhe, brother of Sir Bartholomew Burgſherſhe Knight of the Garter, and Dr. Henry Burgſherſhe Biſhop of Lincoln, Chancellor and Treaſurer of England. He had the office of Chief Butler granted him by King Richard II, which was afterwards given him for life by Letters Patents from King Henry IV, and confirmed by Henry VI. In the reign of Henry IV he was Speaker of the Houſe of Commons, Sheriff of Oxfordſhire and Berkſhire, Conſtable of Wallingford Caſtle and Knareſborough Caſtle during life; Embaſſador to France, and Burgundy, and paſſed thro' ſeveral other public ſtations, as appears by the Records. The chief place of his reſidence was at Ewelm in Oxfordſhire, where he died Novemb. 18th 1434 and lies buried in the Pariſh-Church there. By his wife Maud, who died April 28th, 1436, he had one daughter, named *Alice*, who was thrice married, firſt to Sir John Philips Knt.; and afterwards to Thomas Montacute, E. of Saliſbury, who dying left her very rich. Her third huſband was the famous William de la Pole, Earl and afterwards Duke of Suffolk, by whom ſhe had one ſon, John Duke of Suffolk. The Ducheſs ſurvived him ſeveral years, and after an honourable life died at Ewelm May 20th 1475, and lies interred there. Leland, Bale, and Pits erroneouſly aſſert, that it was our Poet's ſiſter, who married the Duke of Suffolk. His ſecond ſon Lewis was born in 1381, for he was ten years old †, when his father wrote his *Aſtrolabe*, which was in 1391 *. He was then Student in Merton-College, and pupil to the famous Nicholas Strode. But we have no further account of him.

(45) *Ubi ſupra.*

(46) Idem, ibid.

† Aſtrol. pag. 439, a.

* Ibid. pag. 442, b. 433, a.

his abſence was more agreeable to her than his converſation. In his early years his inclination was ſomewhat too gay and looſe; nor did even marriage confine his amorous humours (*u*), and he himſelf ſpeaks in his Retractation [*Y*] with a penitent concern of the many wanton ſongs which he had written in his younger years. Towards the latter part of his Life the gay Gentleman gave way to the grave Philoſopher and pious Divine (*w*). He was intimate with the moſt celebrated ſcholars of his age [*Z*]. We ſhall give his character in the Note [*AA*]. His works are

(*u*) *Life of Chaucer.*

(*w*) Ibid.

[*Y*] *His* Retractation.] This is printed in Mr. Urry's edition of Chaucer's Works (47), and in the *Appendix* (48) to Mr. Thomas Hearne's edition of *Robert of Glouceſter's Chronicle*, publiſhed at Oxford 1724 in 8vo in two volumes, who obſerves (49), that beſides the Tracts ſaid in this Revocation to have been written by Chaucer, and the difference of the three copies mentioned by Mr. Hearne, the Scribe has intitled himſelf to a ſhare in the Petition; whence Mr. Hearne thinks, that the Revocation is not genuine, but that it was made by the Monks. "For not only the Regular, "but Secular Clergy were exaſperated againſt Chaucer, "for the freedom he had taken to expoſe their lewd- "neſs and debauchery; but nothing gave them ſo "much offence, as the *Plowman's Tale*, in which he "has in lively colours deſcribed their pride, covetouſ- "neſs, and abominable luſts, and ſhewed that the Pope "is *Anti-Chriſt*, and they his Miniſters. Such a Sa- "tire made by a perſon of his note and diſtinction, "and ſo much celebrated for his wonderful fine parts "and exquiſite learning and judgment; could not but "work mightily upon them, eſpecially when many "of them had arrived at ſo high a pitch of wicked- "neſs, and were, as it were, drowned in ſloth and "luxury, being much worſe now than their predeceſ- "ſors above three hundred years before, when moſt of "even the Biſhops themſelves were illiterate, though "adored and flattered upon account of their dignity "and unbounded wealth, and attended upon by an "amazing number of ſervants and ſycophants: *circa "ea tempora plerique Epiſcopi erant illiterati, pecuniis "& blanditiis potentes, veſtium apparatu, ſatellitum "ſtrepitu muniti*, as in the manuſcript Hiſtory of the "Church of Lichfield in the Bodleian Library (1). "They could not endure to think of a Reformation, "eſpecially ſince they were indulged to keep concu- "bines, now celibacy had ſo generally prevailed; &c." Mr. Hearne afterwards remarks (50), that if notwithſtanding what has been alledged, it be ſuppoſed, that this Revocation is authentic, and was written by Chaucer himſelf, we may then conjecture, that it was done by him towards the end of the reign of Richard II, *when having loſt the favour of his Prince, and moſt of his noble friends here, and being withal grown old, he retired himſelf from the pleaſures of the world, and reflected ſeriouſly upon the changes and infirmities, to which human nature is ſubject. This conſideration with the thoughts of a future ſtate could not but make him renounce the vanities of this life, and retract thoſe paſſages, which he perceived, either had or might do miſchief to Religion and Morality. After which he became quite weary of this life, and ſeemed to have no reliſh for any thing in it; tho' that may be attributed chiefly perhaps to the misfortunes, which happened to him, and he and his lands being taken into the King's Protection in the ſecond year of his reign, becauſe of ſome danger, that ſeemed to threaten him from his favouring and ſtriking in with the raſh attempts of the common people. Whatever this attempt was, whether rebellion, or ſomething bordering upon it, 'tis certain he forfeited the love of his Prince and moſt of his friends, and he was forced to lead afterwards a melancholy life, which often extorted from him grievous complaints, particularly of his own raſhneſs in following the multitude, and ſometimes would wiſh to exchange life for death* (1); *which miſery however was fortunate in this, that it prepared him the better for Eternity, and influenced him to retract all the looſe things in his writings.* Mr. Hearne (51) then obſerves, that the *Plowman's Tale* having given more offence than all the reſt of his writings, perhaps that is the reaſon why it appears in ſo few manuſcripts; and that this has made ſome think it is not Chaucer's, which they believe confirmed from the ſtyle, which is different from his other Poems.

(47) Pag. 214.

(48) Num. 4. § 4. pag. 602. vol. 2.

(49) Ibid. § 5. pag. 603.

(1) Muſ. 65.

(50) Ibid. § 6. pag. 604.

(1) This may be ſeen, in the *Complaint* he made to his Empty Purſe, which Mr. *Speght* found ten times larger in Mr. *Stowe's* MS. than in the Print.

(51) § 7. pag. 605.

[*Z*] *He was intimate with the moſt celebrated Scholars of his age.*] Among his particular friends were Sir *John Gower*, and Sir *Thomas Occleve* or *Hockliffe*, of the office of the Privy Seal, and perhaps *John Lidgate* Monk of Bury, who was thirty years old at Chaucer's death. In the former part of his life he had been acquainted with *Francis Petrarch*; and our Poet in the Prologue to the *Clerk of Oxenford's Tale* ſeems to hint at himſelf in that character (as he does very often on the like occaſions) where the Clerk ſays, that he learned the ſtory of Griſild at Padua from Petrarch. Mr. Dryden in the Preface to his Tales ſays, it was the Invention of Petrarch by him ſent to Boccace, from whom it came to Chaucer; but Petrarch only tranſlated it from Boccace into Latin, and dedicated it to him. Nor is there any reaſon to doubt of our Poet's acquaintance, at leaſt friendſhip with *Boccace*, (from whom he borrowed many things), who at that time beſtowed a great deal of pains in refining the Italian tongue, as Chaucer did the Engliſh.

[*AA*] *We ſhall give his character in the Note.*] Roger Aſcham (52) ſtiles him the *Engliſh Homer*, and tells us, that he *ever thoughte his ſayinges to have as much Authoritye as eyther* Sophocles *or* Euripides *in Greke*. Sir Philip Sidney (53) obſerves, that our Poet "un- "doubtedly did excellently well in his *Troilus* and *Cre- "ſeid*; of whom truly, *ſays he*, I know not whether "to marvell more, either that he in that myſtie time "could ſee ſo clearly, or that we in this clear age go "ſo ſtumblingly after him; yet has he great wants fit "to be forgotten in ſo reverent an Antiquitie." Mr. Francis Beaumont in his Letter to Mr. Speght (54), dated from Leiceſter the 30th of June 1597 comparing him with other Poets tells us, that his "*Canter- "bury Tales* contain in them almoſt the ſame argument, "that is handled in Comedies. His ſtile therein for "the moſt part is low and open, and like unto theirs; "but herein they differ. The Comedy-Writers do "all follow and borrow one of another, as Terence "from Plautus and Menander; Plautus from Me- "nander and Demophilus; Statius and Cæcilius "from Diphilus, Apollodorus and Philemon; and "almoſt all the laſt Comedians from that, which was "called *Antiqua Comœdia*. . . . Chaucer's Device of his "Canterbury Pilgrimage is merely his own; his drift "is to touch all ſorts of men, and to diſcover all "vices of that Age; which he doth ſo feelingly and "with ſo true an aim, as he never fails to hit what- "ſoever mark he levels at." He afterwards obſerves, that our Poet "may rightly be called, the Pith and "Sinews of Eloquence, and the very Life itſelf of all "Mirth and pleaſant writing; beſides one gift he "hath above other Authors, and that is, by excel- "lency of his deſcriptions, to poſſeſs his readers with "a more forcible imagination of ſeeing that (as it "were) done before their eyes, which they read, than "any other that ever hath written in any tongue." Sir Henry Savil (55) ſtiles him the Chief of our Engliſh Poets, and ſays, that he had a ſharp judgment and a pleaſant wit, and was well ſkilled both in Philoſophy and Divinity. Milton in his Poem intitled *Il Penſeroſo* (56) ranks him with the greateſt of Poets in theſe lines, alluding to the *Squier's Tale* in Chaucer,

But, O ſad virgin, that thy power
Might raiſe Muſæus *from his bower,*
Or bid the ſoul of Orpheus *ſing,*
. . . . .
Or call upon him, that left half-told
The ſtory of Cambuſcan *bold,*
Of Camball *and of* Algarſife
And who had Canace *to wife,*
That own'd the virtuous ring and glaſs,
And of the wondrous horſe of braſs,
On which the Tartar King did ride.

Mr. Thomas Rymer (57) tell us that "they who at- "tempted verſe in Engliſh down till Chaucer's time, "made

(52) *Toxophilus*, fol. 13, b. edit. 1571.

(53) *Defence of Poeſie*, pag. 513. edit. 1598.

(54) Printed in Mr. Speght's edition 1602.

(55) Preface to his edition of Archbiſhop *Bradwardine de Cauſâ Dei*. London 1617.

(56) *Poems upon ſeveral Occaſions*, pag. 45, 46. edit. London 1673.

(57) *Short View of Tragedy*, cap. 7. pag. 78, 79. edit. London 1693.

are very numerous [*BB*], and have had many editions.

CHEDERLES

" made an heavy pudder, and are always miſerably " put to it for a word to clink, which commonly fall " ſo aukward and unexpectedly as dropping from the " clouds by ſome machine or miracle. *Chaucer* found " an Herculean labour on his hands, and did perform " to admiration. He ſeizes all Provencal, French or " Latin that came in his way; gives them a new garb " and livery; and mingles them amongſt our Engliſh; " turns out Engliſh, gouty, or ſuperannuated, to place " in their room the Foreigners fit for ſervice, trained " and accuſtomed to poetical diſcipline. . . . Chaucer " threw in Latin, French, Provencal, and other lan- " guages, like new ſtum to raiſe a fermentation. In " Queen Elizabeth's time it grew fine, but came not " to an head and ſpirit, did not ſhine and ſparkle till " Mr. Waller ſet it a running." Mr. Dryden (58) obſerves, that as our Author is the father of Poetry, ſo he holds him in the ſame degree of veneration as the Grecians held Homer, or the Romans Virgil; that he is a perpetual fountain of good ſenſe, learned in all ſciences, and therefore ſpeaks properly on all ſubjects; and that as he knew what to ſay, ſo he knows alſo when to leave off. That he followed nature every where, but was never ſo bold to go beyond her. That his verſe indeed is not harmonious, but that it is like the eloquence of one whom Tacitus commends, *auribus iſtius temporis accommodata.* " They who lived with " him, and ſome time after him, thought it muſical: " and it continues ſo even in our judgment, if com- " pared with the numbers of *Lidgate* and *Gower* his " contemporaries. There is the rude ſweetneſs of a " Scotch tune in it, which is natural and pleaſing, " tho' not perfect." Mr. Dryden further remarks, that *he muſt have been a man of a moſt wonderful comprehenſive nature, becauſe it has been truly obſerved of him, he has taken into the compaſs of his* Canterbury Tales *the various manners and humours (as we now call them) of the Engliſh nation in his age. Not a ſingle character has eſcaped him. All his pilgrims are ſeverally diſtinguiſhed from each other; and not only in their inclinations, but in their very phyſiognomies and perſons.* Baptiſta Porta *could not have deſcribed their natures better than by the marks, which the Poet gives them. The matter and manner of their tales, and of their telling are ſo ſuited to their different educations, humours, and callings, that each of them would be improper in any other mouth. Even the grave and ſerious characters are diſtinguiſhed by their ſeveral ſorts of gravity. Their diſcourſes are ſuch as belong to their age, their calling, and their breeding; ſuch as are becoming of them, and of them only. Some of his perſons are vicious, and ſome virtuous; ſome are unlearned, or (as* Chaucer *calls them)* lewd, *and ſome are learned. Even the ribaldry of the low characters is different. The* Reeve, *the* Miller, *and the* Cook, *are ſeveral men, and diſtinguiſhed from each other, as much as the mincing* Lady Prioreſs, *and the broad-ſpeaking, gap-toothed* Wife of Bathe.

(58) Preface to his Fables.

(59) *Theatrum Poetarum*, Part 2. pag. 51.

[*BB*] *His works are very numerous.*] Bale and Pits give (after their manner) a very long catalogue of his Works, by repeating the ſame pieces under different titles. Mr. Edward Philips (59) ſuppoſes *a great part of his Works to be loſt, above what we have extant of him.* And of that number may be *manye a ſong and many a letcherous lay* (60), which might perhaps have been written by him while he was a ſtudent at Cambridge. The *Court of Love* was written while he reſided in that Univerſity, in the eighteenth year of his age (61). The *Craft of Lovers* was written in 1348, which was the twentieth of his age (62); and it is probable the *Remedy of Love* was written about that time, or not long after (63). *The Lamentation of Mary Magdalen*, taken from Origen, was written in his early years (64); and perhaps *Boethius de Conſolatione Philoſophiæ* was tranſlated by him about the ſame time (65). The *Romaunt of the Roſe* is a tranſlation from the French, and ſeems to be done by him while he was at Court, and about the time of the riſe of Wickliffe's opinions, it conſiſting of violent invectives againſt Religious Orders. It is left imperfect at the end, and there are ſome chaſms in other places of it. The *Complaint of the Black Knight*, was written, according to ſome, during John of Gaunt's courtſhip of Blanche; and *Chaucer's Dreme* is ſuppoſed to be written upon account of the Duke's marriage. The *Poem of Troilus and Creſeide* was written in the former part of his life, and tranſlated as he ſays from Lollius (66), an Hiſtoriographer of Urbane in Italy. It is called *Trophe* in the Lombard tongue. Chaucer has not contented himſelf with a bare tranſlation, but added ſeveral things of his own. From his *Houſe of Fame* Mr. Pope took part of the deſign of his *Temple of Fame.* The *Book of Blaunch the Ducheſs*, commonly called *the Dreme of Chaucer*, was written upon the death of that Lady. The *Aſſembly of Fowls* was written before the death of Queen Philippa. The *Life of St. Cecilia* ſeems to have been at firſt a ſingle Poem (67), afterwards made of his *Canterbury Tales.* And ſo perhaps was that of the *Wife of Bath*, which he adviſes John of Gaunt to read (68), and was afterwards inſerted in the *Canterbury Tales.* The *Canterbury Tales* were written about the year 1382. It is certain, that the tale of the *Nonnes Prieſt* was written after the inſurrection of Jack Straw and Wat Tyler, which was in 1381, it being mentioned in that tale (69). It is probable moſt of the tales were written as ſo many diſtinct Poems, and afterwards collected into one body in imitation of *Boccace's Decameron*, whence the arguments of ſome of them are taken. The *Flower and the Leaf* was written by him as appears from his own words in the prologue to the *Legende of gode Women.* This is thought by Mr. Dryden (70) to be of our Author's own invention after the manner of the *Provencals*, and he was ſo particularly pleaſed with it, both for the invention and moral, that he has given it in a modern dreſs. His A. B. C. called *La Priere de noſtre Dame* was written for the uſe of the Ducheſs Blanch. The Book of *the Lion* is mentioned in his *Retractation*, and by Lidgate in the Prologue to the *Fall of Princes*, but it is now loſt; as is that *De Vulcani Veru.* i. e. *Of the Broche of Vulcan*, mentioned by Lidgate in the ſame Prologue. *La Belle Dame ſans Mercy* was tranſlated from the French of Alain Chartier, whom the Author of the *Life of Chaucer* prefixed to Mr. Urry's Edition, erroneouſly aſſerts to have been Secretary to Lewis the eleventh, King of France, who ſucceeded his Father Charles VII, July 22d 1462, whereas Chartier died about the year 1458 (71), and was born in 1386 (72), and was Secretary to Charles VII, who came to the Crown October the 20th 1422. Since Chaucer therefore died October the 25th 1400, when Chartier was but ſixteen years of age, and the Author of the tranſlation of this Poem in the Introduction to it mentions *Maiſtre Aleine*, as he calls him, under the title of *Chief Secretarye with the King of Fraunce* (73), it is impoſſible, that this tranſlation could be done by our Poet. The *Complaint of Mars and Venus* was tranſlated from the French of Sir Otes de Grantſon, a French Poet. The *Complaint of* Annelida *to falſe* Arcite was written by him. The *Legende of Gode Women* (called *The Aſſembly of Ladies*, and by ſome *The Ninetene Ladies*) was written to oblige the Queen at the requeſt of Margaret Counteſs of Pembroke. The Treatiſe of the *Concluſions of the Aſtrolabe* was written in 1391. The *Cuckow and Nightingale* ſeems by the deſcription to have been written at Woodſtock. The Ballad beginning *In Feverere*, &c. was a compliment to the Lady *Margaret* Counteſs of Pembroke. Several Ballads are aſcribed to him, ſome of which are juſtly ſuſpected not to have been written by him. The Comedies aſcribed to him ſeem to be nothing elſe but his *Canterbury Tales*; and the Tragedies were thoſe which his Monk tells in his Tale; and they are ſo called in the title of that Tale in ſome MSS. The *Teſtament of Love* was written in his troubles in the latter part of his life. The Song beginning *Fly fro the preſe*, was written on his death-bed (74). The *Teſtament and Complaint of* Creſeide are by Bale and Pits after Leland aſcribed to Chaucer; but the real Author of them is ſaid to be Mr. *Robert Henderſon*, chief Schoolmaſter of Dumferlin in Scotland, who wrote them a little before Chaucer was firſt printed and dedicated to King Henry by Mr. *Thynne* (75). Leland ſays (76), that by the conſent of the learned in his time the *Plowman's Tale* was attributed to our Poet, but ſuppreſſed in the Edition there extant, becauſe of the vices of the Clergy therein expoſed. Fox is

(60) See his *Retractation*, pag. 214, b. and the *Legend of Gode Women*, ver. 422, 423.

(61) *Court of Love*, ver. 43, 911, &c.

(62) Urry's edit. of Chaucer, pag. 552, 553.

(63) See the *Prologue to the Remedy of Love*, pag. 526.

(64) See the *Legend of Gode Women*, ver. 427, 428.

(65) Ibid. ver. 425.

(66) *Troil.* lib. 1 ver. 395.

(67) See the *Legend of Gode Women*, ver. 426.

(68) See the *Envoy to the Duke of Lancaſter after the Loſs of Blanch*, ver. 29. pag. 413. Urry's edit.

(69) Ver. 1509. pag. 173. Urry's edit.

(70) Preface to his *Fables.*

(71) *See* Baillet *Jugemens des Savans*, tom. 4. pag. 10. edit. Amſterd. 1725, in 4to.

(72) See the Article of ALAIN CHARTIER, vol. 1. pag. 407.

(73) Urry's edition of Chaucer, pag. 422.

(74) See above note (4).

(75) See the note prefixed to them in Mr. Urry's edition, pag. 333.

(76) Pag. 423.

CHEDERLES, among the Turks, is the ſame with S. George among the Chriſtians. The Derviſes told Buſbequius, when he was going to Amaſia in Cappadocia, that Chederles was a great Hero, who ſlew a furious dragon, and delivered a maid who was expoſed to that cruel creature. They added, that after having wandred a long time in unknown countries, he at length arrived at the banks of a river, the water whereof rendred thoſe who drank of it immortal; that this river is perpetually covered with thick darkneſs, and that it has been ſeen by no body ſince Chederles. The Hero being become immortal, and mounted on a fine horſe to whom the waters of that river had procured the ſame advantage, ranges through the world, loves battels, and aſſiſts the warriors who have the juſteſt cauſe, or who invoke him, whatever Religion they be of. He was, ſay they, one of Alexander's Captains [*A*], and yet they will not allow him to be a different perſon from the S. George of the Chriſtians; ſo ignorant are they in Chronology. They have in their Moſque a marble fountain, the water of which is very clear, and they ſay it owes its original to the piſs of Chederles's horſe. The Hippocrene of the Poets was not ſo groſly imagined. They ſhew very near it the tombs of his groom and of his nephew (*a*), where they ſay miracles are continually wrought in favour of thoſe who invoke them (*b*). They believe that drinking an infuſion of the ſcrapings of the ſtones, and of the earth where Chederles ſtopped when he waited for the dragon, is a remedy againſt the fever, the head-ach, and ſore eyes. The Turks cannot forbear laughing when they ſee the picture of S. George, their pretended Chederles, in the Chriſtian Churches; for the Greeks paint him with a little child riding behind him, who fills him out wine (*c*). This is a piece of parallel for him who would enlarge the Books which have already appeared concerning the conformity of Religions.

(*a*) His ſiſter's ſon.

(*b*) *Ubi multa quotidie opem illorum invocantibus divinitus beneficia conferri perſuadere nobis conabantur.* Busbeq. Epiſt. I, pag. m. 93, & *ſeq.*

(*c*) *Ex Busbequii Epiſtolâ I,* pag. m. 93, & *ſeq.*

The paſſage which I ſhall quote from Poſtel, *a Coſmopolite, twice returned thence, and truly informed* (*d*), will ſerve for a Supplement to what I have ſaid above [*B*].

(*d*) Theſe are the qualifications he gives himſelf in the Title of his Book.

is of the ſame opinion (77); who alſo aſcribes the little piece of *Jack Upland* to him, as do ſome that Poem called *Piers Plowman's Viſions*, confounding it with the *Plowman's Tale*. Mr. Speght in his life of Chaucer mentions a Tale in Mr. Thynne's firſt printed Book of Chaucer's Works more odious to the Clergy than the ſpeech of the Plowman, which began thus:

In Lincolneſhire faſt by a Fenne
Standeth a religious houſe, who doth it kenne &c.

(77) *Acts and Mon.* vol. 2. pag. 342, &c. edit. 1684.

The argument of which Tale, as alſo the occaſion thereof, and the cauſe why it was left out of Chaucer's Works, and the Tale itſelf, if it could be found, he promiſed ſhould be ſhewed in Mr. *Francis Thynne*'s Comment upon Chaucer (78), but neither the one nor the other have been ſince publiſhed. In 1635 Sir Francis Kynaſton of Otely in Shropſhire publiſhed the firſt and ſecond Books of *Troilus and Creſſida*, with an elegant Latin verſion of them in rhime. Mr. Dryden in his *Fables* printed in 1700 has turned into modern language the *Knight's Tale*, the *Wife of Bath's Tale*, and the *Nonne's Prieſt's Tale*, and alſo the Poem of *the Floure and the Leafe*. He wrote likewiſe the *Character of a good Parſon*, in imitation of Chaucer's deſcription of a *Parſon* in his *Prologues*, with ſome enlargements. Mr. Pope alſo modernized two of the *Canterbury Tales*, viz. the *Merchaunt's Tale of January and May*, and the *Wife of Bath her Prologue*. And ſome other of our Author's Poems have been attempted by other ingenious perſons in the ſame manner.

(78) *See* Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 376. 2d edit. London 1721.

T.

[*A*] *He was .... one of Alexander's Captains.*] This is not agreed to in the Supplement to Monſ. d' Herbelot's *Bibliotheque Orientale*: for we are there aſſured that, according to the traditions of the Orientals, Kheder *was the Companion or Counſellor and General of Dhoulcarnein, who is not Alexander of Macedon, but a Monarch of the whole world more ancient than he, who firſt bore the name of Iskender Dhoulcarnein, Alexander the Great having born the ſame name in imitation only of him, and by reaſon of his great conqueſts* (1). Several Muſulmans confound Kheder with the Prophet Elias; but *the Author of the Tarikh Montekheb diſtinguiſhes them very well, and adds that Kheder lived in the time of Caikobad, an ancient King of Perſia; and that having found the fountain of life, and drank of its water, he will not die till the ſound of the trumpet, that is, till the day of judgment* (2).

(1) *Bibliot. Orientale*, pag. 992, 993.

(2) Ibid. pag. 993, col. 1.

[The Mahometans ſuppoſe Kheder to have been the ſame, not only with Elias and St. George, but alſo with Phineas the ſon of Eleazar, ſaying that the ſame ſoul tranſmigrated ſucceſſively thro' all three: for they are not ſo ignorant but that they know they lived at different times. The Jews alſo fancy Elias was Phineas (†). ADD. REM].

(†) *See Mr.* Sale's Notes on the Koran, pag. 245. *and the Authors there quoted.*

[*B*] *A paſſage .... of Poſtel will ſerve for a ſupplement to what I have ſaid above.*] This Author relates that there are numberleſs Saints in Turky who work miracles, and have each his peculiar office. *There is one who comforts the afflicted .... another aſſiſts travellers who invoke him. Another on the confines of Syria, not very far from Adena, who is called* Sedi cadi, *or Lord Judge: where they ſay all ſorts of wiſhes are obtained; and there the Soldiery recommend themſelves very earneſtly, being perſuaded that whoever has viſited him will not die in war. Others diſcover loſt goods* (3): *there is alſo a great one in Natolia, near Cariaſar, named* Guzel mirſſin, *or* Gotuelmirſs, *the good bringer back, who finds all loſt cattle. Another who is called* Baſſa ſſic, *the God or Prince of love, to whom they go to become lucky in marriage, to have children, and to be reconciled. There is one more who is Captain General of them all; for he performs the offices of all the others, and they ſay one never aſks any thing of him, without receiving ſome comfort; and this Saint has no place dedicated to him, but rides about on a grey mare thro' the whole country of Natolia only, and appears any where to all who invoke him: they call him* Chederelles, *and ſuppoſe him to be S. George, for they give S. George the name of* Chederelles; *and there are great numbers of people who pretend to belong to him; and alſo know at what time the Chriſtians celebrate his feaſt, and come before, or on that day, to move them to beſtow alms for his ſake: for when they aſk any thing of thoſe Saints, they promiſe, according to their ability, to eat for their ſakes a hot loaf, or a capon, or a ſheep, or an ox, with the poor and the pilgrims; which they diligently perform. They eat with the poor for the ſake of their Saints* (4).

(3) Poſtel, *des Hiſtoires Orient.* Part II. pag. 231.

(4) Compare with this the *Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes*, num. 31.

☞CHEKE (Sir JOHN), a very learned and polite Writer in the ſixteenth Century, was deſcended of a good family originally (*a*) of the Iſle of Wight, and was ſon of Peter Cheke by Agnes, daughter of Mr. Dufford (*b*) of the County of Cambridge. He was born at Cambridge June the 16th in the year 1514 (*c*). After having paſſed thro' the Grammar School, he was admitted into St. John's College in the Univerſity of Cambridge, at about ſeventeen years of age (*d*), where he made a great progreſs in polite Learning, and eſpecially the Greek Language, which was at that time almoſt univerſally neglected.

(*a*) Sir John Hayward in his *Life of K. Edward VI*, pag. 8. having ſtiled him a *man of mean birth*, is confuted by Fuller in his *Church Hiſtory*, B. 8. § 3. p. 37.

(*b*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 100. 2d edit. London 1721, calls him *Duffield.*

(*c*) *Life of Sir John Cheke by John Stryne*, M. A. c. 1. Sect. 1. p. 2--5. edit. London 1705, in 8vo.

(*d*) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

neglected. This diſtinguiſhed him to ſuch advantage, that he by means of Dr. William Butts, Phyſician to Henry VIII, was made the King's Scholar (*e*), and in 1540 appointed Profeſſor of the Greek Language, which place he held till he left the Univerſity in October 1551 (*f*). Here he began to reform the pronunciation of the Greek Tongue, but met with great oppoſition from Dr. Stephen Gardiner, Biſhop of Wincheſter, and Chancellor of the Univerſity [*A*], who expreſly prohibited any alteration in the pronunciation of Greek in a ſolemn decree dated June the 1ſt 1542. However Cheke's manner of pronouncing Greek prevailed, and there paſſed ſeven elegant Epiſtles between the Chancellor and him, which were afterwards publiſhed [*B*]. In 1543 he was choſen Univerſity Orator (*g*), and publiſhed a Latin Verſion of two Homilies of St. Chryſoſtom [*C*] dedicated to the King. July the 10th 1544 he was ſent for to Court, in order to be Tutor to Prince Edward (*h*), and about the ſame time (*i*) was incorporated into the Univerſity of Oxford, where he ſtudied ſome time, and took the degree of Maſter of Arts (*k*), and was made Canon of King Henry's College there [*D*]. In 1547 he publiſhed a Latin Tranſlation of St. Chryſoſtom's ſix Orations concerning Providence [*E*]. After Prince Edward's acceſſion to the Crown, he granted our Author a hundred marks yearly for twenty one years, and appointed him Provoſt of King's College in Cambridge (*l*), and beſtowed upon him ſeveral lands to a conſiderable value (*m*). In May 1549 he went to Cambridge, and was one of the King's Commiſſioners for viſiting that Univerſity (*n*), and

(*e*) Ibid. Sect. 2. pag. 6, 7.

(*f*) Ibid. Sect. 3. pag. 16, 17.

(*g*) Ibid. Sect. 6. pag. 27.

(*b*) Ibid. cap. 6. Sect. 1. pag. 28.

(*i*) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, ſays in 1542.

(*k*) Ibid. pag. 31.

(*l*) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, erroneouſly aſſerts, that he was made Provoſt in 1543.

(*m*) Ibid. cap. 6. Sect. 5. pag. 41, 42, 43, 44.

[*A*] *He began to reform the pronunciation of the Greek Tongue, but met with great oppoſition from Dr. Stephen Gardiner, Biſhop of Wincheſter, and Chancellor of the Univerſity.*] It was the cuſtom at that time to confound the ſound of the vowels and dipthongs in ſuch a manner that there was ſcarce any difference between them. For inſtance, αι was pronounced as ε; οι and υι as ι; η, ι, υ were expreſſed in one and the ſame ſound, that is, as ι. Some of the conſonants were pronounced differently, according as they were placed in the word; thus, when τ was placed after μ, it was pronounced as our *d*; and when π was put after ν, it was founded as our *b*. The letter κ was pronounced as we do *ch*, and β as we do the *v* conſonant (1). Our Author and Mr. Smith, afterwards Sir Thomas Smith, and Secretary of State to Queen Elizabeth, began to obſerve the inconveniencies in this ſort of pronunciation, and ſaw that not only the beauty of the Greek language was loſt in this way, but likewiſe its very ſpirit and life were gone, by the loſs of ſo many vowels and dipththongs, and the language become jejune and languid. In this way of ſpeaking it, nothing of numeroſity appeared in the antient Orators and Rhetoricians, nor thoſe periods, for which they had been renowned in old Greece; neither could they themſelves ſhew their eloquence in their orations and lectures, for want of the beauty and variety of ſounds. This put them upon thinking of a reformation; and they conſulted moſt of the antient Rhetoricians and other Greek Authors, who had treated of ſounds, and found ſufficient grounds from thence for an alteration (2). Mr. Cheke therefore in his lectures plainly diſcovered thoſe errors; and the more ingenious ſort of Students rreadily forſook their old way of pronouncing Greek. But there was a party in the Univerſity who diſliking any thing which was new, and dreading alterations, would by no means allow of the new pronunciation, but oppoſed it to the utmoſt of their power, by diſputing againſt it, and at laſt by complaining to Biſhop Gardiner, the Chancellor, againſt our Author and his Adherents for this great miſdemeanour. The Biſhop being of the ſame mind with the complainants, and apprehenſive of innovations, made a ſolemn decree, dated the Calends of June 1542, confirming the old manner of pronouncing Greek, and enjoining the Students to make no variation, under this penalty, that he ſhould be expelled the Senate, if a Regent; if he ſtood for a degree, not to be admitted to it; if a Scholar, to loſe his Scholarſhip; and that the younger ſort ſhould be chaſtiſed. In ſhort, the decree declared, that no perſon ſhould philoſophize at all in ſounds, but all ſhould uſe the preſent; and that if any thing were to be corrected in them, it ſhould be left to authority (3). We ſhall mention two or three heads of the decree, ſince they are very remarkable. *Quiſquis noſtram poteſtatem agnoſcis, ſones literis ſive Græcis ſive Latinis ab uſu publico præſentis ſeculi alienos, privato judicio affingere ne audeto. Diphthongos Græcas nedum Latinas, niſi id diæreſis exigat, ſonis diducito. . . . . Αι ab ε, & ει ab ι, ſono ne diſtinguito, tantum in Orthographia diſcrimen ſervato; η, ι, υ, uno eodemque ſono exprimito. . . . Ne multa; in ſonis omnino ne philoſophator, ſed utitor præſentibus. In his ſiquid emendandum ſit, id omne autoritati permittito.* After ſuch a public declaration, there was no further room for private judgment; an obedience was paid, and Gardiner's way prevailed, till a reformation in Religion made way for a reformation in language, which has obtained ever ſince. However the controverſy was then managed with much warmth and learning; Gardiner inſiſted principally upon cuſtom and the authority of the preſent Greeks. On the other ſide they pleaded antiquity, and that drawn down from the moſt ancient Authors; ſeveral of the Greek Rhetoricians was brought into the controverſy, and other Authors, who had dropt any expreſſion, which looked that way; and a man would wonder to ſee ſo much learning ſhewn on ſo dry a ſubject. *Where the victory lay*, ſays Mr. Thomas Baker in his *Reflections upon learning* (4), is *pretty viſible; and ſo great a man* (*r*) *as* Du Freſne *could not have been at a loſs how to determine the matter, had he not been poſſeſſed with partiality for a party, which he ſhews too plainly by blaming Biſhop* Godwin *(tho' very unjuſtly) for leaving* Gardiner *out of his Catalogue of Biſhops.*

(1) *Life of Sir John Cheke by John Strype, M. A.* cap. 1. Sect. 3. pag. 18. edit. London 1705, in 8vo.

(2) *Reflections upon Learning*, chap. 3. pag. 35, 36. 4th edit. London 1708.

(3) Strype, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 19.

(4) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 38.

(*r*) Gloſſ. Græc. Prefat. § 12.

[*B*] *There paſſed ſeven elegant Epiſtles between the Chancellor and him, which were afterwards publiſhed.*] The originals of theſe letters being left in the hands of Cœlius Secundus Curio, a learned man of Baſil, by our Author, as he paſſed through that city in his journey to Italy in the beginning of Queen Mary's reign. Curio publiſhed an edition of them in 1555 in 8vo, under the following title; *Joannis Cheki Angli de pronunciatione Græcæ potiſſimum Linguæ diſputationes cum Stephano Wintonienſi Epiſcopo, ſeptem contrariis Epiſtolis comprehenſæ*; and dedicated them to Sir Anthony Cook, our Author's friend, and Fellow-Inſtructor of King Edward VI (5). Mr. Strype tells us (6), that "in theſe "elegant, copious, and learned Epiſtles both the Biſhop "and Cheke ſhewed ſo great learning, parts, and read-"ing, that they ſeemed not Epiſtles, but rather the "antagoniſtical Orations of the beſt Orators, as the "Publiſher wrote."

(5) Strype, pag. 24, 127, and 203, & *ſeq.*

(6) Pag. 127.

[*C*] *A Latin Verſion of two Homilies of St. Chryſoſtom.*] It was printed at London 1543 in 4to under the following title; *D. Joannis Chryſoſtomi Homiliæ duæ, nunc primum in lucem editæ Græce & Latine, Interprete Joanne Cheke Cantabrigienſi.*

[*D*] *Made Canon of King Henry's College there.*] The King having lately new founded the College of St. Frideſwide in Oxford, which had firſt been founded by Cardinal Wolſey, granted our Author one of the Canonries there. But the rents of the Canons decaying, the King in 1545 gave particular penſions to ſome of them, and among the reſt to Mr. Cheke; which penſions were 26 *l.* 13 *s.* 4 *d.* each. By this preferment we may conclude that he was now in holy Orders (7).

(7) Strype, pag. 31. *and* Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 68. 2d edit. London 1721.

[*E*] *Publiſhed a Latin Tranſlation of St. Chryſoſtom's ſix Orations concerning Providence.*] His friend Dr. Walter Haddon wrote theſe verſes upon it:

Divus Joannes Chryſoſtomus aurea Græca,
Fundere quod poſſet, nomen ſuſcepit ab auro.
Noſter Joannes ſit nomine Checus eodem,
Aurea qui Græcis verbis dat verba Latina (8).

(8) *See* Strype, pag. 39, 40.

and ſoon after publiſhed his book, intitled, *The Hurt of Sedition* [F]. The ſame year he was likewiſe one of the thirty two Commiſſioners for examining the old Eccleſiaſtical Law-Books, and compiling thence a Body of Laws for the government of the Church, and the deciſion of civil matters; and again three years after, upon a new Commiſſion to the ſame purpoſe, he was again nominated for the execution of it (o). Upon his return to Court from Cambridge he met with ſome uneaſineſs on account of ſome offence, which his wife, whom he had married in 1547 (p), had given to the Ducheſs of Somerſet (q), and of his being charged with having ſuggeſted ill counſels to the Duke of Somerſet, and afterwards proving falſe to him (r). But having got over this ſhock at Court, he ſtood the firmer afterwards, and his intereſt and authority daily encreaſed there, ſo that he became the great Patron of Learning and Religion. In 1550 he was made chief Gentleman of the Privy-Chamber (s); and about the ſame time tranſlated the Communion-Book into Latin, in order that Peter Martyr, who did not underſtand Engliſh, might paſs his judgment upon it (t). The King made a great progreſs in his ſtudies under our Author, who read over Cicero's Philoſophical Writings and Ariſtotle's Ethics to him, and inſtructed him in the Hiſtory, State and Intereſt, Laws and Cuſtoms of his Kingdom (u), and directed him to keep a Diary of all the Tranſactions of any importance during his reign [G]. In October 1551 he received the honour of Knighthood from his Majeſty (*), and ſoon after held two Conferences with ſome other perſons upon the ſubject of the Sacrament [H]. In 1552 he diſputed at the Commencement in the Univerſity of Cambridge againſt our Saviour's local deſcent into Hell (w); and Auguſt the 25th following he was made Chamberlain of the Exchequer (x), and afterwards Clerk of the Council; whence he was advanced to the poſt of Secretary of State and Privy Counſellor (y). He was attached to the intereſt of the Lady Jane Grey [I], and upon the King's

(o) Ibid. cap. 6. Sect. 2. pag. 55, 56.

(p) Ibid. pag. 43.

(q) Ibid. pag. 56, 57.

(r) Ibid. pag. 58.

(s) Ibid. Sect. 4. pag. 59.

(t) Ibid. pag. 68.

(u) Ibid. pag. 72, 73.

(*) Ibid. cap. 4. pag. 85. Wood, Col. 101. ſays it was in 1549.

(w) Ibid. pag. 116.

(x) Ibid. pag. 117, 118.

(y) Ibid. pag. 119.

[F] *The Book intitled*, The hurt of Sedition.] The whole title is as follows; *The Hurt of Sedition: How grievous it is to a Commonwealth.* The running title is, *The true Subject to the Rebel.* It is written by way of expoſtulation with the rebels, who in the ſummer of the year 1549 broke out into an open and formidable inſurrection in moſt Counties of England, and eſpecially in Devonſhire in the Weſt, and Norfolk in the North. Our Author ſuited his diſcourſe to the different pretences of the rebels; thoſe in the Weſt complaining of the alterations made in Religion; and thoſe in Norfolk and Suffolk inſiſting upon ſome reformation in the State; that Gentlemen ſhould not be put into places of truſt and honour, while the poor Commons were excluded theſe advantages, but that all the ranks of people ſhould be placed upon an equal foot. The former of theſe he addreſſes in this manner: *Ye riſe for Religion. What Religion taught you that? If ye were offered perſecution for Religion, ye ought to flee; ſo Chriſt teacheth you, and yet you intend to fight. If ye would ſtand in the truth, ye ought to ſuffer like martyrs; and ye would ſlay like tyrants. Thus for Religion, ye keep no Religion, and neither will follow the counſel of Chriſt, nor the conſtancy of martyrs. Why riſe ye for Religion? Have ye any thing contrary to God's Book? Yea have ye not all things agreeable to God's Word. But the new* [*Religion*] *is different from the old; and therefore ye will have the old. If you meaſure the old by truth, ye have the oldeſt. If ye meaſure the old by fancy, then it is hard, becauſe men's fancies change, to give that is old. Ye will have the old ſtyl. Will ye have any older than that as Chriſt left, and his Apoſtles taught, and the firſt Church did uſe? Ye will have that the Canons do eſtabliſh. Why, that is a great deal younger than that ye have of later time, and newlier invented; yet that is it that ye deſire.* " And do you prefer the Biſhops of " Rome before Chriſt? Men's inventions before God's " Law? The newer form of worſhip before the " older? Ye ſeek no Religion; ye be deceived; " ye ſeek tradition. They that teach you, blind you; " that ſo inſtruct you deceive you. If ye ſeek what " the old Doctors ſay, yet look what Chriſt the oldeſt " of all ſaith; for he ſaith, *Before Abraham was* " *made, I am.* If ye ſeek the trueſt way, he is the " very Truth. If ye ſeek the readieſt way, he is the " very Way. If ye ſeek everlaſting life, he is the " very Life. What Religion would you have other " now than his Religion? You would have the Bibles " in again. It is no mervail, your blind Guides " would lead you blind ſtill." This Book was reprinted in the year 1576 as a ſeaſonable Diſcourſe upon the apprehenſion of Tumults from malecontents at home, or renegado's abroad. And Hollingſhed thought proper to inſert it in his Chronicle, where he treats of this Rebellion. Dr. Gerard Langbain at Oxford about the year 1641 reprinted it likewiſe, *intending it*, ſays Mr. Strype (9), *for the uſe and conſideration of the Rebels againſt King Charles I in the time of the civil wars.*

(9) Pag. 55.

[G] *Directed him to keep a Diary of all the tranſactions of any importance during his reign.*] He adviſed him to write down briefly under each day of every month debates in Council, diſpatch of Embaſſadors, honours conferred, and other remarks, as he thought proper. And this we may conclude produced that excellent Journal of the King preſerved in the Cotton Library, and printed thence by Biſhop Burnet in his *Hiſtory of the Reformation.* To ſhew the advantage of ſuch a Diary, Cheke is ſaid to make uſe of this aphoriſm, " That a dark and imperfect reflection upon " affairs floating in the memory, was like words diſ- " perſed and inſignificant; whereas a few of them in " a book was like the ſame words digeſted and diſpoſ- " ed in good order, and ſo made ſignificant (10)."

(10) Idem, pag. 73, 74. *and* David Lloyd's *State Worthies*, pag. 194. 2d edit. London 1670, in 8vo.

[H] *Held ſome Conferences with ſome other perſons upon the ſubject of the Sacrament.*] The firſt Conference was held at Secretary Cecil's houſe, and the latter at Sir Richard Moriſon's. The Auditors were but ſix, viz. the Lord Ruſſel, Sir Thomas Wroth of the Bed-chamber, Sir Anthony Cook, one of the King's Tutors, Mr. Throgmorton, Chamberlain of the Exchequer, Mr. Knolles, and Mr. Harington; with whom were joined the Marquis of Northampton, and the Earl of Rutland at the ſecond Conference. The Diſputants were Sir John Cheke, Sir William Cecil, Secretary of State, Horn Dean of Durham, Whitehead and Grindal, who were againſt the Real Preſence; Feckenham, who was afterwards Dean of St. Paul's and Abbot of Weſtminſter, and at the ſecond Conference Mr. Yong, who were for it. An account of theſe diſputations is ſtill extant in Latin in the Library of Manuſcripts in Bennet College in Cambridge; which Mr. Strype has publiſhed in Engliſh (11). The firſt Conference was held November 25th 1551; and the ſecond December 3d the ſame year.

(11) Pag. 91, *& ſeqq.*

[I] *He was attached to the intereſt of the Lady Jane Grey.*] He was ſworn into the office of Secretary at the ſame time that there were two other Secretaries; but Mr. Strype is of opinion (12), that at this juncture one of the other Secretaries was intended to be laid aſide, and he perhaps was Cecil, who was unwilling to go along with the ambitious deſigns of the Duke of Northumberland to advance the Lady Jane, married to his ſon Guilford Dudley, to the Crown. Cecil was then abſent from the Court, ſick in mind as well as in body. But Sir John Cheke's zeal for Religion made him willing to eſpouſe the Duke's party, who induced the King to ſettle the Kingdom upon the Lady Jane, excluding the next legal heirs to his two ſiſters, Mary and Elizabeth. David Lloyd in his *State-Worthies* (13) tells us indeed, that

(12) Pag. 119.

(13) Pag. 196.

King's death, acted as Secretary to her and her Council; but upon Queen Mary's acceſſion to the Crown he was committed to the Tower July the 28th (z), and an indictment was drawn up againſt him; but the year following he obtained the Queen's pardon (aa), and diſliking the eſtabliſhment of Popery, procured a licence to travel abroad; upon which he went to Baſil, and from thence to Italy, and read a Greek Lecture at Padua. He afterwards ſettled at Straſburg, where the Engliſh Service was kept up, which gave ſuch great offence to the Zealots for the Roman Catholic Religion in England, that his eſtate was confiſcated (bb). Being thus reduced to very low circumſtances at Straſburg, he read a Greek Lecture there, which was the means of ſupporting him (cc). His wife being at Bruſſels in the ſpring of the year 1556, he reſolved to go thither to fetch her; but firſt conſulted Aſtrology, of which he was very credulous [K], whether he might undertake that journey with ſafety; and being deceived by it he was ſeized May the 15th by the Provoſt Marſhal between Bruſſels and Antwerp [L], and brought to England, where he was commited to the Tower (dd). As Religion was the cauſe of his impriſonment, two of the Queen's Chaplains were ſent to diſcourſe with him, but without ſucceſs; upon which her Majeſty ſent Dr. Feckenham, Dean of St. Paul's, in order to reduce him to a compliance with the Romiſh Religion. His arguments were ſo ſtrongly inforced by this

(z) Wood, col. 101. ſays the 27th.

(aa) Wood, ibid. ſays that he was ſet at liberty September 3d.

(bb) Ibid. pag. 122-126.

(cc) Ibid. pag. 134. Wood, *ubi ſupra*, ſays that he was choſen public Profeſſor of the Greek Tongue there.

(dd) Ibid. pag. 136. Wood, col. 101.

(ee) Ibid. 166.

(ff) Ibid. 166, 167

(gg) Ibid. Fox in hi *and Mom* 3. pag. 7 us, *that Bonner go fit in the where the tyrs were demned.*

(hh) Ibid 170. Wo 102.

that he was againſt this Will of King Edward, and that he ſaid, that *he would never diſtruſt God ſo far in the preſervation of his true Religion, as to diſinherit orphans, to keep up Proteſtantiſm.* But Mr. Strype obſerves (14), that this *muſt be placed among the ſlips of the looſe pen of that Writer*; and that *Sir John Cheke was induced to agree to it by foreſeeing what a perſecution was like to enſue, and what an overthrow of that Reformed Religion which had been ſo carefully planted by King Edward.* "For tho' ſome ſecular and ambitious "ends drove on the Duke in theſe lofty and dangerous "projects; yet the fears of the return of Popery and "miſerable times conſequent thereupon both to the "Nation and to the State of true Religion, were the "arguments, that prevailed with Cheke to countenance that intereſt; and his inclination perhaps to "this party made the way for him to be Secretary; "to which office he was ſworn and admitted June the "2d, and the two other Secretaries were yet continued, and all three Secretaries appeared in Council "together. And this appears from the Council-Book." David Lloyd above quoted is extremely miſtaken in aſſerting (15), that our Author enjoyed this place three years, ſince he held it but a little above four weeks; to which we may add the nine days of the Lady Jane Grey's reign, who being proclaim'd Queen, the State-Letters were written by Sir John Cheke as Secretary. And he check'd his brother-in-law Cecil, who would not be engaged in this affair, and endeavoured to be abſent; and to the very laſt day of Queen Jane's reign, viz. to July 19th he acted as Secretary to her and her Council. On that day, upon information from the Lord Rich, Lord Lieutenant of the County of Eſſex, that the Earl of Oxford (who lived in that County) had gone over to the Lady Mary, a Letter ſigned by the Lords of Queen Jane's Council ſitting in the Tower, to excite that Lord to continue firm, was drawn up by Cheke, and ſigned by him with the reſt; which Letter required the Lord Rich "like a Nobleman to re-"main in that promiſe and ſtedfaſtneſs to our ſove-"reign Lady Queen Jane, as ye ſhall find us ready "and firm with all our force to maintain the ſame; "which neither with honour, nor with ſafety, nor "yet with duty we may now forſake (16)."

(14) Pag. 119, 120.

(15) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 194.

(16) Strype, pag. 122.

[K] *But firſt conſulted Aſtrology, of which he was very credulous.*] David Lloyd (17) and Mr. Strype inform us of this, and the latter tells us (18), that he was not unſkilful in that art, and being doubtful of his own ſafety, in his intended journey to Bruſſels conſulted it, in order to know whether he might go without danger. The ſame Writer likewiſe obſerves (19), that this art was about theſe times exceedingly ſtudied by the Nobility and Gentry, ſo that Dr. Laurence Humfrey, who lived then, and was afterwards Profeſſor of Divinity at Oxford, in his Book *de Nobilitate* (20), which he wrote for the uſe and inſtruction of the Gentry, exhorting them to the ſtudy of divers ſciences, obſerved how this ſcience above the reſt was ſo zealouſly ſtudied by moſt perſons of rank and quality, *ſic rapi, ſic adamari, & devorari a pleriſque nobilibus*, that they needed no inticement to this, but rather a bridle to reſtrain them. And he tells us, that many had placed ſuch confidence in it, that they almoſt diſtruſted God, and partook of ſuch events as proved unhappy, not in truth foretold by the ſtars, nor expected by them.

(17) Pag. 195.

(18) Pag. 135.

(19) Pag. 138.

(20) Lib. 3. pag. 347. *See* Strype, pag. 138, 139.

[L] *He was ſeized May 15th by the Provoſt Marſhal between Bruſſels and Antwerp.*] Mr. Strype (21) tells us, that he was induced to go to Bruſſels by the invitation given him by the Lord Paget and Sir John Maſon, two of his former learned friends, but who had complied with Queen Mary's Religion, and were come into thoſe parts, the former in a more private capacity to uſe the baths, the latter as Embaſſador to the Court of Bruſſels. They had deſired Sir John Cheke to take that opportunity to viſit them; and for his better ſecurity Maſon had aſſured him of ſafe-conduct thither in King Philip's and his own name. He went with Sir Peter Carew in his company, and enjoyed the converſation of Paget and Maſon, whom after he had attended towards the ſea, as he was upon his return he fell into a fatal ſnare between Bruſſels and Antwerp. For an order being ſent from King Philip, he was ſeized May 15th by the Provoſt Marſhal, with his fellow-traveller, unhorſed, blindfolded, bound, thrown into a waggon, and ſo conveyed on board a ſhip, and brought to London; *being taken as it were with a whirlwind*, as he expreſſes it in his Recantation, *from the place he was in, and brought over ſea, and never knew whither he went till he found himſelf in the Tower of London.* Upon his firſt ſeizure he was apprehended by his friends to be in great danger. And Bale in his *Scriptorum Illuſtrium Majoris Brytanniæ Catalogus* (22), printed at Baſil 1557 in fol. obſerves, that he was fallen into the hands of thoſe, who always hated him, and ſubjoins this prayer, "that the Lord would direct "his heart into the love of God and the patience of "Chriſt, and let him be delivered from outragious and "wicked men." *Nunc autem reverſus denuò in manus eorum, qui illum ſemper oderunt, incidit. Dominus dirigat cor ejus in charitate Dei & patientiâ Chriſti, defendaturque ab importunis & malis hominibus.* There was a perſon then living, and one of conſiderable knowledge in the intrigues of thoſe times, who repreſents this as a plot of the Lord Paget and Sir John Maſon. The Writer is Dr. Ponet, who in his Treatiſe of *Politick Power* has the following paſſage: *By* Maſon's *working, and* Paget's *deviſing, Sir* Peter Carew *went into Flanders, (who was before in France)* Maſon *pledging for his ſafe-guard King Philip's fidelity and his own honeſty. Afterwards he and Sir* John Cheke *being inticed both to come to Bruſſels to ſee the Queen's Embaſſadors, and having brought Paget on the way toward England, both in their return were taken by the Provoſt Marſhal, ſpoiled of their horſes, and clapt into a cart, their legs, arms, and bodies tyed with halters to the body of the cart, and ſo carried to the ſea-ſide, and from thence into the Tower of London. And before Paget came to Calais, Sir Peter's man coming out of England meeteth him, and aſketh for his Maſter; Paget ſmileth and ſaid nothing, but that his Maſter was in health. But how cometh this to paſs? Mark well, the Queen thought Paget a meet man for her in all things, ſeeing that without cauſe ſhe ſuſpected his Religion. And at his coming over, ſhe like a woman uttereth to him what ſhe thought of him, and promiſeth, if ſhe may perceive his*

(21) Pag. 135.

(22) Centur. 8. cap. 97. pag. 700.

(23) 143.

(24) 146.

(25) 151.

this alternative either of ſubmiſſion or death, that Sir John Cheke deſired to ſpeak with Cardinal Pole, who adviſed him to depart from the variety of Doctors to the unity of the Church. At laſt he entirely ſubmitted, and wrote a paper, in which he declared his aſſent to the corporal preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament, and to all other articles of the Church of Rome [*M*]. He made a ſubmiſſion likewiſe to the Cardinal, who abſolved him, and admitted him a member of that Church; and he wrote a Letter to the Queen dated July the 15th 1556, and made a ſolemn Recantation before her Majeſty [*N*] October the 4th following, and ſubmitted to all the penances which ſhould be enjoined him by the Cardinal (*ee*). His lands were afterwards reſtored to him upon condition of an exchange with the Queen for others (*ff*). He was obliged likewiſe to keep company with the moſt zealous Papiſts, and to be preſent at the Examination of Heretics (*gg*). But his Recantation had ſo ſevere an effect upon his mind, that the ſhame and regret ruined his health, and he died September the 13th 1557, aged forty three years, at the houſe of his friend Mr. Peter Oſborn in Woodſtreet London, and was interred in St. Alban's Church there (*hh*). His friend Dr. Walter Haddon wrote his Epitaph [*O*]. Beſides his Works abovementioned he wrote ſeveral others [*P*]. By his widow the Lady Mary Cheke,

(*ee*) Ibid. pag. 166.

(*ff*) Ibid. pag. 166, 167.

(*gg*) Ibid. p. 169. Fox in his *Acts and Monum.* tom. 3. pag. 701. tells us, *that Biſhop Bonner got him to ſit in the place where the Martyrs were condemned.*

(*hh*) Ibid. pag. 170. Wood, col. 102.

his heart and mouth to agree together, ſhe would ſet him aloft. He aſſureth her, that whatſoever ſhe ſhould will him ſhould be done; yea he would do more than ſhe ſhould require him. . . . " Coming over he bruited that " he liked not the State in England, (for he is one of " them, that hangeth now on Propheſies, but of a " wrong thing) and therefore would be out of the way " in the height of the mad month of May [when inſurrections frequently uſed to be in the City of London] and pretendeth to come to the Bains at Acon; " but indeed the intent was to ſee if he could practiſe " with ſome of the Duke of Cleves men to betray the " poor Ducheſs of Suffolk (who was fled abroad for " her Religion) and ſome of the Engliſh Congregation at Weſel; that he to perform his promiſe might " ſend them to the Queen. But when he ſaw his " purpoſe failed, (God had better provided for the " Ducheſs to keep her from Traitors hands) he com- " eth not to the Bains, he needeth them not at that " time. But he then cauſed Carew and Cheke, whom " Maſon had prepared ready to ſerve his turn, to be " taken and carried away, as before ye have heard. " And at his return had great thanks, and the Queen's " favours encreaſed towards him."

[*M*] *Wrote a paper, in which he declared his aſſent to the corporal Preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament, and to all other articles of the Church of Rome.*] The paper conſiſted of ſeveral quotations from St. Hilary, Chryſoſtom, Cyril, and Auguſtin, which ſeemed to favour the doctrine of the Corporal Preſence; and he concluded it with theſe words, *In hac cauſa & in reliquis omnibus idem me profiteor dicere & ſentire, quod ſancta Chriſti & Catholica tenet Eccleſia.* This paper written and ſubſcribed by himſelf he ſent by the Dean of St. Paul's to the Cardinal, with a Letter from the Tower dated July 15th deſiring him, that this might put an end to any further queſtion concerning him, and that he would grant ſome requeſts, which were then put into his hand by the Dean; the chief of which ſeems to be, that he would have ſo much compaſſion of his frailty, as to diſpenſe with his making an open Recantation. But this was refuſed him (23).

(23) Strype, pag. 143, 144.

[*N*] *Made a ſolemn Recantation before her Majeſty.*] It was uſhered in by an Oration of Dr. Feckenham, addreſſed to the Queen in favour of Sir John Cheke, who ſtood by him (24). But beſides this Recantation, Mr. Strype tells us (25), that he met with another fram'd for Sir John's mouth by Cardinal Pole's pen or direction; the former Recantation ſpoken before the Queen being in the Cardinal's judgment not ſufficient. *But ſince he had lived long in the Court, and had been inſtrumental to ſow the doctrine of the Goſpel in the hearts of many there, it was thought convenient that he ſhould recant likewiſe in the face and hearing alſo of the Court.* And this alſo he was obliged to ſubmit to. In this Recantation he confeſſed, " that he had blaſ- " phemed the name of God, and perſecuted the name " of Chriſt; and that the ignorance of the Jews, " who killed Chriſt, was more excuſable than his. " That he had done what he could to bring the whole " Realm into blindneſs. That ſince he came into the " Tower he never came into a place, where he had " more cauſe to thank God. And that for an aſſured " token to the auditors, that what he ſaid with his " mouth, he thought with his heart he made uſe of " the very words of Berengarius's Recantation." Mr. Strype obſerves (26) that from a clauſe of the Recantation it appears upon what reaſon their reſentments againſt Cheke were chiefly grounded; that is, becauſe he had been the great inſtrument of inducing King Edward VI, and other noble youth of the Court to embrace the Proteſtant Religion; whereas *his office*, as he ſays in his Recantation, *was not to teach him matters of Religion, which was committed to others.*

(24) Idem, pag. 146.

(25) Pag. 150, 151.

(26) Pag. 166.

[*O*] *His friend Dr. Walter Haddon wrote his Epitaph.*] It is as follows (27):

(27) Idem, pag. 171.

Doctrinæ Lumen, Checus, Vitæque magiſter †,
Aurea naturæ Fabrica morte jacet,
Non erat è multis unus, ſed præſtitit unus
Omnibus, & Patriæ flos erat ille ſuæ.
Gemma Britanna fuit, tam magnum nulla tulerunt
Tempora theſaurum, tempora nulla ferent.

† Mr. Wood, col. 102. reads this line as follows; *Doctrinæ, Checus, Linguæq; utriuſq; magiſter.*

[*P*] *Beſides his works abovementioned he wrote ſeveral others.*] We ſhall give a Catalogue of them from Bale's *Scriptorum Illuſtrium Majoris Brytanniæ Catalogus* (28), Mr. Wood (29), and Mr. Strype (30). I. *In quoſdam Pſalmos.* II. *In Pſalmum, Domine probaſti.* Theſe Mr. Strype ſuppoſes to be only ſome pious Meditations. III. *De Fide juſtificante.* IV. *De Euchariſtiæ Sacramento.* It is uncertain whether this contains his diſputations with Dr. Feckenham againſt Tranſubſtantation, or ſome other Tract. V. *In Obitum D. Anthonii Dennei*; London 1555 in 4to. It begins *Cum claras hominum vitas.* This Sir Anthony Denny was educated at St. John's College, and was a man of ſuch great merit and learning, that he was made Gentleman of the Bed-Chamber to Henry VIII, and one of his Privy-Council. VI. *Super Mortem Buceri.* This perhaps is his conſolatory Epiſtle to Peter Martyr concerning the Death of Bucer, printed in Bucer's *Scripta Anglicana*, and elſewhere; unleſs it ſhould rather mean the *Epicedium*, which Cheke wrote upon that Divine. VII. *Epitaphiorum Lib. I.* " This one Book of Epitaphs or Inſcripti- " ons and Verſes, *ſays Mr. Strype* (31), upon perſons " deceaſed, means no more, but, according to Bale's " way, that theſe Epitaphs, if they were all collected, " might be ſufficient to make one Book." Of this ſort, beſides his Verſes upon Denny and Bucer, were probably the monumental Inſcriptions upon his Patron Dr. Butts in Fulham Church, and Richard Hill, his wife's father, in the Church of St. Michael Queen-Hith, London. We may likewiſe refer to this head an Engliſh Elegy, wherein the ſickneſs of King Edward VI, together with the circumſtances of his death, are deſcribed, which was printed in 1610 by H. Holland in his *Heroologia.* VIII. *De Nativitate Principis*; i. e. " Of the Nativity of the Prince." This the Author of the *Heroologia* repreſents as a Panegyric upon the Prince's Birth; but Mr. Strype (32) conjectures, that it was ſome private calculation of Prince Edward's Nativity, as Cheke was very fond of that Art. IX. *An liceat nubere poſt Divortium*; i. e. " Whether a wo- " man may marry after a Divorce." This ſeems to have been a caſe put to him in behalf of a great Lady, whoſe huſband being a Nobleman had obtained

(28) *Ubi ſupra.*

(29) *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 101.

(30) Pag. 216, & ſeqq.

(31) Pag. 217.

(32) Pag. 221.

Cheke, daughter and heireſs of Richard Hill, a Wine-Merchant of London (*ii*), he had three ſons, Henry, John, and Edward [2], and his poſterity by the eldeſt is ſtill ſubſiſting. Mr. Aſcham in his *Schoolmaſter*, and other eminent men of that time, give him a very great character. He was a prodigious admirer of the Greek Writers, and particularly of Xenophon and Demoſthenes (*kk*), and highly recommended thoſe two Authors together with Plato, Ariſtotle, Iſocrates, and Cicero (*ll*). He was very careful about

(*ii*) Ibid. pag. 43.

(*kk*) Ibid. pag. 199.

(*ll*) Ibid. pag. 200.

tained a divorce from her (33). X. *Introductio Grammaticæ*; i. e. "An Introduction to Grammar." XI. *De Ludimagiſtrorum Officio*:" i. e. "Of the Duty of "Schoolmaſters." Both theſe ſeem firſt to have been written for the uſe of the Prince, to whom he was Preceptor. XII. *De Superſtitione ad Regem Henricum*; i. e. "Of Superſtition to King Henry." This Diſcourſe was drawn up for the uſe of the King, in order to the Reformation of Religion, which in his reign was overwhelmed with ſuperſtitions. It was prefixed by way of Dedication to his Tranſlation of Plutarch's Book upon that ſubject, and is written in a very elegant Latin ſtyle. The manuſcript is extant in the Library of Univerſity-College in Oxford, in a beautiful character, and bound in cloth of ſilver, which makes it probable that it might be the very Book, which he preſented to the King. Mr. William Elſtob, Rector of St. Swithen's in London tranſlated it into Engliſh; and his Tranſlation is publiſhed at the end of Mr. Strype's Life of our Author. XIII. *De Cineribus & Palmis ad Vintonienſem.* Dr. Gardiner, Biſhop of Wincheſter, was very importunate with the Lord Protector for the retaining of the old uſages in the Church, and particularly ſprinkling aſhes on Aſh-Wedneſday, and carrying palms on Palm-Sunday. There is a Letter of his written to the Lord Protector upon that ſubject. Perhaps, the latter engaged Cheke to write an Anſwer to that Letter. XIV. *De Eccleſiâ, an poteſt errare:* i. e. "Of the Church, whether it "can err." It is written in Latin, and ſtill extant among the manuſcripts of Mr. John Fox. It is an argument managed by him with great learning againſt the Papiſts; wherein he proceeds upon theſe queſtions, Whether there be a Church? What the Church is? and Whether it can err? XV. His *Epiſtles*; whereof ſeveral are extant; as his Epiſtle to Peter Martyr at Oxford concerning the Death of Martin Bucer; and a conſolatory Letter to Dr. Walter Haddon upon his ſickneſs; with ſeveral others. XVI. His two *Recantations*: but as Mr. Strype obſerves (34), they were no farther his, than as he uttered them with his mouth, but did not compoſe them. XVII. His *Tranſlations*; ſome of which were from the Greek into Latin; as 1, Divers pieces of St. Chryſoſtom, viz. *De Fato Homiliæ tres*; *De Providentiâ Homiliæ tres*; *Contra Obſervatores Novilunii Homil. I*; together with other pieces of that ancient Father. 2. Joſephus's *Antiquities*, five Books. 3. *Leo de Apparatu Bellico.* Baſil, 1554 in 8vo. 4. *Aſceticum maximi Monachi*, Lib. 1. 5. *Plutarchus de Superſtitione*, Lib. 1. 6. Several pieces of Demoſthenes, as his *Philippus*, Lib. 3. His *Olynthiacs*, Lib. 3. *Adverſus Leptinem*, Lib. 1. *Demoſthenes & Æſchines*, their *adverſe Orations*. 7. Sophocles tranſlated *ad literam*. 8. Euripides likewiſe. 9. Ariſtotle *de Anima*. Others of his Tranſlations were out of Engliſh into Latin, as *Archbiſhop Cranmer's Book of the Lord's Supper*. This book was printed abroad. *The Communion Book*. This was done for the uſe of Bucer, that he might underſtand it, and give his judgment of it. It is extant in his *Opuſcula Anglicana*. And laſtly out of Greek into Engliſh he tranſlated the Goſpel of St. Matthew, of which we ſhall give an extract in the note [S]. We may add to the reſt of his writings and learned labours, that he collected the arguments and reaſons of both ſides upon the buſineſs of the Euchariſt in Parliament, where that point was learnedly and largely debated, when the Communion-Book was appointed. He alſo made ſome corrections of Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato, Demoſthenes, Xenophon, and other Greek Authors. *This*, ſays Mr. Strype (35), *is all we know of the fruits of his learned head; tho' no queſtion this Catalogue is very imperfect, and that he did write much more than we at this diſtance know. But this is ſufficient to inform us what a Scholar he was.*

(33) Idem, ibid.

(34) Pag. 223.

(35) Pag. 224.

[2] *He had three ſons, Henry, John, and Edward.*] John and Edward died without iſſue. John was killed in 1579 or 1580 in Ireland in an engagement againſt ſome Italians and Spaniards, who had invaded that country for King Philip II. of Spain (36). Edward is likewiſe ſuppoſed to have died young (37). Henry the eldeſt, who was nine years old at his father's death, was educated to learning by the care of Mr. Oſborn, his father's friend, and afterwards ſent to King's College in Cambridge, under the tuition of Dr. Bartholomew Clerke. The Univerſity gave him his Grace for Maſter of Arts, and adopted him into the rank of their Senators in the year 1568, he being then ſcarce twenty years old. In 1569 or 1570 he married Frances, daughter of the Lady Ratcliff, who was wife to Sir Humphrey Ratcliff of Elſtow, Knt. whoſe ſon Edward was Earl of Suſſex. In 1576 he travelled into Italy; and in 1581 he was made Secretary to the Council in the North, and received the honour of Knighthood from her Majeſty (38). He is ſuppoſed to have died about the year 1586 (39). His iſſue by his Lady was Thomas his eldeſt ſon; Hatton, who followed the wars in Flanders, and was killed in a duel by Sir Thomas Dutton, Knt. near Calais; and Henry, who died without iſſue, and was buried at Dover near his brother Hatton. Thomas being left a minor, was educated in a ſchool at York. He was Knighted by King James I, and then ſtiled Sir Thomas Cheke of the county of Lincolne, in reſpect perhaps of his eſtate at Spalding in that county. He was afterwards ſtiled Sir Thomas Cheke of Pyrgo in the liberty of Havering in Eſſex, being an eſtate which he purchaſed of the Greys, and where he lived in 1634. He married firſt a daughter of Peter Oſborn Eſq; with whom he lived near twenty years, but had no iſſue by her. His ſecond wife was Eſſex, daughter of Robert Lord Rich, Earl of Warwick, by whom he had three ſons, Robert, Thomas, Charles; and five daughters, Frances, Eſſex, Anne, Iſabel, and Elizabeth. He lived to a great age, and was interred March the 25th 1659 in St. Alban's Church in Woodſtreet. Robert Cheke was born in 1625. He was crooked, but a man of exquiſite parts, and was ſome time Governor of one of King Charles the IId's natural children. Thomas, who inherited the eſtate, called Colonel Cheke, was Lieutenant of the forces under Charles II and James II. He married firſt Dorothy, daughter of Philip Sidney, Lord Viſcount Liſle, afterwards Earl of Leiceſter, by whom he had no iſſue. His ſecond wife was Lætitia, daughter of Edward Ruſſel, ſecond ſon of Francis Earl of Bedford; by whom he had iſſue Henry, who died at eight or nine years of age, and was buried in the Chapel at Pyrgo, beſides other children dying young. He had likewiſe a ſon, named Edward, who enjoyed the eſtate at Pyrgo, to whom Mr. Strype dedicated the life of Sir John Cheke, his great great grandfather in 1705. He married a daughter of Sir William Ellis of Nocton, in the county of Lincoln Bart. The daughters of Colonel Cheke by his wife Lætitia, were Eſſex and Anne, wife of Sir Thomas Tipping of Oxfordſhire, Bart. This is the poſterity male of Sir Thomas Cheke, Grandſon to Sir John Cheke. The daughters of Sir Thomas were five, all honourably married. 1. Frances, the eldeſt, was married to Sir Lancelot Lake of Canons in the county of Middleſex, Knt. 2. Eſſex, the ſecond daughter, was married to Sir Robert Bevyl of Cheſterton in the county of Huntington, Knt. of the Bath; and afterwards to Edward Earl of Manchеſter, Lord Chamberlain of the Houſhold to King Charles II, by whom he had ſix ſons and two daughters. 3. Anne, the third daughter, was married to Richard Rogers of the county of Dorſet Eſq; and afterwards to Robert Lord Rich, Earl of Warwick. 4. Iſabel, the fourth daughter, married to Sir Francis Gerard of Harrow on the Hill in Middleſex, Bart. 5. Elizabeth, married to Sir Richard Franklin of More-Park in the county of Hertford, Bart. (40).

(36) Idem, pag. 180.

(37) Idem, pag. 182.

(38) Idem, pag. 182-189.

(39) Idem, pag. 189.

(40) Idem, pag. 189-192.

about the Orthography of the Latin and Engliſh Language [*R*], which latter Tongue he endeavoured to improve [*S*]. He was extremely charitable, eſpecially to foreigners, and very communicative of his knowledge (*mm*). His widow married Henry Mac Williams Eſq; a Gentleman of conſiderable fortune and quality, and died November the 30th 1616 (*nn*). The Author of the *Hiſtory of Socinianiſm* has treated Sir John Cheke as a *Libertine by profeſſion*; but Mr. de la Roche in his *Memoires Litteraires de la Grande Bretagne* (*oo*) has ſhewn that this imputation has been caſt upon him without the leaſt foundation imaginable.

(*mm*) Ibid. pag. 228, 229.

(*nn*) Ibid. pag. 173-179.

(*oo*) Tom. 15. pag. 277.

[*R*] *He was very careful about the orthography of the Latin and Engliſh Languages.*] With regard to the Latin, that it might be ſpoken truly, and the ſyllables in reading pronounced long or ſhort, according to their nature, he deviſed a way to write the vowels according to their quantity; as the long vowel o after this manner *ω*, like a Greek *Omega*, as in *uxωrem*, *liberωs*; and the long I with two tittles over it, as in *Divinitus*. And as for the long E, eſpecially the diphthong, which before was commonly written as the ordinary E, he put a tail to it, as in *Le,tor*. Thus Mr. Strype found he wrote ſome of his letters; but he obſerved in his writings afterwards, that he did not ſo much regard it, except the E diphthong. And whereas the writing and ſpelling of the Engliſh tongue was in thoſe times very erroneous, even Scholars themſelves taking little care how they ſpelt, as appears both from manuſcripts and books then printed, he endeavoured to correct and regulate it in theſe reſpects following. 1. He would not have the letter E put to the end of words, becauſe he thought it unneceſſary and unexpreſſive of any ſounds; as in theſe words, *Excuſ*, *giv*, *deceiv*, *praiſ*, *commun*; unleſs where it is pronounced, and then to be written with a double E, as in *Neceſſitee*. 2. Where the letter A was pronounced long, he would have it written with a double A, in diſtinction from A ſhort, as in *Maad*, *ſtraat*, *daar*. Where the letter I was pronounced long, he would have it written with a double I, as in *deſijr*, *Lijf*. 4. He entirely threw the letter Y out of the alphabet, as uſeleſs, and ſupplied it with I, as *mi*, *ſai*, *awai*. U long he wrote with a long ſtroke over it, as in *Preſūm*. 6. The reſt of the long vowels he would have to be written with double letters, as *weer*, *theer* (and ſometimes *thear*) *noo*, *noon*, *adoo*, *thoof*, *loov*, to avoid an E at the end. 7. Letters without ſound he threw out, as in theſe words, *Frutes*, *wold*, *faut*, *dout*, *again* for *againſt*, *hole*, *meen* for *mean*. 8. He changed the ſpelling in ſome words to make them the better expreſſive of the ſounds; as in *gud*, *britil*, *praiſabil*, *ſufferabil* (41).

(41) Idem, pag. 211, 212.

[*S*] *Which latter tongue he endeavoured to improve.*] Dr. Thomas Wilſon, afterwards Secretary of State to Queen Elizabeth, tells us (42), that our Author had better ſkill in the Engliſh language, to judge of the phraſes and properties of words, and to divide ſentences, than any perſon elſe that he knew, and that he was thought by ſome judicious men greatly to have improved the language by a practice, which he had when he read his Greek lectures, to take the book, and only looking upon the Greek to read it into Engliſh. What he did further for our language was, that he brought it into a ſhort and expreſſive way of writing without long and intricate periods. He would not allow any words but ſuch as were true Engliſh or of Saxon original; ſuffering no adoption of any foreign word into the Engliſh language, which he thought was copious enough of itſelf, without borrowing words from other countries. Thus in his own tranſlations into Engliſh he would not uſe any but pure Engliſh phraſes and expreſſions; which indeed made his ſtyle ſometimes a little affected and harſh, and obliged him to uſe ſeveral odd and uncouth words, as *deſiirful ungreevous*, *Tollers* for Publicans, &c. (43). This perhaps might occaſion that ſevere character of him by Sir John Hayward in his *Life of King Edward VI*, who allows his eloquence in the Latin and Greek tongues, but tells us, that *for other ſufficiences, ſo far as appears by his Books, it was pedantic enough*. Mr. Strype (44) obſerves, that this "cenſure was too raſh "upon a man of ſuch fame and learning, and indeed "beſpoke Hayward to be but little acquainted with "him or his books, being far otherwiſe thought on "by thoſe learned men his contemporaries, that well "knew him, and wanted not for ſkill to judge of "men." Our Author ſeemed to diſlike the Engliſh tranſlation of the Bible, becauſe there were ſo many foreign words in it. This induced him once to attempt a new verſion of the New Teſtament, and he completed that of the goſpel of St. Matthew, and began that of St. Mark; throughout which tranſlation he endeavoured to uſe only true Engliſh Saxon words. The original under his own hand ſtill remains in the Manuſcript-Library at Bennet College in Cambridge. We ſhall give the reader a ſpecimen from the Goſpel of St. Matthew, Chap. I. Ver. 17. *Therefor from Abraham unto David there wer fourteen degrees; and from David unto the out-peopling to Babylon fourteen degrees; and from the out-peopling to Babylon unto Chriſt fourteen degrees.* 18. *And Jeſus Chriſt's birth was after this manner. After his mother Mari was enſured to Joſeph, before thei weer cupled together, ſhe was preived to be with child; and it was indeed by the Holi Ghooſt.* 19. *But Joſeph her huſband being a juſt man, and loth to uſe extremitee toward her, entended privili to divorſe himſelf from her.* 20. *And being in this mind, lo the Angel of the Lord appeired bi dream* &c. Chap. II. V. 16. *Then Herod ſeeing that he was plaid withal by the wiſe-heards*, &c. T.

(42) *Ap.* Strype, pag. 212.

(43) Idem, pag. 212, 213.

(44) Pag. 213.

CHELIDONIS, a woman of a diſſolute life, whom I mention only that I may have an opportunity to relate a circumſtance which I have promiſed above (*a*), and which we read in Cicero. This woman loved Verres, and had a very great power over him. All they who had any law-ſuit depending, applied to her whilſt he was Prætor; and as this was the only means to ſucceed, ſome perſons of honour, whoſe claim was well-grounded, were obliged to pay their attendance to Chelidonis. The baſeneſs of this proceeding was very elegantly expoſed by Cicero [*A*]. He obſerves that a young man of Quality was

(*a*) Towards the end of the Remark [*C*] of the Article CETHEGUS.

[*A*] *The baſeneſs of this proceeding was very eloquently expoſed by Cicero.*] The father-in-law, the uncle, and one of the guardians of a pupil, who was threatened with a dangerous proſecution at law, had recourſe to Marcus Marcellus another of the youth's guardians. Marcellus went to Verres and deſired him to protect the pupil's innocence, but could not prevail with him to promiſe any thing; whereupon all other means failing, he was obliged to apply himſelf to Chelidonis. *Quum ſibi omnes ad iſtum allegationes difficiles, omnes aditus arduos, aut potius intercluſos viderunt, apud quem non jus, non æquitas, non miſericordia, non propinqui oratio, non amici voluntas, non cujuſquam auctoritas pro pretio, non gratia valeret, ſtatuunt id ſibi optimum eſſe factu, quod cuivis veniſſet in mentem, petere auxilium a Chelidone, quæ iſto Prætore, non modo in jure civili, privatorumque omnium controverſiis populo Romano præfuit, verum etiam in his ſartis tectis dominata eſt. Venit ad Chelidonem C. Muſtius eques Romanus publicanus, homo cum primis honeſtus; venit M. Junius patruus pueri, frugaliſſimus homo & caſtiſſimus; venit homo ſummo honore, pudore, & ſummo officio, ſpectatiſſimus ordinis ſui, P. Potitius tutor. O multis acerbam, ô miſeram, atque indignam Præturam tuam! ut mittam cætera, quo tandem pudore tales viros, quo dolore meretricis domum veniſſe arbitramini? qui nulla conditione iſtam turpitudinem*

was ashamed to name this creature [B]. She left her estate to Verres by her last will (b).

(b) Cicero, *in Verr. II.* chap. 47.

dinem subissent, nisi officii necessitudinisque ratio coegisset (1). i. e. "As they found it was difficult to convey "him any thing; that it was hard or rather impossi- "ble to have the least access to him; that neither "justice, nor equity, nor compassion, nor the entrea- "ties of his relations, nor the desires of his friends, "nor any person's authority, but money alone could "prevail upon him to grant a favour, they thought, "that the best thing for them to do was, what every "body else did, which was to beg Chelidonis's assi- "stance, who during his Prætorship, not only govern- "ed at Rome in civil affairs, and in all the law-suits "between private persons, but also in what related "to the keeping those public buildings in repair *. "C. Mustius a Roman Knight and a tax-gatherer, "a very worthy man, went to Chelidonis, with M. "Junius the child's uncle, a very sober and modest "man, and with P. Potitius the child's Guardian, a "man who by his reputation, his modesty, and his "great employment was the most eminent of his rank. "Oh, how cruel, how miserable, how shameful was "thy Prætorship! And not to mention other things at "present, what a shame, what a grief was it, think "you, for such men to go to the house of a prosti- "tute? nor would they have done this shameful action "on any account whatsoever, had not their duty and "friendship forced them to it." They met Chelidonis surrounded with a vast number of Clients; and were obliged to wait till she had dispatched a great many of them. Their turn came at last; they propo- sed their business to her, desired her to serve them, and offered her money. She answered like a true Courtezan; I will serve you with all my heart, said she; I shall speak to him about it effectually; but the next day she declared, that she could not prevail upon him, and that he expected a large sum of money from that affair. *Veniunt, ut dico, ad Chelidonem. Domus erat plena; nova jura, nova decreta, nova judicia pete- bantur. Mihi det possessionem, mihi ne adimat, in me judicium ne det, mihi bona addicat. Alii nummos nume- rabant, alii tabulas obsignabant. Domus erat non me- retricio conventu, sed prætoriâ turbâ referta. Simul ac potestas primum data est, adeunt hi quos dixi, loquitur Mustius, rem demonstrat, petit auxilium, pecuniam pol- licetur. Respondit illa, ut meretrix, non inhumanè, li- benter ait se esse facturam, & cum isto diligenter ser- mocinaturam, reverti jubet; tum discedunt; postridie revertuntur. Negat illa posse hominem exorari, permag- nam eum dicere ex illa re pecuniam confici posse* (2). i. e. "They went, as I said, to Chelidonis; her house "was full of people, who asked for new laws, new "decrees, new sentences: let him grant me that es- "tate, says one; let him not deprive me of it, says "another; do not let him give sentence against me, "says a third; let this estate be forfeited to me, "says a fourth: some give money, others sign bonds. "The house was filled, not with such people as use "to visit a Courtezan, but with such as use to attend "a Prætor. The persons, whom I have mentioned, "approached the Lady, as soon as they could: Mus- "tius spoke, explained the whole affair, begged her "assistance, and promised her money: she, like a true "Courtezan, answered very kindly, and said, she "would with all her heart, comply with their request, "and recommend the affair effectually to Verres; and "desired them to come again. The next day they "returned; but her answer was, that he could not "be prevailed upon, and said he could make a very "good penny of that affair." The Chamber-Coun- sellors had no longer any business; men did no more resort to them, but only to Chelidonis; it was she, who regulated all Sentences and Decrees; the Prætor reversed his own Decrees, and pronounced quite oppo- site sentences, according to this woman's suggestions. Cicero expresses this exceedingly well. *Quæso redite in memoriam, Judices, quæ libido istius in jure dicendo fuerit, quæ varietas decretorum, quæ nundinatio, quam inanes domus eorum omnium, qui de jure civili consuli solent, quam plena atque referta Chelidonis, à qua mu- liere quum erat ad eum ventum, & in aures ejus insusur- ratum, aliàs revocabat inter eos quos jam decreverat, de- cretumque mutabat, aliàs inter alios contrarium sine ulla Religione decernebat, ac proximis paulo ante decreverat* (3). i. e. "Pray call to mind, ye Judges, how in- "constant he was in his judgments, how various and "corrupt in his Decrees; how empty the houses of "those were, who used to be consulted concerning the "Civil Law, and how full Chelidonis's house was; "if a person was but recommended by her, Verres "used to alter by her insinuations his former Decrees, "nor did he scruple to give such sentences as were in- "consistent with one another."

(1) Cicero, *Orat. in Verrem* I. cap. 51, *& seq.*

* This did properly belong to the Censor. But as there was no Censor at Rome under Verres's Prætorship, he had the inspection of the public buildings. Freigius, *Not. in Verrinam Primam*, pag. m. 301.

(2) Cicero, *Orat. in Verr.* ibid.

(3) Cicero, *Orat. in Verrem* I. cap. 46. See also *Orat. 5. in Verrem*, cap. 13.

[B] *A young man . . . . was ashamed to name this creature.*] What a shame is it, cries Cicero, that a Prætor should have discharged his office according to the will and pleasure of a woman, whom Domitius did not think he could name, without offending against the rules of modesty. *L. Domitius . . . de Chelidone reti- cuit, quoad potuit, alio responsionem derivavit. Tantus in adolescente clarissimo ac Principe juventutis pudor fuit, ut aliquamdiu, quum a me premeretur, omnia potius re- sponderet, quam Chelidonem nominaret. Primo neces- sarios istius ad eum allegatos esse dicebat, deinde aliquando coactus, Chelidonem nominavit. Non te pudet, Verres, ejus mulieris arbitratu gessisse præturam, quam L. Domi- tius ab se nominari vix sibi honestum esse arbitraba- tur* (4). i. e. "Domitius avoided to name Chelidonis "as much as he could, and made but indirect answers. "Such was the modesty of this noble young man, the "chief of our youth, that tho' I pressed him, yet he "chose to answer any thing, rather than to name "Chelidonis. First he said, her friends had been "sent to him; and as I insisted, at last he named Che- "lidonis. And are you not ashamed, Verres, to have "followed, during your Prætorship, the dictates of a "woman, whose name Domitius thought it almost in- "decent for him to pronounce?"

(4) Cicero, *Orat in Verrem* I. cap. 53.

CHELONIS, daughter of Leonidas King of Lacedæmon, and wife of Cleombro- tus also King of Lacedæmon, extricated herself out of a very great perplexity, not in- deed like a politic woman, but like a romantic heroine. The case was this. There arose at Lacedæmon such a formidable faction against Leonidas in behalf of Cleombro- tus, that the former was obliged to take sanctuary in a Temple, and the latter was raised to the Throne. Chelonis was so far from taking a share in her husband's good fortune, that she retired into the same Temple with her father, and they both appeared there in that mortified posture, which was usual to those who fled to such sanctuaries; the best notion we can give of them is by comparing them to those penitents who appear in sackcloth and ashes. Leonidas was some time after permitted to retire to Tegea, whither Chelonis, his inseparable companion in his misfortunes, followed him. Cleombrotus was in his turn forced to take sanctuary in a Temple, and Leonidas was restored to the Throne; but Chelonis left her father then, and went to meet her husband. It was a thing worthy of admiration, to see her intercede with her father in favour of her hus- band, being fully determined to share his misfortune with him, though she had had no share in his prosperity, and not to share her father's happiness with him, though she had shared his misfortunes. Leonidas went with an armed force to the sanctuary where his son-in-law had sheltered himself, and in the most passionate manner upbraided him with

the injuries he had received from him, as the loſs of his Crown, his baniſhment, and ſo forth. Cleombrotus had nothing to anſwer; but his ſpouſe did it for him; ſhe ſpoke in ſuch a ſtrong and moving manner, proteſting at the ſame time, ſhe would die before her huſband, if her prayers and tears proved unſucceſsful, that ſhe ſaved his life, and obtained leave for him to retire to ſuch place as he ſhould chooſe. Amongſt other things, ſhe repreſented to her father that he himſelf made his ſon-in-law's Apology, and that her paſt conduct was a *Manifeſto* againſt her huſband [*A*]. When Leonidas had granted her the life and liberty of Cleombrotus, he deſired her moſt affectionately to continue with him; but ſhe begged to be excuſed, and putting one of her children into her huſband's arms, whilſt ſhe held the other, ſhe went to pray by the altar, and immediately after went with her huſband to the place of his baniſhment (*a*). The paſſage in which Montagne commends her, deſerves to be read (*b*).

(*a*) From Plutarch, in the *Life of Agis and Cleomenes.*

(*b*) Montagne, *Eſſays*, liv. 3. chap. 13. pag. m. 578.

[*A*] *She repreſented to her father, that he himſelf made his ſon-in-law's Apology, and that her paſt conduct was a Manifeſto againſt her huſband.*] If my huſband, ſaid ſhe (1), had ſome plauſible reaſons to deprive you of the Crown, I myſelf confuted them: I bore witneſs againſt him, by leaving him to follow you: but if you ſhould put him to death, will you not prove by this very action, that he was excuſable? Will you not ſhew to the whole world, that a Kingdom is ſomething ſo valuable, ſo worthy to be coveted, that in order to keep it, a man may freely ſpill the blood of a ſon-in-law, and have not the leaſt regard for the life of his own children?

(1) Plutarch. *in Vita Agid. & Cleom.* pag. 802.

CHESNE (JOSEPH DU) in Latin *Quercetanus*, Sieur de la Violette, Counſellor and Phyſician to the King, was of the county of Armagnac in Gaſcony, and died at Paris in the year 1609. Some Authors give him the title of Baron (*a*). He became famous by his ſkill in Chymiſtry [*A*], and he publiſhed ſome books, which were very well received, and have been often reprinted [*B*]. I believe he was of the Proteſtant Religion,

(*a*) See the Remark [*B*].

[*A*] *He became famous by his ſkill in Chymiſtry.*] The paſſage of Gaffarel, which proves this aſſertion, contains ſomething very remarkable, for which reaſon I ſhall not confine myſelf to thoſe words only, which relate to our Du Cheſne's ſkill in Chymiſtry, being perſuaded, that the reader will ſee the whole paſſage with pleaſure. *Mr. Du Cheſne Sieur de la Violette one of the beſt Chymiſts of this age relates, that he had ſeen a very learned Pole a Phyſician at Cracow, who kept in vials the aſhes of almoſt every plant that is known; and when any perſon was curious to ſee in theſe vials a roſe, for inſtance, he took the vial in which the aſhes of the roſe-tree were kept, and put it over a lighted candle; when it had felt the heat a little, the aſhes began to move, afterwards they roſe and diſperſed themſelves thro' the vial, in which one could perceive a ſmall dark cloud, which dividing itſelf into little parcels, came at laſt to repreſent a roſe ſo fine, ſo freſh, and ſo perfect, that one would have thought it could be handled, and muſt ſmell like one that is pluckt from the roſe-tree. This learned man ſays, that he often tried to make that experiment, but could not ſucceed with all his ſkill, till at laſt he ſaw this wonder by chance. For as he was amuſing himſelf with Mr. de Luynes, ſurnamed de Formentieres, Counſellor in the Parliament, by making ſome curious experiments, and had drawn the ſalt from the aſhes of ſome burnt nettles, and expoſed the lye to the dew in winter, he found it frozen in the morning, but with this wonderful circumſtance, that the ſpecies of the nettles, their form and figure were ſo naturally and perfectly delineated upon the ice, that they ſeemed to be true nettles. This man* (Du Cheſne) *being overjoyed at this, called the ſaid Counſellor to be a witneſs of this ſecret, the excellency of which made him cry out in theſe words:*

" Secret dont on comprend que, quoyque le corps
" meure,
" Les formes ſont pourtant aux cendres leur démeure.
That is,
" This is a ſecret, which ſhews, that tho' the bodies
" die, yet their forms ſtill continue in their aſhes."

This ſecret is more common at this time, for Mr. de Claves, one of the moſt eminent Chymiſts of this age, ſhews it every day (1).

(1) Gaffarel, *Curioſit. Inouyes.* chap. 5. num. 9. pag. m. 100.

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſome Books, which were very well received, and have been often reprinted.*] We want no other proof of this but the great number of editions, which his works went through, as may be ſeen in the *Lindenius renovatus* (2), to which I refer the reader for this particular as well as for the titles of his works. I ſhall only obſerve I, That as much as I could find by my inquiries, the firſt book he publiſhed was his *Apologia pro Chymicis* (An Apology for the Chymiſts): Thus Du Verdier gives the title of it (3), and he ſays, it was printed at Lyons in the year 1575, 8vo. It is no doubt the ſame book with that, which is intitled, *Ad Jacobi Auberti, Vindonis, de ortu & cauſis Metallorum contra Chymicos explicationem, brevis Reſponſio. Et de exquiſita Mineralium, Animalium, & vegetabilium Medicamentorum ſpagyrica præparatione & uſu perſpicua Tractatio.* i. e. " A ſhort Anſwer to James Au-" bert's Treatiſe concerning the Origin and Cauſes of " Metals, againſt the Chymiſts. With a plain account " of the excellent chymical preparation and uſe of me-" dicines compoſed of minerals, animals, and vegeta-" bles." Printed at Lyons in 1575, 8vo. Du Verdier aſcribed to him *Traité de St. Auguſtin de la Vie Chréſtienne, avec les Traitez de charité & de la vanité de ce ſiecle, & monde inferieur d'obedience & d'humilité. Et l'Echelle de Paradis.* i. e. " St. Auguſtin's Treatiſe " concerning a Chriſtian Life; with the Treatiſes of " Charity, and of the Vanity of this lower World, " which is a place of obedience and humility. And " the ladder of Paradiſe." Printed at Paris in 1542. But I cannot think he was the Author of this work, if the date of 1542 be right. I believe that the cut prefixed to his *Diæteticon*, printed in 1606, was made that ſame year. Now it is there ſet down that he was then ſixty years old; ſo that he was born after this Treatiſe of St. Auguſtin was printed. II. I ſhall obſerve in the ſecond place, that Du Verdier in his *Bibliotheque* ſtiles him only, *Sieur de la Violette, Conſeiller & Medecin ordinaire de Monſeigneur Frere unique du Roi*, Lord de la Violette, Counſellor and Phyſician in ordinary to the King's only brother; and in La Croix du Maine he is only called, *Baron & Seigneur de Morencé & Lyſerable*; i. e. " Baron and Lord of Morencé and " Lyſerable." It is certain that theſe two Authors ſpeak of the ſame Writer; for they both aſcribe to the Joſeph du Cheſne, they mention, the Book intitled, *Traite de la cure generale & particuliere des Arquebuſades.* i. e. " A Treatiſe concerning the general and " particular manner of healing wounds made by an " Arquebus;" printed at Lyons in the year 1576. It was alſo printed the ſame year in Latin and in French. Baillet mentions the *Baron de Morencé*, whoſe name was Joſeph du Cheſne (4); but he mentions him only as a Poet, and it is certain that this Phyſician made ſome Verſes. Du Verdier aſcribes to him, *La Morocoſmie; ou de la Folie, Vanité, & Inconſtance du Monde, en* 100 *Octonaires. Avec deux Chants Doriques de l'Amour celeſte & du Souverain bien*; i. e. " *Moro-" coſmia*, or a Poem concerning the Folly, Vanity, " and Inconſtancy of this World, in an hundred Stan-" zas of eight verſes each. With two Canto's upon " the Love of God, and the *Summum Bonum.*" Printed at Lyons in 1583, 4to. I believe, this is not the firſt edition of that work; for the Author, who quotes it in his *Diæteticon* (5), printed in 1606, obſerves, that it was then twenty ſix years ſince he had publiſh'd it.

(2) Pag. 710 and 711.

(3) Du Verdier, *Bibl. Françoiſe*, pag. 773.

(4) Baillet, *Jugemens ſur les Poetes*, tom. 3. num. 1332, pag. 363.

(5) Folio 17.

Religion, as it is aſſerted in the *Index Librorum prohibitorum* (*b*). He married Margaret du Trie (*c*), whoſe mother was the daughter of the learned William Budæus; he had a daughter by her, whom I ſhall mention in another place (*d*). Patin has abuſed him very much [*C*]; and indeed, how could he have ſpared him, conſidering the hatred he entertained againſt all the Chymiſts, and his averſion for antimony? It is true, the Sieur de la Violette did not preſcribe this medicine, but he had in a manner declared himſelf the Protector of it (*e*). This with ſome other circumſtances in his way of practice raiſed him a great many enemies. He was obliged to anſwer ſome books of Riolan, which were not without ſome abuſive expreſſions. But he could eaſily comfort himſelf under thoſe little perſecutions; for he was favoured by the Great. Mr. de Silleri, who has been Chancellor of France, was one of his patrons; he took him along with him into Switzerland, when he went Embaſſador thither in the year 1601, to renew the alliance with France; and as there was then a report that a certain girl had lived a long while without eating, he ſent du Cheſne to Bern, to enquire into the truth of the matter; the account he brought back was, that the ſtory was true (*f*). I ſhall obſerve a ſmall miſtake which crept into the Catalogue of Oxford [*D*].

(*b*) Pag. 660. of the Geneva Edition 1667.

(*c*) See the Remark [*C*] in the Article SPANHEIM.

(*d*) Ibid.

(*e*) See his *Diæteticon*, folio m. 458, &c.

(*f*) Taken from Joſeph Du Cheſne's *Diætetica*, fol. 31.

[*C*] *Patin has abuſed him very much.*] "That ſame year (1609) died here a great rogue and quack, who "in his life-time killed a great many perſons, and "ſtill continues to do ſo, by the wretched Books he "left us under his name, and which he cauſed to be "written by other Chymiſt-Phyſicians, whom he "pick'd up here and there. I mean, *Joſephus Quercetanus*, who at Paris ſtiled himſelf the Sieur de la "Violette. By his firſt trade he was only a Surgeon's journeyman in the County of Armagnac, "which is a poor wretched and curſed Country; "being come to Paris, he paſſed there, and eſpecially "at Court, for a great Phyſician, becauſe he had learned in Germany ſomething of Chymiſtry. The beſt "Chymiſt, that is to ſay the leaſt bad, has done but "little good in the world, and this man has done a "great deal of harm (6)." Patin betrays a very great paſſion in theſe words.

(6) Patin, Let. 31. pag. 142. of the 1ſt vol. edition of Geneva in 1691.

[*D*] *I ſhall obſerve a ſmall miſtake, which crept into the Catalogue of Oxford.*] The Authors of this Catalogue mention (7) one *John du Cheſne*, to whom they aſcribe the Treatiſe concerning the manner of healing wounds made by an Arquebuſs, printed at Lyons in the year 1576, 8vo, and the *Grand Miroir du Monde*, Great Mirror of the World, printed in the ſame city in the year 1587, 4to; tho' both theſe works certainly belong to our Joſeph du Cheſne. Merclinus does not mention the latter (8); but the Author himſelf quotes it in his *Diæteticon Polyhiſtoricon*, folio 398.

(7) Part 1. pag. 158.

(8) *In Lindenio renovato.*

I muſt alſo obſerve, that in the Catalogue of Oxford they give us (9) a long liſt of the Latin Works of *Joſephus Quercetanus*, without telling us, that he is the ſame, who had already been mentioned under the name of *Du Cheſne*.

(9) Part 2. pag. 88.

CHEVREAU (URBAN) born at Loudon, and Author of ſeveral books, and amongſt others an Univerſal Hiſtory (*a*), which has been often reprinted, died in his native-place February the 15th 1701, at the age of fourſcore and ſeven years and ſome months. See his Elogium in the *Journal of Trevoux* (*b*); they have not given there an exact catalogue of all the books he publiſhed, for they have not mentioned his Romance of *Hermiogene*, printed at Paris in the year 1648, in 8vo, nor the volume of Letters which he publiſhed in the ſame City in the year 1642, in 8vo.

(*a*) See the Article BABYLAS, Remark [*F*].

(*b*) For the months of March and April 1701, pag. 241. of the Amſterdam edition.

CHIGI (*a*), a noble family of Sienna, the members of which had been a long time conſiderable in their own country, when they began to be raiſed to ſome dignities at the Court of Rome under Pope Julius II (*b*). It is true they were not preferred to Prelacies, but they enjoyed great employments in the Apoſtolic Chamber. Julius II made Auguſtine Chigi Intendant of the Finances, and had reaſons to be very well pleaſed with his choice. All the world knows this Pope's warlike and reſtleſs genius, which could not but engage him in very great expences. Auguſtino Chigi was obliged to employ all his ſkill and induſtry in order to find the neceſſary funds to provide for ſuch great charges; and did it with all the activity, contrivance and honeſty, that were requiſite [*A*]; ſo that

(*a*) The true name is *Chigi*.

(*b*) See hereunder the Remark [*F*].

[*A*] AUGUSTINO CHIGI *Intendant of the Finances under Julius II, ... had all the honeſty, that was requiſite.*] I have followed my Author exactly, who ſays, there never was the leaſt ground to ſuſpect the honeſty of this Financer. *Non hebbe mai Giulio che ombrarſi dell' Integrita di che l'eſſercitava* (1). But yet I know, that they have publiſhed very ſtrange things concerning Auguſtino Chigi's profuſeneſs. He once entertained the Pope and all the Cardinals with ſuch a ſumptuouſneſs, that one would have thought that he deſigned to exceed the extravagance of Vitellius himſelf. The plenty, delicacy, and choice of the meats would have been ſufficient to raiſe one's admiration; but it was not this way that Auguſtino Chigi deſigned to diſtinguiſh himſelf; at every courſe, all that was upon the table was thrown into the Tyber, tho' all the diſhes and plates were ſilver. The laſt courſe conſiſted of a vaſt quantity of parrot's tongues, dreſſed an hundred different ways. It can hardly be believed that a Financer, who is guilty of ſuch a profuſeneſs, gained his riches by lawful means. I wiſh the Author, who acquaints us with this particular, had been pleaſed to let us know whence he had it, which was but juſt. If he would have us believe him upon his bare word, I can't help it; however here follows his own account. *Privatum hominem ad prodigioſi luxus enormem licitationem, non macelli unius, ſed peregrini quoque orbis conturbatricem aſpiraſſe, quis non merito maximo demiretur. Is fuit Auguſtinus quidam Chieſius, Romanus Trapezites, qui Leoni X Pontifici Maximo totique purpurei Senatus cœtui, exterorumque Regum Legatis, ob filium ab illo Baptiſmi lavacro tinctum ſplendidiſſima, ut ita dicam, repotia conſtituit, in quibus non ſatis fuit eduliorum omnis generis miſſumque exquiſitiſſimorum apparatui modum omnem adimiſſe, niſi etiam lances, pinaces, cæteraque cum eſcaria vaſa, tum potûs inſtrumenta affabre facta omnia in Tiberis præterlabentis alveum inani luxus oſtento præcipitarentur, idque non unâ modo, ſed pluribus quoque vicibus, quotieſcunque ſcenicum illud ferculorum & menſarum choragium mutandum foret. Atque iſta parvo conſtitiſſe æſtimandum erat, niſi & alieno ex orbe petitarum immani precio avium, (quos Pſittacos nominamus) ſolæ linguæ variis in patinis conditæ, ultimo ferculo omnem luxus oſtentationem ſuperaſſent* (2). i. e. "Who would not wonder, that a private man "would carry his profuſeneſs to ſuch an exceſs, as "to exhauſt not only one market, but even all the "markets of the whole world? Yet there was ſuch a "man; I mean one Auguſtino Chigi, a Banker at "Rome, who invited Pope Leo X, all the Cardinals, "and

(1) *Relatione della Corte Romana*, fatta dal Signor *Angelo Corraro*, pag. 9. *The Journal of Trevoux for July* 1702, pag. 48. tells us, that Mr. Du Tot Counſellor in the Parliament of Roan, is the Author of the *Relation de la Cour de Rome*. See alſo *il Sindicato di Aleſſandro VII.* pag. 29. edition of 1668.

THE prodigious ſumptuouſneſs of a feaſt.

(2) Hadrianus Junius, *Animadverſ.* lib. 4. cap. 8.

that Julius II, who was very well pleaſed with his Finances, honoured him with a kind of adoption; he ordered, that Auguſtino Chigi and his deſcendants ſhould be conſidered as belonging to the family of the Rovere's. Under Pope Paul III the family of the Chigi's underwent an unhappy revolution, which obliged them to retire from Rome, and to return to Sienna. They had a fine garden upon the Tyber near the palace of the Farneſe's; but this neighbourhood proved fatal to them; for it was neceſſary, in order to beautify that ſeat, to add this fine portion of the Chigi's inheritance to it, and thus to expel the true owners out of it. From this time the Chigi's led a retired life at Sienna till the time of Pope Urban VIII, when Fabio Chigi went to ſeek his fortune at Rome, and ſucceeded ſo well, that he was choſen Pope in the year 1655, upon which he took the name of Alexander VII; he is the ſubject of the following Article. This Pope loaded his relations with riches and honours. MARIO CHIGI, his eldeſt brother, who was made Governor of Rome, did not meddle much with Politics and State-Affairs; but on the other

" and the foreign Miniſters to a Chriſtening entertain-
" ment, which was excedingly ſumptuous. For it
" not only abounded with all ſorts of the moſt choice
" and delicate meats, even to exceſs; but as tho' this
" had not been ſufficient, the plates, diſhes, tankards,
" all of ſilver curiouſly wrought muſt be thrown into the
" Tyber, and that not for once but ſeveral times, and
" at every courſe. And yet, as if this was thought
" to be but a triſle, the tongues only of coſtly birds,
" (we call them Parrots) brought from foreign Coun-
" tries at an exorbitant price, and dreſſed ſeveral ways
" were preſented at the laſt courſe, which thus exceed-
" ed all the former thro' exceſſive ſumptuouſneſs." This Writer makes uſe of the word *Trapezites* a Banker, to expreſs the employment of our Chigi; this is not much better than Mezerai's expreſſion (3).

(3) *Auguſtin Ghiſi, Fermier des Salines du Pape (Jules II) s'en étant plaint à ſa Saintité.* i. e. " Auguſtine " Ghiſi, Farmer " of the Pope's " (Julius II) " Salt-pits, hav- " ing complain- " ed of it to his " Holineſs, &c." Mezerai, *Abregé Chronol.* tom. 4. pag. m. 45. under the year 1510.

They who underſtand Latin will be here entertained with a ſtory, which I met with in Paolo Jovio, and which confirms what we have ſaid of our Chigi's ſumptuouſneſs. It will alſo acquaint the reader, that he had a miſtreſs, to whom he made a preſent of a fiſh's head, which the Cardinal of St. Severino, who owed him a great ſum of money, ſent him. A famous Paraſite of thoſe times traced that head to the houſe of the Courtezan, and ſatisfied at laſt his gluttony, after he had ſoundly tired himſelf with running after this delicate bit. This is very elegantly related in the original; I ſhall tranſcribe the whole paſſage (4). *Eam* (Umbram) *hodie Romani Umbrinam vocant. Capita Umbrarum, ſicuti & Silurorum Trium-viris rei Romanæ conſervatoribus dona dantur, qui piſcatores inveterata quadam conſuetudine eorum Capitum tributi nomine vectigales fecerunt. . . . Extat adhuc in ore quorundam facetorum ridenda fabula de T. Tamiſio, qui Romanis auliciſque ſalibus erat inſignis; ſed gulæ adeò proſtitutæ, ut infamis haberetur. Is quum per ſervum, qui in foro piſcario in eam curam intentus eſſe ſolebat, ingentis Umbræ caput Triumviris delatum eſſe cognoviſſet, in Capitolium protinus aſcendit, ut ſimulato apud Magiſtratum negotio, ſermoneque de induſtriâ protracto, prandium captaret. Verum illud Triumviri jam Riario Cardinali donandam decreverant: ita Tamiſius cum limine curiæ efferri ingenti coronataque patina caput illud nobile conſpexiſſet, primo deceptus conſilio, illud ſubſecutus eſt præmiſſo ſervo, qui veſtigiis deferentium miniſtrorum inſiſteret. Nec multo poſt, cum Riarianis ædibus inferretur, bene habet, ſalva res eſt, inquit Tamiſius, opiparè excipiemur: erat enim imprimis menſæ Riarianæ, quæ longe omnium ſemper lautiſſima fuit, familiaris. At Riarius, ut erat naturæ munificus, maximum, inquit, hoc Triumvirale caput maximo debetur Cardinali, ſtatimque Federico Sanſeverino proceritatis admirandæ Cardinali tranſmittitur. Colligit ex templo togam Tamiſius, Riarium intempeſtivæ munificentiæ incuſans, in mulamque reſilit, & munus ad Sanſeverianam domum conſequitur. Idem pari liberalitate facit Federicus, caputque ipſum ſplendidis exornatum verbis* (5), *auurataque illatum patina Ghiſio publicano ditiſſimo deferri jubet, quod ei multo ære alieno, gravibuſque uſuris obſtrictus erat. Volitat tertia jam ſpe avidam fruſtratus gulam Tamiſius, feſtinabunduſque incaleſcente jam die in Tranſtyberinos hortos, quos ipſe Ghiſius magnificentiſſimos extruebat, contendit: ibique feſſus admodum, & multo ſudore madidus, quod gravis ſit abdominit, quarto a Fortuna decipitur: quippe qui Ghiſium caput illud recentibus floribus redimitum adamato Scorto, cui ob forma, eruditiſque illecebris Imperiæ cognomen fuit, ut extemplo deferretur, curantem reperit. Flectit itaque indignabundus habenas retro, nec tamen ſubiratus gulæ, quæ Herculeos labores attulerat, & ad Imperiam jam multo ſole Sextini pontis ſemitam exurente adequitat. Ad extremum anhelantis gulæ ea vis atque libido fuit, ut qui per totam urbem fuerat ruptatus, idem & togatus & ſenex cum ſcorto admirante novi hominis adventum, nullo pudore diſcubuerit.* i. e. " The Romans call that fiſh now *Ombrina*. It
" is an ancient cuſtom to make a preſent of the heads
" of theſe fiſhes, as well as of the Siluri, to the three
" Magiſtrates, who are ſtiled Conſervators of Rome;
" they require this as a kind of a tribute from the
" Fiſhermen. . . . There is a merry ſtory, which ſome
" facetious people uſe to tell about T. Tamiſius, a
" man eminent for his witty ſayings againſt the Ro-
" mans, and the Courtiers, but infamous for his ex-
" ceſſive gluttony. It happened once, that his ſer-
" vant, who uſed to lurk about the market, told him
" that they had carried the head of a prodigious large
" Ombrina to the Magiſtrates. Up goes Tamiſius to
" the Capitol, feigning ſome buſineſs with the
" Magiſtrates, ſpeaks to them, and ſpins out his
" diſcourſe on purpoſe as long as he can, in
" hopes of being invited to dinner, and to have his
" ſhare of that delicate bit. But the Magiſtrates had
" already deſigned to make a preſent of it to Cardi-
" nal Riario. Tamiſius ſeeing they carried away that
" noble head in a large diſh, and being diſappointed
" in his firſt deſign, ſent his ſervant after the perſons
" that carried it, and followed them himſelf at ſome
" diſtance. He ſoon found that it was brought to
" Cardinal Riario's houſe; whereupon he cried out, all
" is well, we are ſafe, we ſhall have a delicate dinner;
" for he uſed to go and dine familiarly with Riario,
" who kept always the beſt table in Rome. But as
" he was very generous, he ſaid, this great head,
" which the Magiſtrates ſend me, muſt be given to
" the greateſt of the Cardinals, and ſent it immedi-
" ately to Cardinal Frederic St. Severino, a man who
" was exceedingly tall. Tamiſius takes up his cloak,
" railing againſt Riario's untimely generoſity, jumps
" upon his mule, and away he rides after the head to
" St. Severino's houſe. But this Cardinal, who was
" no leſs generous than Riario, ordered the head to be
" adorned with the choiceſt greens, and put in a gilt
" diſh, and ſo carried to Chigi a very rich tax-ga-
" therer, to whom he owed a great ſum of money
" at a very high intereſt. Tamiſius, whoſe gluttony
" was now diſappointed for the third time flies away,
" and makes all the haſte he can, the day beginning
" now to grow very hot, to Chigi's fine gardens be-
" yond the Tiber; he arrived there very much fa-
" tigued and all in a ſweat, for he was a fat and luſty
" man; but fortune again fruſtrated him for the fourth
" time; for he met Chigi giving orders to have the
" head adorned with freſh flowers, and thus to be ſent
" to his miſtreſs, who for her beauty and alluring
" charms was ſurnamed Imperia. Tamiſius went back
" with ſome indignation, tho' not angry with his own
" gluttony, which made him undergo Herculean la-
" bours, and rode to Imperia in the middle of the
" day, when the heat of the ſun rendered the bridge
" Sextinus, over which he was to paſs, burning hot.
" Finally, ſuch was his eager gluttony, that he who
" had run all day thro' the whole city, and was a
" grave and old man, was not aſhamed to dine with
" a proſtitute, who wondered to ſee a ſtranger come
" to her."

(4) Paulus Jovius, *de Piſcibus Romanis*, cap. 5. pag. 49, & ſeq. edit. Frobeniana 1531.

(5) It is thus printed in the Baſil edition, which I quote, and in that of Baſil 1561, 8vo, *apud Henricum Petri*, and in that of Baſil in folio, 1577, *apud Petrum Pernam*, but it is certainly an error of the Preſs, inſtead of *Herbis*.

other hand, he was very eager after gain (*c*), and found out some very effectual means to get money, which made the people exclaim loudly against him. Donna Berenice his wife (*d*), who when she came to Rome was entirely unacquainted with the manners of the Court, became in a short time so well skilled in them, that she could have taught them to others. She had very seldom audience of the Pope, and was put at first upon such a footing, as not to meddle with any affairs but her own; this was owing to the complaints and clamours which still subsisted against Donna Olympia, Innocent X's sister-in-law. FLAVIO CHIGI Don Mario's son was made Cardinal Patron; but he loved his pleasures too much [B], and was still too young to gain any reputation by such a conduct as becomes a Statesman [C]. He did not care to hoard up riches, either because he loved to live nobly, or did not think it worth his while to get his riches for another branch of his family; for he had no brothers. We shall give a more particular account of him in the Remarks. AUGUSTUS CHIGI, Don Mario's brother, left two sons, of whom Pope Alexander VII took a particular care. AUGUSTINO CHIGI who was the eldest, and was designed to be the head of the family, married (*e*) one of the greatest fortunes at Rome; she was niece to Prince Marc Anthony Borghese; had a hundred and

(*c*) *Ne di altro si compiace, che di trovar modi de accumular denari.* Angelo Corraro, *Relazione di Roma*, pag. 15.

(*d*) She was of Sienna, of the Family *della Ciaia.*

(*e*) In the year 1658.

[B] FLAVIO CHIGI . . . *loved his pleasures too much.*] It is not a difficult matter to understand Angelo Corraro's meaning, who with an affected simplicity says, that this Cardinal kept his bed oftener than his youth seemed to require, and that he desired his Physicians not to acquaint the Pope with the reasons of it, lest his Holiness should think, he loved wine and women too much. *Goderebbe assai migliore sanità, se fosse piu temperato nel mangiare, nel che eccede ogni precetto di viver sano con largo e saccoso pasto. Vogliono anco che non sia sobrio quanto dovrebbe ne' piaceri del senso, onde e che piu di quello che dovrebbe aspettarsi dalla sua gioventu, viene obligato al letto. I medici però non reportano al Papa le vere ragioni della sua decumbenza, così avertiti dal Cardinale, acciò sua santità non concepisca sinistra opinione di lui, come di crapulone e incontinente* (6). i. e. "He might have enjoyed a "better health, had he been more temperate in his "eating, not breaking through those rules, which are "necessary to preserve one's health, by too much and "too strong victuals. And tho' he was not as sober "as he ought to have been, yet he would enjoy sen-"sual pleasures; whence it happened, that he was "obliged to keep his bed oftener than might have "been expected from a young man as he was. His "Physicians did not give the Pope the true reason of his "lying a bed, because he had desired them not to do it, "lest his Holiness should conceive an ill opinion of "him, and think him a drunkard and a dissolute "man." Some have asserted that affront, which the Duke de Crequi, French Embassador at Rome, received there (7), was owing originally to some love-intrigue, in which the Cardinal Patron was engaged: Bussi Rabutin has taken this for granted (8), as may be seen in his satyrs. However it be, Cardinal Chigi was in a very ill repute, with regard to venereal pleasures, when he was in France in 1564 (9), and there was an infinite number of ballads made against him, and sung thro' the whole Kingdom. The long sicknesses under which he laboured towards the latter end of his life, and which have been so often mentioned in the news-papers, are but doubtful proofs of the dissolute life he led in his youth. See the Remark [C] of the following article.

(6) Corraro, *Relaz. della Corte Romana*, pag. 16.

(7) In the year 1662.

(8) If he be the Author of the *Amours du Palais Royal*, which he does not own. See at the end of Mr. Bayle's Dictionary, the *Dissertation concerning Libels*, Remark [D].

(9) He went thither *Legate a Latere* to make satisfaction for the affront which the Duke de Crequi had received.

[C] . . . *And he was too young to gain any reputation by such a conduct, as becomes a Statesman.*] Angelo Corraro speaks of him with some contempt in this respect. One could draw nothing from him but mere compliments and promises which proved ineffectual; for which reason Corraro would not apply himself any longer to him, but went directly to the Pope. *De quel che vaglia*, says he (10), *nel negotio non mi dà l'animo d'affermare cosa certa, perche s'egli non sa fare piu di quello che fà, bisogna dire che vaglia poco, già che esso non riportana se non complimenti, gentilezze di concetti, e speranze di voler far assai, che in fine si resolvono in nulla; terminando le risposte in repugnanze trovate in S. S.ta e in qualche motivo delle cause, ò della negativa, à della prolatione. Onde io ho retrovato meglio ne' negozi importanti, andarmene di primo tratto al Papa medesimo, che valermi dell' interpositione del Cardinale.* i. e. "As to his skill in business, I do not design to assert "any thing for certain: but if he cannot do more "than he does, we must needs say that his ability is "not very great; for all that can be got from him is "nothing but compliments, civility attended with witty "sayings and fair promises, which at last came to no-"thing; his excuse being then, that his Holiness "would not give his consent; or find in the na-"ture of the affair in question some reasons either to "refuse it or to put it off for another time. For "which reason I thought it better to go directly to "the Pope himself, in all important affairs, than to "make use of the Cardinal's mediation." He observes that this Cardinal laboured under three or four defects, which rendered him incapable of business. 1. He loved his pleasures too much. 2. He forgot those material circumstances, which were the most proper to make an affair succeed. 3. He was too easily discouraged as soon as he found that any affair did in the least perplex the Pope's mind (11). These are certainly very great obstacles, which will almost constantly prevent the success of any negotiation, with which a person can be intrusted. This Cardinal grew wiser in time, for he supported his credit, and knew how to use it in the Conclaves at the head of those Cardinals, whom his uncle had raised to the purple. But he had been very well provided with money during his uncle's life; and when once a man has plenty of cash, he may intrude himself any where, and speak with authority, and he will never want a party ready to support him. Here follows what has been said of this Cardinal in a Book printed at Amsterdam (12). "There "are in Chigi's faction several Cardinals, who are "proper persons to be raised to the Papal Dignity; "they have at their head Flavio Chigi, a powerful "man who behaved himself with so much policy and "address since the death of his uncle Alexander VII, "that there has been already one Pope chosen, who "was devoted to him, because in the two last Con-"claves he did not insist with too much obstinacy, "to have one of his dependants chosen, but contented "himself with favouring the other factions, as much "as suited with his own interest: but Cardinal Bar-"berini, who did not act with the same policy, could "never get a Pope, who was indebted to him for "his exaltation." The History of the same Conclave, in which Clement IX was chosen, acquaints us, that Cardinal Chigi had no mind that Cardinal Rospiglioni should be chosen Pope; nor could the latter be chosen, till the former had been prevailed upon to give his consent. We read in the History of the Conclave of Clement X (13), that Cardinal Chigi had almost as much power under Clement IX, as he had under Alexander VII. This Cardinal had so much influence in the Conclave, in which Clement X was chosen, that Cardinal d'Este told him one day, *Well, Cardinal Chigi, what business have we here? Why do not you give us a Pope* (14)? And indeed Altieri would never have been chosen, had it not been for Cardinal Chigi's interest. Let us observe by the by, that in the Conclave, in which Clement IX was chosen, Cardinal d'Arach, the head of the Spanish faction, told Cardinal Chigi; *That he was not very well versed in the present affairs; that this was the first Conclave, in which he happened to be, so that he could not have a great experience; and that before he undertook to manage such an important affair, he ought to render himself capable of it* (15).

(10) Angelo Corraro, *Relaz. della Corte Romana*, pag. 17.

(11) *E bene spesso divertito da suoi passo tempi, ò si scorda delle circostanza essentiali dell' affiare, che possono facilitare l'intento, ò cagliia alle prime perplessita che scuopre nel Papa.* Ibid.

(12) *Idée du Conclave present.* (1676) pag. 74.

(13) By Amelot de la Houssaye, pag. 14.

(14) *Mémoires des Intrigues de la Cour de Rome*, printed at Paris in 1677, pag. 19.

(15) *Conclave de Clement XI.* printed at Paris in 1699, pag. 58.

and eighty thouſand crowns for her portion; was beautiful, and had been educated by a Lady of an eminent virtue (*f*). This match would perhaps have never been concluded, had not her uncle died; for though he had received with great civility the firſt propoſals that were offered to him, yet he aſked, what eſtate and dignities would be conferred upon Don Auguſtino. This was wavering, as though he had thought the Pope's alliance alone was not a ſufficient equivalent for the Lady. His Holineſs was not pleaſed with this proceeding; and beſides, the ſon of the Conſtable Colonna courted the young Lady, and ſhe liked him better than ſhe did Don Auguſtino. But Prince Marc Anthony Borgheſe dying, the match was immediately concluded by the interpoſition of the Princeſs of Roſſano [*D*], the Lady's mother. A marriage ſo advantageous on many accounts did not ſettle Don Auguſtino's affections [*E*]. The Pope bought for him the Principality of Farneſe, which is a Fief of the Empire, ſituated in St. Peter's Patrimony, and which coſt him a hundred and ſeventy thouſand crowns. SIGISMOND CHIGI Don Auguſtino's brother received ſeveral large penſions from Pope Alexander VII (*g*), and was made a Cardinal by Pope Clement IX, in the year 1667 (*b*).

(*f*) By her grand-mother.

(*g*) Taken from the *Relation de la Cour de Rome*, written by Angelo Corraro, Embaſſador of Venice, printed at Leyden in 1663. See alſo the *Nepotiſme*, Part 1. lib. 3.

(*b*) *L'Idée du Conclave preſent*, printed at Amſterdam in 1676.

We find in Angelo Corraro's account, which I have quoted, that this family began to raiſe itſelf at the Court of Rome under Pope Julius II; but this is a miſtake; for that family already made a conſiderable figure at Rome under Alexander VI [*F*].

[*D*] *The Princeſs of Roſſano.*] Her name was *Donna Olympia Aldobrandina*. She was the daughter of one of Clement VIII's nephews, and had married to her firſt huſband Prince Borgheſe. This Lady's ambition had been known a great while. She was very young when ſhe was left a widow, and being very beautiful, of a noble family, witty and rich, ſhe was courted by ſeveral Princes; but ſhe preferred Don Camillo Pamphilio before them all, and the reaſon of her choice was, that ſhe might have a ſhare in the government, he being Pope Innocent X's nephew. The ſame reaſon made her chooſe for her daughter the nephew of a Pope rather than the Conſtable Colonna (16). She did it only *per guadegnar l'affetto della caſa pontificia, e per haver parte al Vaticano, che è tutto quello che ſempre hà cercato queſta Signora*, i. e, "to "gain the love of the Pope's family, and to have "ſome credit in the Vatican, which was all that this "Lady ever aimed at." She was very much diſappointed under Pope Innocent X, for inſtead of enjoying a great credit at Court, as ſhe expected from her marriage with Don Camillo, ſhe was obliged to follow him into baniſhment. The inſtruction for the French Embaſſadors at Rome, which is aſcribed to the *Bailli de Valençay*, gives a very bad character of this Lady. "As God reſiſts proud and haughty perſons, thus this "Princeſs Roſſana finds herſelf depreſſed, humbled, "mortified and ſunk from that ſovereign grandeur "and high degree of glory, in which ſhe diſplayed "ſuch a pomp and oſtentation on the Theatre of that "noble and glorious City of Rome. And now, that "ſhe is far removed from that ſtage, ſhe mourns, and "takes no delight but in a ſad and fantaſtic humour, "being never pleaſed with the preſent ſtate of things, "ſhe calls imprudently to mind thoſe that are paſſed "and vaniſhed away long ago, and thoſe which may "happen hereafter. For my part . . . I cannot ima-"gine that this is capable of giving any real and con-"ſiderable trouble . . . , though this Lady ſhould now "confine her ambition within the narrow bounds of "her doors and chambers, inſtead of making it ap-"pear by a ridiculous and ſuperfluous oſtentation, in "every corner, and in all the public places and walks "of the city (17)." The Author of the *Queen of Poland's Voyage* (18), having mentioned *the famous garden of the Aldobrandini's at Freſcati, which is very juſtly called Belvedere*, continues thus (19). *This place is now in the poſſeſſion of Prince Pamphilio the Pope's nephew, lately a Cardinal; as alſo of the Princeſs, heir to the houſe of Aldobrandini, whoſe firſt huſband, Prince Roſſano, the preſumptive heir and only hope of the family of the Borgheſes, died at that ſame place a few days before we arrived* (20), *being not yet twenty two years old, as well as ſhe; he left her with two ſons and two daughters. It is a great happineſs for that Cardinal, that he met ſo ſoon with ſuch an advantageous match, both with regard to riches and beauty; for ſhe is the moſt beautiful Princeſs and one of the moſt witty in the whole country.*

(16) See the book intitled, *Il Nepotiſmo*, Part 1. lib. 3. pag. 143, 193.

(17) See the *Recueil de diverſes Relations des Cours de l'Europe*, Printed at Cologne 1681, pag. 332.

(18) *Le Laboureur, Voyage de la Reine de Pologne*, Part 3. pag. 222.

(19) Ibid. pag. 225.

(20) They arrived July the 18th 1646, and the Author publiſhed his Relation the following year.

[*E*] *Marriage . . . did not ſettle Don Auguſtino's affections.*] His wife had brought him immenſe riches; ſhe was beautiful, had had a very good education, and ſoon gave him children, and yet he muſt go and gratify his deſires abroad; what a ſhame! *Eſſendo la ſpoſa di non ordinarie bellezze, e allevata ſotto la diſciplina dell' Ava, Signora di ſantiſſimi coſtumi, non reſtava che deſiderar piu in queſto genere di contentezze, e gia s'è cominciato à goderne i frutti, havendo la Principeſſa gia dato ſegno di fecundita co'l porto di una figliuola. Non reſta però che il Sig. D. Agoſtino non vada vagando in altri amori, come lo luſinga la ſua natura proclive al guſto del ſenſo, e la facilità di paſcerla quando gliene poſſa mai venir voglia* (21). i. e. "His ſpouſe "was exceedingly beautiful, and had been educated "by her grandmother, a Lady of eminent virtue; ſo "that he ſeemed to have nothing more to wiſh for in "that reſpect to be perfectly ſatisfied; nay he had al-"ready begun to taſte the fruits of his marriage, for "the Lady had given him proofs that ſhe was not "barren, having been delivered of a daughter. And "yet Signor Auguſtino engaged in other amorous in-"trigues, being by his own temper inclined to ſenſual "pleaſures, and having eaſy opportunities to ſatisfy "his deſires whenever he pleaſed." He never was very nice with regard to the love he owed his ſpouſe; for ſoon after his wedding, he could not forbear ſaying, that he was more pleaſed with his marriage, on account of the victory he gained over his rival, than on account of the Princeſs her ſelf, whom he had married. When the Conſtable Colonna heard this, he anſwered, that his ſon courted this Lady, becauſe he deſerved to obtain her, but that Don Auguſtino obtained her by the credit and authority of his uncle the Pope. The Conſtable's ſon married ſome years after a niece of Cardinal Mazarin (22); it was a much better match for him, conſidering the Lady's portion, but it proved an unhappy match; the hiſtory of it has been publiſhed.

(21) Corraro, *Relatione della Corte Romana*, pag. 21.

(22) Taken from a book intitled *Il Nepotiſmo*, Part 1. lib. 3. pag. 194.

[*F*] *This family made a conſiderable figure at Rome under Alexander VI.*] Tomaſo Tomaſi obſerves in the Life of the Duke of Valentinois, that LORENZO CHIGI, a Nobleman of Sienna, was cruſhed under the ruins of a chimney in one of the rooms of the Vatican, which was blown down by a ſtorm on St. Peter's day (23). This ſtorm was like to prove fatal to Pope Alexander VI. The ſame Author adds (24) that when the Duke of Valentinois was making preparations for his expedition into Romagna in the year 1500, *Auguſtino Chigi, Lorenzo's brother, one of the moſt wealthy and ſtately Gentlemen, that were then at Court* (25), *did not only lend him ſome thouſands of crowns, but even went ſo far as to cauſe all his plate, which was very conſiderable, to be melted, and coined into current money.*

(23) Tomaſi, *Life of the D. of Valentinois*, pag. 302.

(24) Ibid. pag. 319.

(25) See the Remark [*A*].

CHIGI (FABIO) born at Sienna February the 16th 1599 (*a*), was Pope under the name of Alexander VII. His family ſeeing he was a hopeful youth ſent him young to Rome, where he ſoon engaged in a friendſhip with the Marqueſs Pallavicini (*b*), which proved very advantageous to him. For the Marqueſs recommended him ſo effectually

(*a*) Angelo Corraro, *Relatione della Corte Romana.*

(*b*) He has been ſince a Jeſuit and a Cardinal.

fectually to Pope Urban VIII, that he ſoon procured him the poſt of Inquiſitor at Malta. Chigi acquitted himſelf of that employment in ſuch a manner as ſhewed that he was capable of greater things; ſo that he was ſent Vice-Legate to Ferrara, and afterwards Nuncio into Germany (*c*). He met with the moſt favourable opportunity that a man in his character can wiſh for, to diſplay his intriguing genius; for he was a Mediator at Munſter in the long conferences which were held in that city in order to conclude a peace with Spain, and acted his part very well [*A*]. Before he went to Munſter he had been Nuncio at Cologne, and was ſent thither again in the ſame quality, when the peace was concluded. He was ſtill in the ſame poſt in 1651, when Cardinal Mazarine retired to the Court of the Elector of Cologne; our Chigi had even orders to complain in the name of Pope Innocent X, a great enemy of Cardinal Mazarin, that the Elector ſuffered his Eminence to raiſe troops (*d*). Cardinal Mazarin had ſome reſentment againſt Fabio Chigi, who ſoon after was made a Cardinal, and Secretary of State by Pope Innocent X; but this reſentment was ſacrificed to political views in 1655, when a Pope was to be choſen. Cardinal Saccheti, Mazarin's good friend, finding it was impoſſible for him to be raiſed into St. Peter's Chair, becauſe of the powerful oppoſition made by the Spaniſh faction, deſired Cardinal Mazarin to conſent to Fabio Chigi's exaltation; his requeſt was granted; and as ſoon as they knew in the Conclave how France was diſpoſed, all the friends of that Court united their votes in favour of Chigi. The flying ſquadron, who looked upon him as their chief man, could not but ſupport his intereſt: the faction of the Medicis, and that of Spain had particular reaſons to give him their votes; ſo that he was elected Pope (*e*) by the votes of all the ſixty four Cardinals, who were in the Conclave (*f*). There are but few inſtances of ſuch an unanimity in the Elections of Popes. Cardinal Chigi merited that day and the following years the encomium which the Duke de Guiſe paſſed on Innocent X. [*B*]. As it was known the day before the election, with what choice the Holy Ghoſt would inſpire the electors the next day, the Cardinals went to wiſh Chigi joy, but he anſwered them only with ſighs and tears (*g*), and begged of them, that they would chooſe better (*b*); afterwards he reſumed his courage, and thanked them for their good will. After the election he was carried, according to cuſtom, to St. Peter's Church, there to receive the Cardinals adoration upon the great altar; he would not be placed in the middle altar, but only on a corner of it, becauſe, he ſaid, he did not judge himſelf worthy to ſit in the place which his predeceſſors had filled. During the whole ceremony of the adoration, he continued proſtrate on the ground, a crucifix in his arms, with very great humility. When he was arrived at his apartment in the Vatican, he ordered, that they ſhould, firſt of all, make the coffin in which he was to be laid after his death, and put it under his bed, that the continual thoughts of death might more and more encourage him to lead a holy life. When they dreſſed him in his pontifical habits, they found a hair-cloth under his ſhirt. Being Pope he continued to faſt twice a week, as he uſed to do when he was but a Cardinal. The next day after his election he rebuked very ſeverely *Signora Olympia*, who was come to wiſh him joy, and told her, it was not decent for a woman to enter the palace of the Head of the Church. He forbid all his relations to come to Rome without his leave (*i*), but the following part of his Pontificate has ſhewed that all this was nothing but diſſimulation and artifice; and ſeveral Roman Catholics have not ſcrupled to complain of his deceitful proceedings. He became in time more favourable to his nephews [*C*], and loaded

(*c*) Angelo Corraro *Relatione della Corte Romana.*

(*d*) *Conclave d'Aleſſandro VII.* See alſo the *Hiſtoire de la Paix des Pyrenées*, by Gualdo Priorato.

(*e*) April the 8th 1655.

(*f*) See the *Conclave of Alexander VII* in Latin by JohnSchwarzkopfius, *apud* Heidegerum, *Hiſtoriæ Papatus*, pag. 404, &c.

(*g*) *Egli da principio pianſe tenendo agl' occhi la mano, e doppo fattoſi animo ringratiava tutti del loro buon affetto.* Conclave de Aleſſandro VII.

(*b*) *Gratulationes excepit Chiſius profuſis lacrymis, ſubinde orans, ut digniorem alium eligerent.* Heidegger, *Hiſt. Papatus*, pag. 406.

(*i*) Ex *Conclavi Alexandri VII, apud* Heidegerum, *Hiſt. Papatus*, pag. 406.

[*A*] *He was a mediator at Munſter . . . and acted his part very well.*] A modern Author obſerves, that the mediation of Denmark, which was at firſt accepted, for the peace of Munſter, having been afterwards rejected by the Swedes, "the whole mediation remained "in the hands of the Pope, and in ſome meaſure in "thoſe of the Republic of Venice: they made uſe of "the ability of Fabio Chiſi and Aloyſio Contarini to "compleat this glorious work. The former had a"mongſt other great talents, that of knowing per"fectly well how to hide his bad qualities, which he "did with ſuch admirable artifice, that the whole "College of the Cardinals did not know them till "they had choſen him Pope. The other was a man "of honour, who had acquitted himſelf in a great "many embaſſies with ſo much glory, that he gained "the reputation of one of the moſt able negotiators of "his time (1)." The Chevalier Angelo Corraro obſerves, that though Fabio Chigi could not ſupport effectually the intereſt of the Catholic Religion, becauſe the Proteſtants had a greater authority than the Catholics in the Aſſembly of Weſtphalia, yet he acquitted himſelf of his duty perfectly well (2), and had even the art not to loſe the regard and eſteem, which the Spaniards and the Imperialiſts had for him, though he had cenſured them very bitterly, for conſenting to a peace, which was ſo detrimental to the Catholic Church.

(1) Wicquefort, *Traité de l'Ambaſſadeur*, tom. 2. pag. 308, 309.

(2) *Fece almeno le parti ſue egregeamente.* Corraro, pag. 11.

[*B*] *He merited the encomium which the Duke de Guiſe paſſed upon Innocent X.*] "The things which "Cardinal Grimaldi told him, and Monſieur de "Fontenai's and the Abbot of St. Nicholas's manner "of negotiating with him, lay very heavy upon his "heart, and grieved him exceedingly; for they pub"liſhed every where, as he ſaid, that he was a de"ceitful knave, who neither could nor ought to be "truſted; this vexed and exaſperated him to ſuch a "degree, that the tears came into his eyes. Yet this "did not move me very much, for I knew perfectly "well, that he had his tears at command, and was a "very great hypocrite (3)."

(3) *Mémoires du Duc de Guiſe*, pag. 6. of the Paris edition, 1681, 12mo.

[*C*] *He became in time more favourable to his nephews.*] There never was a Pope, who better deſerved the Paſquil, *Et homo factus eſt*, i. e. "And was "made man," and who made a better advantage of what is called *Nepotiſm*. It is ſaid, I don't know how truly, that he had ſworn never to receive his relations at Rome, and that finding himſelf bound by his oath, he was perplexed how he ſhould teſtify his friendſhip for his family; but that Cardinal Palavicini removed his ſcruples, by adviſing him to go and receive his relations at ſome leagues diſtance from Rome, and that he gave him to underſtand, that his oath was not, that he would not receive his friends upon the road from Sienna to Rome, but only that he would not receive them at Rome; that the Pope admitting

loaded them with favours, which proved a very great diſappointment to Father Paul's famous adverſary [*D*]. Moreri's aſſertion, that Alexander VII *endeavoured with a truly paternal care to conclude a peace between France and Spain by the marriage* of Lewis XIV with the Infanta, ought to be corrected [*E*]. He was alſo in the wrong to commend him on account of the pyramid, which was ſet up at Rome, after the injury which the Duke de Crequi received from the Corſes *. The Pope does not deſerve any praiſe for the ſatisfaction he made the French on this occaſion; for he did it againſt his will, and only in order to prevent a war, which would ſoon have obliged him to retire from Rome. France was never well convinced of his impartiality with regard to her; nor were the Spaniards

* The Pope's Life-guard.

this witty diſtinction, went to meet his relations, and received them juſt in the middle of the road. Since that time he poured down upon them in full ſhowers all kinds of dignities and benefices. Don Mario his brother was made Governor of the State of the Church; Flavio Chigi Don Mario's ſon was made Cardinal Patron. Sigiſmond Chigi, an orphan, and ſon to another brother of the Pope was loaded with penſions, till he was old enough to be made a Cardinal with ſome decency (4). Auguſtino Chigi (5), who was to be the ſupport of the family, was married to a niece of Prince Borgheſe, a very rich Lady. *Auguſtinum futurum Chiſianæ familiæ columen, cui principis Borgheſii opulentiſſimam conjugem dote centum millium ducatorum, & viginti inſuper millibus duplionum loco margeritarum expenſis, denique ſexaginta millibus duplionum in manus ipſius ſponſi reſignatis impetravit* (6). i. e. "He obtained for Auguſtino, who was to be the ſupport of the family of the Chigi's, a very rich ſpouſe, the niece of Prince Borgheſe: ſhe had a hundred thouſand ducats dowry, beſides twenty thouſand double ducats or piſtoles † in jewels, and threeſcore thouſand depoſited into the bridegroom's hand." A ſon of the Pope's ſiſter (7) was made a Cardinal, and the other, who was a Knight of Malta, was made General of the Gallies. Donna Berenice, Don Mario's wife, and her daughters received alſo very rich preſents (8). Flavio Chigi, who was Cardinal Patron, and had been ſent Legate a Latere into France, to make ſatisfaction for the affairs of the Corſes, expoſed his character very much in the world. He died (9) loaded with riches and titles, being Vice-Dean of the Sacred College, Biſhop of Porto, Arch-prieſt of St. John Lateran, *Preſect* of a Court for diſpatching of the Pope's Bulls, &c. He made Don Livio Chigi his nephew, his chief heir, and left ſix thouſand crowns, with the eſtate he had at Sienna to the Marquiſs Zandedari his brother-in-law, on condition that he ſhould take the name and coat-of-arms of the family of Chigi (10). See the Remark [*B*] of the preceding article.

(4) Heideggerus, pag. 432. aſſerts, *that he obtained the Cardinal's Cap from Alexander VII, at the age of 17, but I find it was not till the year 1667, by Clement IX, Alexander VII's ſucceſſor.*

(5) Sigiſmond's brother.

(6) Heidegger, *Hiſt. Pap.* p. 432.

† This, I think, is the meaning of the Latin word *Duplio.*

(7) She had been married at Sienna to Mr. Bichi.

(8) Heidegger, *Hiſt. Pap.* pag. 432.

(9) September the 13th 1693, at the age of 63.

(10) *Mercure Hiſt.* for October 1693, pag. 364.

[*D*] . . . *Which proved a very great diſappointment to Father Paul's famous adverſary.*] I mean Sforza Pallavicini, the Author of an Hiſtory of the Council of Trent, deſigned to confute that of Father Paul, and for which Pallavicini was rewarded with a Cardinal's Hat. He had prefixed to his Hiſtory a very pompous elogium of Alexander VII, in which he did not ſpare his incenſe with regard to the reſolution, in which the Pope ſtill continued, not to ſuffer that his relation ſhould come to Rome. It is eaſy to gueſs, how many fine things could be ſaid upon ſuch a ſubject, which will abundantly furniſh a good Orator with reflexions for a moſt eloquent panegyrick. But it happened unluckily for father Pallavicini, that the Pope altered his mind, and deſired to raiſe his relations, according to the conſtant practice of Nepotiſm. It is even ſaid that this Father was obliged to remove the doubts and ſcruples of conſcience, which hindered the Pope from following his inclination. After all it was much more advantageous to oblige the Pope and his whole family, than to preſerve a Preface tho' already printed off, how fine ſoever the panegyrick it contained might be. This indeed, could not much pleaſe the Author, yet he was obliged to ſtoop to it, and to ſuppreſs all that had already appeared, and to alter his panegyrick as well as he could. If all this be not true, I am not to anſwer for it, but they from whom the Author I quote, borrowed it. Here follow his own words. *Jamque Cardinalis Pallavicinus in ejus laudes effuſiſſimus Hiſtoriæ Concilii Tridentini galeatum prologum præfixerat, quo Alexandri ceu Angeli ἀκροσωπολήπτου heroicum iſthoc neglecti Nepotiſmi facinus tertium uſque in Cœlum tulit: quem tamen cum res aliùm longè eventum ſortita eſſet, non ſine pudore & impenſarum jactura (plurima enim folia jam impreſſa, laudes has fictitias ebuccinantia, ſupprimi debuerant) ceu abortivum fœtum tollere, & cum neſcio quo Epilogo operis (qui ipſe tamen poſt mortem Alexandri, ſaltem in Latina Editione Baptiſtæ Glattini, omiſſus etiam fuit) commutare neceſſe habuit* (11). We have given the ſenſe of this paſſage, except only the laſt ſentence, in which we are told, "That Pallavi-"cini, inſtead of his fine panegyrick, was obliged to "add a kind of Epilogue or concluſion at the end of "his Book, which Epilogue has yet been left out after "the death of Alexander VII, at leaſt in the Latin E-"dition of Baptiſt Giattinus." This Author alſo aſſerts, that Pallavicini was Confeſſor to Alexander VII, and that he was a Cardinal before the Pope's relations came to Rome: but it is certain, that he was not promoted to the Cardinalſhip, but after his hiſtory was publiſhed; whence it appears from that Author's own account, that the Hiſtorian was made a Cardinal after the Pope had received his family at Rome. I do not believe, that any Pope ever had a Cardinal for his Confeſſor in ordinary, nor that Father Pallavicini ever was Confeſſor to Alexander VII (12), and yet the Author of the *Nepotiſmo* aſſerts it (13); perhaps it is only the better to ſet off the ſtory he intended to relate concerning this Jeſuit's Book. He does not ſay, that the Panegyrick was prefixed to the Hiſtory, but only that the Author had inſerted in ſeveral places ſome hints in praiſe of the Pope, relating to his reſolution, not to give his relations the liberty to come to Rome. There were above twenty ſheets, which contained ſomething of this nature, and which for that reaſon muſt be reprinted. This ſtory ſeems to me more probable than the other.

(11) Heidegger, *Hiſt. Pap.* pag. 431.

(12) In order to be better informed of this, I have conſulted a perſon, who could know it perfectly well, and who anſwered me, that F. Pallavicini never was Confeſſor to Pope Alexander VII.

(13) *Il Nepotiſmo*, Part 1. lib. 3. pag. m. 19 & 176. See alſo *Il Sindicato d'Aleſſandro VII*, pag. 83, &c.

[*E*] *Moreri's aſſertion . . . . ought to be corrected.*] Nothing in the Pyrenean peace drew the public's attention ſo much, as this circumſtance, namely, that it was concluded without the Pope's mediation. There were ſome Cardinals, who gave their vote to Fabio Chigi, only becauſe they hoped *he would do his beſt endeavours to procure a peace between the two Kingdoms* (of France and Spain), *and that he would ſucceed better in it than any other perſon. And yet things took ſuch a different turn* (I quote the words of Galeazzo Gualdo Priorato (14)) *that ſeveral perſons ſaid, this peace was a diſgrace to the Holy See, and that it was cenſured even at Rome. And indeed it was looked upon as an effect of the great care and diligence of the two Prime Miniſters alone, who concluded it at a time when the Pope did no longer labour to procure it, and perhaps did not think any more of it.* I own, that Priorato adds (15), that Alexander VII, in the very beginning of his Pontificate, acquitted himſelf with a great zeal, of the duties of a common Father, in order to prevail upon the two Kings to come to an agreement, and even to make them conſent that the conferences be held at Rome in his preſence. But Priorato alſo ſays, that *when Father Donnelli a Jeſuit, was negotiating the peace with the Pope, by Cardinal Mazarin's order, his Holineſs ſhewed ſuch a diſtruſt and ſuch a coldneſs as was ſufficient to excuſe France, if ſhe did not admit him in the treaty of peace* (16). He was not named in the preamble of the articles of the treaty, which vexed him very much; and *it has even been known, that Cardinal Mazarin was inclined not to mention the Pope at all in the whole treaty.* The miſunderſtanding, which had for ſome time ſubſiſted between them, was encreaſed becauſe the peace had been concluded, without the mediation of the Court of Rome, and this is the reaſon why the Pope was ſorry for this peace: "So that the Cardinal uſed to ſay "ſometimes

(14) Priorato, *Hiſtoire de la Paix*, pag. 119. of the edition of Cologne, 1667.

(15) Ibid. pag. 120.

(16) Ibid. pag. 125.

Spaniards always pleaſed with his conduct [F]. I muſt obſerve, as a very ſingular thing, that it is aſſerted in ſome printed books, that he had once a mind to forſake his Religion, and to turn Proteſtant [G]. The news-papers printed in Holland beſtowed great

" ſometimes in his private converſations, that not-
" withſtanding the comfort he found in the general
" peace, yet he was ſorry to ſee that his Holineſs did
" not rejoice at it; and the Pope in his turn might
" have made uſe of the Spaniſh Proverb, *If the mira-*
" *cle be but done, no matter whether God or the Devil*
" *does it* (17)." Let us conclude from all this, that Moreri did not much reflect upon what he related. If he had read Angelo Corraro's account, he would not have ſo much extolled the aſſiſtance, which the Pope gave to the Venetians for the war of Candia: For the Author of that account complains of two things; 1. That the Pope refuſed all the favours, that might be of ſome uſe in the war againſt the Turks; 2. That he was not in the leaſt zealous to procure a peace between the two Kingdoms. *Chi haverebbe mai penſato, che un Cardinale, che prima anche d'eſſere Cardinale, ſpirava tutto zelo, e monſtrava di languire ſu la conſideratione dello ſtato miſerabile, in che ſi andava reducendo il mondo Chriſtiano con una guerra coſi obſtinata tra le maggiori corone di eſſo, non doveſſe aſſunto al pontificato infervorarſi per la pace univerſale* (18), i. e. " Who
" would have thought, that a Cardinal, who be-
" fore he was a Cardinal was all zeal, and ſeemed to
" ſigh, when he conſidered the wretched condition,
" to which the whole Chriſtian World was likely to
" be reduced, by ſuch an obſtinate war between the
" two moſt powerful Kingdoms, would not have been
" more zealous ſtill to procure a general peace when
" he was Pope?"

(17) Ibid. pag. 124.

(18) Corraro, pag. 13.

[F] *The Spaniards were not always pleaſed with his conduct.*] Mr. de Wicquefort will furniſh me with a proof of this, in the following words: " Don Pedro
" d'Arragon, the Spaniſh Embaſſador at Rome in the
" year 1665, having dropt ſome angry expreſſions a-
" gainſt the Court, which favoured the King of Por-
" tugal with regard to the Churches of that Kingdom,
" Pope Alexander VII, who had been acquainted with
" it, told him that he was a wicked man, and a Mi-
" niſter uncapable to ſerve his Maſter. The Embaſ-
" ſador replied, that the Pope was in the right, to
" accuſe him of negligence and incapacity, ſince he
" condeſcended not to obey the King's orders, when
" they treated, to his prejudice, with the Miniſter of
" Portugal. That the Pope by his reproach upbraid-
" ed him alſo at the ſame time with his good-nature;
" but that he was in the wrong to call him a wicked
" man, ſince he on the contrary could with more ju-
" ſtice ſay, that Fabio Chigi was a wicked man, ſince
" he forced him to execute the orders of the King his
" Maſter, and to deſire the College of the Cardinals to
" conſider, whether it was better for the Holy See to
" do ſomething for four Biſhopricks of Portugal, than
" to hazard an hundred and thirty Biſhoprics and ſixty
" Abbeys in Spain. The Pope told him alſo, that the
" Aſſemblies he held at his houſe, were very danger-
" ous, and might expoſe the City to be plundered.
" The Embaſſador anſwered, that if that were his de-
" ſign, he had only to retire from Rome, with all
" the ſubjects of the King his Maſter, and that they,
" who would remain in the city, not finding where-
" withal to ſubſiſt, would ſoon raiſe the diſturbance,
" which was not to be dreaded from him (19)."

(19) *De l'Ambaſſadeur*, tom. 2. pag. 168.

[G] *It is aſſerted in ſome printed Books, that he had once a mind . . . to turn Proteſtant.*] The Book which acquaints me with this particular is a journey into Switzerland printed in the year 1686 at Geneva, tho' it be ſaid in the title-page, *at the Hague by Peter du Glaſſon.* The Author of this *Journey* is Mr. Labrune, a French Miniſter, who fled into Holland for his Religion. I ſhall quote what he relates concerning the Religion of Alexander VII; this cannot but belong to this Dictionary; if it be true it belongs to this work in as much as it is an hiſtorical work; if it be falſe, it belongs to it as a critical Dictionary. " Fabio
" Chigi was ſent Inquiſitor to Malta, Vice-Legate to
" Ferrara, and laſtly Nuncio to Cologne, when the
" Peace of Munſter was negotiating. The affairs of
" the Princes of Europe were happily brought to a
" concluſion, after a negociation which laſted two
" years, at Munſter and at Oſnabrug. Chigi, who
" had been ſent thither Nuncio from the Pope, and
" who was obliged to converſe every day with the Pro-
" teſtant Princes or with their Miniſters (20), got ſome
" notion of their Religion, and tho' he had publiſhed
" about the ſame time under the fictitious name of one
" *Erneſtus de Euſebiis* that famous *Judicium Theologi-*
" *cum*, in which the Proteſtants are very much abuſed,
" yet he remained convinced, that there is nothing
" heretical in their doctrine. But he did not go far-
" ther. Count Pompey, one of his neareſt relations
" in Italy, opened his eyes entirely. This Count
" lived in Germany upon an eſtate which fell to
" him by his mother's ſide . . . . Chigi . . . . .
" would not return to Rome before he had ſeen
" this relation. . . . He went therefore to him with
" his two nephews, whom he brought with him to
" Cologne, and ſpent the whole winter with his rela-
" tion. . . . They talked of Religion, and after ſeve-
" ral converſations upon that ſubject, they reſolved to
" read the Bible with Mr. Diodati's Notes. The
" Count had already read thoſe learned Notes, and
" even knew by heart the moſt remarkable of them.
" They both made ſeveral reflections, and were ſur-
" prized to find themſelves convinced at every turn.
" They were puzzled what courſe to take, and after a
" mature conſideration . . . they agreed, that the Pro-
" teſtant Religion was true, and Chigi promiſed im-
" mediately to his friend, that he would forſake
" his errors as ſoon as he had given an account of
" his proceedings as Nuncio, and would go and meet
" him again at his houſe, entreating him to abjure
" the Roman Religion immediately, ſince by the grace
" of God he knew the truth and was free. Chigi
" went away with his nephews, firmly determined to
" quit the Court of Rome, and never wrote to the
" Count, but he exhorted him to perform his deſign.
" His journey was longer than he expected, becauſe
" one of his nephews fell ſick, and at laſt died. In
" the mean time Count Pompey made the neceſſary
" preparation to perform his deſign. . . . He went to
" Orange, and there openly profeſſed our Religion.
" He was even ſome time at Nimes, where he made
" himſelf known. This converſion made a great noiſe
" in the world, and even too much; for as he was
" on his return into Germany, he was poiſoned at
" Lyons, where he died. This news vexed Chigi to
" the heart; the Count's death . . . diſappointed all
" his deſigns: he thought that he might have the ſame
" fate; he had no place now where to retire; but
" whilſt he was thus wavering . . . he was made Car-
" dinal and firſt Secretary to the Apoſtolic Chamber.
" This was ſufficient to ſmother in Chigi's heart all
" the principles of truth, which were not yet deeply
" rooted. The ſplendor of the purple dazzled his
" eyes. . . . he was choſen Pope by thoſe artifices
" which all the world has heard of. As ſoon as he
" had been made a Cardinal, he affected to be always
" ſick, he ordered his apartment to be furniſhed all
" in black, and had a coffin, and the head of a dead
" corpſe (21). . . He was a Calviniſt in his heart: in
" vain did he endeavour to hide it in the affair of the
" Janſeniſts, it was eaſily diſcovered notwithſtanding
" all his artifices. During his Pontificate they print-
" ed ſeveral Books in Flanders, in which he was
" charged with hereſy: All the world has ſeen theſe
" Books. Mr. Amiraut had once a converſation with
" the Duke of Longueville at his Grace's ſeat called
" *Du Pleſſis-Belleau* (22), which agrees perfectly well
" with what I have been ſaying. Mr. Amiraut was
" a ſincere man. He related that the Duke, whom
" he had the honour to ſee very often, told him, that
" when he was Plenipotentiary at Munſter on the part
" of his moſt Chriſtian Majeſty, he had been perfectly
" well acquainted with the Pope, (who was in St. Pe-
" ter's Chair when that converſation was held) and
" that he was very much inclined to a Reformation;
" ſo that if the Huguenots would but yield ſomething,
" there never was a fairer opportunity to reunite the
" two parties in the ſame Religion, ſince they might
" be ſure that the Head of the Church would not be
" againſt them."

(20) Mr. de Wicquefort in the 1ſt vol. of his *Ambaſſadeur*, pag. 648. ſays, *that this Nuncio declared, he would not in the leaſt converſe with Heretics, and that he was Mediator only of the Roman Catholic Princes.* Mr. De Wicquefort *calls this* a ſtrange and fantaſtical caprice in Fabio Chigi, and in thoſe who employ'd him. *He oppoſes this conduct to that of* Berilaqua, *Nuntio at the Conferences of Nimeguen, who was ſo far from diſliking to confer with the Miniſters of the Proteſtant Princes and States, that he even offered to make the firſt ſteps in point of civility, if they would but promiſe to anſwer them.* Angelo Corraro *alſo ſays, that Chigi did not in the leaſt converſe with the Proteſtant Embaſſadors.* Con i quali riſpetti egli eſſere Miniſtro di chi era, non potera havere communicatione. *But the Author* del' Sindicato d'Aleſſandro VII, pag. 36. *ſays the contrary.*

(21) Heidegger, *Hiſt. Pap.* pag. 411. *does not mention the Coffin, but with regard to the time, after Chigi's exaltation; and as to the time before that, he only ſays, that Chigi uſed to lye upon the ground, and to faſt twice a week.*

(22) Compare this with the Remark [D] of the Article AMYRAUT; and ſee, whether different facts are not blended together in theſe accounts.

I am

great encomiums upon him [*H*], and acquainted the public, that he did not approve the cruel perſecutons of the Waldenſes in the Principality of Piedmont. People have talked very much of what he ſaid to ſome Proteſtant Gentlemen who would kiſs his toe [*I*]. Some Authors have aſſerted, not without finding ſome myſtery in it, that he was related to the Grand Signior Mahomet IV [*K*]. This particular is much more extraordinary than

I am perſuaded that the Author of this Account will not take it amiſs, if I acquaint my readers with what Mr. Amyraut's ſon told me to clear up this matter. He has aſſured me, that he had not the leaſt knowledge of any converſation, which his father is ſaid to have had with the Duke of Longueville concerning the Nuncio Chigi or Pope Alexander VII. That it is true indeed the Duke had a ſeat three leagues diſtant from Saumur, but that this ſeat was not called *le Pleſſis-Belleau*, but *Monſtrepil-Bellai* (23). When he went to that ſeat he never failed to ſend his compliments to Mr. Amyraut, who on his part went very punctually to pay his reſpects to the Duke, and was always very well received: ſo that his Highneſs muſt be added to the great Lords, who had a great eſteem for this Miniſter (24). Now ſince Mr. Amyraut the ſon never heard any thing of the Duke of Longueville's diſcourſe concerning Pope Alexander VII, we may infer from thence, without the leaſt heſitation, that Mr. Amyraut the father did not learn any ſuch thing in his converſations with the Duke. We have then here an inſtance, which ſhows, how much we ought to miſtruſt thoſe ſtories, which are grounded only upon hear-ſays. I am perſuaded, that by this time the Author of the *Journey into Switzerland* is fully convinced, that a man ought to be carefully upon his guard againſt ſuch ſorts of traditions.

(23) He ſold it to Marſhal de la Meilleraye.

(24) See the Text of the Article AMYRAUT.

[*H*] *The News-Papers printed in Holland beſtowed great encomiums upon him.*] I find this in a Letter which Courcelles (Curcellæus), Profeſſor of the Remonſtrance at Amſterdam, wrote to Sorbiere December the 24th, 1655 (25). *I will not deny*, ſays he, *but Alexander VII deſerved a great part of the commendations, which the public beſtows upon him. The News-Writers at Amſterdam, who are not ſo much uſed to ſing the praiſes of the Popes, as the Gazetteers of Paris often do, have told us ſo many good things of this Pope, that there muſt be ſome truth in them. They have even teſtified, that he diſapproved the cruel manner in which the poor Vaudois have lately been treated in the Valleys of Piedmont, ſaying, that this was not a proper method to bring back thoſe, that go aſtray into the Pale of the Church.* If it be true, that this Pope diſapproved the Duke of Savoy's conduct, the Vaudois have much more reaſon to boaſt of it, than the Reformed in France had to boaſt of the judgment, which Innocent X is ſaid to have paſſed upon the perſecution, which they ſuffered; for this Pope's reſentment againſt the Court of France might alone have made him ſay, that he did not like that method of converting heretics.

(25) It was firſt printed by itſelf in 8vo; and you will find it in the *Præſtantium ac eruditorum Virorum Epiſtolæ Eccleſiaſticæ*, pag. 876. of the folio edition 1684.

[*I*] *People have talked very much of what he ſaid to ſome Proteſtant Gentlemen who would kiſs his toe.*] Sorbiere (26) in his Anſwer to a Letter, in which it had been written to him, that his journey to Rome would make him return to the Proteſtant Church, declared, that he did not meet with any thing at Rome, but what proved very much to his edification, and that notwithſtanding the pomp of that Court, they are all very civil and modeſt. *For my part*, continues he, *I can aſſure you, Sir, that I did not obſerve in any of the Prelates, with whom I had the honour to converſe, ſo much pride and haughtineſs, as is obſervable in ſome Miniſters of our acquaintance, and that in every audience I had of our holy Father, I ſpoke to him with the ſame freedom, as I do to you, ſuch being his goodneſs, that he requires this freedom from all thoſe who approach him. And here I muſt acquaint you with a very remarkable circumſtance, which you will not be ſorry to know. Some time before I left Rome, there were in that city ſome Engliſh Gentlemen, who were deſirous to know by their own experience what I tell you of his Holineſs's affability; they mixed with thoſe, who went to pay their reſpects to the Pope on their knees. The Pope aſked them who they were, and afterwards whether they were not Proteſtants, which they owned. Whereupon his Holineſs told them with a ſmiling countenance,* " Get up then, I will not ſuffer you " to commit, what in your opinion is an act of ido- " latry. I ſhall not give you my bleſſing, ſince you " do not believe me to be, what I am; but I will pray " to God, that he will pleaſe to render you capable of " receiving it."

(26) His Letter is printed with that of Courcelles in 8vo.

A famous Proteſtant Controverſiſt does not relate this ſtory well. Here follow his own words; I take them from page 158 of his Anſwer (27) to a Book of Mr. Brueys. " I muſt refer Monſieur Brueys to a new " convert like himſelf: I mean Sorbiere, who obſerves " ſome where, that ſome Engliſh Gentlemen being at " Rome, had a mind to ſee Pope Alexander VII, to ſa- " lute him and to kiſs his toe. The Pope having been " acquainted that they were Engliſh, *be* (28) aſked them " of what Religion they were. They were afraid, " and ſcrupled to own that they were Proteſtants. But " Alexander VII having removed their fear, they " owned what they were. Whereupon he told them; " conſidering the Religion you are of, your conſcience " will not ſuffer you to do me homage by kiſſing my " toe. I do not receive it as a Temporal Prince of " Rome, which is the only title you acknowldge in " me: I receive it as Jeſus Chriſt's Vicar, and you " do not think me ſuch. I ſhall pray God to convert " you, and I give you my bleſſing; but till you be " enlightened from above, I do not require you to do " any thing out of complaiſance, againſt your Religi- " on and your inclination. I do not know whether " Sorbiere invented this ſtory, to extol Alexander VII's " glory; however that be, theſe are ſentiments which " become an honeſt man, and this is the rule, by " which we ought to conduct our ſelves in matters " relating to Religion." It is eaſily obſerved, by comparing theſe two accounts together, that our Controverſiſt never read Sorbiere's Letter, or at leaſt, that he did not look into it, when he was writing his Anſwer to Mr. Brueys. He had heard the ſtory mentioned, and took upon him to embelliſh it. But this is not prudently done; we ought to miſtruſt our memory. When a ſtory is thus falſified in two circumſtances, firſt that the Engliſh Gentlemen were afraid, ſecondly that the Pope gave them his bleſſing, it may alſo be eaſily falſified in other circumſtances; and it is great odds, if it be not altered in ſome material point. I could make here a great many reflections upon the fate of controverſial Writers, but they would not be in their proper place. When the Author of the *Preſervative* commended the maxims of Alexander VII, he did not foreſee, that he ſhould ſome time be engaged to write upon the ſubject of an erroneous conſcience, and lay down ſuch principles, according to which the Pope would have been very much in the wrong to prevent the adoration of the Engliſh Gentlemen.

(27) It is intitled, *Suite du Preſervatifs contre le Changement de Religion*, at the Hague 1683. It was written by Monſieur Jurieu.

(28) *This be is a Barbariſm* ſays Mr. Bayle; and it is ſo in Engliſh as well as in French; but Mr. Bayle would, no doubt, have paſſed it unobſerved in any other writer, but Mr. Jurieu.

[*K*] *Some Authors have aſſerted, . . . that he was related to the Grand Seignior Mahomet IV.*] As I have not the Book in which this is proved, I can only preſent the reader with the following words of Mr. Heidegger. *Mahometem eo ipſo tempore Imperatorem Turcicum quinto gradu conſanguinitatis ex Alano Moruglio, communi ſtirpe & atavo utriuſque parentis Pontifici & Turcici, peſſimo utique omine contigit, uti quidem Paſtorius in Henninge redivivo, pag. 157, demonſtravit* (29). i. e. " Mahomet, who was then Emperor of the " Turcs, was related to him (Alexander VII) in the " fifth degree of conſanguinity; they being deſcended " from Allen Morugli (Nani Marſili, I ſuppoſe is " meant here) the common ſtock of the two families, " and great grandfather both to the Pope and to the " Grand Seignior, which was a very ill omen, as Pa- " ſtorius ſhews in his *Henning revived*, page 157."

(29) Heidegg. *Hiſt. Papatus*, pag. 413.

I met lately with a Book, in which the relation between Alexander VII and the Grand Seignior is repreſented in a genealogical Table. It is there pretended, that Margaret Marſili, daughter to Nani Marſili, a Nobleman of Sienna, was wife of Soliman, and mother of Selim II, whoſe ſon Amurath III was the father of Mahomet IV. This laſt was the father of Achmet I, who was the father of Amurath IV, whoſe ſon Ibrahim was Mahomet IVth's father. On the other hand Leonardo Marſili, Margaret's brother, had a ſon named

than that which I shall now mention, namely, that Alexander VII was an Author [L]: there is a volume of his Poems extant. He loved the *Belles-Lettres*, and to talk with learned men upon Poetry, History, and Politics. He was very fond of stately buildings; it was not his fault that the City of Rome was not rendered equally beautiful and regular, with regard to the streets, public places, and houses: the misfortune was, that these expences intirely exhausted the Apostolic Chamber, and that the pulling down of several houses, which rendred the streets irregular, ruined the Proprietors of them (*k*). There is something very grand in the plan of the College *della Sapienza* which he finished, and which he adorned with a very fine Library. The Consistorial Advocates drew up a very pompous inscription for him on this occasion (*l*). He died May the 22d 1667, much more regretted by the Jesuits than by the Jansenists.

(*k*) Angelo Corraro, *Relatione di Corte Romana.*

(*l*) Spizelius has given it in his *Dissert. Prælim. Speciminis Bibliothecæ Universalis.* See F. Mabillon's *Musæum Italicum*, tom. 1. pag. 150.

ed Cæsar Marsili, who was the father of Alexander Marsili, and of Laura Marsili the mother of Fabio Chisi, who has been Pope under the name of Alexander VII. The Author to whom I refer (30), quotes Francis Niger's account of the taking of a certain castle in the territory of Sienna; the Corsairs, who plundered that castle about the year 1525, found Margaret Marsili there, and because she was very beautiful, they kept her for Soliman.

(30) Joh. Ulricus Wallichius in *Tractatu de Religione Turcica, Mahometis Vita, & Orientalis cum Occidentali Antichristo comparatione*, pag. 329, & *seq.*

[L] *Alexander VII was an Author.*] The most beautiful edition of his Latin Poems is that which was printed at the Louvre in the year 1656, *in folio*; it contains epic, elegiac and lyric Poems; these last are in greater number than the former. It also contains a Tragedy intitled *Pompey*; the Author composed it towards the end of the Campain in 1621. He took Seneca for his model, as well with regard to the whole order and disposition of the Drama, as to the measure of the verse. There is a letter prefixed to this collection, which acquaints us, that the Author could hardly be prevailed upon to print his Poems, and would not suffer that they should be published under his name, or with any other title, but such an one as might hint they were the production of his younger years (31). And yet he did not make them all in his youth; for there are a great many pieces, which he wrote when he was grown a man, and in great employments. It is worth the while to read the pages 65 and 66 of Mr. Kortholt's (32) Treatise *de Poetis Episcopis*, (of Poets who were Bishops). Printed at Kiel in 1699. Borrichius observes, that Pope Urban VIII had more talents for Poetry, both natural and acquired by study, than Alexander VII, but that the latter laboured his Poems more carefully than the former (33). He finds something harsh and rough in the epic verses, in which he describes his journey from Rome to Ferrara, from Ferrara to Cologne, and from Malta to Rome. This is but a part of his description of his journeys; for he also describes that from Cologne to Munster, from Munster to Aix-la-Chapelle, from Aix-la-Chapelle to Treves, &c. If all the praises, which the Authors of poetical Elogiums (34) bestowed upon this Pope's Poems, were well grounded, we should be forced to acknowledge, that he was the most accomplish'd Poet that ever was. But as they were in the number of those Poets, who lived at Rome under this Pope, we ought not to lay too much stress upon their encomiums (35). I dare not assert, that he was the Author of a work, which was published in 1646, with this title, *Judicium Theologicum super quæstione, an pax, qualem desiderant Protestantes, sit secundum se illicita. . . . Opera ac studio Erneſti de Eusebiis*, i. e. "The opinion of "a Divine upon this question, whether a peace, such "as the Protestants desire, be in its own nature unlawful. By Ernest Eusebius." I only think, that it was printed by his orders and directions. He endeavoured to prove in this piece, that such a peace, as the Protestants insisted upon, was so detrimental to the Catholic Church, that the Emperor could not with a safe conscience consent to it. But all these Remonstrances proved unsuccessful. They were obliged to grant to the Protestants a thousand things, which vexed the Court of Rome exceedingly, and against which the Nuncio Chigi protested with a terrible passion, shaking off the dust of his feet. The Pope thundered out a Bull in the same style against the Peace of Munster; but all this was only time and paper lost. I must observe in this place, that there are in the Library of Cardinal Chigi several manuscripts adorned with Notes in Alexander VII's own hand, and a very large collection of authentic Acts and Records drawn up and compiled by this Pope; which shews how much he applied himself to study (36). The Book, in which I have read this (37) acquaints me with another particular, which shews this Pope's inclination for learning. He had invited to Rome three Dutch Booksellers, who imposed upon him in a very base manner, with regard to the Polyglot Bible of Paris; for they made him believe it was a new edition, which they undertook under his protection and in honour to him; they printed a new title to it, with a Dedication as full of flattery, as tho' true Roman Catholics had wrote it. But they could not hide their artifice a long time. *Ab ultimis Belgarum Urbem Dominam, sedem vestram Romanam divinarum literarum sarcina instructi magis quam onusti, multiplici sanctitatis vestræ* ILLICIO, *ceu potentiore quodam magnete fortiter suaviterque* PROTRACTI, *anhelis non tam fatigatione, quam exultatione animis passibusque subintramus desideratissime terris & nobis, Pontifex maxime* (38). The new title was, BIBLIA ALEXANDRINA HEPTAGLOTTA, *Auspiciis S. D. Alexandri VII anno sessionis ejus XII feliciter inchoato.*

(31) The title is *Philomathi Musæ juveniles.*

(32) Sebastian.

(33) Borrich. *de Poet. Lat.* pag. 108.

(34) They are printed at the end of the edition of *Philomathi Musæ Juveniles.*

(35) *See* Baillet, *Jugem. sur les Poetes*, tom. 5. num. 1506, and 1527.

(36) *See* Mabillon, *Musæum, Ital.* tom. 1. pag. 94.

(37) Mabillon, ibid. pag. 99.

(38) Idem, ibid.

CHILLINGWORTH (WILLIAM) (*a*), an eminent Divine of the Church of England, was son of William Chillingworth Citizen, and afterwards Mayor of Oxford, and was born in St. Martin's parish there in October 1602, and on the last of that month received baptism there (*b*). William Laud, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, and then Fellow of St. John's College, and Master of Arts (*c*), was his godfather (*d*). He became a Scholar of Trinity College under the tuition of Mr. Robert Skinner June 2d 1618, being then about two years standing in the University; and going thro' with ease the classes of Logic and Philosophy was admitted Master of Arts in the latter end of 1623, and Fellow of his College the 10th of June 1628 (*e*). "He was then, says "Mr. Wood (*f*), observed to be no drudge at his study, but being a man of great parts "would do much in a little time, when he settled to it." He did not confine his studies to Divinity, but applied himself with great success to Mathematics; and what shews the extent of his genius, he was esteemed likewise a good Poet (*g*) [A]. His intimate friends were Sir Lucius Cary, afterwards Viscount Falkland; Mr. John Hales of Eton, &c. but more particularly Mr. Gilbert Sheldon, who succeeded Dr. Juxon in the See of Canterbury

(*a*) We have a very accurate account of this great man by Mr. Des Maizeaux in his *Historical and Critical Account of the Life and Writings of William Chillingworth, Chancellor of the Church of Sarum*, printed at London 1725, in 8vo.

(*b*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 40. 2d edit. Lond. 1721.

(*c*) *Diary of the Life of Archbishop Laud*, published by Mr. Wharton, pag. 1, 2.

(*d*) Wood, col. 42.

(*e*) Idem, col. 40.

(*f*) Ibid.

(*g*) Des Maizeaux, *ubi supra*, pag. 2.

[A] *He was esteemed likewise a good Poet.*] Sir John Suckling mentions him in his *Sessions of the Poets* (1).

There Selden, *and he sate hard by the chair*;
Weniman *not far off, which was very fair*;
Sands *with* Townsend, *for they kept no order*;
Digby *and* Shillingsworth *a little further.*

(1) *Fragmenta aurea.* A Collection of all the incomparable pieces written by Sir John Suckling, &c. Lond. 1646, pag. 7.

Canterbury in 1663 (*b*). The ſtudy and converſation of the Univerſity Scholars at that time turned chiefly upon the controverſies between the Church of England and that of Rome; and the great liberty, which had been allowed the Popiſh Miſſionaries in the latter end of the reign of King James I, being continued under King Charles I, upon the account of his marriage with Henrietta, daughter (*i*) to Henry IV of France, there was among them a famous Jeſuit, who went under the name of *John Fiſher* (*k*), and was very buſy in making converts, particularly at Oxford; and attacking Mr. Chillingworth upon the neceſſity of an infallible living judge in matters of faith [*B*], the latter forſook the Communion of the Church of England, and with an incredible ſatisfaction of mind embraced the Romiſh Religion, and ſoon after wrote a letter to his friend Mr. Gilbert Sheldon [*C*], wherein he recommended to his conſideration the chief arguments which had prevailed with himſelf, and invited him to follow his example. Mr. Fiſher, in order to ſecure his conqueſt, perſuaded Mr. Chillingworth to go over to the College of the Jeſuits at Doway; and the latter was deſired to ſet down in writing the motives or reaſons, which had engaged him to embrace the Romiſh Religion. But Dr. Laud, then Biſhop of London, hearing of this affair, and being extremely concerned at it, wrote to him, and Mr. Chillingworth's anſwer expreſſing a great deal of moderation, candour, and impartiality, that Prelate continued to correſpond with him [*D*], preſſing him with ſeveral arguments againſt the doctrine and practice of the Romaniſts. This ſet Mr. Chillingworth upon a new enquiry, which had the deſired effect. But the place where he was not being ſuitable to the ſtate of a free impartial inquiry, he reſolved to come back to England, and left Doway in 1631, after a ſhort ſtay there (*l*). Upon his return to England he was received with great kindneſs and affection by Biſhop Laud, who approved his deſign of retiring to Oxford, (of which that Prelate was then Chancellor,) in order to complete the important work, in which he was engaged, a free inquiry into Religion (*m*). At laſt after a thorough examination, the Proteſtant principles appearing to him the moſt agreeable to the Holy Scripture and Reaſon, he declared for them (*n*); and about the year 1634 wrote a confutation of the motives which had induced him to go over to the Church of Rome [*E*]. As in his forſaking the Church of England, as well as in his return to it, he was ſolely influenced by a ſincere love of truth, ſo he conſtantly perſevered in that divine temper of mind; and even after his return to Proteſtantiſm, he made no ſcruple to examine the grounds of it, as appears by a letter of his to Dr. Sheldon *containing ſome ſcruples* he had *about leaving the Church of Rome, and returning to*

(*b*) Idem, pag. 3.

(*i*) There is an error of the preſs in Mr. Des Maizeaux's *Life of Mr. Chillingworth*, pag. 3. where ſhe is called *ſiſter* to Henry IV.

(*k*) His true name was *John Perſe* or *Percey*. See *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jeſu. Opus.. recognitum & productum ad annum Jubilæi 1675 à Nathanaele Sotvello ejuſdem Societatis Presbytero*, pag. 487, 488. edit. Romæ 1676.

(*l*) Des Maizeaux, pag. 9.

(*m*) Idem, pag. 13.

(*n*) Idem, pag. 14, 15, 16.

[*B*] *Attacking Mr.* Chillingworth *upon the neceſſity of an infallible living Judge in matters of Faith.*] Mr. Des Maizeaux obſerves (2), that "this hath always "been the darling topic of the Romaniſts, and is "perhaps the ſtrongeſt battery they can raiſe againſt "the Proteſtants (3)." Mr. Chillingworth found himſelf unable to anſwer the arguments of the Jeſuit, nor could he be ſatisfied with the ſolutions which were given him by thoſe of our learned Divines, to whom he propoſed the ſaid arguments. And being among other things convinced of the neceſſity of an infallible living judge of controverſies, he was eaſily brought to believe, that this infallible judge was in the Church of Rome, and that therefore the Church of Rome muſt be the true Church, and the only Church, in which men could be ſaved (14).

(2) *Hiſtorical and Critical Account of the Life and Writings of William Chillingworth, Chancellor of the Church of Sarum*, pag. 6, 7.

(3) Mr. Armand de la Chapelle, in his *Biblioth. Angloiſe*, tom. 13. Part 2. pag. 445. had made ſome Reflections upon this paſſage of Mr. Des Maizeaux.

(4) Des Maizeaux, pag. 7.

[*C*] *Wrote a Letter to his friend Mr.* Gilbert Sheldon.] It was as follows (5): "Good Mr. Sheldon. "Partly mine own neceſſities and fears, and partly "charity to ſome others, have drawn me out of London into the countrey. One particular cauſe, and "not the leaſt, was the news of your ſickneſs, which "had I found it had continued with you with any "danger, no danger of my own ſhould have kept me "from you. I am very glad to hear of your recovery, but ſorry that your occaſions do draw you ſo "ſuddenly to London. But, I pray, leave a direction "with Charles Green, where you may be ſpoken "with, and how I may ſend to you, and you ſhall "very ſhortly hear further from me. Mean while "let me intreat you to conſider moſt ſeriouſly of theſe "two quæries: I. *Whether it be not evident from Scripture, and Fathers, and Reaſon, from the goodneſs of God, and the neceſſity of mankind, that there muſt be ſome one Church infallible in matters of Faith?* "II. *Whether there be any other ſociety of men in the world, beſides the Church of Rome, that either can upon good warrant, or indeed at all challenge to itſelf the privilege of infallibility in matter of Faith?* "When you have applied your moſt attentive conſideration upon theſe queſtions, I do aſſure myſelf "your reſolution will be affirmative in the firſt, and "negative in the ſecond. And then the concluſion "will be, that you will approve and follow the way, "wherein I have had the happineſs to enter before "you, and ſhould think it infinitely increaſed, if it "would pleaſe God to draw you after. I reſt your "aſſured friend, &c."

(5) Idem, pag. 7, 8.

[*D*] *That Prelate continued to correſpond with him.*] The Archbiſhop in his ſpeech before the Lords on the firſt day of his tryal, March the 12th 1643, appealed to the letters, which paſſed between him and Mr. Chillingworth, in order to vindicate himſelf from the charge of Popery. *Mr.* Chillingworth's *learning and abilities*, ſays he (6), *are ſufficiently known to all your Lordſhips. He was gone and ſettled at Dowaye. My letters brought him back, and he lived and died a Defender of the Church of England. And that this is ſo, your Lordſhips cannot but know; for Mr.* Pryn *took away my letters, and all the papers which concerned him, and they were examined at the Committee.* Theſe letters are ſuppoſed to be loſt. For the Archbiſhop's papers being taken from him by Mr. Prynne purſuant to an Order of the Houſe of Commons, Mr. Prynne kept them till after the Reſtoration, when, by Order of the King in Council, they were delivered to Dr. Sheldon, Archbiſhop of Canterbury. But * *very few of thoſe papers, which* Prynne *had publiſhed in ſeveral pamphlets and Books, came to Archbiſhop* Sheldon's *hands. And not a few, even of thoſe which had not been publiſhed, were found wanting. Particularly the Papers of Archbiſhop Laud concerning the converſion of his godſon, Mr.* William Chillingworth, *which the Archbiſhop ſays were taken away from him by Mr.* Prynne, *and being by him produced at the Committee for drawing up his charge, were there examined.*

(6) *Hiſtory of the Troubles and Tryal of William Laud, &c.* pag. 227.

* Mr. Wharton in his *Preface* to the *Hiſtory of the Troubles and Tryal of William Laud, &c.*

[*E*] *About the year* 1634 *wrote a confutation of the motives, which had induced him to go over to the Church of Rome.*] He did not think proper to publiſh it for ſome particular reaſons (7). This paper is now loſt. It is true we have a paper of his on the ſame ſubject; but it ſeems to be written upon ſome other occaſion, probably at the deſire of his friends. In this paper he demonſtrates the fallacy of the arguments, which had moſt prevailed with him to change his Religion. It was firſt publiſhed in 1687 in 4to. in the *Additional Diſcourſes of Mr. Chillingworth.*

(7) Des Maizeaux, pag. 17.

to the Church of England. Theſe ſcruples, which he freely declared to his friends, ſeem to be the occaſion of a groundleſs report, that he had turned Papiſt a ſecond time, and then Proteſtant again (*o*). His return to the Proteſtant Religion making a great deal of noiſe, he was engaged in ſeveral diſputes with thoſe of the Romiſh Religion [*F*], and particularly with Mr. John Lewgar, Mr. John Floyd a Jeſuit, who went under the name of Daniel, or Dan. a Jeſu, and Mr. White. But in 1635 he was engaged in a work, which gave him a far greater opportunity to confute the principles of the Church of Rome, and to vindicate the Proteſtant Religion, and which was printed in 1637 under the title of, *The Religion of Proteſtants a ſafe Way to Salvation; Or an Anſwer to a Book intitled,* Mercy and Truth, or Charity maintained by Catholics [*G*]. While he was about this work, he wrote a Letter to one of his friends, who had deſired to know what judgment might be made of Arianiſm from the

(o) Idem, pag. 18. and Remark [*F*].

[*F*] *Engaged in ſeveral diſputes with thoſe of the Romiſh Religion, &c.*] Mr. Lewgar, a great zealot for the Church of Rome, and one who had been an intimate friend of our Author, as ſoon as he heard of his return to the Church of England, ſent him a very angry and abuſive letter, to which Mr. Chillingworth returned an anſwer full of love and charity, which for its excellency hath been often printed. Mr. Lewgar could not help being touched with the letter, and deſired to ſee his old friend again; and Mr. Chillingworth had a diſcourſe with him about Religion before Mr. Skinner and Dr. Sheldon (8). He had likewiſe a diſpute with Mr. Daniel, a Jeſuit, wherein he diſproves the infallibility of the Church of Rome by an argument taken from the contradictions which are contained in the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation (9). He had another with a Gentleman, whom he does not name, in which he confutes the ſame infallibility, by proving, that either the preſent Church of Rome errs in offering *tapers* and *incenſe* to the Virgin Mary, or that the antient Church of Rome did err, in condemning as Heretics the Collyridians, for offering a cake to her (10). He wrote likewiſe a paper to demonſtrate, that the doctrine of infallibility, the main point of the Romiſh Votaries, is neither *evident of itſelf*, nor grounded upon *certain and infallible reaſons*, nor warranted by any paſſage of the *Scripture* (11). And in two other papers he ſhews that the Church of Rome hath formerly erred; firſt, by admitting of infants to the Euchariſt, and holding that without it they could not be ſaved (12); and ſecondly, by teaching the doctrines of the *Millenaries*, viz. that before the world's end Chriſt ſhould reign upon earth for a thouſand years, and that the Saints ſhould live under him in all holineſs and happineſs (13); both which doctrines are condemned as falſe and heretical by the preſent Church of Rome. He wrote alſo a ſhort letter, in anſwer to ſome objections put to him by one of his friends; wherein he ſhews, that neither the Fathers, nor the Councils are infallible witneſſes of tradition; and that the infallibility of the Church of Rome muſt firſt of all be proved from the Scripture (14). He wrote likewiſe an *Anſwer* to ſome Paſſages in the *Dialogues*, publiſhed under the name of *Ruſhworth*. The occaſion was this. The Lord Digby, afterwards Earl of Briſtol, deſired Mr. Chillingworth to meet Mr. White, the true Author of theſe Dialogues, at the lodgings of Sir Kenelm Digby, a late convert to the Church of Rome. The Lord Digby was there himſelf. Their conference turned upon *Tradition*; and as Mr. White had treated the ſame matter in his Dialogues, which were not yet publiſh'd, Mr. Chillingworth, probably at the requeſt of the Lord Digby, ſelected out of them ſome paſſages, relating to that ſubject, and confuted them (15).

(8) See the *Conference between Mr. Chillingworth and Mr. Lewgar*, in the *Additional Diſcourſes of Mr. Chillingworth never before printed.* London 1687, in 4to, pag. 1, &c.

(9) Ibid. pag. 41.

(10) Ibid. pag. 41.

(11) Ibid. pag. 26.

(12) Ibid. pag. 68.

(13) Ibid. pag. 80.

(14) Ibid. pag. 90, &c.

(15) Ibid. pag. 103. *See* Des Maizeaux, pag. 40, 42, 43.

[*G*] *In* 1635 *he was engaged in a Work... printed in* 1637 *under the title of,* The Religion of Proteſtants a ſafe way of Salvation &c.] A Jeſuit, who went by the name of *Edward Knott*, tho' his true name was *Matthias Wilſon* (16), had publiſhed in 1630 in 8vo. a little Book, called, *Charity miſtaken, with the want whereof Catholics are unjuſtly charged: for affirming, as they do with grief, that Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroies ſalvation.* This was anſwered by Dr. Potter, Provoſt of Queen's College in Oxford; and his Anſwer came out in 1633 with this title; *Want of charitie juſtly charged on all ſuch Romaniſts, as dare (without truth or modeſty) affirme, that Proteſtancie deſtroyeth ſalvation. In anſwer to a late Popiſh Pamphlet intitled,* Charity miſtaken &c. The Jeſuit replied in 1634 this title: *Mercy and Truth. Or Charity maintayned by Catholiques. By way of Reply upon an anſwere lately framed by D. Potter to a Treatiſe, which had formerly proved,* that Charity *was* miſtaken *by Proteſtants: with the want whereof Catholiques are unjuſtly charged for affirming, that Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroyes* Salvation. *Deuided into two parts.* Mr. Chillingworth undertaking to anſwer that Reply, and Mr. Knott being informed of his deſign, reſolved to prejudice the public both againſt our Author and his Book, in a Libel, intitled, *A Direction to be obſerved by N. N. if hee meane to proceede in anſwering the Booke, intitled,* Mercy and Truth, *or* Charity maintained by Catholicks &c. printed in 1636 in 8vo. pagg. 42. *permiſſu Superiorum.* In this Piece he repreſents Mr. Chillingworth as a *Socinian.* Mr. Chillingworth's Anſwer was very near finiſhed in the beginning of the year 1637 (17), and having been examined at Archbiſhop Laud's requeſt by Dr. Prideaux, afterwards Biſhop of Worceſter, Dr. Baylie, Vice-Chancellor of the Univerſity of Oxford, and Dr. Fell, Lady Margaret's Profeſſor in Divinity, it was publiſhed with their approbation in the latter end of that year with this title: *The Religion of Proteſtants a ſafe way to Salvation: Or an Anſwer to a Booke entitled,* Mercy and Truth, or Charity maintained by Catholiques, *Which pretends to prove the contrary. By* William Chillingworth *Maſter of Arts of the Univerſity of Oxford.* This Book was received with a general applauſe; and what perhaps never happened to any other controverſial Work of that bulk, two Editions were publiſhed within leſs than five months (18); and it hath been reprinted many times ſince the Reſtoration (19). On the other hand Mr. Knott ſeeing that he had not been able to deter our Author from publiſhing his anſwer, tried once more to prejudice the public againſt it, wherein he was ſeconded by ſome Jeſuits. For in 1638 Mr. Knott publiſhed a Pamphlet, intitled, *Chriſtianity maintained. Or a Diſcovery of ſundry Doctrines tending to the overthrowe of the Chriſtian Religion: contayned in the anſwere to a Book, entitled,* Mercy and Truth, or Charity maintayned by Catholiques (20). In this Piece (21) he promiſes a larger volume in anſwer to Mr. Chillingworth. To this Pamphlet is ſubjoyned a little Piece, printed the ſame year and at the ſame place, under the title of, *Motives maintained. Or a Reply unto M.* Chillingworth's *Anſwere to his own* Motives *of his Converſion to the Catholicke Religion* (22). The next Pamphlet againſt our Author was alſo printed at St. Omer in 1638, with this title; *The Church Conquerant over human wit. Or the Churche's authority demonſtrated by M.* William Chillingworth *(the Proctour for wit againſt her) his perpetual contradictions, in his Booke entituled,* The Religion of Proteſtants a ſafe way to Salvation (23). The Author was a Jeſuit called John Floyd (24), who in 1639 publiſhed likewiſe another piece, intitled; *The totall Summe: or no danger of Damnation unto Roman Catholiques for any errours in Faith: Nor any hope of Salvation for any Sectary whatſoever that doth knowingly oppoſe the Doctrine of the* Roman *Church. This is proved by the confeſſions and ſaying of M.* Chillingworth *his Book* (25). The third and laſt Pamphlet, which appeared againſt Mr. Chillingworth, was printed in 1639 at St. Omer, as Mr. Des Maizeaux ſuppoſes (26), and intitled: *The Judgment of an Univerſity-Man concerning M.* William Chillingworth *his late Pamphlet, in Anſwere to* Charity maintayned (27). It was written by Mr. William Lacy, a Jeſuit (28). To this piece is ſubjoined another, intitled, *Heautomachia. Mr. Chillingworth againſt himſelf* (29). It hath no title-page nor preface, being the ſequel of the other, and printed at the ſame time. The ſtyle is alſo the ſame. In 1652 nine years after our Author's death Mr. Knott publiſhed a large

(16) *Bibliotheca Patrum Societatis Jeſu*, pag. 185.

(17) Des Maizeaux, pag. 136.

(18) Idem, pag. 220.

(19) Idem, Remark [*II*]. pag. 220-228.

(20) Printed at St. Omer's in 4to, pag. 86.

(21) Preface, pag. 11.

(22) Pagg. 24.

(23) In 4°, pagg. 193.

(24) Des Maizeaux, Remark [*LL*], pag. 233, *& ſeqq.*

(25) In 4to pagg. 104.

(26) Pag. 240.

(27) In 4to, pagg. 158.

(28) Des Maizeaux, Remark [*MM*] pag. 241, *& ſeqq.*

(29) Pagg. 46.

the ſenſe of Antiquity [*H*]. In the year 1635 Sir Thomas Coventry, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, offering him preferment, Mr. Chillingworth refuſed to accept it on account of his ſcruples with regard to the ſubſcription to the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England (*p*), and wrote a Letter upon this ſubject to Dr. Sheldon [*I*]. However at laſt

(*p*) Idem, pag. 57, 58, 59, 60.

large Anſwer to him intitled, *Infidelity unmaſked. Or the Confutation of a Booke publiſhed by Mr. William Chillingworth, under this title,* The Religion of Proteſtants a ſafe way to Saluation (29).

(29) Printed in Gant 1652 in 4to, pagg. 949. beſides the Preface and the Index.

[*H*] *Wrote a letter to one of his friends, who had deſired to know what judgment might be made of Arianiſm from the ſenſe of antiquity.*] The original letter is at preſent in the Library of the Royal Society, and is as follows: " Deare Harry (30), I am very " ſorry it was my ill fortune not to ſee the day that " I went out of Oxford: otherwiſe I ſhould haue " thanked thee very heartily for the favour thou didſt " the night before, eſpecially for Mr. Coventryes com- " pany and diſcourſe, whoſe excellent wit I doe very " much admire, and had I ſo much intereſt in him " as you have, I ſhould deſire him often (though I " hope I need not) to remember what our Saviour " ſayes, *To whom much is given, of them much ſhall* " *be required.* Mr. Taylor did much confirme my " opinion of this ſufficience; but let mee tell you in " your eare—meethinks he wants much of the ethicall " part of a diſcourſe, and ſlights too much many times " the arguments of thoſe he diſcourſes with. But " this is a fault he would quickly leaue, if he had a " friend that would diſcreetly tell him of it. If you " or Mr. Couentry would tell him, that you heard " one, that knowes him, magnifye him exceedingly " for other thinges, but cenſure him for this, you " might doe him a very friendly office; and my writ- " ing to you thus much giues you grownd enough to " ſay ſo truely; but you muſt not giue the leaſt ſuſpi- " cion that I am the man, and therfore not doe it yet " a good while. When Dr. Sheldon comes to Oxford, " I will be there again, and then will be very ready " to doe any ſeruice in the buſineſſe you imparted to " mee. I was miſtaken in my directing you to Euſe- " bius for the matter you wott of. You ſhall find it in " a witneſſe much farther from exception herein than " Euſebius, euen Athanaſius himſelfe, the greateſt ad- " uerſary of that doctrine, and Hilary who was his " ſecond. See the firſt in *Ep. de Synodis Arim. & Se-* " *leuc.* p. 917. *D. Tom. I.* Edit. Paris 1627. See the " ſecond, *de Synodis*, fol. 97. In the firſt, you ſhall " find that the eighty Fathers, which condemned Sa- " moſatenus, affirmed expreſſely,—That *the Sonne is* " *not of the ſame eſſence of the Father:* which is to " contradict formally the Councell of Nice, which " decreed *the Sonne coeſſentiall to the Father.* In the " ſecond you ſhall find theſe wordes to the ſame pur- " poſe, — *Octoginta Epiſcopi olim reſpuerunt τὸ Ho-* " *mouſion.* See alſo if you pleaſe, Juſtin, *cont. Tryphon.* " p. 283, 356, 357. Tertull. againſt Praxeas, c. 9. " Novatian *de Trin. in fine*, who is joined with Ter- " tullian. Athanaſ. *Ep. de Fide Dion. Alex.* Tom. I. " p. 551. Baſil. T. 2. p. 802, 803. *edit. Paris* " 1618. See St. Hieron, *Apol. 2. contr. Ruffinum*, T. " 2. p. 329. *Paris* 1579. See Petavius upon Epiph. " his *Panar. ad Hær.* 69. *quæ eſt Arij.* p. 285; and " conſider how well he cleares Lucian the Martyr " from Arianiſme, and what he there confeſſes of all the " ancient Fathers. If you could underſtand French, I " would referre to Perron, p. 633 of his reply to King " James; where you ſhould find theſe wordes: *If a man* " *ſhould demand of any Arrian, if he would ſubmitt to* " *the judgment of the ages præcedent to that of Conſtan-* " *tine and Marcian, he would make no difficulty of it,* " *but would preſſe himſelf that the controverſye might be* " *decided by that little which remaines to us of the Au-* " *thors of that time. For an Arrian would find in Ire-* " *næus, Tertullian, and others, which remaine of thoſe* " *ages,—That the Sonne is the Inſtrument of the Father;* " *That the Father commanded the Sonne in the works of* " *Creation; That the Father and the Sonne are* aliud " & aliud: *which thinges he that ſhould now hold,* " *now when the language of the Church is more exa-* " *mined, would be eſteemed a very Arrian.* If you read " Bellarmine touching this matter, you ſhould find " that he is troubled exceedingly to find any tolerable " Gloſſes for the Speeches of the Fathers before the " Councell of Nice which are againſt him; and yet " he conceals the ſtrongeſt of them; and to counter- " poyſe them, cites Authors that have indeed ancient " names, but ſuch whom he himſelfe has ſtigmatized " for ſpurious or doubtfull in his Booke *de Script. Ec-* " *cleſ.* Were I at leyſure, and had a little longer time, " I could referre you to ſome that acknowledge Ori- " gen's judgment to be alſo againſt them in this mat- " ter. And Fiſher in his Anſweare to Dr. Whites " Nine Queſtions has a place almoſt parallel to that a- " bove cited out of Perron. In a word, whoſoeuer " ſhall freely and impartially conſider of this thing, " and how on the other ſide the ancient Fathers wea- " pons againſt the Arrians are in a manner onely " places of Scripture, (and thoſe now for the moſt " part diſcarded as impertinent and unconcluding,) " and how in the argument drawne from the authority " of the ancient Fathers, they are almoſt alwayes de- " fendants, and ſcarſe ever opponents; he ſhall not " chooſe but confeſſe, or at leaſt be very inclinable to " beleeve, that the Doctrine of Arrius is eyther a " truth, or at leaſt no damnable hereſy. But the Carrier " ſtayes for my Letter, and I haue now no more time " than to adde that I am, Thy very true and louing " Friend &c." The Poſcript to this Letter is as follows: *See* Facundus Hermianenſis, *Lib* 10. *c.* 15. *Remember alwayes the Wordes of our Saviour:* If you will doe the Will of my Father, you ſhall know of the Doctrine, whether it be of God. *If you can, ſend mee Mr.* Diggſes *Speech. I prythee goe to Dr.* Littleton, *and deſire him to ſend mee all that he has of Vorſtius. For in the Epiſtles of his which I borrowed of him he referrs me to ſome other books of his, which I ſhall have eſpecially occaſion to uſe, eſpecially his booke againſt Piſtorius the Jeſuit.*

[*I*] *Wrote a Letter upon this ſubject to Dr. Sheldon.*] Mr. Des Maizeaux (31) tells us, that he had two tranſcripts of it, one of which, (that hath a Poſtſcript) was communicated to him by Dr. White Kennet Lord Biſhop of Peterborough, to which and the copy of another Letter of Mr. Chillingworth, which has been given the Reader above (32), his Lordſhip had ſubjoined the following memorandum: *To the copies of theſe two Letters to Mr. Gilbert Sheldon and Dr. Sheldon, Mr. Wharton, who procured the Tranſcripts, gave this atteſtation under his own hand.* " Ex autographis Literis penes " Danielem Sheldon Armigerum, Archiepiſcopi Ne- " potem." It is dated *from Tew*, September 21. 1635. It is as follows, with the various readings of the other tranſcript communicated to Mr. Des Maizeaux, noted in the margin. " Good Dr. Sheldon. I do here ſend " you news, as unto my beſt friend, of a great and " happy victory, which at length with extream diffi- " cultye I have ſcarcely obtained over the onely ene- " mie that can hurt me, that is, my ſelfe. Sir, ſo it " is, that though I am in debt to your ſelfe and others " of my friends above twenty pounds more than I " know how to pay; though I am in want of many " conveniences; though in great danger of falling " into a chronicall infirmitie of my body; though in " another thing, which you perhaps gueſſe at what it " is, but I will not tell you, which would make me " more joyfull of preferment then all theſe (if I could " come honeſtly by * it;) though money comes to me " from my father's purſe like blood from his veins, " or from his heart; though I am very ſenſible that I " have been too long already an unprofitable burden " to my Lord, and muſt not ſtill continue ſo; though " my refuſing preferment may perhaps (which fear, " I aſſure you, does much afflict me) be injurious to " my friends and intimate acquaintance, and prejudi- " cial to them in the way of theirs; though con- " ſcience of my own good intention and deſire * ſug- " geſts unto me many flattering hopes of great poſſi- " bilitie † of doing God and his Church ſervice, if " I had that preferment which I may fairly hope for; " though I may juſtly fear, that by refuſing thoſe pre- " ferments which I ſought for, I ſhall gain the repu- " tation of weakneſſe and levity, and incur their diſ- " pleaſure, whoſe good opinion of me, next to God's " favour, and my own good opinion of myſelfe, I do " eſteem

(31) Pag. 86, 99.

(32) Note [*G*].

* *to.*

* *intentions and deſires.*

† *poſſibilities.*

laſt he ſurmounted theſe ſcruples, and being promoted to the Chancellorſhip of the Church of Sarum July the 20th 1638, with the Prebend of Brixworth in Northampton-ſhire annexed to it (*q*), he complied with the uſual ſubſcription [*K*]. About the ſame time he was appointed Maſter of Wigſtan's Hoſpital in Leiceſter; "both which, "ſays Mr. Wood (*r*), and perhaps other preferments, he kept to his dying day." In 1640 he was deputed by the Chapter of Saliſbury as their Proctor in Convocation (*s*). In 1642 he was put into the Roll with ſome others by his Majeſty to be created Doctor of Divinity, but he came not to take that Degree, nor was he diplomated (*t*). At the ſiege of Glouceſter, begun Auguſt the 10th 1643, he was in the King's army before that city, and obſerving that they wanted materials to carry on the ſiege, he ſuggeſted the making of ſome Engines after the manner of the Roman *Teſtudines cum pluteis*, in order to ſtorm the place (*u*). That ſiege being raiſed by the Earl of Eſſex, and the war continuing with great vigour on each ſide, the King appointed the Lord Hopon General of his troops in the Weſt, who forced Arundel-Caſtle in Suſſex to ſurrender; but that Caſtle

(*q*) Idem, pag. 265.

(*r*) Col. 42.

(*s*) Des Maizeaux, pag. 267, 268.

(*t*) Wood, *Faſti Ox.* vol. 2. col. 30.

(*u*) Ruſhworth, *Hiſtor. Collect.* vol. 2. Part 3. *ad ann.* 1643. tom. 4. pag. m. 288, 289.

"eſteem and deſire above all things; though all theſe "and many other *terribiles viſu formæ* have repreſent-"ed themſelves to my imagination in the moſt hideous "manner that may be; yet I am at length firmly "and unmoveably reſolved, if I can have no preſer-"ment without *Subſcription*, that I neither can, nor "will have any. For this reſolution I have but one "reaſon againſt a thouſand temptations to the con-"trary; but it is *ὁ μέγας*, againſt which if all the "little reaſons in the world were put in the ballance, "they would be lighter than vanity. In brief this it "is; as long as I keep that modeſt and humble aſſu-"rance of God's love and favour, which I now enjoy, "and wherein I hope I ſhall be daily more and more "confirmed; ſo long in deſpite of all the world, I "may and ſhall and will be happy. But if I once "loſe this; though all the world ſhould conſpire to "make me happy, I ſhall and muſt be extremely "miſerable. Now this ineſtimable jewel, if I ſub-"ſcribe (without ſuch a declaration as will make * "the ſubſcription no ſubſcription,) I ſhall wittingly "and willingly and deliberately throw away. For "though I am very well perſuaded of you and my "other friends, who do ſo with a full perſuaſion that "you may do it lawfully; yet the caſe ſtands ſo with "me, and I can ſee no remedy but for ever it will "do ſo, that if I ſubſcribe, I ſubſcribe my own dam-"nation. For though I do verily believe the Church "of England a true member of the Church; that ſhe "wants nothing neceſſery to ſalvation, and holds no-"thing repugnant to it; and had thought that to think "ſo, had ſufficiently qualified me for a ſubſcription: "yet now I plainly ſee, if I will not juggle with my "conſcience, and play with God Almighty, I muſt "forbear. For, to ſay nothing of other things, which "I have ſo well conſidered as not to be in a ſtate to "ſign them, and yet not ſo well as to declare myſelf "againſt them, two points there are, wherein I am "fully reſolved, and therefore care not who knows "my mind. One is, that to ſay the fourth Com-"mandment is a Law of God appertaining to Chri-"ſtians, is falſe and unlawfull: the other, that the "damning ſentences in St. Athanaſius's Creed (as we "are made to ſubſcribe it) are moſt falſe, and alſo in "a high degree preſumptuous and ſchiſmatical. And "therefore I can neither ſubſcribe that thoſe things "are *agreeable* † *to the Word of God*, ſeeing I believe "they are certainly repugnant to it: nor that the "whole *Common-Prayer is lawful to be uſed*, ſeeing I "believe thoſe parts of it certainly unlawful; nor pro-"miſe that *I my ſelf will uſe it*, ſeeing I never in-"tend either to read theſe things, which I have now * "excepted againſt, or to ſay Amen to them. I ſhall "not need to intreat you, not to be offended with me "for this my moſt honeſt, and (as I verily believe) "moſt wiſe reſolution: hopeing rather you will do "your endeavour, that I may neither be honeſt at ſo "dear a rate, as the loſſe of preferment, nor buy pre-"ferment at ſo much dearer a rate, the loſſe of ho-"neſty. I think my ſelfe happy that it pleaſed God, "when I was reſolved to venture upon a ſubſcription "without full aſſurance of the lawfulneſſe of it, to caſt "in my way two unexpected impediments to divert "me from accompliſhing my reſolution. For I pro-"feſs unto you, ſince I entertained it, I have never "enjoyed quiet day nor night, till now that I have "rid my ſelf of it again; and I plainly perceive, "that if I had ſwallowed this pill, howſoever guilded "over with gloſſes and reſervations, and wrapt up in "conſerves of good intentions and purpoſes, yet it "would never have agreed or ſtay'd with me, but I "would have caſt it up again, and with it whatſoever "preferment I ſhould have gained with it as the wages "of unrighteouſneſs, which would have been a great "injury to you and to my Lord Keeper: whereas now, "*res eſt integra*; and he will not loſe the gift of any "preferment by beſtowing it on mee, nor have any "engagement to Mr. Andrewes for me. But howe-"ver * this would have ſucceeded in caſe I had then "ſubſcribed, I thank God, I am now reſolved, that "I will never do that while I am living and in health, "which I would not do if I were dying; and this I am "ſure I would not do. I would never do any thing for "preferment, which I would not do but for preferment; "and this, I am ſure, I ſhould not do. I will never † un-"dervalue the happineſs which God's Love brings to "mee with it, as to put it to the leaſt adventure in the "world, for the gaining of any worldly happineſſe. "I remember very well, *quærito primum regnum Dei, "cætera omnia adjicientur tibi*: and therefore when-"ever § I make ſuch a prepoſterous choice, I will "give you leave to think I am out of my wits, or do "not believe in God, or at leaſt am ſo unreaſonable, "as to do a thing in hope I ſhall be ſorry for it "afterwards, and wiſh it undone. It cannot be a-"voided but my Lord of Canterbury muſt come to "know this my reſolution, and, I think, the ſooner "the better. Let me entreat you to acquaint him with "it, (if you think it expedient) and let me hear from "you as ſoon as poſſibly you can. But when you "write, I pray remember, that my foregoing preſer-"ment (in this * ſtate wherein I am) is grief enough to "me; and do not you add to it by being angry with "mee for doing that, which I muſt do or be miſera-"ble. I am your moſt loveing and true ſervant, &c."

* *as makes.*

† *to theſe things as agreeable.*

* *I now howe.*

* *howſoever.*

† *never ſo.*

§ *whenſoever.*

* *being in this.*

To this Letter Mr. Chillingworth added a Poſtſcript, which was as follows: *So much of my Defence of Dr. Potter as I have done, I intend to review and perfect before I proceed, and if it ſhall be thought fit, to publiſh it, annexing a diſcourſe to this effect, that if this be anſwered, all the reſt is ſo; which by the ſtrict dependance of that which follows on that which goes before I ſhall be able very eaſily to demonſtrate. Direct your Letters to me at my Father's houſe in Oxford, and it will be ſufficient. I am ſorry to hear that Mr. Craven continues ill ſtill. I fear he is in more danger than he imagines. Pray if you can ſee him, ſend me word how he does.* Dr. Sheldon's Anſwer to this Letter of Mr. Chillingworth has not yet been diſcovered; but by a paper containing the heads or hints of another anſwer of his to our Author (33), it appears, that there paſſed ſeveral Letters between them on that ſubject; ſome, for greater ſecrecy, written in a third perſon. For Mr. Chillingworth being intent upon a full inquiry into the ſenſe of the Articles, every new Examination afforded him ſome ſcruples (34).

(33) Des Maizeaux, Remark [*K*], pag. 103, 104.

(34) Idem, pag. 100.

[*K*] *Complied with the uſual Subſcription.*] The Jeſuit Knott having objected to him his having refuſed to ſubſcribe the Articles of the Church of England, our Author anſwers him in theſe words (35). *Now though I hold not the Doctrine of all Proteſtants abſolutely true, (which with reaſon cannot be required of me while they hold contradictions,) yet I hold it free from all impiety and from all error deſtructive of ſalvation, or in itſelf damnable. And this I think in reaſon may ſufficiently qualifie me for a maintainer of this aſſertion, that*

(35) *Religion of Proteſtants, &c.* Preface § 39, 40.

Caſtle was retaken by Sir William, and Mr. Chillingworth among the reſt made priſoner of war, who out of reſpect to the Lord Hopton "had accompanied him in that "march, and being indiſpoſed by the terrible coldneſs of the ſeaſon, choſe to repoſe "himſelf in that garriſon till the weather ſhould mend (*w*)." Mr. Chillingworth's illneſs increaſed to ſuch a degree, that not being able to go to London with the garriſon, he was conveyed to Chicheſter; which favour he obtained at the requeſt of his great adverſary Mr. Francis Cheynell, who accidentally met him in Arundel-Caſtle, and frequently viſited him at Chicheſter till he died. He hath given an account of our Author's ſickneſs, and of his own behaviour towards him [*L*], wherein he ſhewed himſelf as charitable and compaſſionate as his rigid Orthodoxy would permit him to be (*x*). Mr. Chillingworth died about January the 30th 164$\frac{3}{4}$ (*y*), and was interred in the Cathedral of Chicheſter. Beſides his *nine Sermons* and his ſmall Tract to ſhew that *Epiſcopacy is not repugnant to the government ſettled in the Church for perpetuity by the Apoſtles*, and intitled, *The Apoſtolical Inſtitution of Epiſcopacy, deduced out of the premiſes by W. C.*, he wrote ſeveral pieces not yet publiſhed [*M*]. There have been a great many editions of his works; and to the eighth were ſubjoined the *two Letters* inſerted in the Notes [*H*] and [*I*]; but the Editor of the ninth edition at London in 1727 omitted them both, which omiſſion was animadverted upon in one of the public papers by a very learned Divine of the Church of England [*N*].

(*w*) Clarendon, *Hiſtory of the Rebellion*, B. 8. tom. 4. pag. 472, 473.

(*x*) Des Maizeaux, pag. 314.

(*y*) Des Maizeaux, Remark [*DDD*] pag. 346.

CHOCQUET

Proteſtancy deſtroys not ſalvation. *For the Church of England, I am perſuaded, that the conſtant doctrine of it is ſo pure and orthodoxe, that whoſoever beleeves it, and lives accordinq to it, undoubtedly he ſhall be ſaved; and that there is no error in it which may neceſſitate or warrant any man to diſturb the Peace, or renounce the Communion of it. This in my opinion is all intended by Subſcription; and thus much if you conceive me not ready to ſubſcribe, your charity I aſſure you is much miſtaken.* Mr. Chillingworth not only expreſſes here his *readineſs* to ſubſcribe, but declares what he conceives to be the ſenſe and intent of ſuch a ſubſcription; which he takes now to be a Subſcription of Peace or Union, and not of Belief or Aſſent, as he thought it formerly was, as appears from his Letter to Dr. Sheldon in the preceding Note. And as he did within a few months actually ſubſcribe, we have reaſon to believe, that he did it in the ſame ſenſe (36).

(36) *See* Des Maizeaux, Rem. [*DD*], pag. 157, *& ſeqq.*

[*L*] *He hath given an account of our Author's ſickneſs, and of his own behaviour towards him.*] It is intitled, Chillingworthi Noviſſima; *Or the Sickneſſe, Hereſy, Death, and Buriall of* William Chillingworth, *(in his own phraſe)* Clerk of Oxford, *and in the conceit of his fellow-ſouldiers, the* Queen's Arch-Engineer, *and* Grand-Intelligencer. *Set forth in a Letter to his eminent and learned Friends, a Relation of his Apprehenſion at Arundell, a Diſcovery of his Errours in a brief Catechiſme, and a ſhort Oration at the Buriall of his Heretical Book. By* Francis Cheynell, *late Fellow of Merton College. Publiſhed by Authority* (37).

(37) Printed at London 1644, in 4to.

[*M*] *He wrote ſeveral pieces not yet publiſhed.*] In the manuſcripts of Mr. Henry Wharton, bought by Dr. Teniſon, Archbiſhop of Canterbury, and preſented to the Library at Lambeth, were ſeveral pieces of our Author not yet printed. We have mentioned ſome already, and ſhall give an account of them all from the Catalogue of thoſe manuſcripts, drawn up by Mr. Wharton himſelf. He obſerves (38), that the volume marked *M*, is *Volumen Chartaceum in fol.* containing, *A Collection of Papers formerly belonging to Archbiſhop Laud, many of them wrote with his own hand, but moſt of them endorſed with his hand; together with ſome papers of the Archbiſhops* Sheldon *and* Sancroft, *and many of Mr.* Chillingworth. And after having ſet down part of the contents of that volume, he adds, "Several papers of Mr. William Chillingworth, viz.

(38) *Catalogus MSS. Hen. Wharton*, in Bibl. Lambeth. 2d Vol. M.

"*Mr. Peake's five Queſtions propoſed to Mr. Chillingworth, about the Nature of Faith, and the Reſolution and Conſequences of the Faith of Proteſtants.*

"*Mr. Chillingworth's Anſwer to Mr. Peake's Queſtions*: firſt draught imperfect.

"*Mr. Chillingworth's Anſwer to the ſame*: being compleat and perfect.

"The Beginning of *a Treatiſe againſt the Scots; by Mr. Chillingworth.*

"*Paſſages extracted out of the Declaration of the Scots; by Mr. Chillingworth.*

"*Obſervations upon the Scottiſh Declaration; by Mr. Chillingworth.*

"*A Treatiſe of the Unlawfulneſs of reſiſting the lawfull Prince, although moſt impious, tyrannical, and idolatrous; by Mr. Chillingworth.*

"*A Letter of Mr. Chillingworth excuſing his writing againſt the rebels* (39).

"*Notes of Mr. Chillingworth concerning God's univerſal mercy in calling men to repentance.*

"*A Problematical Tentamen of Mr. Chillingworth againſt puniſhing crimes with death in Chriſtian Societies* (40): Cancelled.

"*A Letter of Mr. J. to Mr. Chillingworth, of the Imperfection of naturall Religion and Reaſon, without the aſſiſtance of Revelation*: wrote 1637.

"*A ſhort Diſcourſe of the Nature of Faith; by Mr. Chillingworth.*

"*A larger Diſcourſe of the Nature of Faith; by Mr. Chillingworth.*

"*Of the Abſurdity of departing from the Church of England for want of Succeſſion of viſible Profeſſors in all ages; by Mr. Chillingworth.*

"*A briefe Anſwere to ſeveral Texts of Scripture, alledged to prove the Church to be one, viſible, univerſal, perpetual, and infallible; by Mr. Chillingworth.*

"*A Letter of Dr. Sheldon to Mr. Chillingworth, to ſatisfy his ſcruples about ſubſcribing* (41).

"*Letter of Mr. Chillingworth to Dr. Sheldon, containing ſome ſcruples about leaving the Church of Rome, and returning to the Church of England.*

"(42) *Letter of Mr. Chillingworth to Dr. Sheldon, containing his Scruples about Subſcription, and the reaſon of them* (43)."

(39) Mr. Des Maizeaux has publiſhed this Letter, pag. 300, *& ſeqq.*

(40) This Paragraph is razed out in the Catalogue.

(41) *See* Des Maizeaux, Rem. [*X*], pag. 103, 104.

(42) This Paragraph is razed out in the Catalogue.

(43) This Letter hath been inſerted in note [*I*].

[*N*] *The Editor of the ninth Edition at London in 1727 omitted them both; which omiſſion was animadverted upon in one of the public papers by a very learned Divine of the Church of England.*] The Author in a Letter ſigned *Philoleutherus*, and inſerted in the *London Journal* (44) having among other reflections obſerved, that "in new editions of the works of one, who is "dead, no Editor is at liberty to take away what he "thinks fit; but is obliged in juſtice and honour to "give the world what his title promiſes, his *Author's*, "not his own works; and not under a pretence of "new publiſhing the works of any one, give us what "*parts* or *portions* he judges to be right;" tells us, that when the eighth impreſſion of Mr. Chillingworth's works was publiſhed, the two Letters abovementioned were printed, and with moſt of the Books bound up. "'Tis natural, ſays he, *to expect that theſe ſhould have been added to this ninth edition, or ſome very good reaſon given why they are left out. The Editor would inſinuate, that theſe Letters are ſuppoſititious, when he ſays, that they are* "ſaid to be written by Mr. Chilling-"worth:" *whereas the* one *is publiſhed immediately from Mr.* Chillingworth's *original manuſcript at preſent in the* Royal-Society Library; *the other Mr.* Wharton *tranſcribed, as he himſelf ſays,* Ex autographis Litteris penes Danielem Sheldon Armigerum, Archiepiſcopi Nepotem. *Vid.* Chillingworth's Life, *p.* 99. *The Editor goes on:* "The truth is, if we look upon theſe "Letters in the moſt advantageous light imaginable, "they

(44) Num. 397. Saturday March 11, 1726-7.

CHOCQUET (LEWIS) a famous French Poet, lived towards the middle of the fifteenth Century, and was the Author of a very ſcarce but very extraordinary work, of which we ſhall give ſome extracts below [*A*]. La Croix du Maine was not acquainted with him, but du Verdier was, and gave him a place in his *Bibliotheque* (*a*), as the Author (*a*) Pag. 796.

" they appear only to be pieces, which the Writer " never *intended for the preſs*, and perhaps would not " have taken it kindly, that they ſhould have been " made publick." *Whether Mr.* Chillingworth *would have* taken it kindly, that theſe Letters ſhould have been made publick, *ſeventy five years after his death, is more than the Editor can know. And whoever ſees the great volumes of* Letters *of learned men publiſhed after their deaths, and which every man values at a more than ordinary rate, becauſe they contain their undiſguiſed ſentiments, will wonder to hear our Editor ſay in juſtification of himſelf,* " The Way of expoſing a man's " private Letters after his death is by many thought " not agreeable to the ſtrict rules of honour, and too " near a-kin to the ungentleman-like practice of over- " looking private papers in a man's ſtudy without the " leave of the owner." *However ſuppoſing this to be true, yet what is this to the* preſent Editor? *Mr.* Chillingworth's *Letters were already publick; and how have we his* Works *without theſe? Or how would the preſent Editor be concerned in the* ungentleman-like Practice, *that he complains of? But* " they were never in- " tended for the preſs." *This argument is an excellent one from an Editor of* Chillingworth, *when he can't but know, that every one of his* Sermons *were publiſhed after his death, and* eight *out of* nine *no leſs than* twenty *years after it; and the Editor of them expreſly tells us, that they were intended* only for the benefit of *hearers*, not of *Readers. The* Additional Diſcourſes *of Mr.* Chillingworth *were not publiſhed till above* twenty *years after the Sermons, and were no more* intended for the preſs *from any thing that appears, than the* Sermons *were; and yet our* new Editor *makes no ſcruple to publiſh theſe. What can be the meaning of ſuch excuſes, ſuch ſelf-contradiction as this, to juſtify the omiſſion of theſe* Letters, *that have been already publiſhed? He proceeds;* " Theſe Letters were ſo far from being *countenanc-* " *ed by any name of reputation*, that they were then pub- " liſhed by an *anonymous perſon.*" *Admitting this, does this make Mr.* Chillingworth's *own hand-writing not his own? The Writer of his Life has publiſhed to the World a full account of* both *of them; and he has told us how he came by them. That which was not in Mr.* Chillingworth's own hand, *is a copy in the hands of a conſiderable perſon, taken from the original. But whether this be enough to countenance the Letters or not, was it not an* anonymous *perſon, that publiſhed our Author's* Sermons, *which yet his edition makes no ſcruple to republiſh? Was it not an anonymous one that publiſhed his* Letter to Mr. Lewgar *eighteen years after his death? Or is it not an* anonymous *perſon, that now leaves out theſe Letters, as well as an* anonymous one, *that firſt publiſhed them? Whatever therefore be the real motives of this Editor for theſe omiſſions, the reaſons by which he juſtifies himſelf are ſuch, as would have juſtified him in rejecting one* third, *or very near a* third *of what he has in fact publiſhed. Had a Papiſt treated any* Greek *or* Latin *Father of the Church in the ſame manner, would not every Proteſtant have loudly complained? And the ſevereſt reflections would not have been thought too heavy on thoſe, who not only perſecute the living, but will not let their Tyranny ceaſe to rage over men, even when they are dead.* This paper was followed by another of the ſame Writer relating to the ſeveral methods uſed by the Church of Rome for the caſtration and ſuppreſſion of heretical Books (45). H.

(45) *London Journal*, Num. 399. Saturday March 25, 1727.

[*A*] *He was the Author of . . . a very extraordinary Work, of which we ſhall give ſome Extracts below.*] The Copy, that has been lent me (1), contains three parts: The firſt is intitled, *Le premier volumes des Catholiques œuvres & Actes des Apotres, redigez en eſcript par Saint Luc Evangeliſte & Hiſtoriographe, depute par le Saint Eſperit. Icelui Saint Luc eſcripuant à Theophile. Avecques pluſieurs hiſtoires en icelui inſerez des geſtes des Ceſars. Et les demonſtrances des figures de Lapocalypſe veues par Sainct Jehan Zebedée en l'iſſe de Pathmos ſoubz Domitian Ceſar. Le tout veu & corrige bien & duement ſelon la vraye verite & joue par perſonnages à Paris en l'hoſtel de Flanders l'un mil cinq cent xli. Avec privilege du Roy. On les vend en la grand ſalle du Palais par Arnoul & Charles les Angellers freres tenant leurs Bouticques au premier & deuxieſme pilliers devant la Chappelle de Meſſeigneurs les Preſidens.* i. e. " The " firſt volume of the Catholic Works and Acts of the " Apoſtles, ſet down in writing by Saint Luc, Evan- " geliſt and Hiſtoriographer, choſen by the Holy " Ghoſt. The ſaid Saint Luc writing to Theophilus. " Together with ſeveral Hiſtories of the Emperors. " And explications of the figures of the Apocalyps ſeen " by St. John Zebedee in the Iſle of Patmos, under " the Emperor Domitian. The whole reviſed, and " well and duly corrected according to the certain " truth, and acted upon the Stage at the *Hotel* of " Flanders, in the year 1541. With the King's Li- " cence. Sold in the great Hall of the Court, by Ar- " nold and Charles l'Angelier, brothers, who keep " their Stall at the firſt and ſecond Pillar, over againſt " the Preſident's Chapel." The firſt volume contains the Acts of the Apoſtles in five Books, which take up 210 leaves. The ſecond part is entitled: *Le ſecond Volume du Magnifique Myſtere des Actes des Apoſtres continuant la narration de leurs faicts & geſtes ſelon l'eſcripture ſainte, avec ques pluſieurs hiſtoires en icelui inſerées des geſtes des Ceſars. Veu & corrige bien & duement ſelon la vraye verite, & ainſi que le Myſtere eſt la joue à Paris, cette preſente annee mil cinq cent quarante & ung. Avec privilege.* i. e. " The ſecond volume of the " wonderful Myſtery of the Acts of the Apoſtles, con- " taining the continuation of the Hiſtory of their Acts " and Deeds, according to the Holy Scripture; in " which are inſerted ſeveral Hiſtories of the Emperor's " actions. Well and duly reviſed and corrected, ac- " cording to the certain truth, and as the Myſtery is " acted at Paris this preſent year 1541. With Li- " cence." This ſecond volume contains 165 leaves, and concludes with the ninth book of the Acts of the Apoſtles. The third part is, *L'Apocalyſe de Sainct Jehan Zebedee, ou ſont comprinſes les viſions & revelations que icelui Sainct Jehan eut en l'Iſle de Pathmos, le tout ordonne par figures convenables ſelon le texte de la ſaincte eſcripture. Enſemble les cruaultez de Domicien Ceſar. Avec Privilege, MDXLI.* i. e. " The Apocalypſe of St. " John Zebedee, containing the Viſions and Revela- " tions, which St. John had in the Iſle of Patmos: " the whole explained by proper cuts, according to the " text of the holy Scripture. Together with the Cru- " elties of the Emperor Domitian. With Licenſe. " 1541." This part contains forty ſix leaves, and was printed off May 27, 1541. The work is *in folio.*

(1) Dr. Sloane, a famous Phyſician at London, who has ſeveral ſcarce books in his large Library, did me the favour to lend me this, and Mr. Silveſter took the trouble to ſend it me over.

Lewis Chocquet put his name only to the third part of his work; and did it two ways; firſt by prefixing it to a Latin Epigram, which is printed on the ſecond page of the firſt leaf (2), ſecondly by printing it on the top of the ſecond leaf; " Cy enſuit le Myſtére de " l'Apocalypſe de Sain Jehan, avec les crualtez de " Domician Emperour de Romme, compoſe par mai- " ſtre Loys Chocquet. i. e. " Here follows the Apo- " calypſe of St. John, with the cruelties of the Em- " peror Domitian, compoſed by Lewis Chocquet." He is not in the leaſt mentioned in any of the Licenſes for printing his work. It was one William Alabat, *a Merchant living at Bourges*, who obtained a Licenſe from King Francis I, at Lyons, July the 24th, 1536, for ſix years following. He ſet forth, in his petition, " that for the honour and glory of God, of our mother " the holy Church, and of the holy Catholick Faith, " and for the edification and comfort of all good Chri- " ſtians, he deſired to procure the printing of the Acts " of the Apoſtles in five or more Volumes, which he " had by him, and which had been compoſed in " French Verſe, and corrected with pains and coſt." He and his Bookſellers (3) went to Law before the Parliament of Paris in the year 1540, *with Francis Hamelin, Francis Poutrain, John Louvet, and Leonard Chovelet Maſter-Undertakers of the Myſtery of the Acts of the Apoſtles*, that ſame year at Paris. The Court ordered, that theſe four undertakers ſhould not cauſe *the Myſtery of the ſaid Acts of the Apoſtles to be printed, but*

(2) *Ludovici Choquet, ad Magiſtrum Antonium le Coq, Doctorem medicum perdoctum Epigramma.* This Epigram conſiſts of ſixteen lines, *Hexameters* and *Pentameters.*

(3) Arnold and Charles Langelier.

Author of a book in folio, which was printed at Paris in 1541. He only obſerves, that it is a book, in which the Acts of the Apoſtles, and Revelation of St. John *are put into French*

but by thoſe who had the licence to print them, notwithſtanding any new addition that might be made to the work. We find the names and titles of theſe four undertakers in a Ballad, which is printed at the beginning of the ſecond Volume. The paſſage in which they are mentioned, is as follows.

Au Plaſmateur rendant grace le quatre
De bon vouloir entre Pariſiens
Leſquels ont fait appairoir le Theatre
Bien en ſuivant les Rommains anciens.
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
François de nom les deux, n'en faut debattre,
L'ung Hamelin, l'autre Poutrain, ſeients
L'ungen practique, & l'autre pour ſembattre
Tixtre tapis ſoubs rethoriciens
Sçait aſſez bien, puis pour l'exploict parfaire
Leonard Chevelet boucher voulut bien faire
Et Jehan Louvet operateur aux fleurs
Bien congnoiſſant des bons grains les meilleurs.
A iceulx quatre honneur royal deſire,
Donner faveur abollir les erreurs,
Qui ſons humains a vertu contre dire.

The ſenſe is: "The four undertakers give thanks to "the Creator. They are the beſt natured men amongſt "the inhabitants of Paris, and have raiſed the reputation of the ſtage by following the example of the "ancient Romans. . . . . Two of them are named "Francis without diſpute: the one Hemelin, the other "Poutrain. The former is learned in the Law; the "latter is a pretty good Weaver, who makes carpets "for Lawyers to ſtamp upon as they plead. The third "is Leonard Chovelet a Butcher, and the fourth is "John Louvet, a Gardener, who knows how to diſtinguiſh the beſt ſeeds from the worſt. I wiſh them "all four a Royal Glory, and God's favour, that they "may forſake the errors, which make men act againſt "the maxims of virtue."

I relate all theſe minute circumſtances, becauſe they may ſerve to give ſome notions of the comedy in thoſe times. Some of theſe circumſtances are not in Moreri (4): as for inſtance, we do not find there, that the *Hotel of Flanders* ever was the place, where theſe dramatic Poems containing the Hiſtories related in the Holy Scripture, were acted at Paris. But to give the reader a diſtinct notion of the State, in which the French Theatre was at that time, I ſhall tranſcribe ſome paſſages from our Chocquet's Works. It will appear from them, that whilſt the people were not ſuffered to read the Sacred Hiſtory, in the Books in which they are faithfully related, they were permitted to ſee them acted upon the ſtage, mixed with a thouſand groſs and ridiculous fables expreſſed for the moſt part, in a very low and burleſque ſtile.

The firſt Hiſtory, which is deſcribed in this volume, is the choice of an Apoſtle in the room of Judas. It is there ridiculouſly ſuppoſed, that they made the two candidates play at ſhort and long, for thus I think we may expreſs the device which is there related (5).

Baillez les feſtus preparez
Ainſi que l'avons aſſigne.
Lung en y a qui a ung ſigne
Comme il appert, ſigne lauons
Pour lamour de nos compaignons;
Le ſecond de ſigne n'a point,
Donc pour achever notre poinct,
Pierre, tenez les on vos mains,
Et eulx deux, qui ſont incertains
Ou le ſigne eſt, n'on quelle eſpece,
Viendront tirer chaſcun ſa piece
Et celluy auquel eſcherra
Le ſigne, ſubrogue ſera
Au lieu, qui eſt ja deviſé.

That is,

"Give us here the two bits of ſtraw, prepared as we "have ordered it: one of them has a mark to it, as "it appears; we have marked it for the ſake of our "companions; the other is not marked. Now, "Peter, to finiſh this buſineſs, take the two bits of "ſtraw in your hands; and they two, who do not "know which bit is marked, nor how it is marked, "ſhall take each of them a bit, and he, who happens "to have that which is marked, will be admitted "into the vacant place as we have agreed."

When the cuts were drawn, the Apoſtles examined who had that which was marked, and cried out all together.

C'eſt Mathias. i. e. "'Tis Matthias."

Upon which Peter expreſſed himſelf thus

——— *Loue ſoit Dieu*
Ca Mathias, entre nous autres
Faictes nombre des douze Apotres.
Joyeulx en ſuis, proficiat,
Conferme ſoyez en Veſtat (6).

(6) Ibid.

That is,

"God be praiſed. Now Matthias, you ſhall be one "of us to make up the number of the twelve Apoſtles. "I am heartily glad on't: Huzza! Be confirmed in "your ſtation."

The devils are often introduced, and it is on theſe occaſions, that the Poet raiſes all the ſtrength of his imagination, and exerts all his ſkill: but their characters are not conſiſtently drawn, and inſtead of ſtriking his readers with horror and indignation, he is more proper to raiſe their laughter. He writes entirely in a burleſque ſtyle, ſuch was the bad taſte that prevailed then. He introduces Lucifer who ſummons all the Devils, and he makes him ſpeak thus.

Dyables meſchants deſtinez en terre eſtre,
Clos a jamais dans le centre terreſtre,
Viendrez vous point a mes cris & abois,
Sortez an feu de notre infernal être
Par mes haulx cris vous pouez bien congnoiſtre
Que c'eſt a droict que complaindre me doibs:
Haro, haro, nul de vous je ne veoys,
Si ne venez deſeſperer m'en voys,
Dyables mauldicts, Dyableſſes, Dyabletons,
Courez en l'air, traverſez champs & boys,
Fouldre gectez, accordante a ma voix
Approchez toſt Diabolicques Lucytons: &c. (7).

(7) Ibid. folio 3 verſo.

That is,

"Ye wicked Devils doomed to be in the ground "ſhut up for ever in the center of the earth, will not "my cries and barking make you come? Get out of "the fire of our infernal habitation; you may eaſily "know by my loud cries, that I have a right to complain. Come up, come up! What! I ſee none of "you yet. I ſhall grow ſtark mad, if you will not "come. Ye curſed He-Devils, She-Devils, and little Devils, fly into the air, croſs the fields and the "woods, caſt your thunderbolts about, that their noiſe "may agree with that of my voice. Draw near "quickly, ye deviliſh ſpirits."

Here follows Satan's anſwer.

Prince d'enfer, tes cris a faict eſtendre
Si treſavant, qu'ils ſont venus deſcendre
Juſques au fons des noires regions
Nos viles manoirs tu a preſque faict fendre,
Que te fault-il? Es tu preſt de te pendre,
Dyables ſont hors par grandes legions (8).

(8) Ibid. folio 4.

That is,

"Prince of hell, you have bawled ſo loudly, that "your cries have been heard even in the deepeſt "place of this dark region, and have almoſt cracked "the walls of our wretched habitation. What do "you want? Are you going to hang yourſelf. Whole "legions of devils are gone out."

Here follows another diſcourſe of Lucifer.

"Haro, haro, approche toy grand Dyable,
"Approche toy notaye mal fiable,
"Fier Belyal procureur des Enfers,
"Si tu ne fais ung faulx traict deſuoyable

"Nous

(4) In the Paris edition of 1699, under the word *Comedie*. Obſerve by the by, that they have corrected in that edition, a very groſs error, which had crept into the former editions; but they have overlooked an error of the Preſs. There was in the former editions, *ſur quoy l'on peut voir Boccalini & Ragusglio.* And they have put in the edition of 1699, *ſur quoy on peut voir Boccalini dans ſon Fagualio di Parnaſſo*, They ſhould have put *dans ſon Ragguagli di Parnaſſo.*

(5) *Premier Livre des Actes des Apoſtres, folio 3.*

French Verſe, in a dramatic way, but he gives no extracts of it, and yet he is uſed to do it when a book contains ſomething remarkable. Nay he has often tranſcribed long paſſages,

" Nous perdons tout le genre humain ſaluable
" Et demeurans ſeuls enchaynez en fers,
" . . . . . .
" Sur terre auons des ennemis pervers,
" Encontre nous maſchinans preſcherie
" Ce ſont villains yſſus de peſcherie
" Voulans noncer de Dieu la paix cherie.
" Mais ſi voſtre art a mort ne les ruyne
" Ravis ſerez tous a la boucherie
" Si gay n'aura de qui la bouche rie
" S'il le convient laiſſer mettre en ruyne.

Satan's anſwer.

" Prince dampne de tenebre & bruyne
" Loup raviſſant, ton harlement ne fine
" Que te fault-il, aſſu la rage au coeur?
" Prends plomb fondu, chaulx, ſoufre, & poix re-
" ſine
" Metuil bouillant, qui ſeront drogue fine
" Pour deſtouper ta mauldicte rancueur.

That is,

" Come, come, draw near you great Devil, you rogue
" of a Scrivener, you proud Belial, Attorney of Hell.
" If you do not play now ſome knaviſh trick or an-
" other, all mankind will be ſaved, we loſe them,
" and ſhall be alone chained and fettered for ever. . .
" We have wicked enemies upon earth, who by
" their preaching lay their plot againſt us. They are
" ſome countrey fellows, formerly Fiſhermen, who
" now pretend to proclaim God's beloved peace.
" If by your art you do not find ſome means to diſ-
" appoint their deſign, and put them to death, you
" will all be carried to the ſlaughterhouſe; nor will
" the moſt merry of you be able to ſmile. Judge
" whether it be proper to let us be thus entirely
" ruined."

Satan anſwers;

" You, damned Prince of darkneſs, devouring wolf,
" can't you ceaſe your howling? What do you want?
" Are you raving mad? Take melted lead, lime,
" brimſtone, roſin, and boiling metal; theſe will be
" fine drugs to ſatisfy your curſed ſpite."

Another ſpeech of Lucifer.

" Apres que Chriſt fut au tombeau rendu
" Trois jours après de mort reſuſcita,
" Et qui plus eſt, tout vif ſe preſenta
" A ſes amis, qui ne ſont pas des noſtres
" Douze coquins, qui ſe nomment Apoſtres.
" Grands ſeducteurs de la Loy Judaique.
" Auquels il dit, le texte evangelicque
" Soit ſouſtenu et preſche de par vous:
" Apres es cieulx il monta devant tous
" En les laiſſant tous douze ſur la terre,
" Leſquels preſens nous meinent dure guerre
" En la cite Hieruſalem nommee
" Et tout autour du pays de Judee
" Qui eſt pour nous grande perplexite.
" Dyables obſcurs chaſcun ſoit incite
" Pour ces maraulx a la mort faire rendre
" Si deſſus nous les laiſſez entreprendre
" Dieu pis yra pour nous deſſus les rens.
" Pour ce Sathan vers eulx le chemin prens
" Penſe ſouldain de leur livrer bataille
" Pour mettre a fin la mauldicte canaille
" Tranſporte toy aux preſtres de la loy
" Leſquels toujours ayent lor & aloy
" En recordant leur mauldicte avarice
" De ces coquins donne bien la notice; &c. (9).

(9) *Premier Livre des Actes des Apoſtres, folio* 5.

That is,

" When Chriſt had been laid in his tomb, the third
" day he roſe again from the dead, and ſhewed him-
" ſelf alive to his friends, who are none of ours; they
" are twelve raſcals, who ſtile themſelves Apoſtles,
" great corrupters of the Jewiſh Law. He told them,
" let the Goſpel be ſupported and preached by you.
" Afterwards he aſcended into Heaven in preſence of
" them all, and left them all twelve upon earth; and
" now they wage a very heavy war againſt us, in the
" city, called Jeruſalem, and all about the country of
" Judæa; which puts us in a great perplexity. Ye
" black Devils, let every one of you be active to ſee
" theſe raſcals put to death: If you ſuffer them to pre-
" vail in the leaſt over us, God will treat us much
" worſe for it. Therefore, you Satan make haſte to
" them, and reſolve to give them battle immediately,
" and thus deſtroy at once that damned rabble. Go
" to the Prieſts of the Law, (to whom I with conti-
" nual authority and riches) and remembring their
" curſed covetouſneſs, give them a perfect knowledge
" of theſe villains."

Satan anſwers.

" De tous les droicts aſſez entends l'affaire
" Pour exploicter ſans long temps pretendu
" Au fonds d'enfer je puiſſe eſtre pendu
" Si en brief temps je ne fais des merveilles
" Puiſqu'il convient que je ſouffle es oreilles
" Bien toſt mourrent les coquins de Jeſus.

That is,

" I underſtand the whole buſineſs ſo well, that I
" will go upon it immediately, without arguing any
" longer. Let me be hanged in the bottom of hell,
" if I do not perform wonders in a very little time:
" and ſince it is proper, that I ſhould ſtir up the
" Prieſt, theſe raſcally followers of Jeſus will ſoon
" die."

Lucifer having given every one of the Devils his particular commiſſion, Satan ſpeaks to him thus.

" Voy Lucifer tous Dyables ſont enclins
" Par tout ſouldains movemens & declins
" Deſſus le champs leur devoir tres bien faire,
" Mais au depart pour mieulx nous ſatisfaire
" Ta patte eſtends ſur nos groings dyabolicques
" Pour confirmer nos eſprits drachoniques
" Que recevons pour benediction (10).

(10) Ibid. *folio* 5 *verſo.*

That is,

" See Lucifer, all the Devils are diſpoſed by a ſudden
" motion and inclination, immediately to go and do
" their duty very well. But the better to incourage
" us at our departure, ſtretch thy paw over our dia-
" bolical ſnouts, to confirm our damned ſpirits; we ſhall
" take it as a bleſſing."

To this Lucifer anſwers,

" Dyables damnez en malediction
" Deſſus vous tous par puiſſance interdicte
" Mu patte eſtends qui eſt de Dieu mauldicte
" Pour de tous maulx et malfaies vous abſouldre
" Couverts ſoyez de fulminante fouldre.

That is,

" Devils, damned in malediction, by my power which
" is interdicted, I ſtretch over you all my paw which
" is curſed of God in order to abſolve you of all
" evil and wicked actions; be covered with fulminat-
" ing lightning."

Was not this a very ſilly manner of writing? And was it not turning indirectly into ridicule that holy and apoſtolic ceremony, *the laying on of hands?*

After theſe dialogues between the Devils, we meet with others, which are ſtill worſe in their kind: for the diſcourſes, which the Author makes God and Jeſus Chriſt hold ſpeaking to one another, are intirely below the dignity of the ſubject. The officers, who impriſoned the two Apoſtles, who had cured a lame man, ſpeak in ſuch a burleſque manner, that it is downright farce.

AGRIPPART.

Prends moy ce galland par le poing
Et me le lye d'une corde.

GRIFFON.

Si je lui fais miſericorde
Beau Sire, je veuil qu'on me tonde.

AGRIPPART.

Eſt il lye.

GRIFFON.

Le mieux du monde
Allans les cacher pour la pluye.
Vous ſerez enfans de la lye
Gallans, car vous ſerez en cage (11).

(11) Ibid. *folio* 6.

ſages, which had nothing very extraordinary in them. We may therefore wonder that he quoted nothing from Lewis Chocquet's Poems, for they meet in them with ſome very ſtrange

That is,

" AGRIPPART. Take this ſpark by the wriſt, and " tie him with a rope.

" GRIFFON. If I have the leaſt pity on him, my " pretty fellow, let me be whipped.

" AGRIP. Is he tied?

" GRIFF. As well as can be wiſhed. Let's go, and " put 'em a ſtone doublet on, for fear they ſhould " catch cold. Come, my ſparks, you will be like " young birds, for you ſhall be put in a cage."

Trottemenu, Annas the High-Prieſt's Meſſenger, ſpeaks in a ſtill more burleſque manner.

" C'eſt rage comme je chopine
" De chanter ne me puis tenir,
" Toutes les fois que je chemine,
" Il n'eſt choſe qui ne ſe mine,
" J'ai huy ſi bien tiré laureille
" Puis le matin a ma bouteille,
" Que tout eſt pieca mis en vente
" Je n'ay garde quelle ſefuente
" Car plus ny a raiſin ne mouſt (12).

(12) Ibid. *folio* 7.

That is,

" I have toped ſo plentifully, that I can't forbear " ſinging. When I walk, it ſeems that every thing " turns topſy-turvy. I have been drinking to day " ever ſince the morning, that all I had is now pawn- " ed or ſold. I don't fear that my wine ſhould deaden, " for I have neither grapes nor muſt left."

Let us tranſcribe ſome paſſages from the Dialogue between Annas and Caiphas.

ANNE.

" Je les ai veus tres bonnes gens (13).
" Loyaulx & de bonne faſſon
" Et mont apporte du poiſſon
" Cent fois a vendre en mon hoſtel.

(13) He means the two Apoſtles Peter and John, who had been impriſoned.

CAYPHAS.

" Eſt il vray.

ANNE.

" Par Dieu il eſt tel
" Mes gens en ont bien ſouvenance:
" Mais pour mieulx vivre a leur plaiſance
" Ils ont delaiſſe leur meſtier,
" Dont ils n'auoient pas meſtier,
" Car tres bien ils en pouoient viure
" Et depuis ont voulu enſuyure
" Jeſus le mauvais Sciſmaticque
" Qui leur a apprins la magicque
" Et nygromance on le ſcait bien,
" Car il eſtoit magicien
" Le plus grand qui fuſt juſqu'a Romme (14).

14) *Prémier Livre des* Actes des Apoſtres, *folio* 8 *verſo.*

That is,

" ANNAS. I have ſeen them when they were very " good men, and very loyal: for they have brought " me an hundred times fiſh to ſell at my houſe.

" CAIPHAS. Is it true?

" ANN. By God, it is: My ſervants remember it " very well. But in order to live in plenty, they " have left their trade, which they had no occaſion to " do, for it could ſufficiently maintain them: and " they would follow Jeſus, that wicked ſchiſmatick, " who taught them Magick and Necromancy, as is " very well known; for he was the greateſt magician " that could be met with all the way from hence to " Rome."

The juridical examination of the lame man ought, I think, to be here tranſcribed.

ANNE.

" . . . mais je te vueil demander
" S'il eſt vray ce qu'on a compte
" On nous a icy recite
" Que pour trouuer moyen de viure
" Toy qui eſtoys fort & deliure
" Faignoys d'eſtre tout contrefaict.
" D'y hardiment ſi tu las faict
" Je le te feray pardonner
" Avecques ce te feray donner
" De l'argent pour toy bien pourvoir
" Plus qu'ils nont: On peut bien ſcavoir
" Qu'ils ten ont donne & promis
" Affin que dies qu'ils tont mis
" En bon eſtat & en ſante
" Pour avoir bruyt par la cité
" De faire miracles patens (15).

(15) Ibid. *folio* 8 *verſo.*

That is,

" ANNAS. .... but I muſt aſk you, whether it be " true, as we have been told here that in order to get " a livelihood, you, that were a ſtrong and luſty man " feigned to be lame. Own it roundly; I ſhall pro- " cure you a pardon, and even money to provide for " yourſelf, more than they have. We may be ſure, " that they gave and promiſed you ſome, to make " you ſay that they reſtored you to your health and " the uſe of your limbs, in order to raiſe them through " the whole city the reputation of working unqueſ- " tionable miracles."

It is eaſy to form a judgment of the whole work by theſe inſtances taken from the firſt volume: but it muſt be obſerved, that there are numberleſs paſſages much more ridiculous and burleſque, than thoſe I have quoted.

It muſt alſo be obſerved, that the Author admits without the leaſt ſcruple all the popular traditions. He has inſerted (16) a long epiſode concerning Dionyſius the Areopagite, and his being ordained a Biſhop. He has (17) another and much longer Epiſode concerning the death, reſurrection and aſſumption of the Holy Virgin. Such dramatical performances were admired in thoſe times, but now they are looked upon with ſcorn. I muſt tranſcribe in this place the following verſes of Mr. Boileau Des Preaux;

(16) In the 5th book.

(17) Ibid.

Chez nos devots Ayeux le Théatre abhorré
Fut long-tems dans la France un plaiſir ignoré.
De Pelerins, dit-on, une troupe groſſiére
En public à Paris y monta la prémiere,
Et ſotement zélée en ſa ſimplicité
Joüa les Saints, la Vierge, & Dieu, par pieté.
Le Savoir à la fin diſſipant l'Ignorance
Fit voir de ce projet la dévote imprudence.
On chaſſa ces Docteurs préchant ſans miſſion,
On vit renaître Hector, Andromaque, Ilion (18).

(18) Des Preaux, *Art. Poëtique*, Chant 3. ver. 81, &c.

That is,

" Our pious fathers in their prieſt-rid age,
" As impious and profane, abhorr'd the ſtage:
" A troop of ſilly pilgrims, as 'tis ſaid,
" Fooliſhly zealous, ſcandalouſly playd
" The Angels, God, the Virgin, and the Saints,
" (Inſtead of Heroes and of Love's complaints.)
" At laſt right reaſon did her laws reveal,
" And ſhewed the folly of their ill-plac'd zeal,
" Silenc'd thoſe Nonconformiſts of the Age,
" And rais'd the lawful Heroes of the ſtage."

If you deſire to ſee a Commentary upon this, read the following paſſage (19). " It is certain, that theſe " pious ſhews were firſt introduced by the Pilgrims. " They who returned from Jeruſalem and the Holy " Land, from St. James's of Compoſtella, from Sainte- " Baume of Provence, from Sainte Reine, from Mount " St. Michael, from Our Lady du Puy, and from " ſome other holy places, uſed to compoſe hymns con- " cerning their journeys, in which they inſerted ſome " accounts of the Life and Death of our Saviour, or " a deſcription of the Day of Judgment, but in a " very coarſe manner, which Muſic, and the ſimpli- " city of thoſe times rendered however ſufferable. " They alſo ſung the Miracles of the Saints, their " Martyrdom, and ſome Stories, which the credulous " vulgar called Viſions and Apparitions. Several of " theſe Pilgrims uſed to travel together; and ſtopped " in the ſtreets and public places, where with the ſtaff " in hand, and their ſhort mantle covered with ſhells, " and images of different colours, they acted a kind " of ſhew which pleaſed the people, and engaged ſome " devout

THE origin of this ſort of dramatic pieces.

(19) Meneſtrier, *Repreſentations en Muſique anciennes & modernes*, pag. 153, 154.

ſtrange and ſurpriſing ſcenes. We ſhall ſupply that defect, and make this work a little better known, than it is by Du Verdier's account of it.

" devout Citizens at Paris to raiſe a ſum of money, " and to buy a piece of ground on which they built " a Theatre, where theſe myſteries were acted on " Holy-days, both for the inſtruction and diverſion of " the people. There were ſuch public Theatres in " Italy; I have ſeen one at Veletri on the road from " Rome to Naples, in a public place; and it is not " forty years ſince they have left off acting there the " Myſteries of our Saviour's life. Theſe devout ſhews " were thought to be ſomething ſo beautiful in thoſe " ignorant times, that they were the chief ornaments " of the ſhew, with which Princes were entertained at " their arrival in cities. And as they uſed to cry, " *Noel, Noel*, inſtead of *Long live the King*, ſo they " acted in the ſtreets the Story of the Samaritan Wo- " man, that of Dives and Lazarus, the Paſſion of Jeſus " Chriſt, and ſeveral other Myſteries, at the public " entries of our Kings. The Pſalms and other parts " of the Church Liturgy in proſe, were the Operas of " thoſe days. Men went to meet the Princes with " the Banners of the Church, ſinging all the while ſome " Hymns compoſed to their honour, from ſeveral paſ- " ſages of Scripture, alluding to ſome of their moſt " remarkable actions, or to ſome circumſtances of " their reign."

[* As Mr. Bayle has inadvertently committed a ſmall miſtake in this article, we think it proper to correct it in this place, and at the ſame time we ſhall give a ſhort ſupplement to his account. He aſcribes both the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, and the *Apocalypſe* to Chocquet, who wrote only the latter. Mr. Bayle was miſled by Du Verdier, who makes Chocquet the Author of theſe two Poems (α). But la Croix du Maine, who, as Mr. Bayle very well obſerves, knew nothing of Chocquet, mentions the Book of the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, and tells us, that this work was begun by one Arnoul Greban, and finiſhed by Simon Greban his brother. *Arnoul Greban*, ſays he (β), *born at Compiegne in Picardy, who was a Canon of Mans, in or about the year* 1450, *and brother of Simon Greban . . . . tranſlated the Acts of the Apoſtles out of Latin into French verſe, which tranſlation has been finiſhed by his ſaid brother, and printed at Paris by Galiot du Pré.* In another place he ſays (γ), that *Simon Greban, Secretary to Charles d' Anjou Count du Maine . . . continued the book of the Acts of the Apoſtles, begun by his brother Arnoul, which*, continues he, *were acted in ſeveral cities of France, viz. at Mans, Angers, Bourges and in other cities: I have them by me in manuſcript, they are written in French verſe. Peter Curet or Cúeuret printed them, after he had reviſed and corrected them, &c.* Laſtly in the Article of Cuevret he ſays (δ), that *Peter Cuevret, or according to others, Curet, a Canon of the Church of St. Julian at Mans in the year* 1510 . . . . . *reviſed and corrected the Acts of the Apoſtles, written and compoſed in French verſe by Arnoul and Simon Greban brothers born at Compiegne in Picardy.* Let us obſerve, that the *Apocalypſe* is not mentioned in the King's licenſe granted to Alabat, and of which Mr. Bayle ſpeaks. Let us alſo obſerve, that Sir Hans Sloane has in his Library an Edition of the Acts of the Apoſtles, which he ſhewed to Mr. Des Maizeux, and which is different from that mentioned by Mr. Bayle. It is a large Folio very well printed in a black letter. It is divided into two parts. The firſt is intitled, *Le premier Volume du triumphant Myſtere des Actes des Apoſtres, tranſlate fidelement a la verite hiſtoriale, eſcripte par Sainct Luc a Theophile, & illuſtre des legendes autentiques & vies des Saincts receues pas legliſe: tout ordonne par perſonnages. Avec privilege du Roy.* i. e. " The " firſt volume of the triumphant myſtery of the Acts " of the Apoſtles, faithfully tranſlated according to the " hiſtorical truth written by St. Luke to Theophilus, " and illuſtrated with authentick Legends, and with " the lives of the Saints acknowledged by the Church: " the whole written in a dramatic method. With the " King's Licenſe." Neither the place where it was printed nor the year of the impreſſion are ſet down. The King's Licenſe is dated July the 24th 1536. We find after it an advertiſement of Alabat, in which he ſeems to aſcribe the Acts of the Apoſtles only to Simon Greban, *a very eloquent man, an excellent Poet, and a Doctor of Divinity.* He alſo tells us, that this work has been approved by the Doctors of Divinity. It appears alſo from this Advertiſement; 1, That this Comedy, if we may call it ſo, had been acted at Bourges ſome time before it was printed. There is an edition of it printed at Paris for the Angeliers, in 1540, in 4to, with this title, *Le triumphant Myſtere des Actes des Apoſtres joue a Bourge.* " The triumphant myſtery " of the Acts of the Apoſtles acted at Bourges." 2. That Sir Hans Sloane's Edition, which I ſpeak of, is the firſt, and muſt have been printed in 1536. Alabat's advertiſement was left out of the Edition printed in 1541. 3. That Chocquet's *Apocalypſe* was printed for the firſt time in 1541, with the Acts of the Apoſtles; and indeed we find the following words at the end of Chocquet's work. *Fin du Myſtere de l'apocalipſe Sanct Jehan Evangeliſte nouvellement redigé par perſonnages, avec les Miracles faicts en liſle de Pathmos, le tout hiſtorie ſelon les viſions. Et fut acheve ledit livre d'imprimer le XXVII jour de May l'an mil cinq cent XLI, pour Arnoul & Charles les Angeliers freres.* i. e. " Here ends the myſtery of the Apocalypſe of St. John " the Evangeliſt, newly written in a dramatic way, " with the miracles performed in the iſland of Patmos, " the whole being related according to the viſions. " It was printed off May the 27th, 1541 &c. (ε)." [ADD. REM.]'

(α) *Bibliotheque Françoiſe*, pag. 796.

(β) *Bibliotheque de la Croix du Maine*, pag. 24.

(γ) Pag. 456.

(δ) Pag. 391.

(ε) Taken from Mr. Des Maizeaux's Remarks upon Mr. Bayle's Letters. *Lettres de Mr. Bayle*, tom. 3. *Let.* 245. *à Mr. Des Maizeaux*, pag. 221, &c. note 3.

CHRYSEIS, the daughter of Chryſes Prieſt of Apollo, is more known by this Patronymic than by her true name Aſtynome. She was taken by Achilles, when he ſacked Lyrneſſus and ſome other places in the neighbourhood of Troy; and was married to the King of that country (*a*). Agamemnon taking a great fancy to her retained her for himſelf, and was ſo far from conſenting to reſtore her to the good old Chryſes who came to demand her back, attired in his Sacerdotal ornaments, and furniſhed with a conſiderable ranſom, that he repulſed him in a very unworthy manner (*b*). The reaſons why he was deſirous to keep this Concubine may be ſeen in Homer [*A*]. Chryſes beſought

(a) Dictys, lib. 2. pag. m. 172.

(b) Homer. *Iliad.* lib. 1.

[*A*] *The reaſons why Agamemnon was deſirous to keep this concubine may be ſeen in Homer.*] He declares in the Council of War, that he thought her preferable to his wife Clytæmneſtra, whom he had married; and that Chryſeïs was not at all inferior to Clytæmneſtra, with regard either to her perſon, her mind, or her ſkill in women's works:

. . . . . Ἐπεὶ πολὺ βούλομαι αὐτὴν
Οἴκοι ἔχειν· καὶ γάρ ῥα Κλυταιμνήστρης προβέβουλα
Κουριδίης ἀλόχου, ἐπεὶ οὐ ἧσσον ἔη γε χερείων,
Οὔ δέμας, οὐδὲ φυήν, οὐτ' ἄρ φρένας, οὔτε τι ἔργα. (1)

That is,

Becauſe my prize, my beauteous maid I hold,
And heav'nly charms prefer to proffer'd gold:
A maid, unmatch'd in manners as in face,
Skill'd in each art, and crown'd with every grace.
Not half ſo dear were Clytæmneſtra's charms,
When firſt her blooming beauties bleſt my arms.
Mr. Pope.

(1) Homer. *Iliad.* lib. 1. ver. 112.

He had already told Chryſes that he would detain Chryſeïs till ſhe was old, and that he deſigned to keep her to weave cloth for him and to lie with him.

Τὴν δ' ἐγὼ οὐ λύσω, πρίν μιν καὶ γῆρας ἐπείσῃ
Ἡμετέρῳ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ ἐν Ἀργείῃ τηλόθι πάτρης
Ἰστὸν ὑφαινομένην καὶ ἐμὸν λέχος ἀντιόωσαν (2).

That is,

Mine is thy daughter, Prieſt, and ſhall remain;
And pray'rs, and tears, and bribes ſhall plead in vain:

(2) Ibid. ver. 29.

fought Apollo to revenge him, and was heard: the peſtilence began to rage in the Grecian army, and ceaſed not till Chryſeïs was ſent back to her father, according to the advice of the Soothſayer Calchas (*c*). She was with child; and yet ſhe pretended that no one had touched her: and when ſhe could no longer conceal her condition, ſhe affirmed ſhe was not with child by a man, but by the God Apollo (*d*). The ſon which ſhe was delivered of was named Chryſes. He was informed of his extraction ſomewhat late; however he was informed of it time enough to render a conſiderable ſervice to his brother Oreſtes [*B*]. Some ſay Iphigenia was the daughter of Agamemnon and Chryſeïs (*e*). Others relate that Chryſes, being acquainted with the kind treatment which the Greeks had ſhewn his daughter, brought her back to the army, and delivered her again into the hands of Agamemnon (*f*). We have ſhewn, in the Remarks on the Article BRISEIS, that Horace reaſoned ill, when he made uſe of the example of that Grecian Prince † to prove his friend need not be aſhamed of loving his ſervant-maid. I ſhall obſerve here that Briſeïs and Chryſeïs were couſin germans [*C*].

(*c*) Idem, ibid.

(*d*) Hygin. cap. 121.

(*e*) Tzetzes in Lycophron. & Magnum Etymologicum, *in Voce* Χρυσόπολις.

(*f*) Dictys, lib. 2. pag. 180.

† [Horace makes uſe of Agamemnon's example with regard not to Chryſeïs, but to Caſſandra. See the Article of CASSANDRA, Remark [*G*]. ADD. REM.]

'Till time ſhall riſle ev'ry youthful grace,
And age diſmiſs her from my cold embrace,
In daily labours of the loom employ'd,
Or doom'd to deck the bed ſhe once enjoy'd.

Mr. Pope.

Monſr. Perrault, ridiculing this paſſage of the Iliad, has taken one name for another: let Agamemnon, ſays he, *keep Briſeïs the High-Prieſt's daughter to make him cloth* (3). However, as well pleaſed as Agamemnon was with Chryſeïs, he declared in the Council of War, that provided they would repair his loſs he would reſtore her, if that were neceſſary to prevent the army's deſtruction. He actually did reſtore her, but he indemnified himſelf at the expence of Achilles, from whom he took Briſeïs (4). Achilles would fight no more, whence proceeded an infinite number of evils; and ſo the calamities of that War were always occaſioned by women. If three or four perſons could have lain without females, the lives of two or three hundred thouſand men had been ſaved. The caſe was not ſo deplorable or ſo ſhameful, when it was ſaid:

(3) Paralle'e, tom. 2. pag. 34.

(4) *See* Arrian's *Epictetus*, Book 2. chap. 24.

Scilicet, ut Turno contingat regia conjux,
Nos animæ viles, inhumata infletaque turba,
Sternamur campis (5).

(5) Virgil. Æn. lib. 11. verſ. 371.

That is,

" That Turnus may obtain a royal bride,
" We, an ignoble crowd, without a name,
" Unwept, unworthy of the fun'ral flame,
" Are laid in duſt. . . . .

[*B*] *The ſon which ſhe was delivered of . . . rendred a conſiderable piece of ſervice to his brother Oreſtes.*] By helping the Author out a little, we find in the CXXIſt Chapter of Hyginus, that Oreſtes and Iphigenia, having eſcaped from Taurica Cherſoneſus with the ſtatue of Diana, landed in the iſland of Sminthe where Chryſes was Prieſt of Apollo. The young Chryſes, I mean the ſon of Agamemnon and Chryſeïs, had a mind to ſend thoſe two perſons back to Thoas King of Taurica; but his father † acquainted him with the fraternal relation which he bore the new comers. Then the young Chryſes joined Oreſtes to return into Taurica, there to kill Thoas; which having executed they went thence to Mycenæ with the ſtatue of Diana. This is ill enough related in the ſupplement of Moreri; circumſtances have been added which are not in Hyginus, and thoſe which are in that Writer have been forgotten, and yet he is the only one cited. Stephanus Byzantinus tells us that the city of Chryſopolis took its name from Chryſes the ſon of Agamemnon and Chryſeïs. Thoſe who ſay this woman inſiſted that ſhe brought back her honour ſafe and ſound from the Grecian army, follow probability; for it is the language of almoſt all women who are run away with, or are found in towns taken by ſtorm (6). It was a very convenient thing at the time of the ſiege of Troy, that a girl might ſay ſhe was with child by a God.

† [Mr. Bayle ſhould have ſaid his grandfather.]

(6) Louis Guyon, in his *Diverſes Leçons*, tom. 3. liv. 4. chap. 14 & 15, *approves and adviſes this language.*

[*C*] *Chryſeïs and Briſeïs were Couſin-Germans.*] For Briſes and Chryſes were brothers, and ſons of Adrys, Βρίσης γὰρ καὶ Χρύσης ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν, παῖδες Ἀδρύος. Theſe are the words of Euſtathius (7). The learned and obliging Mr. Drelincourt directed me to them.

(7) In *Iliad. A.* pag. 58. lin. 28.

CHRYSIPPUS, natural ſon of Pelops [*A*], was of incomparable beauty (*a*). Laius became paſſionately in love with him, and carried him away by force (*b*); but he was purſued with ſuch ſpeed, that his prey was taken from him, and himſelf brought priſoner to Pelops, who forgave him the fact, in conſideration that Love had induced him to commit it. The affection of Pelops for Chryſippus was greater than that which he bore his legitimate children; for which reaſon his wife Hippodamia, animated by a Step-mother's ſpirit, exhorted Atreus and Thyeſtes, two of her ſons, to take away this baſtard's life; for ſhe made no doubt but he would one day aſpire to the Crown. They refuſed her that baſe act of complaiſance; and then ſhe took the reſolution to execute her ill deſign with her own hand: ſhe took Laius's ſword, while he ſlept, and made uſe of it to diſpatch Chryſippus. The ſuſpicion fell upon Laius, becauſe of his ſword; but Chryſippus, before he expired, had time to clear him. Pelops contented himſelf with turning away Hippodamia (*c*). There are ſome Authors (*d*) who ſay that ſhe did not kill Chryſippus with her own hand, but cauſed the murder to be committed by Atreus and Thyeſtes, and that when they had ſlain Chryſippus they threw him into a well. Their father would not ſee them any more, and they retired to Triphylia (*e*). Some ſay (*f*) he was not ſo favourable as to content himſelf with baniſhing his wife, and that it was principally on her that he deſigned to revenge the death of Chryſippus; but he could not do it, for ſhe eſcaped to Midea (*g*). Others ſay that ſeeing her ſelf accuſed by her huſband ſhe ſlew her ſelf (*h*). We learn from Thucydides, that Atreus fled to his nephew Euryſtheus King of Mycenæ (*i*). It muſt not be imagined that this Chryſippus was a different perſon from him whom Clemens Alexandrinus, Arnobius, and Firmicus Maternus,

(*a*) Hygin. cap. 85 and 272.

(*b*) See the Remark [*B*].

(*c*) Extracted from *Plutarch*, in *Parallelis*, pag. 313. He cites *Dæſitheus* in *Pelopidis.*

(*d*) *Scholiaſt. Euripidis in Oreſt. Tzetzes, Hiſt.* 18. *See alſo* Hyginus, cap. 84.

(*e*) A part of Elis in Peloponneſus.

(*f*) Pauſan. lib. 6. pag. 502, Ed. 1696.

(*g*) A town in the territory of Argos.

(*h*) Hygin. cap. 75.

(*i*) Φεύγοντα τὸν πατέρα διὰ τὸν Χρυσίππου θάνατον. *Patrem fugienti* (Atreo) *propter Chryſippi necem.* Thucyd. lib. 1. *See alſo* Plato, *in Cratyl.* pag. m. 272, C.

(1) Plutarch. in *Parallel.* p. 313.
(2) Apoſtolius, Cent. 18. num. 7. *Scholiaſt. Eurip. in Oreſt.* verſ. 5.
(3) *Scholiaſt. Pindari, ad Olymp. A.*

[*A*] *He was natural ſon of Pelops.*] Some ſay the miſtreſs who bore him this fine child was the Nymph Danaïs (1). Others name her Axioche (2), or Aſtyoche (3); but the Scholiaſt on Homer ſuppoſes the mother of Chryſippus to have been the lawful wife of Pelops. Conſult him on the 105th verſe of the ſecond Book of the Iliad. He ſpeaks, as well as the other writers, of the jealouſy of Hippodamia, and the aſſaſſination committed by Atreus and Thyeſtes, and cites Hellanicus.

Maternus, have given for a companion to Ganymede [B]. Moreri's Dictionary has not as yet ſpoken of this ſon of Pelops, or of CHRYSIPPUS of Tyana [C], Author of a Book concerning the method of making bread (k): but CHRYSIPPUS a famous Phyſician, and native of Cnidos [D], and CHRYSIPPUS the ſcholar of Eraſiſtratus have not been forgotten. It is there wrongly affirmed of this Scholar of Eraſiſtratus, that *he had compoſed Georgies*; for that is a Work which Diogenes Laertius aſcribes to a different Chryſippus (l).

(k) Athenæus, lib. 3. pag. 113. and lib. 14. pag. 647.

(l) Diogen. Laert. lib. 7. num. 186.

CHRYSIPPUS

[B] *It muſt not be imagined that this Chryſippus was a different perſon from him whom Clemens Alexandrinus, Arnobius . . . have given for a companion to Ganymede.*] Clemens Alexandrinus reproaches the Pagans with the Pederaſty of their Gods, and makes uſe of the following words: Οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ θεοὶ παίδων ἀπέσχοντο οἱ παρ' ὑμῖν θεοί. ὁ μέν τις, Ὕλλε· ὁ δὲ, Ὑακίνθε· ὁ δὲ, Πέλοπ· ὁ δὲ, Χρυσίππε· ὁ δὲ, Γανυμήδης ἐρῶντες· τούτους ὑμῶν καὶ γυναῖκες προσκυνεῖσθαι τοὺς θεοὺς· τοιούτους δὲ σύζυγάς εἶναι τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς ἑαυτῶν, οὕτω σώφρονας, ἵνα ὅτι ὁμοιοι τοῖς θεοῖς, τὰ ἴσα ἐζηλωκότες. *Nam nec à pueris quidem dii veſtri abſtinuere, unus quidem Hyllam, alius verò Hyacinthum, alius Pelopem, alius Chryſippum, alius autem Ganymedem, amantes. Hos deos veſtræ uxores adorent, tales autem ſuos eſſe maritos precentur, adeò temperantes, ut ſint diis ſimiles, ſimilia conſectantes* (4). i. e. "For neither did "your Gods abſtain from boys; one loving Hylas, "another Hyacinthus, another Pelops, another Chry- "ſippus, and another Ganymede. Let your wives "worſhip theſe Gods, and let them pray that their huſ- "bands may be ſuch and as ſober, that they may reſem- "ble the Gods, and purſue the like things." Arnobius, who copies this paſſage, as he does a great many others, from the ſame father, expreſſes himſelf in altogether as vague a manner: *Quid, quòd non contenti feminei generis attribuiſſe Diis curas, etiam ſexus adjungitis adamatos ab his mares? Hylam neſcio quis diligit; Hyacintho eſt alius occupatus: ille Pelopis deſideriis flagrat: hic in Chryſippum ſuſpirat ardentius: Catamitus rapitur delicium futurus, & poculorum cuſtos: & ut Jovis dicatur pullus, in partibus Fabius aduritur mollibus, obſignaturque poſticis* (5). Firmicus Maternus is a little more particular: he names not only Jupiter with regard to Ganymede, but alſo Hercules with regard to Hylas, and Apollo as to Hyacinthus. Chryſippus and Pelops are the only youths whoſe lovers he does not name. *Puerorum aliquis delectatur amplexibus, Ganymedem in ſinu Jovis quærat, Herculem videat Hylam impatienti amore quærentem, Hyacinthi deſiderio captum Apollinem diſcat. Chryſippum alius, alius Pelopem videat, ut per Deos ſuos ſibi licere dicat, quicquid hodie ſeveriſſime Romanis legibus vindicatur* (6). His Commentator (7) has nothing to ſay. I have hunted in vain for ſome note in Theodore Canterus, in Godeſchalcus Stewechius, in Gebhartus Elmenhorſtius, and in Deſiderius Heraldus, four famous Commentators on Arnobius; I found them all four as mute as fiſhes with reſpect to our Chryſippus, and the God or Hero who loved him in a criminal way: but what can be the reaſon that the three ancient Writers whom I have cited keep to ſuch uncertain expreſſions as to this laſt particular, and that the firſt has even forborn to name the lover either of Hyacinthus, or of Ganymede? It would be raſh and unjuſt to ſuſpect him of any unfair deſign, as if knowing that Chryſippus's lover was a meer man, he had not dared to name him; and that it might not be thought there was any artifice in this omiſſion, he had at the ſame time ſuppreſſed the names of the others. Let us ſay, either that his memory deceived him, and that on ſome confuted notions he thruſt in Chryſippus among the boys who had been beloved by Gods; or rather that he remembred ſome Authors (8) attributed to Jupiter what almoſt all the reſt attributed to Laius. Let us ſtick to this latter tradition, and ſay that the lover of this beautiful youth was neither a God, nor a Demigod, but a Theban (9), the ſon of Labdacus. Conſult Athenæus, who will inform you that Laius being entertained in Pelops's houſe, fell in love with Chryſippus, his hoſt's ſon, carried him off, and fled with him to Thebes (10). This Author adds, that Laius was ſaid to be the firſt who loved in that way. Ælian aſſerts the ſame thing, and that from thence the Thebans came to think it honourable and praiſe-worthy to make love after the ſame manner (11). Note that according to Hyginus it was Theſeus who forced away Chryſippus (12); but the paſſage muſt be ſuppoſed to have been corrupted: wherefore ſee the ingenious Conjecture of Perizonius, according to which, inſtead of *quem Theſeus ludis rapuit*, he would have us read *quem Nemeis Laius rapuit* (13). And indeed Hyginus had related in his LXXXVth chapter that Laius carried off Chryſippus at the Nemean games (14). Take notice he ſubjoins that Pelops recovered him, having made war on the raviſher. Take notice alſo Piſander was of opinion that the young man was ſo aſhamed of his adventure that he ſlew himſelf. *Piſander apud Eurip. Scholiaſt. pag.* 402. *Edit. Steph. ipſum* (Chryſippum) *præ pudore intuliſſe ſibi manus autumat* (15).

(4) Clem. Alexandr. *in Protrept.* pag. 21, *A.*

(5) Arnob. lib. 4. pag. 145.

(6) Firmicus Maternus, *de Errore profanar. Religionum*, pag. m. 24.

(7) Joannes à Wower.

(8) Athenæus, lib. 13. pag. 603, 604, cites *Praxilla Sicyonia.*

(9) He was King of Thebes.

(10) Athen. lib. 13. pag. 603, 604.

(11) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 13. cap. 5. and *Hiſtor. Animal.* lib. 6. cap. 15. pag. m. 339.

(12) Hygin. cap. 272.

(13) *In* Notis *ad hunc locum referente* Thoma Munckero.

(14) *Propter formæ dignitatem Nemeæ ludis rapuit.* Hygin. cap. 85.

(15) Munckerus *in Hygin.* ibid. pag. 140.

[C] *Moreri's Dictionary has not as yet ſpoken of . . .* CHRYSIPPUS *of Tyana.*] Jonſius ſuppoſes Athenæus has beſtowed on him the elogy of a moſt venerable Writer (16): but it is a meer irony in the mouth of one of Athenæus's interlocutors; and this may ſafely be compared to the *docte Cati* which I have ſpoken of above (17). There is more reaſon to ſay that Athenæus calls him an able diſcourſer about tarts and cakes. Σοφὸς πιμματολόγος. *Sapiens ille Pemmatum ſcriptor* (18).

(16) Σεμνότατος συγγραφεὺς dicitur *apud Athenæum XIV*, 16. Jonſ. *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſ.* pag. 157.

(17) Remark [E] of the Article CATIUS.

(18) Athen. lib. 14. cap. 15. pag. 648.

[D] CHRYSIPPUS *a famous Phyſician, and native of Cnidos.*] Pliny ſpeaks of him as of a man who had made extraordinary innovations in Phyſic: *Horum placita*, ſays he (19), *Chryſippus ingenti garrulitate mutavit, plurimumque & ex Chryſippo diſcipulus ejus Eraſiſtratus, Ariſtotelis filia genitus.* i. e. "Their doc- "trines did Chryſippus change with great garrulity, "and after him his Scholar Eraſiſtratus, begotten on "Ariſtotle's daughter, made conſiderable alterations "therein." Let us obſerve the two qualifications which are here given to Eraſiſtratus: the 1ſt is that of Chryſippus's Scholar; the 2d, that of the ſon of Ariſtotle's daughter. This agrees not with what we read in Sextus Empiricus (20), that Pythias the daughter of Ariſtotle was thrice married, 1ſt, to Nicanor; 2, to Procles, by whom ſhe had two ſons who ſtudied Philoſophy under Theophraſtus; 3, to the Phyſician Metrodorus, who had been the Scholar of Chryſippus the Cnidian, and who taught Eraſiſtratus. Of this third marriage iſſued a ſon who was named Ariſtotle. Perhaps Eraſiſtratus was adopted by Metrodorus and Pythias (21), and in that caſe Pliny would be to blame only for having made ſomewhat an ill choice of the word *genitus*, i. e. *begotten.* We find in Diogenes Laertius that Eraſiſtratus acknowledged he had learned many things from this Chryſippus (22); but the expreſſion being equivocal, it cannot be determined whether he learned them by lectures, or by reading. Galen looks on Chryſippus the Cnidian as the maſter of Eraſiſtratus, and as the head of thoſe who diſapproved bleeding (23). Father Hardouïn obſerves that this Chryſippus compoſed a treatiſe *de Braſſica*, i. e. *of the Colewort*, and an entire Work περὶ λαχάνων, *de Oleribus*, i. e. *of Kitchen-herbs.* He quotes Pliny and Diogenes Laertius as to the firſt of theſe two particulars, and the Sholiaſt on Nicander (24) as to the ſecond (25). But Camerarius, in the catalogue of Authors *de Re Ruſtica* which he has joined to his own Treatiſe *de Re Ruſtica* printed at Nurembergh 1595, in 12mo. has aſcribed the Book *de Braſſica* to a Chryſippus the Scholar of Eraſiſtratus. Conſult Jonſius, who has reckoned up no leſs than nineteen Chryſippus's, without affirming them, however, to have been all diſtinct perſons (26). His Collections are good and curious. The Author of the Treatiſe *de Braſſica* ſet up the Colewort for a Panacea. *Chryſippus medicus peculiarem braſſicæ librum dicavit, omnium morborum ex ea remedia continentem* (27). Let us not forget that Chryſippus the Cnidian was father of another Chryſippus, who was Phyſician to King Ptolemy, and being oppreſſed by calumny, was ſcourged and put to death (28). Laſtly, let us obſerve that Moreri is in the wrong to ſay it is not well known at what time Chryſippus of Cnidos lived. It is eaſy to infer that he was contemporary with Alexander the Great, and the firſt Ptolemy.

(19) Plinius, lib. 29. cap. 1. pag. m. 663.

(20) *Sextus Empiricus adverſus Mathemat.* cap. 12. pag. 51.

(21) *See Father* Hardouin on this paſſage of Pliny.

(22) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. num. 186.

(23) Galen. *de Venæ Sect. contra Eraſiſtr.* cap 2, & 5, *item alibi.*

(24) *Ad Theriac.* pag. 39.

(25) Hard. *in Indice Autor. Plinij*, pag. 104.

(26) Jonſius, *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſ.* pag. 157.

(27) Plinius Valerianus, *de re Medica*, lib. 4. cap. 29. *See alſo* Pliny, lib. 20. cap. 9.

(28) Diogen. Laert. lib. 7. num. 186.

CHRYSIPPUS, a Stoick Philoſopher, was born at Solos in Cilicia (*a*). Some Authors aſſert that he was Zeno's diſciple (*b*); but we know with more certainty, that he ſtudied under Cleanthes Zeno's ſucceſſor (*c*); but as he had a very acute genius [*A*], and a particular ſkill in arguing, he did not adhere to the whole doctrine of theſe two great Philoſophers, but confuted them in ſeveral points (*d*). He wrote a great many books, above 705, as we are told, ſeveral of which related to Logic [*B*], for he applied himſelf with a great deal of care to cultivate and improve that part of Philoſophy. The great number of books he compoſed, will not be ſo ſurpriſing, if it be conſidered, that he wrote ſeveral times upon the ſame ſubject; that he ſet down whatever came into his head;

(*a*) Strabo, lib. 14. pag. 462.

(*b*) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. *in Chryſippo*, num. 179.

(*c*) Valerius Maximus, lib. 8 cap. 7. num. 12. *ext.* ſuppoſes that Cleanthes was Chryſippus's diſciple, which is a very great blunder.

(*d*) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. *in Chryſippo*, num. 179.

[*A*] *He had a very acute genius.*] Let us ſee what Seneca ſaid of it; but the better to underſtand his meaning, it muſt be remembred, that he had been cenſuring ſeveral trifles, which ancient Authors had related concerning the three Graces. *Chryſippus quoque*, adds he (1), *penes quem ſubtile illud acumen eſt, & in imam penetrans veritatem, qui rei agendæ cauſa loquitur, & verbis non ultra, quam ad intellectum ſatis eſt, utitur, totum librum ſuum his ineptiis replet: ita ut de ratione dandi, accipiendi, reddendique beneficii, pauca admodum dicat: nec bis fabulas, ſed hæc fabulis inſerit.* i. e. "Chryſippus alſo, who has a ſharp wit, which diſcovers the moſt hidden truth, who ſpeaks to the purpoſe, and does not employ more words, than are neceſſary to be underſtood, fills his whole book with theſe trifles; ſo that he ſays but very little of the manner of beſtowing, receiving, and returning a favour: nor does he intermix theſe fables with his principal ſubjects, but drowns his ſubject amongſt theſe fables." And as Seneca feared to be blamed for his boldneſs in finding fault with ſo great a Philoſopher, he vindicates his conduct in the following manner. *Tu modo me tuere, ſi quis mihi objiciet quod Chryſippum in ordinem coegerim, magnum mehercule virum, ſed tamen Græcum, cujus acumen nimis tenue retunditur, & in ſe ſæpe replicatur: etiam cum agere aliquid videtur, pungit non perforat. Hoc verò quod acumen eſt? . . . . Ad hanc honeſtiſſimam contentionem, beneficiis beneficia vincendi, ſic nos adhortatur Chryſippus, ut dicat verendum eſſe, ne quia Charites Jovis ſunt filiæ, parum ſe grate agere, ſacrilegium ſit, & tam bellis puellis fiat injuria. Tu me aliquid eorum doce; per quæ beneficentior gratiorque adverſus bene merentes fiam, per quæ obligantiumque obligatorumque animi certent, ut qui præſtiterint, obliviſcantur, pertinax ſit memoria debentium. Iſtæ verò ineptiæ poetis relinquantur, quibus aures oblectare propoſitum eſt, & dulcem fabulam nectere. At qui ingenia ſanare, & fidem in rebus humanis retinere, memoriam officiorum ingerere animis volunt, ſeriò loquantur, & magnis viribus agant: niſi forte exiſtimas levi ac fabuloſo ſermone, & anilibus argumentis, prohiberi poſſe rem perniciоſiſſimam beneficiorum novas tabulas* (2). i. e. "Do you but defend me, if any one finds fault with me, for cenſuring Chryſippus, who was indeed a great man, but yet a Greek, whoſe wit, as being too ſharp, loſes its edge and becomes blunt: and even when he ſeems to be in earneſt, he pricks only, but does not ſtrike home. Now what ſharpneſs is there in this? . . . . How does Chryſippus perſuade us to this moſt noble ſtrife of outdoing one another in kindneſs? Why, he tells us, that as the Graces are the daughters of Jupiter, we muſt fear leſt we be guilty of ſacrilege, and do theſe beautiful maids an injury, if we be not grateful. But let me be taught ſuch things, by which I may become more benevolent and grateful towards thoſe who have been kind to me; by which they, who oblige others, and they who are obliged may learn to ſtrive, the former to forget the favours they beſtowed, the latter to remember for ever thoſe they received. Let us leave theſe trifles to the Poets, who have no other deſign but to pleaſe the ear, and to tell agreeable ſtories. But they, who propoſe to reclaim the mind, to maintain honeſty amongſt men, and to imprint into their heart the remembrance of the favours they receive, muſt ſpeak with more gravity, and employ the utmoſt ſtrength of eloquence, unleſs you think that idle ſtories and old women's reaſons be ſufficient to prevent that moſt pernicious thing, the cancelling of all obligations." Nothing can be more judicious than this cenſure of Seneca: He was very much in the right to expoſe the impertinence of thoſe poetical arguments, thus diſplayed in a work, which treated of one of the moſt important duties of common life. But yet he was ſo juſt as to mention even in his cenſure one of the moſt beautiful parts in Chryſippus's character, I mean, his ſharp wit. Let us ſee how Cicero ſpeaks of this Philoſopher. *Chryſippus, qui Stoicorum ſomniorum vaferrimus habetur interpres, magnam turbam congregat ignotorum Deorum, atque ita ignotorum, ut eos ne conjectura quidem informare poſſimus cum mens noſtra quidvis videatur cogitatione poſſe depingere* (3). i. e. "Chryſippus, who is ſuppoſed "to be the moſt ſubtle interpreter of the fancies of "the Stoicks, brings in a multitude of unknown Gods, "and ſo unknown, that we cannot form an idea of "them even by conjecture, tho' it ſeems, that our "mind can frame ſome notion of every thing poſſible." *Chryſippus quidem, quamquam eſt acerrimo ingenio, tamen ea dicit, ut ea ab ipſa naturâ didiciſſe, non ut ipſe reperire videatur* (4). i. e. "Tho' Chryſippus had a "very quick genius, yet the things he ſays are ſuch, "that he ſeems to have learnt them from nature, rather than to have found them out himſelf." *Et Chryſippus tibi acute dicere videbatur, homo ſine dubio verſutus & callidus. Verſutos eos appello, quorum celeriter mens verſatur; callidos autem, quorum tanquam manus opere, ſic animus uſu concalluit* (5). i. e. "You "thought that Chryſippus ſpoke acutely; he was certainly a man of a quick and experienced genius. I "call thoſe quick, whoſe mind moves briſkly; and "thoſe I ſtile experienced, whoſe mind is ſtrengthened "by experience, as a workman's hand grows hard by "working." Chryſippus's application to Dialecticks, which I ſhall mention immediately, is a very ſtrong proof of the ſubtlety of his genius.

(1) Seneca, *de Benefic.* lib. 1. cap. 3.

(2) Ibid. lib. 1. cap. 5. *Compare this with* Plutarch. *De audiendis Poetis*, pag. 31, E.

(3) Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, lib. 1. cap. 15.

(4) Idem, ibid. lib. 2. cap. 6.

(5) Idem, ibid. lib. 3. cap. 10. In the 2d book *De finibus*. he calls him *homo acutus & diligens*.

[*B*] *He wrote a great many Books . . ſeveral of which related to Logic.*] Diogenes Laertius makes them amount to the number 311 (6); which makes me find ſome difficulty in what Valerius Maximus aſſerts; he tells us, that this Philoſopher was fourſcore years old, when he began his thirty ninth Treatiſe of Logic. *Citeriores ætatis metas, ſed non parvi tamen ſpatii Chryſippi vivacitas flexit: nam octogeſimo anno cæptum undequadrageſimum λογικῶν exactiſſimæ ſubtilitatis volumen reliquit. Cujus ſtudium in tradendis ingenii ſui monumentis tantum operæ laboriſque juſtinuit, ut ad ea quæ ſcripſit penitus cognoſcenda longa vita ſit opus* (7). i. e. "The ſtrength of Chryſippus's mind did not laſt "quite ſo long, tho' it continued a great while; for "he was fourſcore years old, when he began his "thirty ninth book upon Logic, a work written "with the utmoſt ſubtlety. He has ſpent ſo much "pain and labour to leave us theſe proofs of his genius, that they require the whole life of a man, to "be perfectly underſtood." There are ſome inſtances, by which it appears, that Authors do not always publiſh every part of their works in its natural order: Scaliger publiſhed the XVth Book of his *Exotericæ Exercitationes* without the fourteen that were to precede it, and which were never printed, or I am much miſtaken. You will find an inſtance of the ſame kind in the article MORISON. We might therefore ſuppoſe, that Chryſippus having divided his whole work of Dialectics into ſeveral Books, omitted the thirty ninth, and put it off to another time (8); and did not begin to compoſe it till he was fourſcore years old. It may perhaps alſo be ſuppoſed, that there was ſuch a diviſion of his logical works, according to which the thirty ninth Book was almoſt the laſt: and thus Valerius Maximus may be made to agree with Diogenes Laertius. Obſerve that Moreri has committed here a very groſs blunder. *Valerius Maximus*, ſays he, *relates, that at the age of fourſcore he finiſhed a Treatiſe of Logic, which*

(6) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. num. 198. pag. m. 485.

(7) Valer. Max. lib. 8. cap. 7. num. 10. *De Stud. & Induſtr.*

(8) Diog. Laert. lib. 8. num. 198, obſerves, that the work περὶ τῶν καταλειπομένων ζητημάτων contained 39 books.

head; that he did not take much pains to correct his works [C]; that he crowded them with an infinite number of quotations (e); that he was very laborious (f); and that he lived to the age of above fourſcore years (g). He was a very little man (h), but the opinion he had of himſelf was very great [D]. He adhered for ſome time to the Academicks, and argued after their manner concerning the uncertainty of every thing (i). Yet notwithſtanding this, he is looked upon as a true Stoick, and even as one of the moſt illuſtrious ornaments, and moſt zealous and learned maintainers of this Sect (k). Scioppius

(e) Idem, ibid. num. 180.

(f) Idem, ibid.

(g) See the Remark [B] quotation (g).

(h) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. *in Chryſippo*, num. 183.

(i) Idem, ibid. num. 184.

(k) See the Remark [L].

which he had begun when he was forty years old. Monſr. Menage has committed the ſame blunder (9). Lucian could not forbear ridiculing this Philoſopher's logical ſubtleties (10). Let us obſerve, that he makes him live fourſcore and one years (11), which confirms Valerius's Maximus's aſſertion, concerning the long life of Chryſippus; ſo that I thought Diogenes Laertius was not to be credited, who ſuppoſes he died at the age of ſeventy three years (12).

(9) Menage, *in Laertio*, lib. 7. num. 189.

(10) Lucian. *In Vitar. Auctione*, pag. 374, & *ſeq.* tom. 1. See alſo his *Icaromenippus*, pag. 295. tom. 2.

(11) Idem, *in Macrobiis*, pag. 641. tom. 2.

(12) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. num. 184.

[C] *He did not take much pains to correct his works.*] I pretend to ſupport this aſſertion by Diogenes Laertius's Authority, tho' we read quite the contrary in his works. Ἐπλήθυνε δὲ αὐτὰ, πολλάκις ὑπὸ τῷ αὐτῷ δόγματος ἐπιχειρῶν, καὶ πάνυ τὸ ὑπόπτωσιν γράφειν, καὶ διορθοῦν πλειονάκις. πλείστη τε τῶν μαστυριῶν παραθέσει χρῶνται (13). You ſee that there is very bad reaſoning in this paſſage; for it is there aſſerted, that Chryſippus compoſed ſo many books, becauſe he often wrote upon the ſame ſubject, becauſe he ſet down whatever came into his head, becauſe he often *corrected* what he wrote, and becauſe he made uſe of a great many quotations. Here are four reaſons, whereof the firſt, ſecond, and fourth are very good; but the third is good for nothing, and even proves the contrary of what the Author intended: ſince the trouble of reviſing a work often, and correcting it now and then, will prevent an Author from writing a great many Books. But if he ſets down whatever occurs to him, if he tranſcribes all that he finds in other Writers, and ſeldom corrects what he has once written, he may eaſily overload the learned world with his works. I do therefore believe, that Diogenes Laertius aſſerted, that moſt part of the time Chryſippus did not correct his writings, and I am of opinion that the tranſcribers omitted the privative *Alpha* in the word διορθούμενος (14). I am confirmed in this conjecture by Diogenes Laertius himſelf, who obſerves, that as Chryſippus intended to publiſh as many books as Epicurus, he often repeated the ſame things, and publiſhed whatever occurred to him, without correcting it. He did not read over what he had written; he wrote too haſtily, and filled his Books with quotations (15). Εἰ γάρ τι γράψαι ὁ Ἐπικούρος, φιλοπικεῖ τοσοῦτο γράψαι ὁ Χρυσίππος, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ πολλάκις ταῦτα γέγραφε, καὶ τὸ ἐπιλαθὸν καὶ ἀδιόρθωτον (16) εἶκε τῷ ἐπείγεσθαι. καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια τοσαῦτα ἐστὶν ὡς ἐκείνων γέμειν τὰ βιβλία. It is plain that the Hiſtorian intended to ſay the ſame thing in theſe two paſſages, ſo that the one muſt ſerve to correct the other. Let us obſerve, that our Philoſopher, through his ſtrong deſire of publiſhing a great many Books, not only filled his works with quotations, and ſaid the ſame things over again ſeveral times, but even contradicted his own aſſertions: for he would ſometimes tranſcribe what he had already publiſhed, and at other times he confuted himſelf (17). None of his works are extant: their titles only have been tranſmitted to us; and it is even thought by ſome, that there is ſomething wanting in Diogenes Laertius, where he mentions thoſe titles. This is Jonſius's opinion in his Treatiſe *De Scriptoribus Hiſtoriæ Philoſophicæ* (18), in which he endeavours to ſupply in ſome meaſure the defect in Diogenes Laertius. Obſerve, that Chryſippus never dedicated any of his works to a King (19); ſome Authors think, that this was owing to his haughty and diſdainful temper; they add, that he refuſed to go and meet Ptolemy, who had deſired Cleanthes, either to come to him himſelf, or to ſend him one of his Diſciples (20); but Chryſippus does not deſerve to be blamed on any of theſe accounts; far from it he deſerves to be praiſed; ſince nothing did better become a Philoſopher, than to act as he did. We ſhall give below much ſtronger proofs of his haughtineſs.

(13) Idem, ibid. num. 180.

(14) Or perhaps διορθούμενον.

(15) Diog. Laert. lib. 10. pag. 724. edit. Genev. 1616.

(16) The edition of Amſterdam in 1692, has in this place τῷ μὴ ἐπιλαθεῖν καὶ ἀδιόρθωτα &c.

(17) See the Remark [E] in the Article EPICURUS.

(18) Book 2. chap. 8. pag. 151 &c. *See alſo* Menage in Laert. lib. 7. num. 190, & *ſeq.*

(19) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. num. 185.

(20) Idem, ibid.

[D] *The opinion he had of himſelf was very great.*] He uſed to ſay often to his Profeſſor, Shew me but the doctrines; that is ſufficient for me, and all I want; I ſhall find the proofs of them my ſelf (21). A perſon aſked him one day; Whom ſhall I chuſe for my ſon's Tutor? Me, anſwered Chryſippus; for if I knew any body more learned than my ſelf, I would go and ſtudy under him (22).

(21) Idem, ibid. num. 179.

(22) Idem, ibid. num. 183.

[E] *Scioppius has abuſed him very much.*] He looks upon him as a Chief of thoſe Stoicks, who had diſgraced their Sect, by making an ill uſe of their wit, and by hunting after idle ſubtleties, which were proper only to caſt a ridicule upon the gravity of the Sect. *Neque tamen* (23) *defendere ac negare velim fuiſſe Stoicorum non paucos, qui ſpecie ingenii illecti, inanibus argutiis ludibria quædam excitando dignitatem ſeveriſſimæ ac graviſſimæ rationis in contemptum adduxerint: quorum Princeps jure dici poſſit Chryſippus, qui cum eſſet magna quadam ingenii vi præditus, mireque ad quidvis excogitandum celer & acutus, nihil æquè ſolebat laborare, quam ut non reliquarum tantum ſectarum inventoribus contradiceret, ſed a Magiſtris etiam ſuis Zenone & Cleanthe pleriſque in rebus diſſideret.* His pride, adds he, made him diſpute *pro and con* upon every ſubject; and he wrote a great deal, out of jealouſy againſt Epicurus, who had compoſed more Books than any other Philoſopher: but notwithſtanding all his endeavours, he could never come up with this competitor: he often repeats the ſame things over again, and oftener ſtill contradicts himſelf (24). So that Plutarch had ſome reaſon to attack chiefly this Stoick Philoſopher, and to reprove him for his temerity and audaciouſneſs. This, continues Scioppius, happens generally, when a man in any diſpute aims at gaining the victory, rather than at finding out the truth. *Sed ſolet hoc fieri, quoties victoriæ majorem, qui diſputant, quam veritatis rationem ducunt, verumque eſt illud Poetæ*

(23) Scioppius, *Element. Philoſoph. Stoicæ Moralis*, folio 165 *verſo.*

(24) *Sæpe enim ſcripſit eadem, ſæpius ſibi contraria ac repugnantia.* Idem, ibid. folio 166.

Nimium altercando veritas amittitur.

Quod Carneadi quoque eveniſſe Cicero teſtatur, ut odio ſcilicet Stoicorum in conſtituendo bonorum fine, plurimum ac reliquorum Academicorum, ſuâque ipſius ſententiâ diſcederet (25). i. e. "So true is the Poet's ſaying, *We* "*loſe the truth by diſputing too much*: and this, as Tully "affirms, happened to Carneades, who out of hatred "againſt the Stoicks not only contradicted the opinions "of the reſt of the Academicks, with regard to the "*Summum Bonum* or Supreme Good, but even depart-"ed from his own ſentiments." It muſt be confeſſed, that Scioppius's Reflections are very judicious. It is a very great misfortune for any Sect to be defended by a man, who has a great, quick, ready, and proud genius, and who deſires to acquire the reputation not only of a fine Writer, but alſo of a fruitful Author. The chief or rather only deſign of ſuch a Writer is to gain the victory over any adverſary, whom he undertakes to confute: and as he labours to promote his own glory, rather than the intereſt of his Sect, he inſiſts chiefly upon thoſe particular hints, which his imagination furniſhes him with. He does not much care, whether they be agreable to the principles of his Sect, if they be but proper either to evade an objection, or to puzzle his adverſaries. Being in love with his own fancies, he does not obſerve their weak ſide, nor does he foreſee what an advantage his preſent adverſaries, or thoſe he may happen to diſpute with afterwards, can make of them. The preſent time is his only care, and he does not mind that which is to come. And beſides as he is continually publiſhing Book after Book, now againſt one Sect, then againſt another, he cannot avoid contradicting himſelf, and it is impoſſible his reaſonings ſhould be well connected together. Thus he betrays the cauſe of his party, and as he ſtrives to eſcape one extremity, he throws himſelf headlong into the other, and by turns into both. The ſaying of an ancient Poet quoted by Scioppius, namely, that by too much diſputing we loſe the truth, will perhaps make ſome perſons think, that the diſputes been Philoſophers are like that concerning the Oyſter, which has been ſo elegantly deſcribed both by Monſr. Boileau (26), and by Monſr.

(25) Scioppius, *Element. Philoſph. Moral.* folio 166 *verſo.*

(26) In his 2d Epiſtle.

pius has abuſed him very much [E], and has done it even in a book, in which he extols, to the utmoſt of his power, the opinions of the Stoicks; but he treats him after that manner, becauſe he looked upon him as a man of a proud and contradicting ſpirit, who by his haughty and arrogant behaviour very much injured the whole Sect. The Stoicks complained, that Chryſippus had collected ſo many arguments in favour of the Sceptical Hypotheſis, that he could not afterwards anſwer them himſelf [F], and had thus furniſhed Carneades their antagoniſt with weapons againſt them. This ſeems to prove that he acted with ſincerity, and did not labour to gain an eaſy victory, by a fraudulent miſrepreſentation of his adverſary's arguments. But as on the other hand he blamed thoſe who took care to ſet their antagoniſt's arguments in as fair a light as their own, one might think that his conduct was owing to his vanity rather than to his ſincerity; this at leaſt might be objected to him, that his precepts and his conduct were not of a piece [G]. The Stoicks might

Monſr. de la Fontaine (27). But there is a great difference to be obſerved here; for if the oyſter in conteſt was not given to either of the parties, yet it fell to the ſhare of a third, namely of a Judge; whereas the diſputes between Philoſophers produce quite another effect; they make both the ſpectators of the battle and the champions loſe the truth; no body does nor can ſeize upon it in the ſequeſtration in which it is put, whilſt the ſuit is depending. I ſhall enlarge a little more upon this ſubject in one of the remarks of the article EUCLID (28).

(27) In the 9th Fable of the 4th Part, Book 3. pag. m. 44.

(28) In the Remark [E].

[F] *The Stoicks complained that Chryſippus had collected ſo many arguments in favour of the Sceptical Hypotheſis, that he could not afterwards confute them himſelf.*] The words which I ſhall quote are very remarkable; Cicero makes an Academick ſpeak them. *De quibus volumina impleta ſunt, non a noſtris ſolum, ſed etiam a Chryſippo, de quo queri ſolent Stoici, dum ſtudioſe omnia conquiſierit contra ſenſus & perſpicuitatem, contraque omnem conſuetudinem, contraque rationem, ipſum ſibi reſpondentem inferiorem fuiſſe; itaque ab eo armatum eſſe Carneadem* (29). i. e. "Whole volumes "have been written upon this ſubject, not only by "thoſe of our ſect, but even by Chryſippus himſelf; of "whom the Stoicks uſe to complain, that whilſt he "collected all the arguments he could, againſt the "ſenſes and evidence, againſt cuſtom and againſt rea"ſon, he was not able to anſwer them himſelf, and "thus furniſhed Carneades with weapons againſt them." Plutarch expatiates very much upon this ſubject; that Chryſippus "himſelf in his diſputations often inſiſted "upon arguments, that were contrary to his own "opinion, and that he did it ſeriouſly, and with ſo "much zeal and ardour, that it was not eaſy to diſ"cover what opinion pleaſed him moſt, is confeſſed "even by thoſe, who admire the ſtrength of his mind: "and they aſſert, that Carneades ſaid nothing of his "own invention, but that thoſe arguments, by which "Chryſippus had endeavoured to ſhew, how one may "argue *pro* and *con* upon the ſame ſubject, Carnea"des turned them againſt Chryſippus himſelf, ſo that "*whilſt they diſputed the former uſed often to repeat* "*aloud to the latter* * this line of Homer,

(29) Cicero, *Academ. Quæſt.* lib. 4. cap. 27.

* This is not tranſlated according to the Greek, but according to Amiot's French tranſlation. The reader will ſee the reaſon below, after the quotation (30).

"Unhappy man, thy ſtrength will ruin thee.

"becauſe he had furniſhed thoſe with ſtrong argu"ments, who would undertake to confute him. But "with regard to what Chryſippus has ſaid againſt e"vidence, they boaſt of it to ſuch a degree, that they "do not ſcruple to aſſert, that all the writings of the "Academics taken together are not worthy to be com"pared with what Chryſippus alone wrote againſt "the certainty of the ſenſes. This indeed is a proof "either of the ignorance or of the blind ſelf-love of "thoſe who aſſert it: but yet it is true, that when "Chryſippus undertook to write in favour of the ſenſes "and of cuſtom, he was not equal to the taſk, and "this Book proved much weaker, than the former, "ſo that he contradicts himſelf (30)." Obſerve by the by an error of Amiot. Theſe words *the former uſed often to repeat to the latter &c.* do but too clearly hint, that Chryſippus and Carneades diſputed often together. Now, this is not true (31); for Chryſippus died before Carneades could diſpute with him. Plutarch's words, καὶ πολλάκις παρεφθέγγεσθαι Δημώνια φάσιν ὅτι τὸ σὸν μόνῳ, ſignify, according to Xilander, not that Carneades ſaid this, but that men uſed to cry to Chryſippus, *unhappy man, thy ſtrength will ruin thee*; *& Chryſippo ſolent acclamare; Infelix, tua te vis perdet.* I ſhould rather think, that this muſt be referred to Carneades, and that it ſignifies, that when this Philoſopher confuted Chryſippus in his Lectures he uſed to direct his diſcourſe to him, as tho' he had been preſent, and applied that verſe to him: but to do this, it was not neceſſary that Chryſippus ſhould be preſent, nor even that he ſhould be alive. Nay, Plutarch himſelf obſerves in another paſſage, not very far from that which we have quoted, that theſe two Philoſophers were not contemporaries. He brings in a Stoick Philoſopher, who obſerves, that *it was not by chance, but through the Providence of the Gods, that Chryſippus was born after Arceſilaus, and before Carneades, the former of whom had been the author and promoter of the injury againſt common notions, and the latter had gained a greater reputation than any other of the Academicks. And Chryſippus having been between them both, did by his writings againſt Arceſilaus prevent the effects of Carneades's eloquence* (32). This Stoick does not grant, that Chryſippus furniſhed Carneades with weapons; for he compared him to a General, who puts ſtrong Garriſons in all the Towns, which the enemy is to beſiege, and who with a great order and prudence aſſigns to every ſoldier the poſt he muſt defend (33).

(30) Plutarch, *De Repugnant. Stoicorum*, pag. 1036.

(31) See the Remark [E] of the Article CARNEADES quotations (39) and (40).

(32) Idem, *De Communibus Notionibus, init.* pag. 1059 B.

(33) Idem, ibid.

[G] *It might be objected to him, that his precepts, and his conduct were not of a piece.*] I have obſerved (34), that he ſeems to have acted with ſincerity, and did not artfully propoſe his adverſary's objections in a weak manner. He repreſented them ſo faithfully in their whole ſtrength, that he could not afterwards confute them with the ſame ſucceſs, as he had propoſed them. It is ſaid, he acted in this reſpect againſt his own principles, and this is one of the inconſiſtencies which Plutarch objects to him. Here is the ſequel of the paſſage I have quoted above (35). "So that he contradicts himſelf, ſince he required, "that we propoſe the adverſary's opinions, not as tho' "we admitted them, but in ſuch a manner as to ſhew, "that they are not true: and yet he confutes his own "opinions with more ſtrength, than he eſtabliſhes "them. He adviſes others to beware of contrary ar"guments, as being capable only to make them with"hold their aſſent, and at the ſame time he invents "ſuch arguments, as are much ſtronger, to prove there "is nothing certain, than thoſe he alledges to prove "there is ſuch a thing as certainty in nature. Nay "he himſelf was aware of this; for in the fourth "Book of his Lives he expreſſes himſelf thus: You "muſt not too inconſiderately propoſe the contrary "opinions, nor what may appear probable on the o"ther ſide of the queſtion; but in this you muſt act "with prudence, leſt the hearers ſhould be diſpoſed "to withdraw their aſſent; for as they are not able "ſufficiently to conceive the anſwers, that are made "to what was firſt propoſed, they are eaſily ſhook "out of their aſſent, and drawn contrariwiſe by the "Megarick interrogations, and by a great many other "and more ſtrong arguments (36)." Upon this they "attack him two different ways, and preſs very hard "upon him; for they maintain againſt him, 1. That "his maxim is a bad one; 2. That as he did not fol"low it, he has contradicted himſelf." With regard to the firſt article, read the following words of Plutarch. *He ſays that he does not abſolutely condemn the method of arguing* pro *and* con *upon the ſame ſubject; but he adviſes us to do it cautiouſly, as the Lawyers do, who ſometimes alledge the reaſons of their party, not in order to approve and ſupport them, but only to confute them. They only can act otherwiſe, ſays he, who pretend to doubt of every thing; for their arguing with the ſame ſtrength*

(34) In the text of this Article.

(35) Quotation (30).

(36) Plutarch, *de Repugnat. Stoicorum*, pag. 1036.

might more juſtly complain of his indiſcretion in maintaining ſeveral doctrines, which might render their Sect odious; for he did not ſcruple to aſſert, that it was lawful for a father to lie with his daughter, a ſon with his mother, a brother with his ſiſter (*l*); and that men ought to eat the bodies of the dead (*m*). Moſt of the contradictions and abſurd paradoxes, which Plutarch charges the Stoicks with (*n*), and for which he is very ſevere upon them, which could not but vex them very much, are borrowed from Chryſippus's works. If he had only accuſed them of contradicting themſelves in their doctrine of Fate, and in that concerning the liberty of man, he would not have gained a great victory over them; for to vindicate Chryſippus, the Stoicks might have made the ſame anſwer

(*l*) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. num. 188. *See alſo* Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhon. Hypotypoſ.* lib. 3. cap. 24, 25.

(*n*) See his Treatiſe *De repugnantiis Stoicorum*, and that *De communibus notitiis contra Stoicos.*

(*m*) Idem, ibid. *See alſo* Sextus Empiricus, ibid. cap. 24. I do not ſpeak of his opinion, that women ought to be common among Philoſophers; for in this, other Philoſophers had ſhewed him the way. Ὡς τὸν ἐντυχόντα τῇ ἐντυχούσῃ χρῆσθαι. i. e. "Every man "may enjoy the "firſt woman "he meets." Diog. Laert. lib. 8. in *Zenone*, num. 131.

ſtrength pro *and* con *ſerves their turn, as it is proper to ſhew that every thing is uncertain. But he who intends to eſtabliſh a true knowledge, according to which we ought to regulate our conduct, muſt indeed lay the whole ſubject before us from the beginning to the end, and as occaſion offers, he may mention the adverſary's objections, but only in order to weaken and confute them, as Lawyers do at the Bar. Theſe are his own words. We have ſhewed in another place, how abſurd it is for Philoſophers to alledge their Antagoniſt's opinions unfairly, and to confute them only after having weakened and miſrepreſented the arguments that ſupport them, like Lawyers, who plead at the Bar; as if the deſign of the whole diſpute was not to find out the truth, but only to gain the victory* (37). As to the ſecond article Chryſippus could not but be extremely puzzled; for they object to him (38) one of his works, in which he ſpoke with the utmoſt contempt of Stilpo's and Menedemus's arguments (39). *But yet, good man*, continues Plutarch, *you fear leſt theſe very arguments, which you ridicule . . . . ſhould be capable to make men withdraw their aſſent. And even you, who wrote ſo many Books againſt certainty, in which you have inſerted all that your imagination could furniſh you with, and in which you laboured to outdo Arceſilaus himſelf, did you not intend to raiſe doubts in your reader's mind? For Chryſippus does not make uſe of arguments only, when he diſputes againſt Certainty; but as if it were at the Bar, he endeavours to ſtir up men's paſſions, and ſpeaks with great heat and fervency, ſtiling Certainty ſometimes a folly, and ſometimes a ſilly and idle thing. And that he may not pretend, he did not contradict himſelf, let us quote what he ſays in his Book upon Natural Philoſophy. When a thing is clearly conceived, ſays he, one may venture to argue a little againſt it, and then ſupport it as much as is poſſible. And when neither ſide of the queſtion is clearly underſtood, one may diſpute* pro *and* con. *And in his Book concerning the uſe of reaſon, having ſaid, that we ought not to employ the ſtrength of reaſon any more than that of arms, where it is not proper, he adds, for we muſt make uſe of theſe in order to find out the truth, and what comes neareſt to it, and not the contrary, as a great many do. By a great many, he means, I think, thoſe who withhold their aſſent. But as they pretend, that nothing can be clearly conceived, they act conſiſtently, when they argue for and againſt both ſides of a queſtion; and this, they think, is the only, or at leaſt the chief method to find out the truth, ſuppoſe there be ſomething, that can be clearly conceived. But you, Chryſippus, who accuſe them, ſince you wrote againſt what you conceived yourſelves concerning certainty and evidence, and even have earneſtly adviſed others to do the ſame, you muſt confeſs that you employed your eloquence in things not only uſeleſs, but even detrimental, only out of an idle ambition to ſhew your wit, like a young Scholar.*

(37) Idem, ibid. pag. 1035, 1036.

(38) Idem, ibid. pag. 1037.

(39) They are the ſame with thoſe he called *Megarick Interrogations.*

One cannot eaſily gueſs, how Chryſippus, notwithſtanding his ſharp genius, could extricate himſelf out of this difficulty; for his maxims do not become a Philoſopher, and if he had been able to vindicate them, he would have pronounced a ſentence of condemnation againſt himſelf, ſince he had acted againſt them, where he ſupported with all his ſtrength, and even better than Arceſilaus himſelf, the cauſe of the Academicks, which according to him was a bad one. In my opinion they were in the right to ſay, that the vanity of a young Scholar tranſported him to ſuch a degree, that he made a ſacrifice of his own maxims, to the ſtrong deſire he had of taking hold of a favourable opportunity, to diſplay the ſubtlety of his imaginations, even to the detriment of the truths, which the Stoics maintained. The glory which he expected, if he could but make men ſay, that he had improved upon Arceſilaus himſelf, and had expreſſed the objections of the Academicks in a much ſtronger manner than he, was his only aim, ſo that he did not mind the reſt. Thus we have ſeen a late controverſial Writer, who did not ſcruple to contradict himſelf on every occaſion, nor to lay open very dangerouſly the intereſts of his own Church, and even the moſt important truths acknowledged amongſt the Chriſtians, to the objections of the adverſaries, if he could but gain the reputation of being a man, who found out new and untrodden roads, and new methods of attacking and defending. What was the Idol, to which he offered incenſe, and to which he ſacrificed? Himſelf. After all, ſaid he within himſelf, men muſt own, that I have a very extenſive genius, and a very fruitful imagination.

Let us expoſe here the falſity of Chryſippus's maxims. He pretended, that they who undertake to teach any truth, muſt ſpeak but very ſparingly of the arguments, that might be alledged on the other ſide of the queſtion, and ought to imitate the Lawyers. This was the reigning opinion amongſt the Dogmaticks; and there were but few Philoſophers, beſides the Academics, who propoſed with the ſame ſtrength the arguments on both ſides. Now I aſſert, that the method of the Dogmaticks was very bad, and did not much differ from the deceitful art of the Sophiſtical Rhetoricians, which rendered them ſo odious, and which was, to make the beſt cauſe of that which was the worſt (40): for one of their chief artifices was to ſuppreſs all that could be ſaid in favour of the cauſe which they oppoſed, and to hide the weak ſide of that which they maintained; yet for form's ſake, they would propoſe ſome objections, but never failed to chooſe thoſe which they could moſt eaſily confute. Now this is really, what Chryſippus adviſed the Philoſophers to do: he would have them mention but ſlightly the arguments that favoured their adverſary's opinions, and might ſhake the perſuaſion of the hearer or reader; he would have them act like thoſe who plead at the bar. Why did he not roundly aſſert, that we muſt philoſophize in a mercantile manner, and like the Shop-keepers, mention only the good qualities of our Wares or Stuffs, ſet them off to the beſt advantage, and artfully cry down thoſe of our neighbour? Why did he not ſay, that we muſt do like thoſe, who having ſoundly quarrelled together, go and complain before a Magiſtrate? Each of them relates the affair ſo much to his own advantage, that if you will believe him, he is not in the leaſt to blame (41); but it is, becauſe he omits all the circumſtances that are againſt him, and for his adverſary. Chryſippus is to be blamed, not only for the diſhoneſty, and the low artifice by which he would have us gain the victory; but alſo for his indiſcretion in revealing ſuch a practice. Such a thing ought not to have been communicated to the public in a work; it ſhould have been kept ſecret, as the Politicians do their State-Myſteries, the *Arcana Imperii*; or at leaſt, it ſhould only have been whiſpered to ſome diſcreet and learned Scholar.

(40) Τὸν ἥττονα λόγον κρείττονα ποιεῖν. *See* Creſollius, *Theatr. Sophiſt.* lib. 1. cap. 11. pag. 79, & *ſeq.*

(41) Compare this with what we have obſerved in the article BLONDEL Remark [Q] in the *A lines* concerning the account of facts in the controverſies of the Learned.

Obſerve, that there were amongſt the Ancients two ſort of Philoſophers; ſome were like the pleading Counſellors, and the others, like a Recorder or Judge, who ſums up the evidence on both ſides. The former when they proved their opinions, hid as much as they could the weak ſide of their cauſe, and the ſtrength of their adverſary's arguments. The latter were the Scepticks or Academicks, who faithfully and without any partiality expoſed all that could be ſaid on either ſide of a queſtion. But ſuch a diſtinction has ſeldom been obſerved amongſt the Chriſtians in their ſchools of Philoſophy, and leſs ſtill in thoſe of Divinity. Religion does not ſuffer that academical or ſceptical humour; it requires, that we abſolutely deny or affirm. We do

ſwer, which is made at this time in behalf of thoſe who cannot reconcile God's decree with our free-will, and who, when they ſpeak of Predeſtination cannot but make uſe of ſuch expreſſions as ſeem to be inconſiſtent with thoſe they employ, when they would perſuade men to virtue, and reprove them for their vices. None of the Philoſophers ſpoke in ſtronger terms of the fatal neceſſity of every thing, nor more pompouſly of the liberty of man (*o*), than the Stoicks. Judge then, whether Chryſippus, who wrote ſo many volumes in a hurry, and who had a quick and bold genius, could forbear aſſerting in his moral treatiſes ſeveral propoſitions, which could not be reconciled with thoſe, which he maintained in his metaphyſical books. Plutarch charges him with making God the Author of ſin;

(*o*) See *Præſantium & Eruditorum Virorum Epiſtolæ Eccleſiaſticæ at Theologicæ*, pag. 640. and 659. edit. 1684.

not meet there with any Judges, but ſuch as are at the ſame time parties concerned; and there are numberleſs Authors, who plead their cauſe according to Chryſippus's maxims; I mean, who act only like Lawyers; and there is no Judge or Recorder to report the cauſe; for if any perſon ventures to repreſent faithfully and without any artifice or diſguiſe, the whole ſtrength of the adverſary's arguments, he becomes odious and ſuſpected, and is in danger of being treated like an infamous prevaricator, who betrays his own party (42). It is not only human prudence, policy, and the intereſts of one's own party, that make a man act only the part of a pleading Lawyer: this is alſo owing to a charitable zeal, on which occaſion I ſhall relate here, what I was told the other day by a learned Divine, who is at the ſame time a very honeſt man. I aſſerted that an Author, who, without pretending to dogmatize, keeps within the bounds of Hiſtory, may and ought to repreſent faithfully, the moſt ſpecious arguments, which the moſt erroneous Sects have to alledge either to ſupport their own opinions, or againſt Orthodoxy: and as he denied it, I replied; ſuppoſe you are a Profeſſor of Divinity, and you chuſe the myſtery of the Trinity for the ſubject of your Lectures during a whole winter. You examine thoroughly all that the Orthodox have ſaid, and the Heretics have objected; and by your own meditation and the ſtrength of your mind, you find that one might anſwer the ſolutions of the Orthodox much better than the ſectaries have done; in a word you find out new difficulties, much ſtronger than all thoſe that have been ſtarted till this time; and which are much harder to ſolve; I ſuppoſe you will lay them before your audience; .... Not I, replied he, I ſhall do no ſuch thing; it would be digging a precipice before them; neither Chriſtian Charity, nor the zeal we ought to have for truth, will ſuffer us to do that. Such was his anſwer. Now it may very well be, that ſome Authors boaſt in a preface, that they have overthrown all the fences and bulwarks of the Hereticks, tho' they be conſcious, that out of mere charity they have omitted to examine their ſtrongeſt and moſt captious objections. We may believe this chiefly of the Roman Catholick Writers on Controverſy, ſince complaints were made againſt Bellarmin, that the ſincerity, with which he repreſented the arguments of the Heretics proved detrimental (43).

(42) See the remark [*P*] in the article CHARRON.

(43) See the remark [*I*] of the article BELLARMIN.

WHETHER they who prohibit the books of the Heretics, ought to ſuffer that their objections be publiſhed in the books of the Orthodox, who confute them.

I muſt examine in this place, what I promiſed in the article of that Cardinal (44). Do they who burn the books of an Heretick, and ſuffer nevertheleſs, that the books in which they are confuted, be publickly read, reaſon coherently, and is their conduct uniform and all of a piece? You will anſwer, no: for the reaſon why the reading and ſelling of Heretical Books is prohibited, is, that it is feared leſt they ſhould poiſon the readers. They are apprehenſive in Italy, leſt they who ſhould ſee in what manner a Proteſtant Writer proves his own Doctrine, and how he confutes that of the Catholics, ſhould fill their heads with doubts and ſcruples, and ſhould even be entirely convinced by the arguments of ſuch an Author. But is not the ſame misfortune to be feared if they read Bellarmin's works? Will they not find there the arguments and objections of the Hereticks? And ſuppoſe Bellarmin acted honeſtly, will they not find them there repreſented with as much ſtrength as they are in the Books even of the moſt learned Proteſtants? Yes, you will ſay, but then they will find them there with the anſwers added to them; whereas if they read only the Book of the Heretick, they would find the poiſon without having a wholeſome and well prepared antidote. But this anſwer is not ſatisfactory; for it ſuppoſes, that the Readers are extremely imprudent and lazy; it ſuppoſes that they would chooſe to venture their own ſalvation, rather than take the pains of paſſing from one book to another, and that tho' they knew, they could find Bellarmin's Works at the ſame Bookſeller's ſhop, where they bought the Work of a Calviniſt, they would yet determine the queſtion on the ſide of the latter, before they inquired into this Cardinal's arguments, tho' they could immediately have upon their table both the Book which contains the poiſon, and that which affords the antidote. You muſt own that the difference there is between the arguments of an Heretick, bound up in one volume with thoſe of the Orthodox, and the ſame arguments bound up ſeparately, thoſe of the Heretick in one volume, and thoſe of the Orthodox in another; you muſt own, I ſay, that ſuch a difference does not afford ſufficient ground either for hope or fear. The hope muſt therefore be grounded on ſome other conſideration. It muſt be ſuppoſed, that what may be a ſufficient antidote, when the readers compare the arguments which the Orthodox quotes from the Book of the Heretick, with the Orthodox's anſwer, is not a ſufficient remedy, when the Readers compare the whole Book of the Heretick, with the whole Book of the Orthodox. It muſt therefore be alſo ſuppoſed, that ſetting aſide the anſwer, the arguments of the Heretick are weaker in the Book of the Orthodox, than they are in the work of the Heretick himſelf; conſequently it muſt be ſuppoſed, that the Author of the Anſwer was ſo cautious, as not to propoſe thoſe arguments, till he had diſguiſed and curtailed them, and given them ſuch a turn, that they could not make any impreſſion upon thoſe, who ſeeing them only in that dreſs, ſhould compare them with the anſwers. At this rate the Inquiſitors who prohibit a Book, and ſuffer people to read a confutation of it, do not act inconſiſtently, nor is their conduct incoherent; they are perſuaſed that their prohibition will be uſeful at the ſame time that their permiſſion is not prejudicial. However, we may infer from thence, that the ſame policy, the ſame prudence, the ſame charity, the ſame zeal, (call it by what name you pleaſe) which ingages them to burn ſome works, or to prohibit the reading and ſelling of them, muſt of courſe ingage them not to ſuffer, that all the arguments of the author of theſe works, be inſerted in the Books which are deſigned as a confutation of them. For if againſt Chryſippus's maxim, theſe arguments were propoſed with all poſſible ſincerity, and in their whole ſtrength, it would be needleſs to deſtroy theſe bad Books, unleſs thoſe in which they are confuted, were deſtroyed at the ſame time. This is ſo evident, that it is probable, all the Authors who are zealous for maintaining the diſcipline, accommodate themſelves to the humour of them who govern, and who prohibit ſome Books. It is very probable, I ſay, that if theſe Authors undertake to confute ſome of thoſe prohibited Books, they will take care that their confutation does not contain the leaſt thing that might ſhake the faith of the Readers. They bring within the compaſs of three or four lines an objection which took up ſeveral pages; they ſeparate it from all its ſupports, and from all the preliminary obſervations that ſerved to ſtrengthen it, and what they cannot anſwer, they prudently omit (45). After all it is very difficult, for a Work, be it never ſo ſtrong with regard to thoſe who read it attentively from one end to the other, to appear to have any ſtrength, in the fragments which an Author quotes from it, and which he diſperſes here and there in ſeveral places of his anſwer, tranſcribing four lines in one place, five or ſix in another, &c. theſe are as ſo many branches lopped off from the trunk of a tree; it is clock-work taken to pieces, in which it is impoſſible to obſerve the diſmembered body (46). All the Controverſial Writers complain in their turns of the artifices

(44) Quotation (45) of the Article BELLARMIN.

(45) *Et quæ Deſperat tractata nitescere poſſe relinquit.* Horat. *de Arte Poetic.* ver. 150. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, Juilet, 1685, Art. 3. pag. 804.

(46) *Non ... invenias etiam diſjecti membra poetæ.* Horat. Sat. 4. lib. 1. ver. 62.

ſin; and Lipſius, who endeavoured to clear him of this blemiſh, did not ſucceed in his attempt [H]: nor do I wonder at it; for the very definition of God (p), given by Chryſippus, ſhews, that he did not diſtinguiſh the Deity from the Univerſe; ſo that if he reaſoned

(p) See the Remark [H] quotation (49).

(47) Compare this with the *Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres*, Juliet 1685, Art. 3.

ſices of thoſe who write againſt them (47). I have known a Roman Catholick, who ſaid, that all the Works publiſhed againſt Bellarmin, deſerved to be intitled *Bellarminus enervatus*, *Bellarmin enervated*, (as Ameſius intitled his Book againſt this Cardinal;) *enervatus*, added he, not by the ſtrength of the anſwer, but by the manner of repreſenting his objections. The Proteſtants do ſtill more complain of the unfair proceedings of their adverſaries. Obſerve the diſputes, which ſometimes ariſe between perſons of the ſame party: read the reſpective works of the diſputants; you will find ſome ſtrength in them: but if you will judge of Mævius's Books by the ſcraps which his adverſary Titius quotes from them, and by the reflections he makes upon them, you will think, that Mævius can neither write nor reaſon well, and that he even wants common ſenſe.

Obſerve, that I do not pretend to aſſert, that they who prohibit heretical Books, always act conſiſtently (48).

(48) See the *Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres*, Sept. 1685, pag. 1053. Juin 1686, pag. 639. Juillet 1686, Art. 8. pag. 810.

[H] *Plutarch charges him with making God the Author of Sin; Lipſius, who endeavoured to clear him . . did not ſucceed in his attempt.*] You will find the charge in the remark [G] of the article PAULICIANS. Let us leave it there, ſince it was put there in the firſt edition of this Dictionary. Let us only examine in this place the arguments, which Juſtus Lipſius propoſed; but firſt of all let us ſee what was Chryſippus's opinion concerning the Nature of God. *Ait* (Chryſippus) *vim divinam in ratione poſitam, & univerſæ naturæ animo atque menti: ipſumque mundum Deum dicit eſſe, & ejus animi ſuſtionem univerſam: tum ejus ipſius principatum, qui in mente & ratione verſetur, communemque rerum naturam univerſa atque omnia continentem, tum fatalem umbram, & neceſſitatem rerum futurarum. Ignem præterea, & tum quem antea dixi æthera; tum ea, quæ natura fluerent, atque manarent, ut aquam & terram, & æra, ſolem, lunam, ſidera, univerſitatemque rerum, quâ omnia continerentur, atque homines etiam eos, qui immortalitatem eſſent conſecuti. Idemque diſputat, æthera eſſe eum, quem homines Jovem appellarent, quique aër per maria manaret, eum eſſe Neptunum; terram eam quæ Ceres diceretur, ſimilique ratione perſequitur vocabula reliquorum Deorum. Idemque etium legis perpetuæ & æternæ vim, quæ quaſi dux vitæ, & magiſtra officiorum ſit, Jovem dicit eſſe: eandemque fatalem neceſſitatem appellat, ſempiternam rerum futurarum veritatem, quorum nihil tale eſt, ut in eo vis divina eſſe videatur. Et hæc quidem in primo libro de Natura Deorum. In ſecundo autem vult Orphei, Muſæi, Heſiodi, Homerique fabellas accommodare ad ea quæ ipſe primo libro de Diis immortalibus dixerat: ut etiam veterrimi poetæ, qui hæc ne ſuſpicati quidem ſint, Stoici fuiſſe videantur* (49). i. e. "Chryſippus ſays, the divine energy or power "is univerſal reaſon, and the mind and ſoul of "whole nature: and he aſſerts that the World is God, "and the univerſal effuſion of that mind: and that "it is endowed with the governing power of the "mind and of reaſon, and is the common nature of "all things, as alſo a fatal ſhadow, and the neceſſity "of future events. Beſides, he ſays that God is a "fire, and that Æther, which I have mentioned a"bove: then he aſſerts, that it is all that flows and "emanates from nature, as water, earth, air, the ſun, "the moon, the ſtars, and the univerſality of things, "which comprehends all, and even thoſe men, who "obtained immortality. He alſo endeavours to prove, "that the Æther is, what men call Jupiter, and that "the air which flows over the Seas is ſtiled Neptune, "and that the earth is what is named Ceres. After "the ſame manner does he explain the other names of "the Gods. He alſo aſſerts, that the efficacy of that "perpetual and eternal law, which is as it were the "guide of our lives, and the teacher of our duties, "is nothing but Jupiter himſelf; and he calls it the "fatal neceſſity and the eternal truth of things to "come; tho' no divine energy can be obſerved in "any of thoſe things he mentions. This is what he "ſays in his firſt Book concerning the Nature of the "Gods. In the ſecond he undertakes to reconcile "the fables of Orpheus, Muſæus, Heſiod and Homer "with the ſyſtem he laid down in his firſt Book con"cerning the immortal Gods; thus to make the moſt "ancient Poets, who did not dream any ſuch thing, "appear to have been Stoicks." This paſſage alone would determine the queſtion to Chryſippus's ſhame, had he been a man who ſtuck to his own principles; but as he altered them daily, and maintained by turns the moſt contrary opinions, his Apologiſts may find ſomething to ſay in his favour, and by the means of his contradictions and inconſiſtencies, they may for ſome time keep their ground, and maintain him orthodox. The paſſage, which I have quoted from Cicero, contains an unintelligible jargon, it is a more rude and undigeſted Chaos, than that of the Poets. Yet through all this darkneſs we can clearly perceive, that according to Chryſippus God is the Soul of the World, that the World is the univerſal extenſion of that Soul, and that Jupiter is the eternal Law, the fatal neceſſity, the unalterable truth of all future events. The direct and unavoidable conſequence of this is, that the ſoul of man is a part of God, and that a man's actions have no other cauſe but God himſelf. But let us grant this Philoſopher the liberty of making as many ill-grounded diſtinctions as he pleaſes; after all his windings and turnings he muſt at laſt fall into the precipice. He ſuppoſes that the ſoul of man eſcaped the general fatality, he exempts it from the fate, to which all other things are ſubject, and he makes it free. *Ac mihi quidem videtur, quum duæ ſententiæ fuiſſent veterum Philoſophorum; una eorum, qui cenſerent omnia ita fato fieri, ut id fatum vim neceſſitatis afferret, in quâ ſententia Democritus, Heraclitus, Empedocles, Ariſtoteles fuit; altera eorum, quibus viderentur ſine ullo fato eſſe animorum motus voluntarii; Chryſippus tanquam arbiter honorarius medium ferire voluit, ſed applicat ſe ad eos potius, qui neceſſitate motus animos liberatos volunt . .* (50). *Chryſippus autem cum & neceſſitatem improbaret, & nihil vellet ſine præpoſitis cauſis evenire, cauſarum genera diſtinguit, ut & neceſſitatem effugiat, & retineat fatum. Cauſarum enim, inquit, aliæ ſunt perfectæ & principales, aliæ adjuvantes & proximæ. Quamobrem cum dicimus omnia fato fieri cauſis antecedentibus, non hoc intelligi volumus, cauſis perfectis & principalibus, ſed cauſis adjuvantibus, antecedentibus, & proximis* (51). i. e. "As "there were two opinions amongſt the ancient Philo"ſophers; the one that of thoſe, who held, that all "things are ſo ſubject to fate, in ſuch a manner, that "they are abſolutely neceſſary; the other that of thoſe, "who maintained that the determinations of the mind "are voluntary, and not ſubject to fate; it ſeems to "me, that Chryſippus like an honourable arbiter ſtept "between them both, tho' he comes nearer to thoſe, "who hold that the determinations of the mind are "free from neceſſity. . . As Chryſippus did not admit "an abſolute neceſſity, and yet maintained, that no"thing happens without antecedent cauſes, he diſtin"guiſhed two ſorts of cauſes, thus to eſcape neceſſity "whilſt he maintains a *Fatum*. For ſome cauſes, ſays "he, are perfect and principal cauſes, others are help"ing and near. So that, when we ſay, that every "thing happens by fate thro' antecedent cauſes, we "do not mean it of perfect and principal cauſes, but of "near, helping, and antecedent cauſes." He does not deny, as you ſee, that every thing is produced by an antecedent cauſe, but he admitted two ſorts of cauſes, the latter of which did not deſtroy man's liberty. The perfect and principal cauſes, ſaid he, do not ſuffer an action to be free, but they may be ſo notwithſtanding the helping cauſes. Since therefore he aſſerted, that our deſires were not produced by an external principal cauſe, but only by an external not principal cauſe, which only excited them, he concluded from thence, that the ſoul itſelf produced its deſires, and had a power over them. It wants to be excited by the external objects, without which it could not form the leaſt act of aſſenting; but the objects, which excite it, do not produce the determinations or acts of the will; it determines itſelf by its own ſtrength, when the objects have given it the firſt motion. He explains this by a compariſon. He who throws a cylinder, ſays he, gives it the firſt motion, but not the *volubility*, or faculty of rolling, and the cylinder rolls afterwards by its own

(49) Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, lib. 1. cap. 15.

(50) Cicero, *de Fato*, cap. 17, & ſeq.

(51) Idem, ibid.

ſtrength;

reaſoned conſiſtently, he could not but make God the Author both of moral and natural evil. One cannot, without being ſtruck with horror, read what he taught concerning the mortality

ſtrength; thus our ſoul being excited by the objects, moves afterwards of itſelf. *Quamquam aſſenſio non poſſit fieri niſi commota viſo, tamen cum hoc viſum proximam cauſam habeat non principalem, hanc habet rationem, ut Chryſippus vult, quam dudum diximus, non ut illa quidem fieri poſſit nulla vi extrinſecus excitata, neceſſe eſt enim aſſenſionem viſo commoveri, ſed revertitur ad Cylindrum, & ad turbinem ſuum, quæ moveri incipere niſi pulſa non poſſunt. Id autem quum accidit, ſuapte natura, quod ſupereſt, & Cylindrum volvi, & verſari turbinem putat. Ut igitur, inquit, qui protruſit Cylindrum, dedit ei principium motionis, volubilitatem autem non dedit, ſic viſum objectum imprimet illud quidem, & quaſi ſignabit in animo ſpeciem ſuam, ſed aſſenſio noſtra erit in poteſtate, eaque, quemadmodum in Cylindro dictum eſt, extrinſecus pulſa, quod reliquum eſt ſuapte vi & natura movebitur* (52). Obſerve, that Cicero had ſaid, that Chryſippus intangles himſelf ſo much, that whether he would or not, he confirmed the abſolute neceſſity of fate (53). This does not very clearly appear in Cicero's work, ſo that I could eaſily believe with Lipſius, that there are ſome things wanting in this place (54), as it is certain ſome are wanting in other places. Lipſius has his recourſe to Aulus Gellius, who has preſerved more exactly Chryſippus's explication. I am perſuaded the reader will permit me to tranſcribe at large what he ſays; as this is a very ſublime, intricate and inexplicable ſubject, we muſt not ſtrive to be too ſparing in our quotations. The leaving out ſome things would but render what we tranſcribe more obſcure. You will ſee, in the paſſage of Aulus Gellius, firſt the definition of deſtiny, according to Chryſippus; then the inference which was drawn from it, namely, that men did not ſin, and that all their crimes were to be laid to the charge of deſtiny alone; and laſtly this Philoſopher's anſwer. *Fatum, quod Græci πεπρωμένην vel εἱμαρμένην vocant, ad hanc ferme ſententiam Chryſippus Stoicæ princeps philoſophiæ definit. Fatum eſt, inquit, ſempiterna quædam & indeclinabilis ſeries rerum & catena, volvens ſemet ipſa ſeſe & implicans per æternos conſequentiæ ordines, ex quibus apta connexaque eſt . .* (55). *Aliarum autem opinionum diſciplinarumque auctores huic definitioni ita obſtrepunt. Si Chryſippus, inquiunt, fato putat omnia moveri & regi, nec declinari tranſcendique poſſe agmina fati & volumina, peccata quoque hominum & delicta non ſuſtentanda neque condicenda ſunt ipſis voluntatibus eorum, ſed neceſſitati cuidam & inſtantiæ, quæ oritur ex fato, omniumque ſit rerum domina & arbitra; per quam neceſſe ſit fieri quicquid futurum eſt; & propterea nocentium pœnas legibus iniquе conſtitutas, ſi homines ad maleficia non ſponte veniunt, ſed fato trahuntur. Contra ea Chryſippus tenuiter multa & arguta diſſerit. Sed omnium fere, quæ ſuper ea re ſcripſit, ſententia hujuſmodi eſt. Quamquam ita ſit, inquit, ut ratione quadam principali neceſſariò coacta atque connexa ſint fato omnia; ingenia tamen ipſa mentium noſtrarum proinde ſunt fato obnoxia, ut proprietas eorum eſt ipſa & qualitas, nam ſi ſunt per naturam primitus ſalubriter utiliterque facta, omnem illam vim, quæ de fato extrinſecus ingruit, inoffenſius tractabiliuſque tranſmittunt. Sin vero ſunt aſpera & inſcita & rudia, nulliſque artium bonarum adminiculis fulta; etiamſi parvo ſive nullo fatalis incommodi conflictu urgeantur; ſua tamen ſcævitate & voluntario impetu in aſſidua delicta & in errores ruunt, idque ipſum ut ea ratione fiant naturalis illa & neceſſaria rerum conſequentia efficit, quæ fatum vocatur. Eſt enim genere ipſo quaſi fatale & conſequens, ut mala ingenia peccatis & erroribus non vacent* (56). i. e. "Chryſippus the Prince of the Stoick "Philoſophers, defines fate, almoſt after this manner, "*Fate*, ſays he, is a certain, eternal and unchangeable "ſeries and chain of things, winding and turning it- "ſelf in perpetual revolutions of ſucceſſions, of which "it is compoſed and linked together. . . . The Phi- "loſophers of the other Sects, who held different opi- "nions, made the following objections againſt this "definition. If Chryſippus, ſay they, thinks, that "all things are moved and regulated by fate, in ſuch "a manner, that its influence and courſe can by no "means be turned off, nor avoided, then the very ſins "and evil actions of men are not to be charged upon "nor aſcribed to their will, but to a certain neceſſity, "which is unavoidable, and comes from fate; ſuch a "neceſſity as governs and rules every thing, and by "which whatever is to come muſt abſolutely happen; "whence it follows that the laws are unjuſt, which "ſubject the guilty to puniſhments, if men do not "willingly commit evil actions, but are forced to it by "fate. Chryſippus replied to all this by ſeveral witty "and ſharp reflections; the ſubſtance of what he wrote "upon this ſubject comes to this. Tho' it be true, "ſays he, that all things are fatally connected and "linked together by a principal cauſe, yet our minds "are ſubject to fate in ſuch a manner as is proper to "their nature and qualities; for if at firſt they have "been well and uſefully framed by nature, that whole "energy of fate paſſes through them, in a more eaſy "and gentle manner. But if they be unpoliſhed, un- "learned, and rude, and unprovided with thoſe helps, "which the liberal arts procure, though the influence "they ſuffer from fate were very ſmall, or none at all, "yet by their own unſkilfulneſs, and by the impetuo- "ſity of their will, they would run headlong into "continual crimes and errors. And that this happens "ſo, is the effect of that natural and neceſſary con- "nection of things, which we call *Fate*. For it is "in its own nature almoſt fatal and neceſſary, that bad "minds be not free from ſins and miſtakes." Aulus Gellius relates afterwards the compariſon of the cylinder, and the concluſion, which Chryſippus inferred from his diſcourſe, which was, that no body muſt be admitted to excuſe himſelf by laying the blame of his conduct upon deſtiny, and that criminals muſt not be heard, who have this recourſe to this Aſylum. *Propterea negat oportere ferri, audirique homines aut nequam aut ignavos & nocentes & audaces, qui, cum in culpa & maleficio revicti ſunt, profugiunt ad fati neceſſitatem, tamquam in aliud fati aſylum; & quæ peſſime fecerunt, ea non ſuæ temeritati, ſed fato eſſe attribuenda dicunt* (57).

It is eaſy to obſerve, that this Philoſopher could not extricate himſelf out of the labyrinth in which he was engaged; and that his diſtinction of external cauſes, which neceſſitated, and thoſe which did not neceſſitate, was of no uſe to him. He only winds and turns himſelf about, and at laſt he proves to be exactly where they are, who ſubmit every thing to the unavoidable neceſſity of deſtiny. To be convinced of this, you need but join together his compariſon of the cylinder, and the confeſſion he makes, that all the inward qualifications of the mind, which make men ſin, are a natural and neceſſary effect of Fate (58). He ſays, that there are ſome minds, which having been well framed from the beginning, go without any hurt thro' the ſtorm, which falls upon them from fate; and that there are others, which are ſo ill framed, and ſo rough, that if fate hits them ever ſo little, or even not at all, they fall into ſin by a voluntary motion. This is owing to a natural imperfection, which is in the cauſe. Now he has ſaid that the fatal neceſſity of every thing is the principle, by which it happens, that ſome minds are well and others ill framed; conſequently he muſt alſo ſay, that we may and ought to aſcribe to fate all the crimes which men commit; and ſince he moreover admitted a Divine Providence, he could not but acknowledge, in the courſe of his reaſonings, that God is the cauſe of all thoſe crimes; and conſequently, Plutarch's charge againſt him is very well grounded: for his compariſon of a cylinder cannot be exact, unleſs you compare fate, not to the firſt comer who throws the cylinder, but to the turner who made it, and afterwards ſets it a rolling. The cylinder's rolling a long time is indeed owing to its ſingular figure, but ſince the turner made it with that figure, which is the neceſſary cauſe of a laſting motion, he is himſelf the true cauſe of the motion's duration. The whole difference there is between a Cube that does not roll, and a Cylinder that does, all the conſequences, all the regularities or irregularities in the reſt of the one, and in the continued motion of the other, muſt be aſcribed to the workman, who gave each of theſe bodies ſuch a form from which theſe regularities and irregularities &c. are neceſſary conſequences. It is very eaſy to apply all this to the ſouls of men. This difficulty did not eſcape Lipſius;

(52) Cicero, *de Fato*, cap. 18.

(53) *Dum autem verbis utitur ſuis, delabitur in eas difficultates, ut neceſſitatem fati confirmet invitus.* Idem, ibid. cap. 9.

(54) *Sed quod in Viſo Cicero dicit, & hæret parum pro interiore ipſa re videtur, & credo plura addidiſſe, quæ ævo exciderunt.* Lipſius, *Phyſ. Stoic.* lib. 1. Diſſert. 14.

(55) Aulus Gellius, lib. 6. cap. 2.

(56) Idem, ibid.

(57) Idem, ibid.

(58) *Idque ipſum, ut ea ratione fiat, naturalis illa & neceſſaria rerum conſequentia effecit, quæ fatum vocatur.* Idem, ibid.

mortality of the Gods [I]. He not only thought that they were periſhable, but he even aſſerted, that they would really periſh in the conflagration of the world; and though he excepted Jupiter, yet he thought him liable to change. He wrote a book concerning the Amours of Jupiter and Juno, which abounded with ſo many obſcene paſſages [K], that

Lipſius; but in order to clear his Chryſippus, he ſuppoſes, that the Stoicks aſcribed the defects in the ſoul of man, not to God, but to a real and unconquerable imperfection of matter. *Sed heus, Chryſippe, ſi a Natura hæc conſtitutio aut divirgium; Deum a malo qui excuſas? quomodo non ille Naturæ auctor atque ipſa Natura, malum maloſque genuit, ſi tales fecit? Hoc caput eſt & Arx, ut ſic dicam, cauſſæ, nunc adeunda & occupanda. Aio Stoicos mali principium non in Deo, ſed in materia, (quæ tamen Deo, ut ipſi aliique voluerunt Ævo æquali & æterna,) in materia, inquam, conſtituiſſe. Itaque cum Deus homines aliaque faceret, omnia bona & in bonum finxiſſe, ſed repugnantem aliquam vim & malicioſam in illa fuiſſe, atque eſſe, quæ alio traheret; atque hinc* interna *atque etiam* externa *mala extitiſſe* (59). i. e. "But hark you, Chryſippus, if this conſtitution "and deviation be from Nature, how can you avoid "making God the Author of evil? How is it poſſible that the Author of Nature, who is nature herſelf, "ſhould not have produced evil, and bad men, if he "made them really as they are? This is the chief "point, and if I may ſay ſo, the ſtrong hold of the "cauſe, which we muſt now attack and maſter. I "aſſert then, that the Stoicks placed the principle or "cauſe of evil not in God, but in matter (which yet "they and ſeveral others thought was co-eternal with "God) ſo that when God made man and other things, "he intended them good and for a good end; but "there was a certain repugnant and malignant efficacy "in matter, which oppoſed God's intention; and "hence ſprung all evils both internal and external." But this pretended vindication of Chryſippus has been ſo well confuted by Plutarch (60), that it cannot be of the leaſt uſe. Euſebius has preſerved a Fragment of a Peripatetick Philoſopher, called Diogenianus, who had very well expoſed the defects of Chryſippus's doctrine upon this ſubject (61).

(59) Lipſius, *Phyſ. Stoic.* lib. 1. Diſſert. 14.

(60) See the Remark [U] of the article PAULICIANS.

(61) *See* Euſebius, *Præparat. Evangel.* lib. 6. cap. 8. pag. 262, & *ſeq.* See alſo what Oenomaus ſays againſt the ſame Chryſippus. Ibid. cap. 7.

Obſerve, that neither Calvin, for inſtance, nor any other Chriſtian, who maintains abſolute Predeſtination, lie open to the ſame objections, becauſe they ſuppoſe, that there was not in the ſoul of the firſt man any neceſſitating quality towards evil.

[*I*] *One cannot, without being ſtruck with horror, read what he taught concerning the Mortality of the Gods.*] Plutarch, having a deſign to ſhew, that the Stoicks had perverted all the common notions, which men had of the Gods, begins with the ideas of eternity and incorruptibility. *What man is there,* ſays he (62), *or has ever been, but does or did believe, that God is incorruptible and immortal? Is there any thing more agreeable to the common notions of men, and more univerſally admitted than this? . . . . . One may meet perhaps with ſome ſavage Nations, who do not believe there is a God: but there never was a man, who having ſome notion of a God, did not believe him to be immortal and eternal. They, who have been called Atheiſts, becauſe they denied the being of a God, as Theodorus, Diagoras, and Hippo, durſt not ſay that God is liable to deſtruction, but their opinion was, that there is nothing incorruptible; yet whilſt they denied the poſſibility of an incorruptible ſubſtance, they left men to enjoy the notions they had of a God. But Chryſippus and Cleanthes, who in their writings have crowded (if I may ſay ſo) heaven and earth, the air and the ſea with Gods, yet make none of them incorruptible or eternal, except Jupiter, in whom, they think, all the others are to be reſolved; ſo that he conſumes or deſtroys them, which is not much better, than to be deſtroyed himſelf: for it is not more a ſign of imperfection or weakneſs to be reſolved into the ſubſtance of another, than to feed upon the ſubſtance of another, and turn it into one's own. Nor is this abſurdity like ſome others that are drawn from their aſſertions and writings by way of inference, and as neceſſary conſequences of their doctrines; for they themſelves expreſly declare in their Books concerning the Gods, Providence, Fate and Nature, that all the Gods are born, and will periſh; that they are all combuſtible, and will be burnt, or melted down, as tho' they were made of wax or of pewter. . . . . Chryſippus ſays then, that Jupiter reſembles a man and the world, and that Providence reſembles the ſoul. So that when the conflagration of the world comes, Jupiter (who alone of all the Gods is unperiſhable) ſhall retire into Providence, and they both ſhall ſubſiſt for ever in the ſubſtance of the Æther* (63). There is here, I think, a ſeparation of the body from the ſoul, and conſequently death. We have obſerved (64), that Chryſippus ſuppoſed, that God is the Soul of the World, and in the laſt paſſage we have quoted he tells us, that when the world ſhall be burnt, Jupiter will retire to another place. Let us ſee the battery of his contradictions, and at the ſame time, a parallel between the impiety of Epicurus, and that of Chryſippus. "They, *ſays he* "(*Antipater*) who deny the Benevolence of the Gods, "come in ſome meaſure pretty near to thoſe, who aſſert, that the Gods are born and will periſh; for "there is as much abſurdity in maintaining that the "Gods are corruptible, as there is in denying their "providence and benevolence. Chryſippus therefore "is as much miſtaken as Epicurus, ſince the former "denies the Eternity of the Gods, and the latter their "Benevolence. . . . All the other Gods, *ſays Chryſippus,* uſe equally food, which keeps them up. But "Jupiter and the World are nouriſhed after another "manner than they, who are begotten, and will periſh by fire. Here then he aſſerts, that all the "Gods are nouriſhed, except Jupiter and the World, "and in his firſt Book concerning Providence, he ſays, "that Jupiter is continually increaſing, till all things "be conſumed in him. And ſince death is the ſeparation of the ſoul from the body, and the ſoul of "the world is not ſeparated from it, but is continually "increaſing, till it has conſumed all the matter within itſelf, we ought not to ſay, that the World dies. "Can any one contradict himſelf more glaringly, "than by aſſerting, that the ſame God is and is not "nouriſhed (65)?" It is poſſible, that ſo acute a Philoſopher ſhould have had ſuch monſtrous notions?

(62) Plutarch, *de Commun. Notit. contra Stoicos,* pag. 1074, 1075.

(63) Idem, ibid. pag. 1077, D.

(64) Quotation (49).

(65) Plut. *de Repugnant. Stoicor.* pag. 1052.

[*K*] *He wrote a Book concerning the amours of Jupiter and Juno, which abounded with . . . . obſcene paſſages.*] Diogenes Laertius is not the only Author that acquaints us with this. Εισὶ δέ, ſays he, οἳ κατατρίβεσι τῷ Χρυσίππῳ, ὡς πολλὰ ἀισχρῶς καὶ ἀῤῥήτως ἀναγεγραφότος. ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων φυσιολόγων συγγράμματι αἰσχρῶς τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἥραν καὶ τὸν Διὰ ἀναπλάττει, λέγων κατὰ τὰς ἑξακοσίους σχεδὸν μονοδίους ἠυχηκὼς μολύνειν τὸ σῶμα, εἴποι ἄν. αἰσχροτάτην γὰρ (φησὶ) ταύτην ἀναπλάττει ἐφορίαν, εἰ μὴ ἐπαίνει ὡς φυσικὴν, Χαμαιτύπαις μᾶλλον πρέπουσαν, ἢ Θεοῖς. ἔτι τε τὰ παρὰ τοῖς περὶ πινάκων γράψασι κατακεχωρισμένα (66). i. e. "There are "ſome who expoſe Chryſippus's reputation, becauſe "he wrote a great many abominable and obſcene "things; for in his Book concerning the ancient Phiſiologers, he feigns very ſhameful ſtories relating to "Juno and Jupiter, and ſays in almoſt ſix hundred "lines, what none but the moſt immodeſt men would "ſpeak: he relates a ſtory as they ſay, which tho' he "praiſes it as being natural, yet it is ſo impudent, "that it becomes common proſtitutes rather than Deities; and indeed it has been omitted by thoſe who "wrote upon pictures." We may add to this a paſſage from Origen. Καὶ τί μὴ δεῖ καταλέγειν τὰς περὶ Θεῶν ἀτόπους Ἑλλήνων ἐφορίας, αἰσχύνης αὐτόθεν ἀξίας καὶ ἀλληγορουμένας; ὅπου τι ὁ Σόλους Χρύσιππος, ὁ τὴν Στοὰν τῶν φιλοσόφων πολλοῖς συγγράμμασι σπουδοῖς κεκοσμηκέναι νομιζόμενος, παρεμπεπλεύκει γραφὴν τὴν ἐν Σάμῳ, ἐν ᾗ ἀῤῥητοποιοῦσα ἡ Ἥρα τὸν Δία ἐγέγραπτο (67). i. e. "Why "ſhould I relate the abſurd ſtories of the Greeks con"cerning the Gods, which are ſhameful both in themſelves, and when they are allegorized? Since Chry"ſippus of Solos, who is reckoned to have raiſed the "reputation of the Stoic Philoſophers very high, by "the many books he wrote, explained a picture, "which was at Samos, and in which Juno was repreſented with Jupiter in a very unbecoming poſture." How abominable it is, that there ſhould have been ſuch pictures in the Temples of the Heathens? Obſerve that Chryſippus allegorized all this, and explained it, not in a moral but in a Phyſical ſenſe: judge then whether his expreſſions could be modeſt. You have ſeen above (68), that he had allegorized after the ſame manner all the impertinences of Mythology: he found in them the whole Theology of the Stoics.

(66) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. num. 187.

(67) *Origenes contra Celſum,* lib. 4.

(68) In the Remark [H] quotation (49).

that it was loudly exclaimed againſt. It is therefore eaſy to gueſs, that the Stoicks had not much reaſon to be pleaſed with his writings. For as he was a conſiderable man amongſt them [*L*], it gave people a pretence to charge the whole body with the errors of ſo illuſtrious a member of it. Nor do we find, that the celebrated Authors amongſt the Stoicks, ſuch as a Seneca, an Epictetus, an Arrian, were very forward to ſhew their veneration for him [*M*]; they are, generally ſpeaking, very ſparing in this reſpect. I do not find that any objection was made againſt his morals; which makes me think, that his conduct was blameleſs. It is ſuppoſed, that the only ſervant he had was an old woman [*N*], which is a proof of his chaſtity and temperance. He uſed often to repeat five lines of Euripides (*q*), which condemn all daintineſs and intemperance, and put us in mind that Nature has ſufficiently provided for all our wants by the means of bread and water; and he abhorred the works of Archeſtratus (*r*): this may convince us that he was a very ſober man. I have obſerved already that he applied himſelf very much to Dialectics; I add, that he took extraordinary pains to find out the ſolution of a Sophiſm, which puzzled the Philoſophers very much, and which was called *Sorites* [*O*]; it was a heap

(*q*) Aulus Gellius, lib. 7. cap. cap. 16.

(*r*) See the quotation (80).

[*L*] *He was a conſiderable man amongſt the Stoics.*] He was conſidered as the chief ſupport of that ſect (69), and it became a common Proverb, that had it not been for him, the Stoics had never been. Ὅθεν φασὶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ λεχθῆναι.

Οἷος πέπτωται, τὸν δ' ἂς σκιὰ ἄλετο πάντα.

Καὶ

Εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἦν Χρύσιππος, οὐκ ἂν ἦν Στοά (70).

That is,

" Hence it was ſaid of him, *He alone is wiſe, all the* " *reſt are carried away like as a ſhadow.* And, *If* " *Chryſippus had not been, the Porch* (that is, the Stoics) *had never been.*

[*M*] *A Seneca, an Epictetus, an Arrian were not very forward to ſhew their veneration for him.*] We have ſeen above (71), how Seneca reproved him in his Work *de Beneficiis*. He quotes him in ſome other places, and moſtly without any elogium. I own however, that in his Treatiſe *de otio Sapientis* he aſſerts, that Zeno and Chryſippus have performed greater things by the labours they underwent in their cloſets, than if they had commanded armies, and he conſiders them as the lawgivers of mankind (72). *Nos certe ſumus, qui dicimus & Zenonem, & Chryſippum majora egiſſe, quam ſi duxiſſent exercitus, geſſiſſent honores, leges tuliſſent, quas non uni Civitati, ſed toti humano generi tulerunt.* Epictetus ſeverely cenſures thoſe, who boaſted, that they explained Chryſippus's opinions, and bids them tell themſelves, *If Chryſippus had not wrote too obſcurely, we ſhould not have wherewithal to boaſt* (73). Arrian does often exclaim againſt thoſe, who read this Philoſopher's Works, and looked upon it as a very noble deed (74). It cannot I think be poſitively aſſerted, that he applies to Chryſippus the glory, which ariſes from a reflection he makes, after he had conſidered the divine honours which were paid to Triptolemus (75). I believe, that he means only in general, that he who diſcovered truth to men, and ſhewed them the way to virtue, would more juſtly deſerve to have Altars raiſed to him, than they who taught them to ſow corn.

[*N*] *The only ſervant he had was an old woman.*] Diogenes Laertius mentions this two or three times. Ἤρκειτο τῇ γερωκόμῳ μόνῃ. *He was ſatisfied with one old woman only* (76) for his ſervant. He had already obſerved, that it had been known by this old ſervant, that Chryſippus uſed to write five hundred lines every day (77). Monſieur Menage, who thought that Plutarch ſpoke of the ſame old woman, in the words which I ſhall juſt now quote, was miſtaken (78). *Chryſippus ſays in his Book concerning Jupiter, that it is an idle, abſurd and ridiculous thing to praiſe as the effects of virtue ſuch actions, like theſe for inſtance, the ſuffering patiently the ſting of a waſp, and forbearing to lie with an old decrepit woman* (79). Chryſippus ſays this in general, and thus Plutarch who criticizes upon him, underſtood it, and he alledges this only to convince the Stoics, that they contradicted themſelves, and oppoſed the common notions of mankind. *They maintain,* (he had ſaid a little before,) *that it is the ſame thing, not to lie with an old woman, and not to lie with a young one; both theſe actions being the effects of chaſtity: But that chaſtity in the latter caſe being ſomething great and glorious, a man ought to die rather than not be chaſte: but it would be ſhameful and ridiculous to boaſt of chaſtity in the former caſe.* I have ſaid it a thouſand times; one is liable to miſapply a paſſage, if one does not carefully examine what goes before it, and what follows it. Monſr. Menage is an inſtance of it. I have met with a paſſage in Athenæus, which confirms the good opinion we ought to have of Chryſippus's temperance. See the Margin (80).

(80) Χρυσίππου δ' αὖθις φέλοι τὸν τῆς ὑὸς ἡγεμόνα κατὰ πολλὰ θαυμάζων ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐπαινῶ τὸν πολυθρύλλητον ἐπὶ τῷ φιλολογίᾳ Ἀρχίστρατον· εἰ δέ ποτε μετὰ Φιλιπίδου καὶ τοιούτου, εἰς ἀναφέρεται τὸ περὶ Ἀφροδισίων ἀκόλαστον σύγγραμμα. " My friend: I " do very much " admire Chryſippus, the " chief of the " Stoick Sect; " but I commend him " more eſpecially, becauſe " he deſpiſed " Archeſtratus, " who was famous for his " book concerning meats, as " much as he " deſpiſed Philinides, to " whom they " aſcribe a very " obſcene book " upon a venereal ſubject." Athen. lib. 8. pag. 335.

[*O*] *He took extraordinary pains to find out the ſolution of a Sophiſm . . . . which was called* Sorites.] In Greek Σωρίτης from the word σωρὸς, which ſignifies *acervus* a heap. Hence the Latins thought they might call this Sophiſm *Acervalem* (81). Ulpian defines it thus, *cum ab evidenter veris, per breviſſimas mutationes diſputatio ad ea, quæ evidenter falſa ſunt, perducitur* (82). i. e. " When from ſuch propoſitions, as are " evidently true, you come by ſmall changes to draw " ſuch inferences, as are evidently falſe." Cicero deſcribes it ſo as to make us underſtand the etymology of the word. *Primum quidem hoc reprehendendum, quod captioſiſſimo genere interrogationis utuntur. Quod genus minime in Philoſophia probari ſolet, quum aliquid minutim & gradatim additur aut demitur: Sorites hos vocant qui acervum efficiunt unico addito grano* (83). i. e. " The firſt thing that is to be blamed in them " is, their making uſe of a very captious kind of " interrogation, which is by no means to be admitted in Philoſophy; when ſome thing is imperceptibly and by degrees added or taken away. They " call it *Sorites*, who by the addition of one ſingle " grain make an heap." They inſtanced in a grain of corn, as you will ſee below, and from this propoſition, which is very true, *one grain of corn is not an heap*, they endeavoured to bring the diſputant by degrees to this palpable falſity, *one grain of corn makes an heap.* You will find in Sextus Empyricus ſome inſtances of this captious way of interrogating. I ſhall quote by and by a long paſſage from Cicero, which ſhews, that they pretended to prove by the means of a *Sorites*, that the mind of man can never come to a perfect knowledge of the fixed point which ſeparates the oppoſite properties, or which determines exactly the reſpective nature of every thing. What is it, they aſked, that conſtitutes what we call little, much, long, broad, ſmall, great &c. Do three grains of corn make a heap? The anſwer muſt be, no. Do four grains make a heap? You muſt make the ſame anſwer; and thus they continued their interrogations from one grain to another without end; and if you ſhould happen to anſwer at laſt, *here is a heap*, they pretended your anſwer was abſurd, ſince it ſuppoſed, that one ſingle grain makes the difference between what is and what is not an heap. I could prove by the ſame method, that a great drinker is never drunk. Will one drop of wine fuddle him, would I aſk? You would anſwer, no. Two drops then? By no means, neither three nor four. I would thus continue my interrogations from one drop to another; and if at the 999th drop you anſwered, he is not fuddled, and at the thouſandth he is, I would infer from thence, that one ſingle drop of wine makes the difference between the being drunk and being ſober of a great drinker, which is abſurd. If the interrogations went on from three pints to three hundred pints, you could eaſily mark the difference between enough and too much. But he who attacks you with

(69) *Chryſippus, qui fulcire putatur Porticum Stoicorum,* Cicero, *Academ. Quæſt.* lib. 4. cap. 28. See ſeveral ſuch paſſages in Mr. Menage's *Diogen. Laert.* lib. 7. num. 183. pag. m. 339.

(70) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. num. 339.

(71) In the Remark [*E*].

(72) Seneca, *De otio Sapientis, ſub fin.*

(73) Epictet. *Enchr.* cap. 64.

(74) *See* Arriani Epictetum, lib. 1. cap. 10, 17. lib. 2. cap. 16, & *alibi.*

(75) Arrianus, Ibid. lib. 1. cap. 4. *James Schegkius*, his Latin Tranſlator, puts here in the margin, *Chryſippus Triptolemo divinis honoribus dignior.* i. e. " Chryſippus " does better " deſerve divine " honours than " Triptolemus."

(76) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. num. 184.

(77) Ἡδὺ παρδρώσα αὐτῷ πρεσβύτις ἔλεγεν &c. Idem, ibid. num. 181.

(78) Menag. in *Laert.* lib. 7. pag. 339.

(79) Plutarch. *De Comun. Notit.* pag. 1060. See alſo *de Repugn. Stoic.* pag. 1038, 1039. Mr. Bayle quotes Amiot's French Tranſlation; but it is for the moſt part ſo dark, and agrees ſo little with the original, that we have been obliged to tranſlate moſt of the paſſages in this Article immediately from the Greek of Plutarch.

(81) Cicero, *De Divinat.* lib. 2. cap. 4.

(82) Ulpian. l. 65. ff. *de regulis juris.*

(83) Cicero, *Academ. Quæſt.* lib. 1. cap. 28.

heap of interrogations, in which one could find no end. The progreſs he made in Dialectics, which was no doubt very great, did not ſerve in the leaſt to improve his ſtyle. Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus quotes him as an inſtance, which ſufficiently proves, that thoſe Authors, who are perfectly well ſkilled in Logic, do not well obſerve the rules of Grammar.

with a *Sorites* is at liberty to chooſe his own weapons, and he makes uſe of the ſmalleſt particles of quantity, that you may not find any where a fixed point which ſeparates the not being drunk from the being drunk, little from much, enough from too much, &c. The generality of men, who are not profeſſed Scholars, would juſtly laugh at theſe ſophiſtical quibbles, and would appeal to common ſenſe, and to that degree of knowledge, which in common life is ſufficient to make us diſtinguiſh in the general little from much, &c. But a man who ſet up for a Logician, could not have his recourſe to that Tribunal, he was obliged to anſwer in form, and unleſs he could find a ſolution according to the rules of art, he loſt the field of battle; his defeat, his overthrow were unavoidable. And at this time an Iriſh Tutor *, who ſhould haraſs a Profeſſor of Salamanca with a thouſand captious ſubtilties, and who ſhould receive no other anſwer but this, *common ſenſe and the general conſent of mankind ſufficiently ſhew that your inferences are falſe*, would gain the victory, and it would juſtly be ſaid, that the Profeſſor had been defeated; for he was obliged to anſwer in due form, and according to the rules of his trade, ſince it was by thoſe very rules his Theſes had been attacked. Chryſippus, who in this reſpect knew very well what his duty was, did clearly perceive that *Sorites* of the Dialecticians of Megara required a categorical anſwer. The reader will ſee what his device was; but I muſt firſt quote a Latin paſſage. *Sed quoniam tantum in ea arte* (Dialectica) *ponitis*, thus Cicero makes a Sceptick ſpeak, *videte ne contra vos tota nata ſit, quæ primo progreſſu feſtive tradit elementa loquendi, & ambiguorum intelligentiam concludendique rationem; tum paucis additis venit ad Soritas lubricum ſane & periculoſum locum, quod tu modo dicebas vitioſum interrogandi genus. Quid ergo, iſtius vitii num noſtra culpa eſt? Rerum natura nullam dedit cognitionem finium, ut illa in re ſtatuere poſſimus, quatenus nec hoc in acervo tritici ſolum unde nomen eſt. Sed nulla omnino in re minutatim interrogandi dives, pauper, clarus, obſcurus ſit; multa, pauca, magna, parva, longa, brevia, lata, anguſta, quanto aut addito aut dempto, certum reſpondeamus non habemus. At vitioſi ſunt Soritæ. Frangite ergo eos ſi poteſtis, ne moleſti ſint. Erunt enim niſi caveatis* (84). i. e. "But ſince it depends ſo much upon "that art (of Dialectieks), beware leſt the whole "ſtrength of it be turned againſt yourſelves; for it "begins with teaching the elements of ſpeech in a "very agreeable manner, and ſhews how to get at "the ſenſe of ambiguous expreſſions, and how to draw "inferences; but ſoon after it brings to the Sorites, "a very ſlippery and dangerous place; tho' you ſaid "juſt now, that the Sorites was a bad manner of in-"terrogating. What then are we anſwerable for its "badneſs? Nature has not made us capable of know-"ing the exact boundaries of things; ſo that we can-"not exactly mark where any thing begins or ends, "which is true not only in a heap of corn, whence "the Sorites took its name, but in every other ſub-"ject. For if we are aſked by degrees what it is pre-"ciſely that makes a man rich or poor, famous or "obſcure, or what is much, little, great, ſmall, long, "ſhort, broad, narrow, by what addition or ſubſtrac-"tion it becomes ſo, we have nothing to anſwer. "Yet, you will ſay, the Sorites is an erroneous me-"thod of arguing. Shew then where the error lies; "anſwer the argument, leſt it be puzzling to you; "and it will be ſo, if you do not take care." Chryſippus could not find any other device, but to anſwer a certain number of interrogations, and then to keep ſilence. His device was called the method of reſting. "Multum in eo Chryſippus ſudaverat, ut finitorem "acervi inveniret, ſed fruſtra: quare ſpe inveniendi, "quod quærebat, dejectus, κατὰ διάνοιαν, τινα πλὴν, quod "aiunt, excogitaverat quod vocabat τοπικὸν ζητεῖν λέγειν "(85) cum interrogatus perveniret (86)." Conſult Caſaubon in his excellent Commentary upon theſe words of Perſius

——— *Depunge ubi ſiſtam*
Inventus, Chryſippe, tui finitor acervi (87).

That is,

"Then ſay, Chryſippus, thou who wou'd'ſt confine
"Thy heap, where I ſhall put an end to mine.
Dryden.

This invention of Chryſippus had not a happy ſucceſs: See how Carneades ruined it entirely (88). *Cautum eſt inquit. Placet enim Chryſippo, cum gradatim interrogetur, verbi cauſa tria pauca ſint* (89) *an ne multa, aliquanto priuſquam ad multa perveniat quieſcere, id eſt, quod ab his dicitur ἡσυχάζειν. Per me vel ſtertas licet, inquit Carneades, non modo quieſcas. Sed quid proficit? Sequitur enim, qui te ex ſomno excitet, & eodem modo interroget, quo in numero conticuiſti. Si ad eum numerum unum addidero multa ne erunt? progrediar rurſus quoad videbitur, quid plura? Hoc enim fateris, neque ultimum te paucorum, neque primum multorum reſpondere poſſe. Cujus generis error ita manat, ut non videam quò non poſſit accedere. Nihil lædit, inquit. Ego enim ut agitator callidus priuſquam ad finem veniam, equos ſuſtinebo, eoque magis, ſi locus ille quò ferentur equi præceps erit. Sic me, inquit, ante ſuſtinebo, nec diutius captioſe interroganti reſpondebo, Si habes, quod liqueat, neque reſpondes, ſuperbis; ſi non habes, ne tu quidem perſpicis, quia obſcura concedis. Sed negas te uſque ad obſcura progredi: illuſtribus ergo rebus inſiſtis. Si id tantummodo ut taceas, nihil aſſequeris. Quid enim ad illum qui te captare vult, utrum tacentem irretiat te, an loquentem. Sin autem uſque ad novem, verbi gratia ſine dubitatione reſpondes pauca eſſe, in decimo inſiſtis, etiam a certis & illuſtrioribus cohibes aſſenſum, hoc idem me in obſcuris facere non ſinis. Nihil ergo te contra Soritas ars iſta adjuvat, quod nec augendi nec minuendi quid aut primum ſit aut poſtremum docet.* i. e. "It is a prudent device, ſays he; and Chryſippus "makes uſe of it, when he is interrogated by degrees; "if he was aſked for inſtance, whether three be few "or many, he ſtood ſtill, for ſome time before he came "to anſwer, many. And this is what thoſe (Philoſo-"pers) call *being ſilent*. With all my heart, ſays "Carneades, be not only at reſt, but even ſnore, if you "pleaſe. But what are you the better for it? For "here comes one, who will ſoon rouze you out of "your ſleep, and will interrogate you about that very "number, at which you were ſilent. If you add one "to that number, will it make many? I ſhall go "further ſtill, as much as I pleaſe. What ſhould I "ſay more? by your very ſilence you own, that you "cannot tell what is the laſt number conſiſtent with "the *few*, and what is the firſt, that makes it *many*. "That is nothing to me, you'll ſay: for I, like a ſkil-"ful coachman, will ſtop my horſes, before they come "to the end, and will do it ſo much the more, as "the place, to which they drive, is down hill. Thus "ſhall I be ſilent, you ſay, nor will I any longer an-"ſwer captious queſtions. But if you are able to an-"ſwer any thing to the purpoſe, and refuſe to do it, "you are proud; and if you have nothing to anſwer, "it ſhews that you don't comprehend the thing your "ſelf; ſince you grant it is incomprehenſible. But, "you ſay, you do not go ſo far as to what is incom-"prehenſible; but ſtop at what you clearly under-"ſtand. But if it is only to be ſilent, you do not "get any thing by it. For what is it to him, who "endeavours to catch you, whether he inſnares you "whilſt you are ſilent, or when you ſpeak. But if "you ſhould anſwer without heſitation, as far as nine, "for inſtance, and ſay, nine are few, and ſhould ſtop "at ten, this would be, witholding your aſſent in things "certain and evident; why then would you not ſuffer "me to do the ſame in what is unintelligible? Your "artifice or device is therefore of no manner of uſe to "you, ſince it does not teach you, what is the term "between ſmall or great, few or many, in any thing "that is either increaſing, or diminiſhing." The Sceptics took advantage of Chryſippus's device, and employed it as an *Argumentum ad hominem*. See Sextus Empiricus (90). Obſerve that Horace made uſe of a *Sorites*

* Mr. Bayle ſays, *un Repetiteur Hibernois*. A *Repetiteur* is a teacher in a College, who reads private Lectures to the ſcholars, and makes them rehearſe their leſſons. The Hybernians or Iriſh were reckoned to be very well ſkilled in Dialecticks.

(84) Cicero, *Acad. Quæſt.* lib. 4. cap. 16 and 28.

(85) One might tranſlate this the *Quietiſt* or *Silent*, and give that name to this device, as others were called the *Reaper*, the *Lyar*, &c.

(86) Caſaubonus *in* Perſium, Satyra ultima *verſu ultimo*, pag. m. 521.

(87) Perſius, Sat. ultima, *in fine*.

(88) Cicero, *Academ. Quæſt.* lib. 1. cap. 16.

(89) This ſhews that there is a chaſm in *Diogenes Laertius*, lib. 7. in *Zenone*, num. 82. for the inſtance which is there given of the Sophiſm called *obvelatus*, (*velled*), belongs evidently to the *Sorites*; as *Cujas Tractatu V ad Africanum*, and Gaſſend. *Oper.* tom. 1. pag. 41. have very well obſerved.

(90) Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhon. Hypotypoſ.* lib. 2. cap. 22.

Grammar, concerning the ſituation of words [*P*]. This inaccuracy of ſtyle is leſs ſurpriſing at firſt, than to ſee that this Philoſopher himſelf deſtroyed the foundations of that very Science, which he had cultivated with ſo much care [*Q*]. But even this will not appear very ſtrange, if we conſider with ſome attention, what are the effects of a long and cloſe application to the ſubtleties of Logic. A man of wit, who applies himſelf too much to this kind of ſtudy, ſeldom fails of becoming a caviller, and by his ſophiſtical ſubtleties he perplexes and imbroils the very theſes, which he moſt zealouſly maintained. He chooſes to deſtroy his own work, rather than forbear diſputing, and he ſtarts ſuch objections againſt his own opinions, that his whole art cannot ſolve them. The Spaniſh School-men

a *Sorites* againſt the admirers of the ancients; the paſſage is ſo beautiful, that I cannot forbear tranſcribing it here; I hope the reader will forgive it me.

Si meliora dies ut vina poemata reddit,
Scire velim, pretium chartis quotus arroget annus.
Scriptor abhinc annos centum qui decidit, inter
Perfectos veteresque referri debet? An inter
Viles atque novos? Excludat jurgia finis.
Eſt vetus atque probus, centum qui perficit annos.
Quid? Qui deperiit minor uno menſe, vel anno,
Inter quos referendus erit? Veteresne poetas?
An quos & præſens & poſtera reſpuet ætas?
Iſte quidem veteres inter ponetur honeſtè,
Qui vel menſe brevi, vel toto eſt junior anno.
Utor permiſſo, caudæque pilos ut equinæ
Paulatim vello, demo unum, demo etiam unum;
Dum cadat eluſus ratione ruentis acervi,
Qui redit ad faſtos, & virtutem æſtimat annis.
Miraturque nihil, niſi quod libitina ſacravit (91).

(91) Horat. Epiſt. 1. lib. 2. ver. 34, &c.

That is,

"How many years will make a Poem good?
"One Poet writ an hundred years ago,
"What is he old and therefore fam'd, or no?
"Or is he new, and therefore fam'd, or no?
"Let's fix upon a certain term of years.
"He's good who lived an hundred years ago.
"Another wants but one, and he is ſo too?
"Or is he new and damn'd for that alone?
"Well he's good too and old, that wants but one.
"And thus I'll argue on, and bate one more,
"And ſo by one and one waſte all the ſtore.
"And ſo confute him, who eſteems by years,
"A Poem's goodneſs by the date it bears.
"Who nor admires, nor yet approves a line,
"But what is old, and death has made divine."

Creech.

I find in Monſr. Menage a *tamen*, a *yet*, which is very wrong. He ſays that Carneades ridiculed this device of Chryſippus, and that he *yet* made uſe of the Sorites, when he endeavoured to prove that there are no Gods. *Ridet illud inventum Carneades apud Ciceronem . . . . Tamen ipſe Carneades Soritice multa rogat apud Sextum Empiricum adverſus Mathematicos, p.* 339 & 340, *dum probare ſatagit non eſſe Deos* (92). But Carneades's contempt for the other Philoſopher's *Quietiſt*, could not prevent him from making uſe of the *Sorites*; on the contrary, it is for this very reaſon, that he muſt employ it.

(92) Menag. *in Diogen. Laertium*, lib. 7. num. 197. pag. m. 343.

[*P*] *Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus quotes him as an inſtance, ... that thoſe Authors, who are perfectly well ſkilled in Logic, do not well obſerve the rules of Grammar, concerning the ſituation of words.*] I ſhall quote him according to the Latin Tranſlation. *Denique temporibus conſequentibus omnino neglecta eſt* (bona collocatio verborum) *nullaſque prorſus exiſtimabat* (eam) *neceſſariam eſſe, quidpiamve ad orationis pulchritudinem conferre. Itaque ejuſmodi ſtructuras reliquerunt, . . . Dico autem Philarchum, Durim . . . & alios infinitos. . . . . Verum quid opus eos admirari, ubi etiam hi, qui Philoſophiam profitentur, & de dialecticis diſſerunt diſciplinis, adeo ſunt in collocandis verbis futiles, ut etiam pudeat dicere. Sufficiat autem argumento uti oratione Chryſippi Stoici: (ulterius enim non procedam) quo neque melius quisquam, neque exactius dialecticas diſciplinas proſequutus eſt* (93): *neque deteriori junctura compoſitos ſermones protulit, ex his qui alicujus nominis & famæ ſunt* (94). i. e. "The proper ſituation of words has been afterwards entirely neglected, nor was there any Author who thought it was of any conſequence, or added any beauty to the diſcourſe. So that the ſituation of words was not in the leaſt minded. . . I ſay even by Philarchus, Duris . . and an infinite number of others. . But why ſhould we wonder at it? ſince even they, who pretend to Philoſophy, and treat of Dialecticks, are ſo neglectful of the right ſituation of words, that it is a ſhame. Let it be ſufficient, for argument's ſake, to inſtance in Chryſippus the Stoick; (for I do not intend to go further): no one has treated of Dialecticks better nor with more accuracy than he; nor is there any man amongſt all thoſe that gained ſome reputation, who put his words in a worſe ſituation." We may quote Diogenes Laertius in order to confirm Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus's judgment. For if Diogenes tells us on the one hand, that Chryſippus's Logic was ſo much admired, that it was ſaid, if Dialecticks were in uſe amongſt the Gods, they would employ no other but Chryſippus's; yet he obſerves on the other hand, that this Philoſopher did not write well, nor in a clear ſtile. Οὕτω δ' ἐπιδοξῶ ἐν τοῖς διαλεκτικοῖς ἐγένετο, ὥςε δοκεῖ τοὺς πλείους ὅτι εἰ παρὰ θεοῖς ἦν ἡ διαλεκτική, οὐκ ἂν ἦν ἄλλη ἢ ἡ Χρυσίππειος. πλεονάσας τοῖς πράγμασι, τὴν λέξιν ἐ κατώρθουτε (95).

(93) The Greek words are, τούτου . . ἄμεινον οὐδεὶς τὰς διαλεκτικὰς τέχνας ἐκθέσεται.

(94) Dionyſ. Halicarn. *de Collocatione Verborum*. cap. 15. pag. m. 10.

(95) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. num. 180. *See alſo* Cicero *De Finibus*, lib. 8. cap. 3. where he ſpeaks of Chryſippus's Rhetorick, with the utmoſt contempt.

[*Q*] *He himſelf deſtroyed the foundations of that very ſcience, which he had cultivated with ſo much care.*] Here follows the proof of this, which we borrow from Plutarch. "Believe our friends the Stoicks, *ſays he* "(96), when they aſſert, that it was not by chance, "but by a divine Providence, that Nature deſigning "to turn every thing upſide down, that relates to hu"man life, brought forth Chryſippus, no body being "more proper for that deſign than he. But as Cato "ſaid of Julius Cæſar that none before him ever con"ſpired againſt the State when ſober and in his ſenſes; "ſo this man endeavours with the utmoſt ſtrength and "accuracy to overthrow certainty. This they them"ſelves witneſs, who argue againſt him concerning the "Sophiſm called the *Lyar*. For does not a man over"throw all kind of demonſtration and all certainty, "when he maintains that ſuch propoſitions as conſiſt "of inconſiſtent terms, are not falſe, or that a ſyllo"giſm, the promiſes of which are true, and the in"ference well drawn, may yet have its conſequence "falſe. . . . Since therefore Chryſippus's Dialecticks "overturn and deſtroy their own parts and principles, "what other principle can they allow, but ſuch as "may be ſuſpected of error? For who can believe the "ſuperſtructure to be firm and laſting, when the very "foundations are ſo looſe and unſettled? and what "certainty can there be, where there is ſuch a confuſion and ſo many doubts?" Plutarch adds, that the Stoicks, who complained that the Academicks deſtroyed all common notions of men, were more guilty than they, of that fault. It muſt be ſaid, at leaſt, that our Chryſippus deſerved as much as Arceſilaus, to be compared to thoſe Tribunes at Rome, who diſturbed the public tranquillity (97). There never was a greater diſturber of every thing in the Empire of Philoſophy, than he; and tho' by name he was a Dogmatiſt, yet he did really labour in favour of Scepticiſm as much as the greateſt Scepticks themſelves. For if in a ſyllogiſm, as ſome pretended he aſſerted, the concluſion drawn from true premiſes be true in ſuch a manner as that the contrary propoſition may alſo be true, it is labour ſpent in vain, to reaſon or argue, and we muſt not hope ever to arrive at any certainty: the moſt evident propoſitions are the moſt problematical; and it is the ſame as tho' we doubted with Carneades, that *two things, which are equal to a third, are equal to each other* (98). Such is the fate of thoſe, who apply themſelves too much to the ſubtleties of Dialecticks. They fall at laſt into their own ſnares, out of which they cannot diſintangle themſelves; they find difficulties, which they cannot ſolve, and which even overthrow what they had eſtabliſhed before. Cicero has well drawn their character; I ſhall quote his words, tho' I had quoted them already in another place, in the

(96) Plutarch. *De Com. Notitiis, adverſus Stoicos*, pag. 1059.

(97) See the Article ARCESILAUS quotation (49).

(98) See above, the Article of CARNEADES, quotation (26).

School-men are unqueſtionable proofs of this. They had not the ſame accompliſhment which Chryſippus had; he was an univerſal ſcholar; being perfectly acquainted with Mythology, with the ancient and modern Poets, with Hiſtory, &c. (s). He wrote upon almoſt every ſubject, and even condeſcended to give rules for the education of children [R]; and as this is a ſubject which nearly concerns all mankind, we ought to praiſe him for it. But he does not deſerve our approbation either for his grammatical works (t), or for his books of *Divination*, in which he explained even the preſages of dreams (u). He could not omit mentioning the famous controverſy concerning things poſſible or impoſſible [S]; it belonged to his province as he was a Philoſopher, who aſſerted a fatal neceſſity

(s) *Permulta alia tollegit Chryſippus, ut eſt in omni Hiſtoria curioſus.* Cicero, *Tuſcul.* lib. 1. cap. 45.

(t) Varro, *De Lingua Latina*, lib. 7. pag. m. 101. mentions Chryſippus's ſix Books περὶ τῆς ἀνωμαλίας; and calls him *homo acutiſſimus.*

(u) *See* Cicero *in Libro* De Divinatione, ver. 9. I. 19, and 20. and 39. II. 15, &c.

the firſt edition of this work. *Dialectici ad extremum ipſi ſe compungunt ſuis acuminibus, & multa quærendo reperiunt non modo ea, quæ jam non poſſunt ipſi diſſolvere, ſed etiam quibus ante exarſa & potius detexta prope retexantur* (99). He therefore compares Dialecticks to Penelope, who unravelled her own web (100). Nobody could better than Chryſippus find his own picture, in that which Cicero made of the Logicians.

(99) Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. 2. cap. 38.

(100) *Quod quod eadem illa ars quaſi Penelope telam retexens tollit ad extremum ſuperiora*, Cicero, *Academ. Quæſt.* lib. 4.

[R] *He condeſcended to give rules for the education of children.*] He had ordered the Nurſes to ſing a certain kind of ſongs, and adviſed them to chooſe the moſt modeſt. He even wiſhed, that if it had been poſſible, children had not been nurſed but by learned women. *Chryſippus etiam nutricum, quæ adhibentur infantibus, allectationi ſuum quoddam carmen aſſignat* (101). *Ante omnia ne ſit vitioſus ſermo nutricibus; quas, ſi fieri poſſit, ſapientes Chryſippus optavit: certe, quantum res pateretur, optimas eligi voluit* (102). He ordered that children be three years under the care of their nurſes, and that the nurſes ſhould begin to inſtruct them, without waiting till they were older. He did not approve thoſe, who did not begin to inſtruct them, till they were ſeven years old; and Quintilian was of his opinion. *Quidam literis inſtituendos qui minores ſeptem annis eſſent non putaverunt, . . . melius autem, qui nullum tempus vacare cura volunt, ut Chryſippus, nam is quamvis nutricibus triennium dederit, tamen ab illis quoque jam informandam quam optimis inſtitutis mentem infantium judicat* (133). He had examined this queſtion, whether one ought to chaſtiſe children with blows, and he declared he was not of that opinion. *Cædi vero diſcentes, quanquam & receptum ſit, & Chryſippus non improbet, minime velim* (104). i. e. "I "would not have you ſtrike the children, tho' it be "the common practice, and Chryſippus did not diſ-"approve it *." I wiſh I could know what Voſſius grounded his aſſertion upon (105), when he ſaid that Chryſippus the Stoick was the author of thoſe ſongs, which the nurſes ſung, and which Athenæus calls καταβαυκαλήσεις (106), that is, *Songs proper to lull children to ſleep*. The words, which I have quoted from the Xth Chapter of Quintilian's firſt Book, and which Voſſius alſo cites, are not a ſufficient proof for his aſſertion.

(101) Quintil. *Inſtit. Oratore*, lib. 4. cap. 10. pag. m. 55.

(102) Idem, ibid. cap. 1. pag. 6.

(103) Idem, ibid. pag. 8. Obſerve that he quotes him again in chap. 11 of the ſame book, pag. 57.

(104) Idem, ibid. cap. 3. pag. 17.

* Mr. Bayle has been guilty here of an overſight, or of an inaccuracy. For he aſcribes to Chryſippus quite the contrary opinion; or elſe the *He* in the foregoing ſentence muſt be referred to Quintilian, which is an inaccuracy of ſtile.

(105) Voſſius, *de Poetis Græcis*, pag. 87.

(106) Αἱ δὲ τῶν τιθηνῶν ᾠδαὶ καταβαυκαλήσεις ὀνομάζονται. Athen. lib. 4. cap. 3.

[S] *He could not omit mentioning the famous controverſy concerning things poſſible and impoſſible.*] This controverſy was occaſioned by the doctrine of the Stoics concerning fate. The queſtion was, whether amongſt thoſe things that never were and never ſhall be, there be ſome that are poſſible? Or whether all that never was, is not and never ſhall be, is impoſſible? A famous Logician of the ſect of Megara, whoſe name was Diodorus, denied the former and affirmed the latter of theſe propoſitions. But Chryſippus did ſtrongly oppoſe him. Here follow two paſſages from Cicero: πρὸς διόδωρον με ſcito κατὰ Διόδωρον λέγειν. *Quapropter ſi venturus es, ſcito neceſſe eſſe te venire. Sin autem non es, τῶν ἀδυνάτων eſt te venire. Nunc vide utra te χρῆσις magis delectet. Χρυσιππόν ne an hæc quem noſter Diodorus* (107) *non conquebat* (108). i. e. "You "muſt know I am of Diodorus's opinion concern-"ing things poſſible. If therefore you are to come, "know that it is neceſſary you ſhould come; but if "you are not to come, your coming is amongſt the "things impoſſible. See now what opinion you like "beſt, that of Chryſippus, or that which our friend "Diodorus could not digeſt." That is taken from a letter which Cicero wrote to Varro. He puts the whole queſtion in a ſtronger light, in his little Book *de Fato*. I ſhall tranſcribe ſome paſſages out of it. *Vigila, Chryſippe, ne tuam cauſam, in qua tibi cum Diodoro valente Dialectico magna luctatio eſt, deſeras. . . . annne ergo quod falſum dicitur in futuro, id fieri non poteſt. At hoc, Chryſippe, minime vis, maximeque tibi de hoc ipſo cum Diodoro certamen eſt. Ille enim id ſolum fieri poſſe dicit, quod aut ſit verum, aut futurum ſit verum: & quicquid futurum ſit, id dicit fieri neceſſe eſſe: & quicquid non ſit futurum, id negat fieri poſſe. Tu etiam quæ non ſint futura poſſe fieri dicis, ut frangi hanc gemmam, etiamſi nunquam futurum ſit: neque neceſſe fuiſſe Cypſelum regnare Corinthi, quamquam id milleſimo ante anno Apollinis oraculo editum eſſet. . . . Placet Diodoro id ſolum fieri poſſe, quod aut verum ſit, aut verum futurum ſit: qui locus attingit hanc quæſtionem, nihil fieri, quod non neceſſe fuerit: & quicquid fieri poſſit, id aut eſſe jam, aut futurum eſſe: nec magis commutari ex veris in falſa ea poſſe, quæ futura ſunt, quam ea quæ facta ſunt: ſed in factis immutabilitatem apparere, in futuris quibuſdam, quia non apparent, ne ineſſe quidem videri: ut in eo, qui mortifero morbo urgeatur, verum ſit, his morietur hoc morbo, at hoc idem ſi vere dicatur in eo, in quo tanta vis morbi non appareat, nihilominus futurum ſit. Ita fit ut commutatio ex vero in falſum, ne in futuro quidem ullo fieri poſſit* (109). i. e. "Take care Chryſippus, that you do not betray "the cauſe in which you are ſo ſtrongly oppoſed by Di-"odorus that able Logician . . . all then that is falſe "with regard to futurity, is impoſſible. But this you "will not grant Chryſippus, and this is the very ſub-"ject of your controverſy with Diodorus. For he aſ-"ſerts that only to be poſſible, which either is true "or will be true; and all that is to happen, he "ſays is neceſſary: and all that is not to happen, he "maintains is impoſſible. Whereas you aſſert, that "even thoſe things which will not happen are poſſi-"ble, as for inſtance, that this gem can be broke, "tho' it would never be broke; and that it was not "abſolutely neceſſary that Cypſelus ſhould reign at "Corinth, tho' the Oracle of Apollo had foretold it a "thouſand years before. . . . According to Diodorus, "that alone is poſſible, which either is true or will "be true. Which ſubject comes very near to this pro-"poſition, nothing happens but what is neceſſary: "He alſo maintains, that all that is poſſible, is al-"ready or will happen: and that thoſe things that "will come to paſs, can no more be changed from "true into falſe, than thoſe that have already hap-"pened: But the unchangeableneſs appears evidently "in thoſe that are paſt, whereas they that are to come "do not ſeem to be thus unchangeable becauſe we "have no knowledge of them: as for inſtance, it is "true that a man who labours under a mortal diſeaſe "will die of it: but if the ſame be truly ſaid of a "man whoſe diſeaſe does not appear to be ſo dange-"rous, yet it will nevertheleſs happen. So that there "cannot be even in future events a change from true "to falſe." Cicero gives us ſufficiently to underſtand, that Chryſippus was very much perplexed in this controverſy; nor ought we to wonder at it; for the ſide of the queſtion he choſe to maintain, was not in the leaſt connected with his doctrine concerning fate. Had he been able, or had he dared to argue coherently, he would have admitted with all his heart Diodorus's whole hypotheſis. The Reader may have obſerved above (110), that notwithſtanding the liberty which he ſuppoſed the ſoul enjoys, and notwithſtanding his compariſon of the Cylinder, yet all the acts of human will were really unavoidable conſequences of fate; whence it follows, that whatever does not happen is impoſſible; and that nothing is poſſible, but what does actually happen. Plutarch bears him down both with regard to this, and with regard to his diſpute with Diodorus, and maintains againſt him, that his opinion concerning poſſibility is entirely inconſiſtent with his doctrine of fate (111). Obſerve that the moſt illuſtrious amongſt the Stoics wrote upon this ſubject without following the ſame method. Aulus Gellius names four of them,

(107) A Stoick, who had lodged a great while at Cicero's houſe.

(108) Cicero, Epiſt. 4. lib. 9. *ad Familiares.*

(109) Cicero, *de Fato*, cap. 6, & *ſeq.*

(110) In the Remark [H].

(111) Plutarch. *de Stoic. Repugn.* pag. 1053, 1054.

neceſſity. In his Treatiſe concerning Providence, he ſtarted a thought, which may be conſidered as a pretty good ſkerch of one of the moſt beautiful maxims, which a great Philoſopher of the ſeventeenth Century has aſſerted and cleared up [T]. Some Authors relate, that he uſed to take hellebore in order to encreaſe the ſtrength of his genius (x). He died in the 143d Olympiad (y). They raiſed a monument to him amongſt thoſe of the moſt illuſtrious Athenians (z). His ſtatue was to be ſeen in the Ceramicus * [U]. He

(x) See the remark [E] in the Article CARNEADES.

(y) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. num. 184. Concerning the circumſtances of his death. See the quotation (119).

(z) Pauſan. lib. 1. pag. 55. edit. 1695.

* The *Ceramicus* was a public place near Athens, where they who had been killed in the war, were buried at the expence of the public. There was within the City another place of that name, which was a ſettled habitation for proſtitutes. Geſner. *Onomaſt. in voce Ceramicus.*

them, who are Chryſippus, Cleanthes, Archedemus, and Antipater (112). He ſhews a great contempt for this controverſy, and Monſr. Menage ſhould not have quoted him as an Author who commended Chryſippus's Work περὶ δυνατῶν (113) *concerning things poſſible:* For certainly theſe words γέγραφε δὲ Χρύσιππος θαυμασίως &c. *Chryſippus wrote wonderfully &c.* are no commendation in that place, as appears from what goes before it and from what follows it. Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus mentions (114) two treatiſes of Chryſippus, in which he expatiated very much upon Logical Subjects, tho' the title ſeemed to promiſe quite different things. The work was intitled περὶ τῆς συντάξεως τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν. i. e. *Concerning the diſpoſition of the parts in a diſcourſe*; and yet it treated only of propoſitions true and falſe, poſſible and impoſſible, contingent, ambiguous, &c. a ſubject which our Schoolmen have treated over and over again, and upon which they have exhauſted all their ſcholaſtic learning. Obſerve that Chryſippus acknowledged, that things paſſed were neceſſarily true, which Cleanthes would not admit (115). Οὐ πᾶν ὃ παρελήλυθὸς ἀληθὲς ἀναγκαῖον ἦν καθάπερ οἱ περὶ Κλεάνθην φέρουσι δοκοῦσι. (116). We have ſeen above (117), that ſome perſons pretended, Abelard taught a doctrine much like that of Diodorus. I believe that the Stoics reſolved to maintain that ſeveral things are poſſible, which yet never come to paſs, in order to ſoften the odious and horrid conſequences that were drawn from their doctrine of fate. The Spinoſiſts labour at this time under a very great difficulty, becauſe according to their hypotheſis, it was from eternity as impoſſible, that Spinoſa, for inſtance, ſhould not die at the Hague, as it is impoſſible that two and two ſhould make ſix. They are ſenſible that this is a conſequence which follows unavoidably from their principles, and that it is a conſequence ſo abſurd and ſo directly oppoſite to common ſenſe, that it cannot but diſpleaſe and highly offend all reaſonable men. They do not care that the world ſhould know they contradict a propoſition ſo univerſally received, and ſo evidently true as the following is; namely, *all that implies a contradiction is impoſſible, and all that does not imply a contradiction is poſſible.* Now how could it be contradictory, for inſtance, that Spinoſa ſhould have died at Leyden? Would nature in that caſe, have been leſs perfect, leſs wiſe, or leſs powerful?

(112) Arrian. *in Epictet.* lib. 2. cap. 19. pag. m. 166.

(113) *Citatur honorificè apud Arrianum* Menag. *in Laertium*, lib. 7. pag. 341.

(114) Dion. Hal. *de Collocatione verborum*, cap. 17. pag. m. 11.

(115) *Omnia enim vera in præteritis neceſſaria ſunt, ut Chryſippo placet diſſentienti à Magiſtro Cleanthe, quia ſunt immutabilia, nec in falſum è vero præterita poſſunt converti.* Cicero, *de Fato*, cap. 7.

(116) Arrian. *in Epictet.* lib. 2. cap. 19. pag. m. 165.

(117) In the Remark [M] of the article BERENGER.

Let us not finiſh this remark, without obſerving that Chryſippus placed the reſurrection of men, and their reſtoration to the State in which they appeared before amongſt poſſible events. Lactantius acquaints us with this, and even quotes Chryſippus's own words (118). *Melius Chryſippus . . . . qui in Libris, quos de Providentia ſcripſit, cum de innovatione mundi loqueretur, hæc intulit.* Τάδε δὲ ἄττα ἔχοντες, δῆλον ὡς οὐδὲν ἀδύνατον, καὶ ἡμᾶς μετὰ τὸ τελευτῆσαι, πάλιν περιόδων τινῶν ἐλειμμένων χρόνῳ εἰς ὃν νῦν ἐσμὲν καταστήσειν σχῆμα. i. e. "Chryſippus reaſons better . . . . for ſpeaking of the renovation of the world, in his Books concerning providence, he has the following words. *Since then it is ſo, it is plain that it is not impoſſible, that we after our death may be reſtored to the ſtate in which we are at preſent, after ſome revolutions of time.*" The ſame Father aſcribes to him another material opinion, which is no leſs orthodox, but which engaged him to do a very wicked action. He ſays, that Chryſippus was perſuaded, that the moment his ſoul ſhould leave his body, the former would aſcend into heaven, and that he killed himſelf in order to enjoy that happineſs the ſooner (119). *Multi ex iis, quia æternas eſſe animas ſuſpicabantur, tanquam in cælum migraturi eſſent, ſibi ipſi manus intulerunt, ut Cleanthes, ut Chryſippus, ut Zenon* (120).

(118) Lactant. *Divin. Inſtit.* lib. 7. cap. 23. pag. 506.

(119) Diogenes Laertius does not ſay this; he only relates, lib. 7. num. 184, 185. *that Hermippus ſaid, that Chryſippus having been invited to a ſacrifice by his diſciples, drank ſweet wine without water, and fell into a giddineſs, and died five days after. But that others ſay, he died with laughing, bidding his maid to give ſome wine to the Aſs, that had eat his figs.*

(120) Lactant. *Divin. Inſtitut.* lib. 3. cap. 18. pag. 194.

[T] *He ſtarted a thought which may be conſidered as a . . . . ſketch of one of the maxims, which a Philoſopher of the XVIIth Century cleared up.*] Chryſippus in his Work concerning providence examined the following queſtion amongſt ſeveral others. *Whether the nature of things, or providence, which made this world and all mankind, was alſo the Author of thoſe diſeaſes to which men are ſubject?* He anſwers, that the chief deſign of nature was not to make man obnoxious to diſeaſes; for this did not become the cauſe of all kinds of good. But as nature was preparing and producing ſevaral great things, very well ordered and very uſeful, ſhe found that ſome inconveniences aroſe from thence. They were not therefore agreeable to the chief deſign and aim of nature, but happened to come along with the Work, and exiſted only as conſequences. With regard to the formation of the body of man, a more nice reaſon, the very benefit of the work required, that the head, for inſtance, ſhould be compoſed of very ſmall and thin bones, but for this very reaſon it could not be proof againſt blows. Nature prepared health for man, but at the ſame time the ſpring of all diſeaſes was opened by an unavoidable conſequence. It is the ſame with virtue, the direct action of nature, which produced it, did alſo produce by way of conſequence the brood of vices. This is the ſenſe of Aulus Gellius's words; I have not tranſlated the paſſage literally, I ſhall therefore tranſcribe the original here, in behalf of thoſe who underſtand Latin. *Idem Chryſippus in eodem Libro* (quarto περὶ προνοίας) *tractat conſideratque, dignumque eſſe id quæri putat, εἰ αἱ τῶν Ἀνθρώπων νόσοι κατὰ φύσιν γίνονται. Id eſt, naturâne ipſa rerum vel providentia, quæ compagem hanc mundi & genus hominum fecit, morbos quoque & debilitates & ægritudines corporum, quæ patiuntur homines, fecerit: exiſtimat autem, non fuiſſe hoc principale naturæ conſilium, ut faceret homines morbis obnoxios: nunquam enim hoc conveniſſe naturæ auctori, parentique rerum omnium bonarum: ſed cum multa, inquit, atque magna gigneret pareretque aptiſſima & utiliſſima, alia quoque ſimul agnata ſunt incommoda, iis ipſis, quæ faciebat, cobærentia: eaque non per naturam, ſed per ſequelas quaſdam neceſſarias facta dicit, quod ipſe appellat κατὰ παρακολούθησιν. Sicut, inquit, cum corpora hominum natura fingeret, ratio ſubtilior & utilitas ipſa operis poſtulavit, ut tenuiſſimis minutiſque oſſiculis caput compingeret; ſed hanc utilitatem rei majoris alia quædam incommoditas extrinſecus conſecuta eſt; ut fieret caput tenuiter munitum, & ictibus offenſionibuſque parvis fragile: proinde morbi quoque & ægritudines partæ ſunt, dum ſalus petitur: Sic hercle, inquit, dum virtus hominibus per conſilium naturæ gignitur, vitia ibidem per affinitatem nata ſunt* (121). I do not think that an Heathen could ſay any thing more reaſonable than this, ſince he knew nothing of the fall of the firſt man, with which we are not acquainted but by the Revelation of God, and which is the true cauſe of all our misfortunes. If we had ſeveral ſuch extracts from Chryſippus's Works, or rather if we had his Works, we ſhould entertain a much more favourable opinion of the excellency of his wit.

(121) Aulus Gellius, lib. 6. cap. 1.

The modern Philoſopher, whom I meant, when I ſaid that he cleared up a very beautiful maxim, of which Chryſippus thought a pretty good ſketch, is the celebrated Author * of the *Recherche de la verité* (the inquiry after truth). The Reader will find the ſubſtance of his opinion in the *Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes* (122), and this will enable him to judge whether or no Chryſippus hinted the ſame thought.

* Father Malebranche.

(122) Paragraph 234. pag. 704, &c.

As to the other obſervations he made to clear the providence of God (123), you will find them examined in the Remarks [E] and [G] of the Article PAULICIANS. See alſo the Remark [F] of the Article DEJOTARUS.

(123) *See* Aulus Gellius, lib. 6. cap. 1.

[V] *His ſtatue was to be ſeen in the Ceramicus.*] Diogenes Laertius, who ſays this, adds an obſervation which is not very concluſive. His words are. Ἦν δὲ καὶ τὸ σωμάτιον ἰυτύλης, ὡς δῆλον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδριάντος τοῦ ἐν κεραμεικῷ, ὃς σχεδόν τι ὑποκύρτῳ τῷ πλησίον ἵππῳ. οὕτω αὐτὸν ὁ Καρνεάδης Κρύσιππον ἔλεγεν (124). i. e. "He was a little man, as appears by his ſtatue in the Ceramicus

(124) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. num. 182.

He accepted the freedom of the City of Athens, which neither Zeno nor Cleanthes had done; Plutarch's cenſure upon this is, I think, too ſevere [*X*].

" ramicus, which is almoſt entirely hid by a figure " on horſeback which is near it. Hence Carneades " uſed to call him *Cryppſippus* (*a*)." It ſeems that Diogenes Laertius, in order to prove that Chryſippus's ſtatue was little, obſerves, that it was almoſt intirely hid by a figure on horſeback. But this is not a good argument. I ſhould therefore rather think, for Diogenes's credit, that he relates this circumſtance only as a matter of fact, and not as a proof of what he had aſſerted. For one may eaſily underſtand, that a man on horſeback may hide from our ſight even a very tall perſon. If we add to this, that our Philoſopher was repreſented ſitting (125), we ſhall ſtill more eaſily underſtand how his ſtatue could be hid by a figure on horſeback, ſo that this does not in the leaſt prove that Chryſippus was a ſhort man. I wonder therefore, how Voſſius and others could admit the proof, which Diogenes Laertius is ſuppoſed to make uſe of. *Cheſippum contumelioſe, quaſi latrinam dixeris, vocabat Zeno* (126), *teſte Tullio in I. de Nat. Deorum. Chryſippum Carneades quia eſſet exiguus, ita ut ſtatua ejus in Ceramico poſita a vicino equite occuleretur: teſte Laertio* (127). i. e. " Cicero tells us in his 1ſt Book concern- " ing the nature of the Gods, that Zeno uſed to call " Chryſippus, *Cheſippus*, as you might ſay, a *houſe of* " *office*. And Carneades ſtiled him *Chryſippus*, becauſe " he was ſo little that his ſtatue in the Ceramicus was " hid by the figure of a man on horſeback; as Dio- " genes Laertius informs us." I muſt obſerve by the by, that it is a miſtake to ſay, that Diogenes Laertius, who relates this ſaying of Carneades, does alſo relate, that the ſame Carneades charged Chryſippus with being a *Paraſite of Books*, becauſe he had tranſcribed word for word the works of Epicurus. *Hunc* (Chryſippum) *Carneades lepide Paraſitum librorum appellat, quod ſcripta Epicuri ſit furatus, ſcripſitque eadem & verbis & numeris Diogenes* (128). That is what Volateranus dares to give us as if it were quoted from Diogenes Laertius. This is a ſtrange miſrepreſentation of another thing that was laid to Chryſippus's charge, namely that he was ſo jealous of Epicurus's reputation, that he went to write a Book as ſoon as Epicurus had publiſhed any treatiſe whatſoever. See upon this the Remark [*C*]. Robert Stephens and Theodore Zwinger have tranſcribed Volateranus's blunder (129). Let us obſerve, that according to Pauſanias (130), our Philoſopher's ſtatue was not in the Ceramicus, but in the College, which was called after the name of Ptolomy, who founded it. Monſr. Menage in order to make theſe different accounts agree; obſerves that the ſtatue was in the inner Ceramicus (131); Lipſius had already made this obſervation (132). Plutarch mentions a braſs ſtatue, which was raiſed to Chryſippus, by one of his diſciples, with a very glorious inſcription. Ἀριστοκρέων γὼν ὁ Χρυσίππου μαθητὴς ἡ ἀκμῆς, εἰκόνα χαλκῆν ἀνεκτλώσας ἐπέγραψε πόδι τὸ ἐλεγεῖον,

Τόνδε νέον Χρύσιππον Ἀριστοκρέων ἀνέθηκε
Τῶν Ἀκαδημιακῶν ἐγγαλίδων κοπίδα (133).

That is,

" Ariſtocreon has raiſed this Statue for the young man " Chryſippus, who was the ſword that cut the knots " of the Academicks."

(*a*) From the Greek word κρύπτω, which ſignifies, *to hide*.

(125) *Statua eſt in Ceramico Chryſippi ſedentis, porrecta manu*, Cicero, *de Finib.* lib. 1. cap. 11. Obſerve that *Sidonius Apollinaris* Ep. 9. lib. 9. ſays that Chryſippus was repreſented, *digitis propter numerorum indicia conſtrictis*. See the ſame, *Carm.* 23. ver. 118.

(126) He means Zeno the Epicurean.

(127) Voſſius, *de Philoſoph.* Sect. cap. 19. num. 11. pag. m. 102.

(128) Volateran. lib. 14. pag. m. 531.

(129) See *Thomaſius de Plagio Literario*, pag. 170, 171.

(130) Pauſan. lib. 1. pag. 39.

(131) Menag. *in Laertium*, lib. 7. num. 182.

(132) Lipſius, *Manud. ad Stoic. Philoſoph.* lib. 1. Diſſert. 11. pag. m. 654.

(133) Plutarch. *De Repugn. Stoic. init.* pag. 1033.

[*X*] *He accepted the freedom of the city of Athens, . . . Plutarch's cenſure upon this is too ſevere.*] " Antipa- " ter, in his book concerning the controverſy between " Cleanthes and Chryſippus, writes, that neither Zeno " nor Cleanthes would ever accept the freedom of " the city of Athens, leſt they ſhould ſeem to do an " injury and an affront to their own country. If " therefore they did well, we muſt own that Chry- " ſippus did wrong, who procured himſelf to be ad- " mitted into the number of the citizens of Athens. " Yet I will forbear ſaying many things more upon " this ſubject at preſent; I ſhall only obſerve, that " there is a contradiction and inconſiſtency in their " behaviour, ſince they left their own country only a " bare name and ſhadow: whilſt they themſelves were " abſent, and lived in foreign countries. It is as if a " man forſaking his lawful wife, went to live with " another, lay uſually from her, had children by her, " and yet would not marry her, nor ſign a marriage- " contract, leſt he ſhould do an injury to his former " wife (134)." It is obvious to every reader, that Plutarch compares here together two things, which are not in the leaſt like to each other. The regard which Zeno and Cleanthes had for their country was a civility, which was accepted as ſuch. But the huſband's regard for his wife in Plutarch's compariſon, will never paſs for any thing but a downright raillery.

(134) Idem, ibid. pag. 1034.

CHRYSIS, Prieſteſs of Juno at Argos, was by her negligence the occaſion of the Goddeſs's Temple being burnt to the ground. She had ſet a lamp too near the ſacred ornaments, which took fire; and as ſhe ſlept ſo ſound as not to awake time enough to prevent the conſequences of that accident, the Temple was intirely conſumed (*a*). Some ſay ſhe herſelf periſhed in the flames [*A*]; but others affirm that ſhe eſcaped the ſame night to Phlius [*B*]. She had reaſon to fear the reſentment of the Argians; for inſtead of recalling her, they created another Prieſteſs (*b*). This dignity was very conſiderable among them; it regulated their dates and their Chronology (*c*). This conflagration happened in the ninth year of the Peloponneſian War [*C*].

St.

(*a*) Thucydides, lib. 4. *ſub fin.*

(*b*) *Named Phaëinis.* Thucydid. lib. 4.

(*c*) Joſua Barnes. *in vitâ Euripidis*, pag. 7. See the Remark [*C*].

[*A*] *Some ſay ſhe periſhed . . . . in the flames.*] Arnobius not only aſſerts this, but draws an argument from thence againſt the Pagans. *Ubi Juno regina*, ſays he (1), *cum inclitum ejus fanum ſacerdotemque Chryſidem eadem vis flammæ Argiva in civitate deleret?* i. e. " Where was Queen Juno, when the ſame flames " deſtroyed her celebrated temple, and burned her " Prieſteſs Chryſis, at Argos?" Clemens Alexandrinus had furniſhed him with the whole of this, both the fact and the conſequence (2). Little judgment is ſhewn in employing ſuch a proof againſt the Heathen Gods; for, beſides that Lucretius makes uſe of the very ſame reaſon to ruin the worſhip of the Gods in general, might not the queſtion be retorted on Arnobius himſelf? Might they not aſk him where the God of Iſrael was, when the King of Babylon pillaged and burned the Temple of Solomon? I do not know what the Fathers were thinking of when they wrote ſome of their Arguments againſt the Gentiles.

(1) Arnob. lib. 6. pag. m. 207.

(2) Clem. Alexand. *in Protrept.* pag. 35.

[*B*] . . . . *Others affirm ſhe eſcaped the ſame night to Phlius.*] Since Thucydides, who lived at that time, aſſerts this fact (3), there is great probability that it is true, and conſequently that Arnobius has grounded a very ſorry objection on a falſhood. Pauſanias (4) relates that this Prieſteſs fled to Tegea, and took refuge at the altar of Minerva, and that the Argians, in reſpect to that Aſylum, did not demand her to be delivered to them (5). They even preſerved her ſtatue; for it was yet to be ſeen in the time of Pauſanias at the entrance of the ſame Temple which had been burnt (6).

(3) Thucyd. lib. 4. *ſub fin.*

(4) Pauſan. lib. 2. pag. 59.

(5) Idem, lib. 3. pag. 86.

(6) Idem, lib. 2. pag. 60.

[*C*] *This conflagration happened in the 9th year of the Peloponneſian War.*] It is Thucydides who affirms it (7). The learned perſon to whom the public is obliged for the Edition of Euripides printed in England in the year 1694, acquaints us that Chryſis was ordained Prieſteſs of Juno at Argos in the 3d year of the 75th Olympiad, and that ſhe had executed that office 56 years when the Temple was burnt. Here follow his words and his citation: Argis *quidem hoc anno* Chryſis *Sacerdos* Junonis *conſtituitur, ex cujus ſacerdotio mos erat* Argivis *periochas ſuorum temporum numerare. At illa quum per illa quinquaginta* * *ſex annos ſuo fungeretur officio, tum demum lucerna negligenter ad corollas poſita, templum incendio conflagravit* (8). There is no body but would judge from the place where Mr. Barnes has inſerted

(7) Thucyd. lib. 4. *ſub fin.*

* Thucyd. lib. 4. *in ipſo fine*, folio 164. *Vide* Joh. Meurſii Archont. Athen. lib. 3. cap. 6.

(8) Joſua Barneſius, *in Vita Euripidis*, pag. 7.

(d) *Hieronymus adverſus Jovinian.* lib. 1. pag. m. 498.

St. Jerome, in his 1ſt book againſt Jovinian (*d*), has obſerved that our Chryſis the Prieſteſs of Juno was a virgin. Marianus Victorius erroneouſly aſſerts, in his Notes on that paſſage, that the ſaid Father ſpeaks of Chryſeis the concubine of Agamemnon.

inſerted the citation of Thucydides, that that ancient Hiſtorian informs us Chryſis was in the 56th year of her Prieſthood when the fire conſumed the Temple; and yet Thucydides ſpeaks not of this at all: he only ſays it was then eight years and ſix months after the war of Peloponneſus had been begun. If any one ſhould think fit to cenſure Mr. Barnes for this, he would be a caviller; for if it be once certain that Chryſis was conſtituted Prieſteſs in the third year of the 75th Olympiad, a man has ſome right to alledge the authority of Thucydides in order to ſupport the aſſertion that this woman was in the 56th year of her Prieſthood, more or leſs, when the Temple was burnt, ſince Thucydides obſerves that conflagration happened in the ninth year of the Peloponneſian war (9). Beſides, Thucydides, in another place which Mr. Barnes does not quote (10), obſerves that the War of Peloponneſus began in the 48th year of Chryſis's Prieſthood. It is true, this proves that Prieſteſs to have been in the 57th year of her office at the time of the fire, and not in the 56th, as Monſr. d'Ablancourt (11) and Mr. Barnes aſſert.

(9) That is, in the 2d year, or thereabouts, of the 89th Olympiad.

(10) Lib. 2. *init.* pag. m. 99.

(11) In his Tranſlation of *Thucydides*.

CHRISTINA, Queen of Sweden, who died at Rome the 19th of April 1689. See SWEDEN. CHURCHILL. See MARLBOROUGH.

(a) He is named *Cicchus de Eſculo*, or *Æſculanus*, or *Aſculanus*. Some perſons, inſtead of *Cicchus*, ſay *Cichus*, or *Cbicus*.

CICCHUS (*a*), a native of Aſcoli in Italy, was ſaid to be an Author who amuſed himſelf with magical ſuperſtitions. It is not certainly known, that he aſcribes to himſelf a familiar ſpirit. His Commentary on Sacroboſco's Sphere was printed at Venice in 1499. I ſhall quote the judgment which Naudæus gives of him [*A*].

He relates that Cicchus lived in 1320 (*b*), at the ſame time with *Garbo* a Phyſician of Florence, *who accuſed him, as a Necromancer, to the Inquiſitors, by whoſe ſentence he was burnt alive.* He adds, that he ſaw his tryal in Rome in the Library of the Chevalier del Pozzo, and that *he was an arch fellow who pretended to paſs for a Magician*, and wrote *a treatiſe of Phyſicks in Italian verſe.*

(b) Naudæana, pag. 41. Paris edit.

The Author of *Turco-Papiſmus* committed an egregious error, in declaring that he lived under the Pontificate of Paul III [*B*]. Very near two Centuries intervened, between the death of this Aſtrologer and the acceſſion of that Pope to the Pontificate, if we may credit Creſcimbeni, according to whom, Cecco of Aſcoli was burnt in Florence, the 16th of September 1327 (*c*). From theſe circumſtances I ought to ſay, that he lived, not about the end of the 15th Century, but about the beginning of the 14th. I muſt not omit that he is ranked among ſuch Italian Poets, as are far from being inconſiderable. Some of his Poems, written in Italian, have been printed [*C*]. A certain Author ſays, that he was a better Aſtrologer than Poet (*d*).

(c) Giovanni Mario de Creſcimbeni, *Iſtoria della volgar Poeſia*, pag. 47 and 262.

(d) Leandro Alberti, *Deſcrit. di tutta l'Italia* folio m. 267.

CICONIA

[*A*] *I ſhall quote the judgment which Naudæus gives of him.*] (1) "The only Commentary we have of "Chicus Æſculanus, on the Sphere of Sacroboſco, "ſhews ſufficiently, that he was not only ſuperſtitious, as Delrio calls him (2); but that he alſo was "wrong-headed, he having endeavoured to obſerve "three things therein, which muſt neceſſarily ſpeak "him a weak man; the firſt was, his interpreting "Sacroboſco's book agreeably to the ſenſe of Aſtrologers, Necromancers, and Chiroſcopies; the ſecond, his citing a great number of falſified Authors, "ſtuffed with old ſtories and idle chimæras, as for inſtance, Solomon *de umbris idearum*, Hipparchus *de "vinculo ſpiritus*, *de miniſterio naturæ*, *de Hierarchiis "ſpirituum*; Apollonius *de Arte magica*, Zoroaſter *de "Dominio quartarum octavæ Spheræ*, Hippocrates *de "ſtellarum aſpectibus ſecundum lunam*, Aſtafon *de mineralibus conſtellatis*, and a great many more ſuch; "and the third, his making uſe very often of the Revelations of a Spirit called Floron †, whom he ſaid "was of the order of Cherubims; and who being "aſked, on a certain time, what the ſpots in the Moon "were, he anſwered in theſe few words, *ut terra terra "eſt*. But beſides that he does not aſcribe to himſelf "this Spirit, in any part of the ſaid Commentary; "we alſo may reaſonably ſuppoſe, that this relation "is like what Pliny ſays ‡ of the Grammarian Appion, who raiſed the Devil, purpoſely to know of "what Country Homer was." Leo Allatius relates more at large the anſwer made by this Floron; *Patrum noſtrorum memoria* (3), ſays he (4), *Cichus Aſculanus Commentar. de Sphæra cap. 4. tradit Floron ſpiritum naturæ nobiliſſimæ ex cherubinica hierarchia quærente quæ eſſet illa umbra quæ in luna conſpiceretur, tradit reſpondiſſe, ut terra terra eſt, ſic idea humiditatum eſt terra: ſi totam umbram habueris, te non decipiet ſicut umbra. Rurſumque, ab alio de Chriſto interrogatum dixiſſe, carnem ſumpſit humanam ut per ipſum ſalvaretur omnis caro.* i. e. "In the memory of our Fathers, "Cicchus Aſculanus in the 4th chapter of his Commentary on the Sphere, ſays that the Spirit Floron, "of the moſt noble nature of the cherubinic Hierarchy, "being aſked, what that ſhade is which is diſcovered "in the Moon, replied, as the earth is earth, ſo the "idea of moiſture is earth; had you the entire ſhade "it would not deceive you as ſhade. Again being aſked by another perſon concerning Chriſt, he ſaid, that "he had aſſumed the fleſh, in order that all fleſh "might be ſaved by him."

(1) *Apolog. des grans Hommes*, chap. 13. pag. m. 344.

(2) *Diſquiſit.* lib. 1. cap. 3.

† Cap. 4. Sph.

‡ Lib. 2. cap. 30.

(3) This ſhews he did not well know the time when he lived.

(4) Allatius, *de Patria Homeri*, pag. 3 and 4.

[*B*] *The Author of* Turco-Papiſmus *committed an egregious error, in declaring that he lived under the Pontificate of Paul III.*] He ranks this Pope among thoſe who were addicted to Necromancy, and as a proof of this, he reproaches him with his ſtrict intimacy with Aſculanus a famous Necromancer (5). *Paulum tertium cum Cecio Aſculano, magiæ & necromantiæ inſigniter perito, magnam familiaritatem habuiſſe teſtantur Hiſtoriæ* *. Sleidan one of the two Authors cited by him, cannot be charged with this error. Here follow his words which he extracts from a libel that had been publiſhed againſt the abovementioned Pope. *An non turpiſſimum eſt te pendere totum ab Aſtrologis & Necromanticis? Negari factum non poteſt: nam & honoribus illos & facultatibus atque donis amplificaſti, Cecium, Marcellum, Gaurecum Luſitanum, & alios* (6). i. e. "Is it not moſt ſhameful, that thou ſhouldeſt be "ſo much wrapped up in Aſtrologers, and Necromancers? This cannot be denied: for thou haſt "raiſed them to honours, and leaved them with riches; "viz. Cecius, Marcellus, Gauricus the Portugueze, "and others." Sleidan ſays indeed, that one Cecius had ſhared the favour of Paul III, but he does not ſurname him *Aſculanus*; and he therefore may clear himſelf from the imputation of being in an error. Had he been as cautious with regard to Gauricus, he could not have been reproached with the following miſtake, viz. of making a man who was born in Italy a Portugueze.

(5) Sutlivius, *in Turco-Papiſmo*, lib. 1. cap. 8. pag. 55.

* Sleidan and Verger.

(6) Sleidan. lib. 21. pag. m. 668, *ad ann.* 1549.

[*C*] *Some of his Poems, written in Italian, have been printed.*] His Poem *della natura dell' Univerſo* was firſt printed in 1478, with a Commentary by an anonymous Author; afterwards in 1516, and laſtly in 1552 in 8vo (8). Creſcimbeni who informs me of this particular ſays elſewhere (9), that the *Work entitled* L'acerba *di Maeſtro Cecco d'Aſcoli Aſtrologo del Duca di Calavria* has been publiſhed.

(8) Creſcimbeni, *Iſtoria della volgar Poeſia*, pag. 306.

(9) Ibid. pag. 47.

CICONIA (FLAMINIUS) a native of Vicenza in Italy, was a tolerable Philoſopher, and lived about the end of the ſixteenth Century. I am perſuaded that his name in Italian was *Cicogna*, or *Cigogna*. He printed a book at Vicenza in 1592 [*A*]. Konig had never ſeen this edition (*a*). There was one STROZZI CIGOGNA, a Gentleman of Vicenza, who was a Divine, a Philoſopher, a Doctor of Laws, and Nuncio of the city of Vicenza. Theſe are the titles he gives himſelf at the beginning of a work, dedicated by him to the Doge of Venice and the Council of Ten, the 16th of July 1605 [*B*].

(*a*) He ſays that Ciconia publiſhed *Quæſtiones naturales*, Anno 1603.

[*A*] *He printed a Book at Vicenza in* 1592.] It is in 4to and conſiſts of eighty leaves, entitled, *Quæſtiones naturales in quibus juxta Ariſtotelis principia multa diligenter pertractantur, & ſumma facilitate diſputantur, contra Robertum Juvenatenſem.* I have now by me a work printed at Venice in 1585, and entitled, *Quæſtiones tres. R. P. Domini Honorati de Robertis Juvenatenſis, Congregationis Lateranenſis, Canonicorum Regularium Sancti Auguſtini.* Theſe are the names and qualities of the Author refuted by Ciconia. He attacks ſome other Authors in different parts of his work, as Averroes, Pomponatius, Zimara; but in this Age, all ſuch Books, like baſe coin, are cried down.

[*B*] STROZZI CIGOGNA . . . . *dedicated a work to the Doge of Venice, and the Council of Ten . . . in* 1605.] It is entitled, *Del Palagio de gl' incanti, & delle gran meraviglie de gli Spiriti, & di tutta la natura loro.* The edition I here uſe is of Breſcia, *appreſſo Comino Preſegni*, 1605 in 8vo. The Bodlean Catalogue takes notice of an edition of Vicenza in 4to, printed alſo anno 1605 (1). This work was printed in Latin, the year after, at Colen in 8vo, and its title is *Magiæ Theatrum de Spirituum & Incantationum naturâ.* This tranſlation is by one Gaſpar Ens.

(1) Konig only mentions the edition of 1617.

CIECA, Author of a Hiſtory of Peru in Spaniſh. See LEO.

CYGNE (MARTIN DU) a Jeſuit, was looked upon as the moſt famous Rhetorician of the ſeventeenth Century. He publiſhed in 1661, an Analyſis of Cicero's Orations, which has been ſeveral times reprinted, and particularly at Paris in 1704. He alſo left an Art of Poetry, an Art of Hiſtory, and a Rhetorick. He died at Ypres in 1699 (*a*).

(*a*) Extracted from the *Mémoires de Trevoux*, for July 1704, Art. 95.

CIMON, ſon of that Miltiades who vanquiſhed the Perſians in the famous battle of Marathon, was one of the beſt Generals of the Athenian Republic. There are ſome Hiſtorians who relate that he was caſt into the ſame priſon wherein Miltiades died, and was not diſcharged but on paying the fine which the deceaſed had been ſentenced to pay, and which he would not have been able to pay, had not Elpinice, his ſiſter and wife, married Callias [*A*]. Others ſay he voluntarily ſacrificed his liberty to obtain permiſſion to bury his father [*B*]. It would be no good refutation of this laſt opinion, to ſay he was

[*A*] *Some Hiſtorians ſay he was caſt into the ſame priſon in which Miltiades died, and was not diſcharged &c.*] Cornelius Nepos has followed this opinion: (1) *Quum pater ejus*, ſays he (1), *litem æſtimatam populo ſolvere non potuiſſet, ob eamque cauſam in vinculis publicis deceſſiſſet, Cimon eadem cuſtodia tenebatur, neque legibus Athenienſibus emitti poterat, niſi pecuniam, qua pater multatus erat, ſolviſſet.* "When his father "could not pay the mulct ſet on him to the people, "and for that reaſon died in the public priſon, Cimon "was confined in the ſame place, nor could he be "releaſed by the Athenian laws, unleſs he paid the "ſum which his father had been fined." Callias, adds he, a perſon better ſtocked with money than with nobleneſs of birth, deſired to marry Elpinice, and offered to pay Cimon's debts, if ſhe were granted him. Cimon rejected the propoſal; but Elpinice declared ſhe would not ſuffer the ſon of Miltiades to die in priſon, and that ſince ſhe could prevent it by eſpouſing of Callias, ſhe was reſolved to do it. This was the upſhot of the affair: Cimon recovered his liberty by the marriage of his ſiſter Elpinice (2), a woman who was not reckoned overchaſte (3); I have ſpoken of her in another place (4): ſhe refuſed not the laſt favour to a Painter named Polygnotus: I do not know whether he teſtified his acknowledgment to her otherwiſe than by the picture of Laodice. To underſtand this, you muſt know that Polygnotus, being to paint the Trojan Ladies, drew Laodice perfectly like Elpinice (5). Take notice that Herodotus, ſpeaking of the proſecution againſt Miltiades (6), ſays nothing of the impriſonment either of the father, or of the ſon, and clearly inſinuates that Miltiades was not impriſoned. That great man got a fall at the ſiege of Paros, and hurt his thigh, and for that reaſon he could not anſwer to his accuſation in perſon. His hurt confined him to his bed: he was ſentenced to pay a fine of fifty talents; and as he died ſoon after by the mortifying of his thigh, it was his ſon Cimon who paid the fine. This is the account of Herodotus. There is wanting in it a circumſtance which Plato will inform us of. The ſentence declared that Miltiades ſhould be put into the dungeon: but that part of it was not executed; for the College of Prytanes oppoſed it. Μιλτιάδην δὲ τὸν ἐν Μαραθῶνι εἰς τὸ βάραθρον ἐμβαλεῖν ἐψηφίσαντο· κ᾽ εἰ μὴ ἀξ τὸ πρυτανεῖον, ἐνέπεσεν ἄν. *Miltiadem vero, qui in Marathone pugnavit, in carceris barathrum detrudere decreverunt, ac niſi obſtitiſſet magiſtratus, procul dubio incidiſſet* (7). It is ſtrange, if the affair paſſed thus, that Cornelius Nepos ſhould relate it in the manner you have ſeen above: and here is what he ſays in the life of Miltiades; *Hanc pecuniam quòd ſolvere non poterat, in vincula publica conjectus eſt, ibique diem obiit ſupremum.* i. e. "Becauſe he could not pay this "ſum, he was thrown into the public priſon, and "there breathed his laſt." I ſhall, in the following Remark, quote ſome Authors who maintain that Miltiades died in priſon.

(1) Cornel. Nepos, *in Vita Cimonis, init.*

(2) *Tali modo cuſtodiâ liberatus.* Idem, ibid.

(3) Plutarch. *in Cimone*, pag. 480, F.

(4) In the Article of PERICLES, Remark [*N*].

(5) Plut. *in Cimone*, pag. 480, F.

(6) Herodot. lib. 6. cap. 136.

(7) Plato, *in Gorgia*, pag. m. 352, B.

[*B*] . . . . *Others ſay he voluntarily ſacrificed his liberty to obtain permiſſion to bury his father.*] This was ſo noble an action, that I wonder Plutarch, who follows the opinion of thoſe who aſſert that Miltiades died in priſon (8), has ſaid nothing of it. It appears from Seneca's Controverſies (9) that the impriſonment of Miltiades, and the putting of Cimon in his place, ſerved for a theme to the declamations of the Rhetoricians. See alſo Valerius Maximus, who relates that the inhabitants of Athens conſtrained Miltiades to die in Chains, and would not permit him to be buried, but on condition that his ſon ſhould go to priſon in his ſtead. *Bene egiſſent Athenienſes cum Miltiade, ſi eum, poſt trecenta millia Perſarum Marathone devicta, in exilium protinus miſiſſent, ac non in carcere & vinculis mori coëgiſſent. Sed, ut puto, hactenus ſævire adverſus optime meritum abunde non duxerunt. Imo ne corpus quidem ejus, ſic expirare coacti, ſepulturæ prius mandari paſſi ſunt, quàm filius ejus Cimon eiſdem vinculis ſe conſtringendum traderet. Hanc hæreditatem paternam maximi ducis filius, & futurus ipſe ætatis ſuæ dux maximus, ſolam ſe ſortitum, catenas ſcilicet & carcerem, gloriari potuit* (10). i. e. "The Athenians would "have done well by Miltiades, if, after he had over-"thrown three hundred thouſand Perſians at Marathon, "they had ſent him directly into baniſhment, and "not compelled him to die in priſon and in chains. "But, I think, they did not deem it ſufficient to deal "ſo cruelly with a man who had deſerved extremely "well: they did not even ſuffer his corps, after he "had been conſtrained to die in that manner, to be "interred, before his ſon Cimon ſurrendered himſelf

(8) Ἐτελεύτησεν ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ. *Diem ſuum obiit in carcere.* Plutarch. *in Vita Cimonis*, pag. 480, D.

(9) *See* Seneca *the Father*, Controverſ. 29. pag. m. 243.

(10) Valer. Maximus, lib. 5. cap. 3. num. 3 Ext. pag. m. 460, 461.

was decried for his debaucheries in his younger years [C]; for even those who have blamed him agree that he was of a frank and perfectly generous temper (a). There is reason

(a) See the Remark [C], Citation (18).

" to be bound in the same chains. This was the " only paternal inheritance which the son of a great " General, and who was himself to become the great- " est General of his age, could boast of succeeding " to, I mean chains and a prison." In the next chapter he takes notice in express terms that Cimon voluntarily purchased leave to bury his father at the price of his own liberty. *Ne te quidem Cimon silentio involvam, qui patri tuo sepulturam voluntariis vinculis emere non dubitasti* (11). I should lay no great stress on this Author's testimony, did I not see it confirmed by an Historian; for though nobody had said this besides Seneca's Rhetoricians (12), we should nevertheless have seen it in the Collections of Valerius Maximus: but here is an authority of greater weight. *Græci ducem constituunt Cimonem Athenienſem, filium Miltiadis, quo duce apud Marathonem pugnatum est, juvenem, cujus magnitudinem futuram pietatis documenta prodiderunt. Quippe patrem ob crimen peculatus in carcerem conjectum, ibique defunctum, translatis in se vinculis ad sepulturam redemit* (13).

(11) Idem, ibid. cap. 4. num. 2 *Ext.* pag. 473.

(12) *Miltiades peculatus damnatus in carcere alligatus decessit, Cimonque filius ejus ut eum sepeliret vicarium se pro corpore patris dedit.* Seneca, *Controv. XXIX*, pag. 243.

(13) Justin. lib. 2. *sub fin.*

[C] *He was decried for his debaucheries in his younger years.*] He was not only accused of stupidity, but also of dissoluteness and drunkenness, and of lying with his sister (14). Κακῶς ἤκουεν ὡς ἄτακτος καὶ πολυπότης . . . . νίος ὢν αἰτίαν ἴσχε πλησιάζειν τῇ ἀδελφῇ. *Male audivit ex lustris & vinolentia . . . adolescentia ejus famosa fuit quasi sorori suæ illuderet* (15). Here are great defects both of the heart and mind. It is reasonable to believe there was some calumny in the first accusation; for he discovered so great a capacity after he was advanced to offices, that there is no likelihood he ever was a fool or a blockhead. I acknowledge that some minds open but by slow degrees, and become skilful by being enured to business; but observe, these are minds which even in the time of their heavy dulness act with judgment, and if they have no vivacity, have good sense, and deserve nothing less than the imputation of stupidity or foolishness. Let us therefore, at the worst, keep to the testimony of Stesimbrotus; who was nearly his contemporary (16): now what has he said of our Cimon? that in his youth he learned neither music nor any of the other things which amongst the Greeks were taught those to whom they gave a good education (17), that is, he had not that politeness, and those agreeable ornaments of speech which were proper to the Athenians, and his candour and generosity savoured rather of Peloponnesus than of Attica. Τῷ τρόπῳ πολὺ τὸ γενναῖον καὶ ἁπλοῦς ἐπικράτουν καὶ μᾶλλον εἶναι Πελοποννήσιον τὸ χρῆμα τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς. *Mores insigni generositate & sinceritate tinctos, potiusque ingenium hujus viri Peloponnesium fuisse* (18). I know not even whether this testimony of Stesimbrotus be true; for it is said that Cimon having been requested to sing when he dined with Laomedon had the complaisance to do it, and acquitted himself well. Παρακληθέντος ᾆσαι καὶ ᾄσαντος ἱκανῶς, *cum rogatus esset canere, & non illepide ceciniſſet* (19). Ion, who was present at the entertainment, published this in one of his Poems. Cornelius Nepos asserts that Cimon early attained to a tolerable degree of eloquence, and was well versed in the knowledge of the Civil Law, and of Military Affairs. *Celeriter ad principatum pervenit, habebat enim satis eloquentiæ, summam liberalitatem, magnam prudentiam cum juris civilis, tum rei militaris, quod cum patre à puero in exercitu fuerat versatus* (20). Let us also cite Plutarch: he does not much confirm what is related of the stupidity and bad education of this young man. *Cimon*, says he (21), *was as daring as Miltiades, and not at all inferior to Themistocles for judgment, and he was incomparably more just and honest than either of them. As he was equal to them in understanding, and in discharging all the functions of a Commander; so for the Political part of Government, he excelled them and every one else; and this too when he was very young, and his years not yet confirmed by any experience.* However it be, we find this in an ancient Compiler; *Cimonis incunabula opinione stultitiæ fuerunt reserta* (22). i. e. " Cimon was generally supposed to be dull in his " childhood."

(14) Plut. *in Cimone*, pag. 480.

(15) Idem, ibid.

(16) Idem, ibid.

(17) Stesimbrotus Thasius, *apud* Plutarch. ibid.

(18) Idem, ibid.

(19) Plutarch. *in Cimone*, pag. 484. He cites *Ion.*

(20) Cornel. Nepos, *in Vita Cimonis*, cap. 2.

(21) Plut. *in Cimone*, p. 481.

(22) Val. Maximus, lib. 6. cap. 9. num. 3 *Ext.* pag. m. 583.

Thus much for the first accusation. The second, I mean that which relates to his bad morals, is not so easy to be refuted. Plutarch confesses that Cimon was excessively addicted to the love of women. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅλως φαίνεται τοῖς περὶ τὰς γυναῖκας ἐρωτικοῖς ὁ Κίμων ἔσχος γενέσθαι. *At qui apparet omnino hæsisse circa mulierum libidines Cimonem* (23). He cites the Poet Melanthius, who had named two concubines (24) of whom that General was passionately fond; but it may be matter of surprize that he alledges, as another instance, his grief for having lost a lawful wife; for this sentiment is not always a proof of unchastness: the most virtuous are sometimes inconsolable for the death of their spouses. However that be, you will find this observation in the same passage of Plutarch where his design is to prove Cimon's lasciviousness: you will also find there that this disconsolate widower had need of the Philosophers on that occasion, and that Archelaüs is supposed to have composed the consolatory Elogies which were written on that subject. Δῆλος δ' ἐστὶ καὶ πρὸς Ἰσοδίκην, τὴν Εὐρυπτολέμου μὲν θυγατέρα τοῦ Μεγακλέους, κατὰ νόμους δ' αὐτῷ συμβιώσασαν, ὁ Κίμων ἐμπαθέστερον διατεθείς, καὶ δυσφορήσας ἀποθανούσης, εἴ τι δεῖ τεκμαίρεσθαι ταῖς γεγραμμέναις ἐπὶ παραμυθίᾳ τοῦ πένθους ἐλεγείαις πρὸς αὐτὸν· ὧν Παναίτιος ὁ φιλόσοφος οἴεται ποιητὴν γεγονέναι τὸν φυσικὸν Ἀρχέλαον, οὐκ ἄπο τρόπου τοῖς χρόνοις εἰκάζων. *Jam non obscuro amore filiam Euryptolemi Megaclis filii, justam tamen uxorem, est Cimon prosequutus, ejusque mortem tulit ægerrimè, quatenus conjicere licet ex scriptis ad leniendum luctum ejus elegiis, quas Panætius Philosophus condidisse physicum Archelaum putat, neque absurdè ducit ex temporibus conjecturam* (25). i. e. " However this is certain, that he loved his wife Iso- " dice very passionately; she was the daughter of Eu- " ryptolemus the son of Megacles. Her death he re- " gretted even to impatience, as appears by those Ele- " gies of condolance addressed to him upon the loss of " her. The Philosopher Panætius is of opinion that " Archelaus was the Author of those Elegies; and " indeed the time seems to favour that conjecture." Let us take notice, by the way, there was a report that Cimon having discovered that his wife the daughter of Callias abandoned herself to adultery, put her to death. The Rhetoricians declaimed very copiously on this topic (26): for they supposed him accused of ingratitude, under pretence that by marrying of that woman he had been enabled to pay his debts for which he was detained in prison. Some say it is a feigned case, and that the Rhetoricians changed the circumstances the better to shew their talents at wit (27). This might be, but the reason on which it is founded does not appear convincing to me. Callias, say they, paid the fine, not to procure his daughter the advantage of espousing Cimon, but to procure himself the happiness of marrying Elpinice Cimon's sister. Might not one answer, that Callias stipulated these two marriages on his disbursing fifty talents, I mean that he engaged Cimon to give him Elpinice, and to marry his daughter? There is a great deal of confusion in Authors about this whole affair; for Tzetzes relates that Callias the son of Cimon and Isodice paid a fine of fifty talents to prevent his father's being punished for having lain with his sister (28). Let us boldly reckon this incest among Cimon's debaucheries. As to drunkenness, I do not see that Plutarch undertakes to clear him: he only excuses the matter, by saying that it did not hinder him from performing great actions. Here are his words (29): *Consonant to these calumnies are the famous verses of Eupolis the Poet upon Cimon:*

Ill nature to him we cannot reproach;
But he is lazy, and he will debauch.
He goes to Sparta, and is so unkind
He leaves poor Elpinice in bed behind (30).

But if when slothful and a drunkard he could storm so many towns, and gain so many victories, certainly if he had been sober, and minded his business with the least application, there had been no Grecian Commander, either before or after him, who could have surpassed him for exploits of war.

(23) Plut. *in Cimone*, pag. 481.

(24) Aristeria of Salamis, and Mnestra.

(25) Plut. *in Cimone*, pag. 481.

(26) See the 24th *Controversy of Seneca*, pag. m. 243: the Title of it contains these words: *Callias sordide dives natus redemit eum à republica & pecuniam solvit, eique filiam suam collocavit, quam ille deprehensam in adulterio, deprecante patre occidit. Ingrati reus est.*

(27) Rutgersius, *Variar. Lect.* lib. 1. cap. 9. pag. 43.

(28) Tzetzes, *Chil.* 1. *Hist. XXII.*

(29) Plut. *in Cimone*, pag. 488.

(30) Here is Eupolis's Greek: Κακὸς μὲν οὐκ ἂν λάβοις φιλοπότης δὲ καμιλλᾶται. Κἄπειτ' ἀπειμὶ σπουδάσας ἂν εἰς Λακεδαίμονα, Κἀν Ἐλπινίκην τὴν δὲ κατυλοπιὼν μόνην.

reaſon to believe that in his youth he was not deſtitute, as ſome aſſert (*b*), either of the advantages of education, or of quick natural parts. I ſhall have ſeveral things to ſay concerning his marriage with his ſiſter [*D*]. He ſignalized himſelf at the battle of Salamis,

(*b*) See the Remark [*C*].

[*D*] *I ſhall have ſeveral things to ſay concerning his marriage with his ſiſter.*] The commerce between Cimon and Elpinice is differently related: ſome conſider it no otherwiſe than as a thing lawful, and others as a thing utterly unlawful. Cornelius Nepos is of the number of the former: *Neque enim Cimoni fuit turpe Athenienſium ſummo viro, ſororem germanam habere in matrimonio: quippe quum cives ejus eodem uterentur inſtituto.* i. e. "Neither was it ſcandalous for Cimon, a principal "man among the Athenians, to have his own ſiſter "in marriage: becauſe his fellow citizens uſed that "cuſtom." Thus he ſpeaks in his Preface. *Habebat autem*, ſays he elſewhere (31), *in matrimonio ſororem ſuam germanam nomine Elpinicen, non magis amore quam more ductus, nam Athenienſibus licet, eodem patre natas, uxores ducere.* i. e. "He had his own ſiſter "named Elpinice to wife, induced thereto no leſs by "the cuſtom than by love; for it is lawful for the "Athenians to marry their ſiſters by the ſame father." Athenæus ſpeaks of it in a quite contrary manner: he aſſerts that Cimon lay with Elpinice againſt the laws (32). I have quoted a man who ſuppoſes this infamous commerce had expoſed Cimon to ſome rigorous puniſhment if a large fine had not been paid for him.

(31) Cornelius Nepos, *in Vita Cimonis*, cap. 1.

(32) I have ſet down his words in the Remark [*N*] of the Article of PERICLES.

Καλλίας δὲ πεντήκοντα τάλαντα ζημιῶται
Ὅπως ὁ Κίμων ὁ πατὴρ μηδὲν δεινόν τι πάθῃ
Ἕνεκα γάμων τῶν αἰσχρῶν τῆς ἀδελφομιξίας.

Decies talenta quinque multam Callias
Solvit, Cimon ne quid mali pateretur ob
Turpes ſororis atque fratris nuptias (33).

(33) Tzetzes, *Chil. I. Hiſt. XXII.*

That is,

"Callias a fine of fifty talents paid,
"To free his father Cimon from the pains
"Due to his ſhameful marriage with his ſiſter.

Rutgerſius, who quotes this paſſage, and afterwards that of Athenæus, as two authorities which teſtify that this inceſt of Cimon's was puniſhed, produces three other Authors to the ſame fact, Andocides, Suidas, and Varinus. The firſt aſſerts that Cimon ſuffered the puniſhment of Oſtraciſm, for having violated the laws by lying with his ſiſter (34). According to Suidas he was accuſed of having lain with her, and was baniſhed on account of that crime (35). Varinus obſerves the ſame thing (36); but by a ſlip of memory he puts Ariſtides inſtead of Cimon. All theſe Writers advance mere idle fancies, if we believe Rutgerſius (37): he objects to them that the laws of the Athenians permitted marriages between brothers and ſiſters by the ſame father, which he proves by the teſtimony of Cornelius Nepos (38), by that of Philo (39), and by that of the Scholiaſt on Ariſtophanes (40). He cites theſe words of Minucius Felix, *Athenis cum Sororibus legitima conjugia*, i. e. "At Athens it was lawful to marry with ſiſters;" and Seneca, who ſays, *Athenis dimidium licet, Alexandriæ totum*, i. e. "At Athens it is allowed to marry "half ſiſters, and at Alexandria thoſe of the whole "blood (41)," and Plutarch (42), who relates that Archeptolis the ſon of Themiſtocles eſpouſed Mneſiptolema his ſiſter by the ſame father (43). He makes uſe alſo of other batteries; he is of opinion that the oſtraciſm ſerved not to puniſh crimes, but to diminiſh the luſtre of envied virtue, and he ſhews the variations among thoſe who ſay that Cimon was puniſhed. Some affirm he was baniſhed, others that he was ſentenced to pay a fine of fifty talents. Some ſay he was condemned to pay that fine for his father's fault; whereupon he brings us quotations from ſeveral Writers, Herodotus, Cornelius Nepos, Seneca the father, Valerius Maximus, and Juſtin: quotations which are very uſeleſs, and very ill underſtood; for they have no relation to the queſtion which he is examining, and do not at all concern the puniſhment of which the Authors whom he would refute intended to ſpeak. They only meant the chaſtiſement which was inflicted on Cimon after a long adminiſtration of the Commonwealth. At length he cites Demoſthenes, who aſſures us that Cimon, having attempted to appropriate to himſelf the public adminiſtration, was condemned to pay fifty talents, and that there were but three votes wanting to condemn him to death (44). He alſo quotes a paſſage of St. Cyril (45), where we find that Cimon's puniſhment was founded on his being convicted of having aſpired to the Sovereignty.

(34) Ὅτι τὸν ἐξοστρακισθέντα Κίμωνα διὰ παρανομίαν ὅτι τὴν ἀδελφὴν τὴν ἰδίαν συνοίκιον. Andocides, *in Orat. contra Alcibiadem*, apud *Rutgerſ. Variar. Lect.* lib. 1. cap. 9. pag. 39.

(35) Suidas, *in voce* Κίμων & Ὀστρακισμός.

(36) Varinus, *in Voce* Ὀστρακίνδα.

(37) Rutgerſ. *Var. Lect.* pag. 39.

(38) Above, Citation (31).

(39) Philo, περὶ τῶν ἀναιρουμένων ἐν ἑβδόμῳ νόμων.

(40) *Schol. Ariſtoph. in Nub.* Act. 5. Sc. II. pag. m. 168.

(41) Seneca, *in Ludo de Morte Claudii.*

(42) Plut. *in Themiſtocle, ſub fin.* pag. 128.

(43) Ὁμοπάτριον, eodem patre genitam.

Rutgerſius, methinks, is in the wrong and in the right in different reſpects. He has ſufficient grounds to maintain that the laws of Athens permitted men to marry their ſiſters provided they were not by the ſame venter, and that the baniſhment of Cimon was not founded on his marriage with Elpinice. But he is in the wrong to impute what he does to Athenæus. That Writer giving the particulars of the impurities of Pericles, concludes with the adventure of Elpinice. This concluſion contains four things: 1, that Cimon had criminally enjoyed his ſaid ſiſter; 2, that he had afterwards married her to Callias; 3, that he had been exiled; 4, that Pericles, for having procured him to be recalled, was rewarded with the enjoyment of Elpinice. This is what Athenæus ſays; but this is not ſaying that Cimon was exiled for having enjoyed his ſiſter. Rutgerſius therefore is to be blamed for having inſerted in the Tranſlation of the Greek Words of that Writer a clauſe which he ought not to have inſerted. You will find it in the parentheſis of the words following: *Cum Cimon Elpinice Sorore quam poſtea Calliæ elocavit contra leges abuteretur, ac (ob id) in exilium pulſus eſſet* (46). i. e. "When Cimon, in breach of the "laws, abuſed his ſiſter Elpinice, whom he afterwards "married to Callias, and was (for that reaſon) baniſh-"ed." He is not the only perſon who is miſtaken in this point. Wower (47), Kirchmaier (48), and ſeveral others, impute the ſame thing to Athenæus. The worſt is that they impute it alſo to Plutarch, tho' he has ſaid very clearly that the cauſe of Cimon's oſtraciſm was the indignation which was conceived at an affront the Athenian troops had received at Lacedæmon (49). This reſentment renewed and redoubled the ill deſigns which were hatching againſt Cimon, who had been long ſuſpected of bearing too much friendſhip to the Lacedæmonians, and was become odious to the popular faction (50), becauſe he endeavoured to reſtore the authority of the Areopagus, and to cauſe the Tribunals to be ſurrendred back to the Nobles, which the people had taken from them. The reaſon which may have deceived thoſe whom I here criticiſe is very weak. Plutarch tells us that the efforts to reeſtabliſh the Ariſtocracy raiſed a clamour againſt Cimon, that they animated the people againſt him, and renewed the ſcandalous diſcourſes about his commerce with Elpinice (51). Is this a ſufficient reaſon to maintain that the ſaid Author aſſerts that commerce to have been the cauſe of Cimon's exile? Muſt it not be granted that an infinite number of Authors examine what they alledge very ſlightly, and that few of them are exact?

(44) Demoſth. *adverſ. Ariſtocrat.* pag. m. 457.

(45) Cyril. lib. 6. *contra Julianum.*

(46) Rutgerſ. *Variar. Lect.* pag. 138. Dalechamp, in his Tranſlation of *Athenæus*, has not put in *ob id.*

(47) Wower, *in Minuc. Felicem*, pag. m. 334.

(48) Georgius Gaſpar Kirchm. *in Cornel. Nepot. Cimon.* pag. m. 242.

(49) Plut. *in Cimone*, pag. 489.

(50) Idem, ibid. pag. 488.

(51) Idem, ibid. A.

We grant you, will ſome ſay, that neither Athenæus, nor Plutarch, have ſaid what ſeveral impute to them; yet it will not be the leſs true for that reaſon, that Cimon's commerce with Elpinice cauſed him to be baniſhed. I anſwer that there remains no other authority for this fact except that of the Orator Andocides; for we may believe Suidas depended upon him: and as to Varinus (52), his teſtimony is of no weight, ſince he lived in the beginning of the XVIth Century. Let us ſee therefore what regard is to be had to Andocides, and let us remember that an Orator makes no ſcruple to extenuate or amplify things according to the intereſt of his cauſe. He eclipſes the circumſtances which make not for him; he takes for the principal that which was but acceſſory, or that for acceſſory which was the principal. Andocides knew, either by reading, or by tradition, that Cimon's enemies decried him as much as they could, when they laboured to get him condemned to baniſhment. They publiſhed all the faults of his youth, and above all they raked into the old orduſe of his commerce with Elpinice. He was baniſhed, not for that, but becauſe he was ſuſpected of too much ambition, and becauſe they hated his attachment to the intereſt of Lacedæmon. It was of no uſe to Andocides to mention this true cauſe of the baniſhment;

(52) That is, *Varinus Phavorinus.*

(c) Plutarch. *in Vita Cimonis*, pag. 481.

mis (c), and rendred himſelf ſo agreeable to the Athenians that they quickly advanced him to the moſt conſiderable poſts. If his merit was of ſervice to him, on the one hand, he found,

niſhment; wherefore he ſpoke not of it: but as it was of great uſe to him to repreſent that their anceſtors had ſeverely puniſhed manners which gave ſcandal, he inſiſted only on the reproaches of a debauched life, alledged by Cimon's enemies, and was glad to aſſign them for the ſole cauſe of that great man's exile. But it will be replied, Does not Tzetzes ſay that a great number of Authors have aſſerted that Callias, the ſon of Cimon and Iſodice, paid fifty talents to prevent the misfortune to which his father had expoſed himſelf by his marriage with Elpinice? I own he ſays this:

Τὸ δ' ὅτι ταῦτα γράφουσι, μακρὸν ἐξ ἐμοῦ λέγειν,
Ἐξ ἐγὼ πλῆθος ἀπείρου τῶν ταῦτα γεγραφότων,
Οἱ κωμικοὶ, καὶ ῥήτορες, Διόδωρος καὶ ἄλλοι.

Quòd iſta tradant, longum id eſſet exequi,
Nam ſunt eorum plurimi, qui hæc ſcripſerunt,
Diodorus, alii, Comici, atque Rhetores (53).

(53) Tzetzes, *Chil. I. Hiſt. XXII, apud* Rutgerſium, *Var. Lect.* lib. 1. cap. 9. pag. 37, 38.

But in the firſt place, we have no Author remaining who makes mention of a Callias the ſon of Cimon, or who affirms that a ſon of Cimon paid for his father. In the ſecond place, the Authors which are remaining at preſent furniſh us with grounds to doubt of theſe facts, and therefore we muſt not lay any great ſtreſs on the teſtimony of ſuch a Poet who lived in an age very diſtant from antiquity. III, Pray take notice that he principally refers to comic Poets and Rhetoricians, people who play with circumſtances, and diſpoſe of them according to their fancy. To conclude, I ſay it is uſual for Writers of more ſolidity than Tzetzes, to quote ſeveral Authors at the end of a long narration, though thoſe Authors have ſet forth only the groſs of that narration. We may ſuppoſe therefore that this great number of Authors to whom Tzetzes refers us, had only ſpoken of the unlawful amours of Cimon and Elpinice.

There yet remains another difficulty to examine. If it was allowed in Athens to marry one's ſiſter by a different mother, whence comes it that Cimon was ſo defamed for a marriage of that kind? I anſwer that probably the ſlander which was raiſed againſt him was founded only on the ſuppoſition that he had lain with Elpinice before he married her. Plutarch leads us to this, ſince having obſerved (54) that Cimon was believed guilty of criminal converſation with his ſiſter, he adds, that others ſay ſhe was his wife, and that not being able to find a ſuitable match becauſe ſhe was poor, ſhe had made choice of her brother for her huſband. Εἰσὶ δ' οἳ τὴν Ἐλπινίκην, ὑ κρύφα τῷ Κίμωνι, φανερῶς δὲ γημαμένην συνοικῆσαι λέγουσιν, ἀξίᾳ τῆς εὐγενείας νυμφίου διὰ τὴν πενίαν ἀποροῦσαν. *Sunt qui Elpinicen non clàm cum Cimone, ſed apertè ſtrant contractis nuptiis ut uxorem habitaſſe, quod ſponſum pro generis dignitate non inveniret ob inopiam* (55). As far as there is any certainty in Hiſtories of this nature we may aſſure ourſelves, in conſequence of theſe words, that Cimon enjoyed his ſiſter before ſhe was his wife (56). They were both of an amorous diſpoſition; if he was laſcivious, ſhe was not chaſte. They were very young, and lodged together: judge, I pray you, whether they could contain themſelves. A commerce of this kind laſts not long without being ſuſpected by the world, and the ſcandal ſoon fills the whole town; here then is Cimon defamed. It is probable that to ſcreen himſelf from ſatire, without depriving himſelf of the ſweets of that amour, he did what the laws allowed; I mean that he married Elpinice. He acted therein as many others do, who wed the miſtreſſes they have diſhonoured. It is a reparation of honour with reſpect to the Magiſtrates, but not with reſpect to private people: theſe continue to puniſh the fault by their ſatires; the breach appears to them always open; it is a wound ill cloſed which they maliciouſly tear open again as occaſion offers. We need not therefore wonder that Cimon's enemies took advantage of his old infamy whenever they had a mind to vex and perſecute him. But when Hiſtorians have been favourable to him, they only conſidered the thing on the fair ſide; they omitted the preliminaries of the marriage, and contented themſelves with ſaying Elpinice was his wife. Cornelius Nepos has blindly followed this road, in imitation of thoſe other people whom Plutarch mentions. You ſee plainly by this time, that knowing what the laws of Athens permitted, it might be ſaid that our Cimon tranſgreſſed the laws by his intrigue with his ſiſter. If I am aſked why he did not marry her when he began to love her, I ſhall anſwer, that it was becauſe ſhe was poor. He was glad to divert himſelf without entring into any engagement which might deprive him of the liberty of marrying a rich girl if an opportunity offered. When the ſcandal of his commerce with her fell upon him, he was obliged to take other meaſures, and changed the concubinage into wedlock. We frequently ſee ſuch changes.

(54) Plut. *in Cimone*, pag. 480, F.

(55) Idem, ibid. pag. 481, A.

(56) Plutarch, *de his qui ſerò à Numine puniuntur*, pag. 552, *ſuppoſes a criminal proſecution might have been carried on againſt Cimon on account of his commerce with his ſiſter:* ἢ Κίμωνα συνόντα τῇ ἀδελφῇ διαῤῥᾳσθαι: aut Cimonem cum ſorore concumbentem in judicio reum tanti criminis peregiſſet.

EXAMEN of Muretus's Critique.

I did not remember any one had already employed the diſtinction I have juſt now made; but having read a ſecond time two chapters of Muretus wherein he criticiſes Cornelius Nepos, I find that the Latin Tranſlator of Plutarch has made uſe of it above a hundred years ago. Let us ſee the ſubſtance of this critique a little. Muretus declares (57) that having read in Cornelius Nepos that it was no ſhame for Cimon to marry his own ſiſter, ſince the cuſtom of the Athenians allowed it, he was ſurprized thereat; for he did not remember that any other Author ſays ſuch a thing of the Athenians. He conſidered the matter attentively, and recollected the Oration of Andocides, where it is ſaid that Cimon was baniſhed for that marriage, as a tranſgreſſor of the laws; he therefore thought he had caught Cornelius Nepos in a miſtake. Two or three years after (58) the Apology of this ancient Hiſtorian appeared in ſome Notes on Plutarch (59). The Apologiſt made uſe of two arguments. He obſerved 1, that Cimon was baniſhed only for having had to do with his ſiſter before ſhe was his wife: 2, that the ſon of Themiſtocles married his ſiſter by the ſame father, as Plutarch teſtifies, and therefore Cornelius Nepos is not the only one who has imputed ſuch a cuſtom to the Athenians. The firſt obſervation was confirmed by the word παρανόμως *illegally*, which an Author has made uſe of in ſpeaking of that commerce (60), a word which would have been uſeleſs if the laws of Athens had not, in ſome caſe, permitted a man to lie with his ſiſter. Muretus replied, that he was not ignorant that the Laws of Athens allowed the marriage of a brother and ſiſter who were not by the ſame venter (61): Theon, continues he, had informed me of it in his Notes on Ariſtophanes; and I had read in Philo the difference there was between Solon and Lycurgus: the latter permitted a man to marry his ſiſter by the mother, the former permitted one to marry his ſiſter by the father; but I did not know they ever allowed the marrying of ſiſters both by father and mother: and if Elpinice was not Cimon's ſiſter by the ſame venter, it is a fault in Cornelius Nepos to call her *Sororem germanam*, and they would not have had a juſt reaſon to baniſh Cimon; for it is not an inceſt, but ſimple fornication, to lie with a maid whom the laws allow a man to marry. The addition of the word παρανόμως proves nothing; one might as well tell me that Cicero would not have uſed the term *nefariè*, ſpeaking of the enterprize of Catiline (62), if it was not permitted in any caſe to conſpire the ruin of one's country. Muretus concludes that Elpinice and Cimon had both the ſame father and mother; and that this was the reaſon why their marriage was looked on as a breach of the laws. He adds that S. Cyril (63) would not have reproached Cimon with this marriage as a ſcandalous action, if it had been conformable to the cuſtoms of the Athenians. In that caſe, the condemnation muſt have fallen on Solon, and not on Cimon.

(57) Muret. *Var. Lect.* lib. 7. cap. 1. pag. m. 989.

(58) Idem, ibid. lib. 15. cap. 5. pag. 1138.

(59) See the *Notes of Xylander* and *Cruſerius in Vitas Plut.* pag. 40.

(60) Athenæus, lib. 13.

(61) See the 5th chap. of the 15th Book of his *Variæ Lectiones.*

Let us make ſome Animadverſions on this diſpute of Muretus. I. It was ſo natural to join with the cenſure of Cornelius Nepos the obſervation of the Scholiaſt on Ariſtophanes, and that of Philo, that it cannot be imagined the critic would have omitted them had he known them. I appeal here to the conſciences of all the learned; one word, if you pleaſe, Gentlemen: Do you think that an able man who declares what Cornelius Nepos ſays, *viz.* that it was allowable according to the Athenian Laws for a man to marry his ſiſter, to be a lie, would content himſelf with quoting

(62) *Nam illud quidem argumentum ex Athenæo, non fuiſſe additurum παρανόμως, niſi idem fieri poſſet etiam οὐ παρανόμως, æque bellum eſt, ac ſi quis, quia Cicero alicubi dicit, Catilinam peſtem patriæ nefario moliri, colligat, idem non ſemper nefarie, ſed interdum etiam ſine ſcelere fieri poſſe.* Muret. *Var. Lect.* lib. 15. cap. 5. pag. 1138, 1139.

(63) Cyrillus, lib. 6. *adverſus Julianum.*

found; on the other, a powerful ſupport in the envy which was borne to the glory of Themiſtocles, who had been a long time in too great authority [*E*], not to make people

ing Andocides, and there end his chapter, when he knows what has been obſerved by a Scholiaſt on Ariſtophanes and by Philo? Do you think that if he remembers they tell us it was permitted in Athens to marry one's ſiſter by a different venter, he will make no reflections thereon, but quit Cornelius Nepos abruptly, without acquainting the public with ſo curious a difference as there was between the Laws of Lycurgus and thoſe of Solon as to the marriages of brothers with their ſiſters? I am ſure if you ſpeak ſincerely you will anſwer me in the negative, and that if Muretus has not inſerted thoſe Remarks, it is ſolely becauſe he did not then know what Theon and Philo taught him afterwards. Let us conclude then that in this paſſage of his Anſwer to the Apologiſt of Cornelius Nepos, *ego autem non eram neſcius licuiſſe Athenienſibus ſorores eodem patre, dum ne eadem matre, natas uxores ducere. Docuerat me id Theon . . . . docuerat me id Philo* (64) he yielded to the weakneſs of many learned men, who cannot prevail on their vanity to make an ingenuous confeſſion that they are beholden for ſome light to their Cenſurers (65), whether the obligation be owing to what has been borrowed from their Works, or to the ſeeing of things there which have put them on making farther enquiries which they would not otherwiſe have ſet about. What confirms me in this thought is, that if he had then known what thoſe two Writers ſay, he would have perceived the falſity of his own criticiſm; for he could not be ignorant that the Hiſtorian whom he cenſures ſuppoſes very clearly that Elpinice was her huſband's ſiſter by another venter (66). Muretus therefore could only accuſe him of uſing an improper word, by inſiſting that *Soror germana* ſignifies a ſiſter by the ſame father and mother. II. Muretus did not forget this Grammatical Obſervation, when he anſwered the Apologiſt; but who can believe that a polite Writer of the Auguſtan age ſhould not have known that *Soror germana* may ſignify a Siſter by the father only? Muretus has been ſhewn that his criticiſm is ill grounded (67). III. He is in the wrong to imagine that under pretext of its being allowed to marry one's ſiſter by a different venter, the defiling her out of marriage was not a crime which might be puniſhed. It muſt be ſuppoſed that the Laws by permitting certain things do not clear thoſe who commit them from all blame. I am ſure that few among the Athenians acted in this reſpect as Cimon did, and that the public was offended at a marriage of that ſort. If I am not miſtaken, they found therein ſomething odious and ſcandalous. The action therefore of a man who debauched his own ſiſter, and being at liberty to marry her choſe rather to live in concubinage with her, was looked on as a horrid fact. IV. The argument drawn from the word παρανόμως might have been refuted in a better manner; Athenæus himſelf might have been produced, who ſays ſomewhere that Alcibiades was accuſed of not having obſerved the Laws in his amours with women, ſince, after the Perſian cuſtom, he lay with his mother, his daughter, and his ſiſter. Παράνομον εἶναι λέγων καὶ εἰς γυναῖκας καὶ εἰς τὴν ἄλλην δίαιταν· συνεῖναι γὰρ φησὶν αὐτὸν καὶ μητρὶ καὶ θυγατρὶ καὶ ἀδελφῇ ὡς Πέρσας. *Dicens contra leges eum & fœminarum congreſſu abuti, & reliquam vitæ partem agere: eſſe* NAMQUE *illi cum matre, filia, ſorore, more Perſarum, ſtupri conſuetudinem* (68). V. What relates to St. Cyril is weak. Here are the words of Muretus: *Poſtremo ſanctiſſimus & eruditiſſimus vir Cyrillus Alexandrinus libro ſexto adverſus Julianum, non furtivos concubitus, ſed nuptias cum ſorore Cimoni, ut ſcelus nefarium, objicit: non facturus, ſi id apud Athenienſes legitimum & uſitatum fuiſſet. Tunc enim accuſari Solonem oportuerat, qui id permiſiſſet, non civem, qui patriæ ſuæ legibus paruiſſet* (69). i. e. "Laſtly, that moſt holy and learned "perſon Cyril of Alexandria, in his 6th Book againſt "Julian, reproaches Cimon not with private intrigues, "but with his marrying his ſiſter, as a wicked crime; "which he would not have done, if it had been lawful and cuſtomary among the Athenians: for then "Solon ought to have been accuſed, who allowed it, "and not a private man who acted conformably to "the Laws of his country." If S. Cyril has ſpoken only of the marriage, it does not thence follow that Cimon did not abuſe his ſiſter before he married her. Beſides, there are permiſſions ſo oppoſite to decency, that thoſe who make uſe of them are often very much to be blamed; and then, is it not viſible that the aforeſaid father principally propoſed to himſelf to ſhame Paganiſm on account of the public diſorders which were committed in it? Is it not viſible that he deſigned to wound the Republic of Athens thro' the ſides of Solon?

I cannot conclude without ſaying one word as to the contrary regulations of Solon and Lycurgus. The former permitted men to marry their ſiſters by the ſame father, and forbade them to marry thoſe by the ſame mother. Lycurgus, on the other hand, permitted them to marry the latter, and forbade them to marry the others. There is ſomething ridiculous on either ſide, and I would fain know on what reaſons they founded their diſtinction: I am of opinion they could be but frivolous ones; for what could be more ſilly than to ſay, in juſtification of the Athenian Lawgiver, that the conſanguinity is always more certain with reſpect to the ſiſters by the ſame venter, whereas a man's daughters by his ſecond marriage are ſometimes nothing at all to the children by the firſt venter? Does this leſſen the inceſt? Is it not ſufficient to believe that one marries his ſiſter? The Legiſlator of Egypt very juſtly ridiculed the ſcruple of theſe two Grecians, and though in the main he was very much in the wrong to reunite what they had divided, yet he had reaſon to call their diſtinction a chimæra. Read theſe words of Philo. Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ἀθηναῖος Σόλων ὁμοπατρίους ἀφιεὶς ἄγεσθαι, τὰς ὁμομητρίους ἐκώλυσεν· ὁ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιος νομοθέτης ἔμπαλιν, τὸν ἐπὶ ταῖς ὁμομητρίοις γάμον ἐπιτρέψας, τὸν πρὸς τὰς ὁμοπατρίους ἀπεῖπε. ὁ δὲ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων, κλευάζων τὴν ἑκατέρων ἐυλάβειαν, ὡς ἡμίεργα διαττεμένων, ἐυφόρησεν εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, ἐπιδιψιλευόμενος δυσθεράπευτον κακὸν σώμασι καὶ ψυχαῖς ἀκρασίαν, καὶ παρασχὼν ἄδειαν ἁπάσας ἀδελφὰς ἄγεσθαι, τάς τε ἰδίας τῷ ἑτέρῳ τῶν γενέων, τοῦδε, ἢ τοῦδε, καὶ τὰς ἐξ ἀμφοῖν, καὶ τὰς ἀνεψιάς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρεσβυτέρας καὶ ἡνιλικας. καὶ δίδυμοι γὰρ πολλάκις ἐγεννήθησαν, ὧς ἡ μὲν φύσις ἅμα τῇ γενέσει διήρτησε καὶ διέζευξεν· ἡ δ' ἀκολασία καὶ φιληδονία εἰς κοινωνίαν ἐκάλεσεν ἀκοινώνητον, καὶ ἁρμονίαν ἀνάρμοστον. i. e. "Solon the "Athenian prohibited the marriage of ſiſters by the "ſame mother, leaving men free to marry their ſiſters "by the father: but, on the contrary, the Lawgiver of "the Lacedæmonians, permitting them to marry their "ſiſters by the ſame venter, forbad them their ſiſters "by the father. But the Lawgiver of the Egyptians, "laughing at the circumſpection of both, as inſtituting Laws by halves, gave a looſe to wantonneſs, "indulging in their bodies and minds the incurable "evil of intemperance, and allowing them with impunity to marry all their ſiſters, as well thoſe by "either parent, as thoſe by both parents, and not only thoſe who were younger, but thoſe alſo who were "elder or of the ſame age; for twins were frequently born, whom nature even at their birth ſeparated "and disjoined, but incontinence and voluptuouſneſs "invited to diſagreeable ſociety, and diſcordant "union." Here are three ſorts of Legiſlators whom Philo condemns; but what could he have anſwered to thoſe who might have ſaid to him, Solon does no more than authorize a Law which was uſed in the times of your Patriarchs, and which Abraham the father and ſtock of your believers put in practice (71)? It is certain Clemens Alexandrinus (72) has inferred from that Patriarch's words, that it was no ſin at that time for a man to marry his ſiſter, provided ſhe was not his ſiſter by the ſame venter.

[*E*] *He found . . . . a powerful ſupport in the envy which was borne . . . . Themiſtocles.*] Let us cite Plutarch. "The people were very glad when they ſaw "him applying himſelf to matters of State: for they "were diſguſted with Themiſtocles; in oppoſition to "whom, and becauſe of the candour and freeneſs of "Cimon's temper, which was agreeable to every one, "they advanced him to the higheſt employments in "the government. The man that contributed moſt "to his promotions was Ariſtides, who ſtill cultivated "the honeſt genius he ſaw in him; and purpoſely "raiſed him that he might be a counterpoiſe to the "craft,

(24) Muret. *Var. Lect.* lib. 15. cap. 5.

(65) Compare herewith the Remark [*E*] of the Article MARCIONITES.

(66) *Habebat in matrimonio ſororem germanam ſuam, nomine Elpinicen: non magis amore, quam patrio more, ductus. Nam Athenienſibus licet eodem patre natas uxores ducere.* Cornel. Nepos, *in Vita Cimonis*, cap. 1.

(67) See *Wowerus in Minucium Felicem*, pag. m. 304, *and* Rutgerſius, *Var. Lect.* lib. 1. cap. 9. pag. 41.

(68) Athen. lib. 5. cap. 20. pag. 220.

(69) Muret. *Var. Lect.* lib. 10. cap. 5. pag. m. 1139.

(70) Philo, *de ſpecialibus Legibus quæ ad ſextum & ſeptimum præceptum Decalogi referuntur*, pag. 779, 780. edit. Francof. 1691.

(71) See the firſt Remark of the article SARAH.

(72) Clem. Alexandr. *Stromat.* lib. 2. pag. 421, B.

ple wiſh another might riſe to ſupplant him. Cimon's courteouſneſs, and the good diſcipline he eſtabliſhed among the Athenian troops which he commanded under Pauſanias the Generaliſſimo of the Greeks, a haughty and ill-natured man, greatly contributed to ſtrip Lacedæmon of the ſuperiority which ſhe had over all Greece, and to transfer it to the Athenians. All the Allies put themſelves under his conduct to beſiege Pauſanias (*d*), whoſe ill behaviour they no longer could endure, in Byzantium, and afterwards to attack the Perſians in a City of Thrace (*e*) on the river Strymon. They defeated them on the banks of that river, after which they made a deſcent into the country, and blocked up the Town in ſuch a manner that the Governor, deſpairing to ſave it, ſet fire to it. Cimon, ſome time after made himſelf maſter of the Iſle of Scyros [*F*], from whence he cauſed the bones of Theſeus to be tranſported to Athens. The exploits which he performed after that time were much more conſiderable. He was not ſatisfied with taking from the Perſians whatever they poſſeſſed in Greece, he hotly purſued them into their own country, and without giving them time to recover themſelves. When arms were to be made uſe of, he ſubdued his enemies by that means; but if intrigues ſeemed more expedient, he made uſe of that method to win Towns, by exciting them to rebellion. He did all this with ſuch wonderful ſucceſs, that none of the King of Perſia's troops were to be ſeen in the countries ſituate between Ionia and Pamphylia. Having intelligence that that Monarch's fleet dared not to appear on the coaſt of Pamphylia, he ſet ſail from the Port of Cnidos with two hundred gallies, and having ſubdued the Phaſelites, he attacked the ſaid fleet and deſtroyed it near the mouth of the river Eurymedon [*G*]; and the ſame day he landed his troops, and defeated the King of Perſia's land army (*f*). He afterwards went to attack the fourſcore ſail of Phœnician ſhips, which were to have joined that Prince's fleet, and gained ſo complete a victory over them, that not one veſſel eſcaped. The treaty of peace which was the fruit of ſo many ſucceſſes was a cruel mortification to the enemy [*H*]. The exploits of Cimon after this peace were to vanquiſh the Thracians and the inhabitants of the Iſle of Thaſos; but becauſe thoſe victories gave him

(*d*) They could not take him; for he got away privately. Plutarch. *in Vita Cimon.* pag. 483. C. See the Article CLEONICE, Remark [*A*].

(*e*) Named Eion, See the Remark [*B*] of the Article AGESIPOLIS.

(*f*) He made uſe of a ſtratagem which ſucceeded, and is deſcribed by Diodorus Siculus, lib. 11. cap. 61. *ad Olymp.* 77. He cauſed his ſoldiers to be dreſt in the Perſian habit.

"craft and repreſs the inſolence of Themiſtocles (73)." Here are two cauſes of Cimon's advancement very clearly expreſſed; his own merit, and the pleaſure people took in mortifying Themiſtocles. We ſee here the inconſtancy of mankind, and the effects of envy. Men grow weary of admiring the ſame perſons long, and for that reaſon ſeek for new objects of admiration, turning to the firſt riſing ſun which preſents itſelf. The Republic of Letters is not exempt from this ſpirit of inconſtancy and jealouſy (74). Sometimes a young Author is favoured, becauſe it is thought another has enjoyed applauſe too long. Ariſtides, who paſſed for ſo juſt a man, had perhaps contributed nothing to Cimon's fortune at another conjuncture; but becauſe the point was to counter-ballance Themiſtocles, he made himſelf the great promoter of that young man, who was ſo defamed on account of his debaucheries (75). If we knew the motives of the greater part of the ſervices which men render one another, it would be found that the deſire to do a pleaſure has a leſs ſhare in them than the deſire to vex another. You recommend ſuch a one with warmth, you protect him, you advance him by large ſtrides; is it not becauſe you love him, and becauſe his merit charms you? There are two Anſwers to this queſtion; one from the mouth, the other from the heart. The firſt takes the affirmative, but the heart anſwers thus: I exalt this man to the utmoſt of my power, in order to depreſs that man; what I procure for one is ſo much taken from the good fortune of the other. The maxim of the Naturaliſts may be extended to political actions, *Generatio unius eſt corruptio alterius*, i. e. *The generation of one thing is the corruption of another*; but whereas nature directly propoſes generation, and tends to deſtruction by accident only, it ſeems that in the offices of civil life deſtruction is directly propoſed: that is the end; generation is but the means.

(73) Plut. *in Vita Cimonis*, pag. 481.

(74) See the Preface to the *Nouvelles Lettres contre l'Hiſtoire du Calviniſme de Mr. Maimbourg.*

(75) *See* Plutarch, *an ſeni ſit gerenda Reſpublica*, pag. 795. *C.*

[*F*] *He ſome time after made himſelf maſter of the Iſle of Scyros.*] Cornelius Nepos has not here rightly obſerved the order of time, for he ſuppoſes the conqueſt of this Iſland was poſterior to the two battles which Cimon gained againſt the Perſians on the ſame day (76). I refute him, not by quoting Plutarch, who makes the reduction of the Iſle of Scyros prior to thoſe two victories, but by quoting an Author who obſerves Chronological exactneſs better than Plutarch. This Author is Thucydides: read him; and you will find that Iſland was ſubdued immediately after what paſſed on the river Strymon (77). This fault of Cornelius Nepos is in Moreri, and has not been taken notice of by the Commentators whom I have conſulted (78).

(76) Corn. Nepos, *in Vita Cimonis*, cap. 2.

(77) Thucydid. lib. 1. pag. m. 53.

[*G*] *He deſtroyed the Perſian fleet near the mouth of the river Eurymedon.*] Here is another fault of Cornelius Nepos, adopted by Moreri. It is an error in Geography which the Commentators have taken notice of (79). That Hiſtorian ſays the naval battle and the battle by land, which Cimon won the ſame day, were fought near Mycale. He is miſtaken, whether we underſtand by Mycale (80) a maritime city of Caria, or an Iſland of Ionia. That City and Iſland are both too far diſtant from Pamphylia, to allow us to juſtify Cornelius Nepos, by ſuppoſing that he differs from the other Hiſtorians only by the deſignation of a true place which they have taken no notice of. It frequently happens that a battle has three or four names; wherefore an Author is not miſtaken when he prefers one of thoſe names to all the reſt, and makes no mention of the others. But in ſuch a caſe the action muſt have paſſed near two or three places the names whereof may ſerve to characterize it. Now this is what cannot be ſaid of Mycale, and of the river Eurymedon, or of any other part of the Coaſt of Pamphylia: but the circumſtances oblige us to acknowledge thoſe two battles to have been fought by Cimon on that coaſt. I am apt to believe Cornelius Nepos fell into this miſtake by ſome confuſed ideas of the battle which was gained over the Perſians near Mycale (81), the ſame day that Mardonius was defeated in Bœotia (82).

(78) Gybertus Longolius, Janus Gebhardus, Georgius Gaſpar Kirchmaler.

(79) *See* Kirchmaier *on this paſſage of* Cornelius Nepos: *he cites two other Commentators*, Chriſtianus Fridericus Franckenſteinius, *and* Joannes Andreas Boſius.

(80) See the *Theſaurus Geographicus* of Ortelius. at the word *Mycale.*

(81) *See* Herodotus, lib. 9. cap. 99, &c.

(82) At Platæa.

[*H*] *The Treaty of Peace which was the fruit of his victories was a cruel mortification to the enemy.*] Nothing can be more ignominious than the conditions of peace which the Greeks impoſed on them. Let us hear Plutarch. *This ſucceſs of Cimon ſo daunted the King of Perſia, that he preſently made that memorable peace whereby he engaged that his armies ſhould come no nearer the ſea than the length of a horſe-race; and that none of his gallies or veſſels of war ſhould appear between the Cyanean and Chelidonian iſles. Calliſthenes ſays, that he agreed not to any articles, but that upon the fear this victory gave him, he prudently kept off ſo far from Greece that when Pericles with fifty, and Ephialtes with thirty gallies, cruiſed beyond the Chelidonian iſles, they could not diſcover one Perſian ſail. But in the collection which Craterus made of the public acts of the people, there is an original draught of this Treaty, as following upon that defeat. And it is reported, that at Athens they erected the altar of peace upon this occaſion; and decreed particular honours to Callias, who was employed as Embaſſador*

him a fair opportunity, which he neglected, of ſeizing a part of Macedonia, he was accuſed of being corrupted by the preſents of King Alexander. He juſtified himſelf, and was clearly and fully acquitted. It was not ſo eaſy for him to ſtill another ſtorm which aroſe againſt him; for he could not avoid the baniſhment of Oſtraciſm. He had rendered himſelf odious by the affection he bore to the Lacedæmonians, and by his oppoſing the power of the people. He choſe rather that the authority ſhould be in the hands of the principal men, than at the diſcretion of the multitude. This procured him a great many enemies, who not only expelled him the city, but alſo hindred him from ſerving in the Athenian army againſt the Lacedæmonians. He had repaired thither during his baniſhment to fight as a voluntier, but was conſtrained to retire, by reaſon of the complaints of his enemies. The battle which the Athenians loſt in this war near Tanagra obliged them to recall him; his chief care after his return was to re-eſtabliſh peace, and he ſucceeded therein [*I*]; but ſeeing their thoughts ran on nothing but war, and fearing that warlike humour, if it were not employed againſt the barbarians would raiſe diſturbances among the Grecians, he prepared all things for attacking the Iſland of Cyprus and Egypt. He gained a victory over the Perſians at Sea on the coaſts of Pamphylia; and if he had not died at the ſiege of Citium in the Iſland of Cyprus, it is thought he would have ſubdued all Egypt (*g*). His liberality to every body, and his charity to the poor, were admirable (*b*), as may be ſeen in Moreri. Suidas attributes to him an excellent Book concerning the method of knowing horſes (*i*).

(*g*) Extracted from Plutarch, *in Vita Cimonis.*

(*b*) *See* Cornelius Nepos, *in Vita Cimonis*, cap. 4. Cicero, *de Officiis*, lib. 2. cap. 18. Plutarch. *in Vita Cimonis*, pag. 484; Athenæus, lib. 12. pag. 533, citing the 10th Book of *Theopompus*.

(*i*) Ἔγραψεν ἱππικὸν βιβλίον θαυμάσιον. *Admirabilem librum de cognoſcendis equis agentem ſcripſit.* Suidas, *in* Κίμων.

(83) Plut. *in Vita Cimonis*, pag. 486, 487.

(84) Diod. Siculus, lib. 11. cap. 61.

(85) Idem, lib. 12. cap. 4.

Embaſſador to manage the Treaty (83). Diodorus Siculus mentions this treaty; but he does not agree with Plutarch as to the time: he does not ſay it was concluded after Cimon had obtained two victories in one day in Pamphylia: he places thoſe victories under the 77th Olympiad (84), and the treaty of peace under the 82d (85). It is true, he ſuppoſes that a little before the King of Perſia conſented to ſuch ſhameful conditions, the Athenians under the conduct of Cimon had gained two battles very near the ſame time, the one at ſea, and the other at land, the one in the ſea of Cyprus and the other on the coaſts of Cilicia. The news of this diſaſter, continues he, obliged the King to ſend word to his Generals to conclude a peace at any price. They ſent Deputies for that purpoſe to Athens: their propoſals were agreeable to the Athenians, who immediately named Callias for their firſt Plenipotentiary; and this is what was concluded: *Ut Græcis per Aſiam civitatibus univerſis libertate ac ſuo jure uti permittatur. Ne Satrapæ Perſarum trium dierum itinere inferius ad mare deſcendant. Ne longa navi intra Phaſelidem & Cyaneas excurratur. Hæc ubi Rex & militiæ præfecti rata habuerent, Athenienſes contra jurarunt, ſe in provincias Artaxerxis arma non expeditu*ros (86). i. e. "That all the Grecian cities throughout Aſia ſhould be "allowed the uſe of their liberty and their own laws; "that the Perſian Governors ſhould not approach "nearer to the ſea than three days journey; that no "ſhip of war ſhould cruize beyond Phaſelis and the "Cyanean Iſles. When the King and his Generals "had ratified theſe articles, the Athenians ſwore on "their part, that they would not make any invaſions "on the Provinces of Artaxerxes." As Diodorus Siculus is more exact than Plutarch in ſetting down dates, we may preſume he is in the right. It muſt be confeſſed that Plutarch is no good guide in Chronology; he ſometimes tranſpoſes events juſt as if he was writing an Epic Poem, and aſpired to the praiſe which Horace beſtows on Homer (87).

(86) Idem, ibid. pag. m. 413.

(87) *In mediat res Non ſecus ac notas auditorem rapit.* Horat. *de Arte Poet.* ver. 148.

[*I*] *His chief care after his return was to re-eſtabliſh peace, and he ſucceeded therein.*] I have followed Plutarch (88), and not Cornelius Nepos, who ſeems to ſay that before he returned to Athens, he went to Lacedæmon, and there reconciled the differences between thoſe two cities. *Ille quod hoſpitio Lacedæmoniorum utebatur, ſatius exiſtimans contendere Lacedæmonem, ſua ſponte eſt profectus, pacemque inter duas potentiſſimas civitates conciliavit* (89). The Orator Æſchines obſerves that Cimon, who enjoyed the right of hoſpitality at Lacedæmon, procured a truce for fifty years, which laſted but thirteen (90). This number I a little ſuſpect, when I conſider that Thucydides mentions only one alliance of five years (91). Obſerve that Cimon's exile, which ſhould have laſted ten years, laſted but five (92).

(88) Plut. *in Vita Cimonis*, pag. 490.

(89) Cornel. Nepos, *in Vita Cimonis*, cap. 2.

(90) Æſchines, *de falſa Legatione*, pag. m. 270.

(91) Thucydides, lib. 1. pag. m. 59, 60.

(92) Cornel. Nepos, *in Vita Cimonis*, cap. 2.

CINYRAS, King of Aſſyria, according to certain writers, and of Cyprus according to ſome others, was not more famous for any circumſtance, than for his having begot Adonis on his own daughter Myrrha [*A*]. We obſerve in other articles (*a*), that this inceſt was involuntary with regard to Cinyras, he not knowing that the maiden whom they brought him was Myrrha. The inſtant he diſcovered this he endeavoured to murther her, and would certainly have done it, had it been in his power. It is related, that the thoughts of this inceſt tortured him ſo much, that he was going to lay violent hands on himſelf (*b*); but his death is alſo aſcribed to other cauſes, for, according to ſome, he loſt his life by his diſputing the prize of Muſic with Apollo (*c*), which was after he had forfeited his promiſe with the Greeks [*B*]. Cinyras was to have furniſhed them with proviſions during the ſiege of Troy, but failed them entirely (*d*). Agamemnon loaded him with imprecations; and the worſt circumſtance for him was, the Greeks poſſeſſed themſelves of the Iſland of Cyprus, and drove him from it (*e*). The long life which Anacreon

(*a*) Thoſe of ADONIS and MYRRHA.

(*b*) Hygin. cap. 242.

(*c*) Suidas in Κινύρας.

(*d*) Euſtath. in lib. 10. Iliad.

(*e*) Theopompus *apud* Photium, pag. 389.

[*A*] *He was not more famous for any circumſtance, than for his having begot Adonis on his own daughter Myrrha.*] It is not but that there are other very ſingular incidents in his life; but as the Claſſic Authors, the Writers of Hiſtorical Dictionaries, and the Compilers of Common places, do not ſpeak ſo much of them, as of the adventure of Myrrha, it has ſo happened that Cinyras is but little known to the Literati, except for the abovementioned incident. Some very learned men have been of opinion, that Pindar is oppreſſed with the copiouſneſs of his ſubject, when he is going to write of Cynyras (1); and they ſuppoſe, that the following words of that Poet allude to this Prince Πολλὰ γὰρ πολλεῦς λέλικται. i. e. "Several Authors "have related a great many things of him (2)." But the ſequel of the piece does not exhibit any thing which may induce us to take the words of that Poet in this ſenſe.

(1) Pindar. *Nem. Od.* 8.

(2) Meziriac, *ſur les Epitres d'Ovide*, pag. 398. *Benedictus in Pindari Nem.* Od. 8. Meziriac reads πολλὰ γὰρ λέλικται; i. e. "Many and ma- "ny things are "ſaid of him."

[*B*] *After he had forfeited his promiſe with the Greeks.*] Palamedes had been ſent to this King, in order to obtain auxiliary forces from him; but inſtead of deſiring any, he adviſed him not to join with the Greeks. He returned loaded with preſents, and kept them all for himſelf, except a ſorry coat of mail which he gave to Agamemnon, as a preſent from Cinyras. He flatter'd them with the hopes, that this King of Cyprus would ſend an hundred ſail of ſhips; which hopes however proved abortive. Theſe are ſome of the things of which Alcidamas accuſes Palamedes. He would be in the wrong to ſpeak contemptuouſly of the Coat

Anacreon aſcribes to him (*f*), does not coincide with the muſical conteſt before ſpoken of; for who could believe that a man of an hundred and threeſcore years of age would conteſt with Apollo for the prize of Muſic? The Mythological Hiſtory varies infinitely with regard to the father, the wives, the ſons and daughters of Cinyras (*g*). He is related to have had fifty daughters, who were all metamorphoſed into Halcyons or Kingsfiſhers (*b*); and others ſay, that Juno transformed them into Stones, which were employed as ſteps for the ſtair-caſe of her Temple (*i*). He was very much beloved by Apollo (*k*), and he amaſs'd ſuch prodigious riches, that they, as well as thoſe of Crœſus, became proverbial (*l*). He was extremely beautiful (*m*), and had a great ſhare in the favours of Venus. The Fathers of the Church who have written againſt the abominations of the Heathens, reproached them with ſaying, that the Venus who was honoured in the Iſland of Cyprus, had been Cinyras's ſtrumpet [*C*]. The chief Temple of Venus in this Iſland was that of Paphos. There indeed was an antient tradition which declared, that it had been built by King Aerias (*n*); but according to modern tradition, Cinyras had conſecrated it, and the Goddeſs came thither immediately after her birth. It was not he who inſtituted the Science of the *Aruſpices*, but Thamyras who came from Cilicia; after which an ordinance was made, that the deſcendants both of Cinyras and Thamyras ſhould preſide in the ſacred Ceremonies. In proceſs of time the deſcendants of Thamyras reſigned their privilege to thoſe of Cinyras; which removed all occaſion of complaint, (as being an irregular practice) viz. that the royal family did not employ any prerogative above that of a foreign one. Tacitus obſerves (*o*), that no one but the Cinyrades (*p*) was conſulted. Cinyras had united in himſelf the prieſthood and the regal office (*q*); for which reaſon, the prieſthood of the Paphian Venus was, afterwards, enjoyed always by a Prince of the blood; and hence it was, that Cato imagined he had made very advantageous offers to King Ptolomy, in ſending him word, that provided he would give up the Iſland, the Roman People would appoint him Prieſt of Venus (*r*). Mention was made of another Temple which Cinyras had built on Mount Libanus (*s*). He alſo had built three Cities, Paphos, Cinyrea and Smyrna, and called the laſt by his daughter's name (*t*). He was the inventor of ſeveral implements, as tiles, pincers, the hammer, the lever and the anvil (*u*). He alſo was the firſt who diſcovered copper-mines in the iſland of Cyprus. He is ranked among the antient Soothſayers (*x*). His monument, and that of his deſcendants, ſtood in the temple of Venus in Paphos, as is obſerved by Clemens Alexandrinus (*y*), in his citation from the hiſtory of Philopater, written by Ptolomy, ſon to Ageſarches. According to ſome writers, Cinyras was not born in the iſland of Cyprus, but came thither from Aſſyria over which he reigned. See the Remark [*A*] of the article ADONIS.

(*f*) *Apud* Plinium, lib. 7. cap. 45. 2.

(*g*) *See* Meurſius *in Cypro*, cap. 9.

(*b*) Euſtathius *in Iliad.* lib. 10.

(*i*) Ovid. *Metamorph.* lib. 6.

(*k*) Pindar. *Pyth.* Od. 2.

(*l*) Idem, *Nem.* Od. 8. Plato *de Legibus.* lib. 2. Suidas in Καταγράσας.

(*m*) Anthol. lib. 4. cap. 1. Hygin. cap. 270.

(*n*) Tacit. *Hiſt.* lib. 2. cap. 3.

(*o*) Ibid.

(*p*) i. e. *He who deſcended from Cinyras.*

(*q*) *Schol. Pind. in Pyth. Od.* 2.

(*r*) Plutar. *in Vita Catonis.*

(*s*) Lucian. *de Dea Syria.*

(*t*) Hygin. cap. 275.

(*u*) Plinius, lib. 7. cap. 56.

(*x*) Clem. Alexand. *Stromat.* lib. 1. pag. m. 333. Meurſius, *de Cypro*, pag. 110.

(*y*) *Admon. ad Gent.* pag. 29. Arnob. lib. 6. pag. 193.

Coat of Mail, if it anſwered the deſcription which Homer has given of it (3). Some Authors ſay, that all the veſſels, one excepted, ſent by Cinyras were of earth; and manned with glaſs figures ſhaped like ſoldiers (4). Thoſe who pretend, that the Cinyras of the Heathens is the Noah mentioned in Scripture (5), would find it very difficult, to make the particulars which have been related of Cinyras, and what we are now going to relate of the former ſuit with Noah. I yet do not pretend to ſay but that this may be done, for has not Monſr. Huet (6) pointed out Moſes, where we ſhould never have expected to meet with him?

(3) Iliad. A.

(4) Euſtath. *in Iliad.* A. *apud* Meurſ. *in Cypro*, pag. 111.

(5) *Bibliot. Univerſelle*, tom. 3. pag. 18.

(6) Biſhop of Avranches.

[*C*] *The Fathers of the Church ſay . . . that the Venus honoured in the Iſland of Cyprus, had been Cinyras's ſtrumpet.*] Arnobius ſhall firſt give us ſome account of this. *Numquid rege à Cyprio*, ſays he (7), *cujus nomen Cinyras eſt, ditatam meretriculam Venerem Divorum in numero conſecratam?* i. e. "Have you never heard "that Cinyras, a King of Cyprus, made Venus his "rich Strumpet a Deity?" Firmicus Maternus employs as ſtrong expreſſions (8). *Audio Cinyram Cyprium templum amicæ meretrici donaſſe, ei erat Venus nomen. Initiaſſe etiam Cypriæ Veneri plurimos & vanis conſecrationibus deputaſſe, ſtatuiſſe enim ut quicumque initiari vellet ſecreto Veneris ſibi tradito, aſſem in manum mercedis nomine Deæ daret. Quod ſecretum quale ſit omnes taciti intelligere debemus, quia hoc ipſum propter turpitudinem manifeſtius explicare non poſſumus. Benè amator Cinyras meretriciis legibus ſervit, conſecratæ Veneri à ſacerdotibus ſuis ſtipem dari juſſit, ut ſcorto.* i. e. "I find that Cinyras the Cyprian dedicated a Temple to his Strumpet, named Venus. He even conſecrated many perſons by idle ceremonies, to this Cyprian Venus; for "he enacted, that whoever ſhould deſire to be initiated into the myſteries, with which he was entruſted, "ſhould give to the Goddeſs, a little piece of money "as a reward. What theſe myſteries are, all ought "to conjecture in ſilence, becauſe modeſty will not "permit me to explain them more clearly. This "lover of Cinyras well kept up the fornicating trade; "he ordering his Prieſts to pay a hire to the conſecrated Venus, as to a ſtrumpet." What irregularities were committed! what diſſolute ſcenes are theſe? Myſteries were inſtituted, the ritual of which declared, that whoever was initiated on theſe occaſions ſhould receive a handful of ſalt and a *phallus*; and give a piece of money, by way of offering, to Venus, (9). What kind of ribbon or collar (in this order of Knighthood) was there given? See Clemens Alexandrinus, who informs us, that Cinyras was the firſt, who preſumed to bring theſe abominable ceremonies out of darkneſs, in honour of a courtezan of his own Country. Οὐ γάρ μοι ὁ Κύπριος ὁ νησιώτης Κινύρας παραπίσοι ποτ' ἂν τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην μαγγάνια ὄργια ἐκ νυκτὸς ἐμοὶ παραδοῦναι τελμήσας, φιλοτιμούμενος θεᾶσαι πόρνην πολίτιδα (10). i. e. "I will never ſuffer my ſelf to be perſuaded by "Cinyras the Cyprian, who dared to bring, from "darkneſs into light, the looſe orgies of Venus; and "endeavoured to rank a ſtrumpet in the number of "the Deities." See alſo Arnobius, page 169 of book Vth, where he ſays, *Nec non et Cypriæ Veneris abſtruſa illa initia prætereamus, quorum conditor indicatur Cinyras rex fuiſſe, in quibus ſumentes ea certas ſtipes inferunt ut meretrici, & referunt phallos propitii numinis ſigna.* i. e. "We "alſo will omit thoſe abſtruſe myſteries of Venus, ſaid to "have been inſtituted by King Cinyras; and to which "Venus, all who were introduced gave a hire, as to "a ſtrumpet, and brought back Phallus's, as a mark "that the Goddeſs had been propitious." Now, who could doubt after this, but it is he whom Lucian (11) ranks with Sardanapalus, and exhibits as a complete model of effeminacy?

(7) Lib. 4. pag. m. 143.

(8) *De Errore prof. Relig.* pag. m. 22.

(9) Clem. Alexand. *Admon. ad Gent.* pag. m. 10.

(10) Idem, ibid.

(11) *In Rhetor. Præcept.*

CINUS or CYNUS, a famous Civilian, was of Piſtoia, and nobly deſcended [*A*]. He

[*A*] *And nobly deſcended.*] Forſterus calls his family *Familiam Sygiſbaldorum* (1) and ſome other Authors call it *Sygiſbuldi* (2). Leander Albertus uſes the Italian word *Simbaldi* (3). Creſcimbeni ſays *Sighibaldi* (4).

(1) Forſter. *Hiſt. Juris Civilis*, pag. m. 499.

(2) *See* Konig. *Bibliotb.* p. 753.

(3) Leand. Alberti, *Deſcritt. d'Italia*, folio m. 41.

(4) Creſcimbeni, *Iſtoria della volgar Poeſia*, pag. 87.

He flouriſhed in the fourteenth Century. His Commentary on the Code was finiſhed in 1313. He alſo wrote on ſome parts of the Digeſt. He did not approve of the Interpreters of the Canon Law, and cenſured them very often, for which he himſelf was cenſured by Nicholas de Tudeſchis (*a*). He died in Bologna, and was buried near Dinus, whoſe diſciple he had been (*b*) [*B*]. His death is fixed to anno 1336 (*c*). He was as famous for his Italian Poems as for his Law Lectures; and he is ranked among thoſe who were the firſt that began to add graces to the Tuſcan Lyric Poetry. Petrarch may be conſidered as his diſciple, and the latter did not ſcruple to ſteal ſome thoughts from him. The *Canzoniere* of Cinus is ſtill extant, for which we are obliged to a Lady (*d*) whom the Author loved very tenderly (*e*). I ſhall cite a paſſage, which ſhews that he was of an amorous complexion [*C*].

(*a*) It is he who is ſo well known under the name of *Panormitanus*.

(*b*) Extracted from Forſterus, *Hiſt. Juris Civilis*, pag. m. 498, 499.

(*c*) Kohig. *Bibliotb*, pag. 193, 753.

(*d*) Madonna Ricciarda de' Selvaggi.

(*e*) Extracted from Creſcimbeni, *Iſt. della volgar Poeſia*, pag. 87.

[*B*] *He was buried near Dinus, whoſe diſciple he had been.*] This was done without his being diſtinguiſhed by any mark of honour. *Juxta Dinum pari, hoc eſt ignobili & vulgari ſepulchro terræ conditus* (5). i. e. "He was buried near Dinus, in the like vulgar grave." Some Writers ſay, that theſe two civilians, and Florianus de Sancto Petro lie in the ſame grave, in the Cloyſter of the Dominicans at Bologna (6). Obſerve, that Cynus had been Law-Profeſſor in the Univerſity of this City (7). Here follows his Epitaph: *Cino, eximio juriſconſulto Bartolo Præceptore dignißimo, Populus Piſtorienſis B. M. poſuit.* This gives us room to ſuppoſe, that his countrymen endeavoured to compenſate for the neglect of the inhabitants of Bologna, who had not placed any inſcription over his grave. The word *Bartolo* muſt be changed in this epitaph to *Bartoli*; for Cinus was Bartolus's maſter and not his diſciple (8).

(5) Forſter. *Hiſt. Juris Civilis*, pag. m. 499.

(6) Leand. Alberti, *Deſcritt. d'Italia* folio 41.

(7) Idem, ibid.

(8) Forſter. *Hiſt. Juris Civ.* pag. 503. Creſcimbeni, *Iſtoria della volg. Poeſia*, pag. 87.

[*C*] *I ſhall cite a paſſage which ſhews that he was of an amorous complexion.*] Julius Clarus having aſſerted, that if a woman lies with her footman ſhe deſerves puniſhment, but that a maid who lies with her maſter is not puniſhed, but rather rewarded; adds, that this furniſhed Cynus the Lawyer with a reaſon to aſſert, that preſents ought to be made by perſons who love, and not by thoſe beloved. It will be more proper to inſert the ſequel of this paſſage in Latin, than in Engliſh. *Unde ſumit argumentum Cynus in d. l.* 1. *quod amatores debent donare amaſiis ſuis, non e contra ſubdens; & crede experto, quòd donum magis valet quàm ſuſpirium, imo ſuſpirium nihil valet ſine dono: ferrum tamen præponitur auro, nam ſecundum Juven.* Ferrum eſt quod amant: *Quod (ut ipſe ait) quidam exponunt, id eſt, ferreum membrum, propter cujus ferri fortitudinem inſignes etiam ſervis viliſſimis ſe exponunt* (9). Julius Clarus obſerves on this occaſion, that Dr. Cynus was of a very amorous diſpoſition, and an excellent Poet. *Quæ verba D. Cyni ſunt notanda, quia licet eſſet excellens doctor, fuit etiam maximus amator, & egregius poeta, ut Franc. Petrarcha atteſtatur in iis carminibus, in quibus ipſius mortem deplorat. Et extant adhuc cantiones & alia carmina amatoria D. Cyni non inſulſa* (10). i. e. "Which words of Cynus are worthy of remark, "for tho' he was ſo well ſkilled in the Law, he was "no leſs ſo in matters of love, and an excellent Poet, "as Petrarch teſtifies in thoſe verſes where he bewails "his death. And there are ſtill extant ſome pretty "odes and other love-verſes of Cynus's compoſing."

(9) Julius Clarus, *recept. Sententiarum*, lib. 5. cap. de Fornicatione, num. 20. pag. m. 23.

(10) Idem, ibid.

(*a*) This Article was communicated by FERDINAND LEWIS DE BRESLER, of Aſchemburg, Tranſlator and Continuator of Moreri in German. See the Article BIBLIANDER above, citation (*f*).

CIOLEK (*a*) (ERASMUS) in Latin *Vitellius* [*A*], Biſhop of Ploczko in Poland, was born in Cracow, of low and baſe extraction (*b*); his parents, as well as the education which was given him, being abſolutely unknown (*c*). Nevertheleſs, what he wanted in birth was largely compenſated by the penetration of his genius, by his wiſdom, his erudition and eloquence [*B*]. He was in great favour with Alexander King of Poland. It is alſo thought that this Prince, at the time that he was created Duke of Lithuania, had taken him into his intimate confidence, and followed his Councils chiefly (*d*). Alexander having aſcended the throne of Poland (*e*), after the death of John Albert his brother, was deſirous of recompenſing Ciolek, his miniſter, from whom he had received ſuch faithful ſervices; and accordingly he nominated him, anno 1504, to the Biſhoprick of

(*b*) *Vili & plebeio loco Cracoviæ natus.* Staniſlai Lubienski Vitæ & Series Epiſcoporum Plocenſium; *in* Operibus *ejus Antwerpiæ, an.* 1643 *excuſis*, pag. 370. *Eraſmum Cioclum hominem plebeium, quemadmodum creditum eſt, appellat* Mart Cromer. *de Origine & Rebus geſtis Polonorum*, lib. 30, *cap. ult.*

(*c*) Lubienski, *Operum* pag. 369. *Quo genere quave ſtirpe genitus fuerit Eraſmus Ciolek, unde prodierit, quomodo creverit, & illa ipſa, qua vixit, ignoravit ætas.*

(*d*) Cromerus, *de Origine & Rebus geſtis Polon.* lib. 30, *cap. ult.*

(*e*) Ann. 1501.

[*A*] *In Latin* Vitellius.] The art of metamorphoſing names has alſo not been unknown to the Poles; and our Vitellius imagined, that he ſhould have well confirmed himſelf, in caſe he made *Vitellius* out of the word *Cioleck*, which bears ſome relation to the word *Calf*, in the Poliſh Language. Martin Cromer, who declines this Poliſh word by a Latin termination, calls him *Ciolcum* (1). There ſtill ſubſiſts in Poland a very noble and very conſiderable family called Ciolek, (formerly *Vitellina* in Latin) which came thither from Italy anno 971, in Mieciſlaus's time, by Robert Archbiſhop of Gneſua, of the Houſe of the Vitellii; inaſmuch as Paulinus, brother of Robert, increaſed his family in Poland; whence there have ſprung ſeveral Archbiſhops of Gneſua, and other perſons of diſtinction (2). It will be proper to add here, what Okolſki relates of ſome one of his family (3). I ſhall cite his own words, in order that the reader may be the better able to procure the remedy from the ſource itſelf, which very well ſuits a Poliſh ſubject. His words are theſe, *Staniſlas Ciolek ſeu Vitellius, nobilis Polonus, circa ſec. XV clarus, fertur ante conſuetum tempus natus, quapropter 4 ſeptimanas in adipe apri conſervabatur, crevit in maximum virum, Caſtellanum, Sendomir, Mareſcallum Curiæ &c.* i. e. "Staniſlaus Ciolek, or Vitelli-"us, a noble Pole, living about the fifteenth Cen-"tury, is ſaid to have come into the world before the "uſual time, and therefore was kept four weeks in the "fat or lard of a boar. He roſe to be a very great "man, Caſtellan of Sendomir, Marſhal of the Court "&c."

(1) Mart. Cromerus, *de Origine & Rebus geſtis Polonorum*, lib. 30. cap. ult.

(2) Simon Okolski, *in Orbe Polono*, tom. 1. pag. 108, *ſeq.*

(3) Ibid. pag. 114.

[*B*] *And eloquence.*] T. Spiegelius (4) draws his character exactly; and deſcribes him, in his Letter to Eraſmus, as one of the moſt learned and moſt eloquent men of his time; and likewiſe beſtows the following encomium on him, *Singularis integritatis vita, a Perſon of ſingular integrity and life.* Richard Bartholinus (5) confirmed this, by ſaying, *Epiſcopus Plocenſis vir literatus & gravis orationem habuit Latinam plane & rei ſatis accommodatam, in qua ſapienter & erudite de expeditione contra Turcas ſuſcipienda diſputavit:* That is, "The Biſhop of Ploczko, a very learned and grave "man, delivered an oration which was much to the "purpoſe; and argued therein with great judgment "and learning upon the expedition deſigned againſt "the Turks." Add in another place (6): *Hæc mihi reverendiſſimus Epiſcopus Plocenſis, apud Cæſarem Poloniæ regis oratorem agens recitavit, vir graviſſimus & literatus, & cui ſine controverſia fides adhibenda.* i. e. "The Biſhop of Ploczko, a man of great judgment and "learning, and very worthy of credit, informed me of "this, when he was Embaſſador from the K. of Poland "to the Emperor." But Staniſlaus Lubienſki (7) gives him indeed the character of a learned and diſcreet man; ſince he ſays that he had obtained, by his artful management, the Biſhoprick of Ploczko: however, one would

(4) In his *Letter to Eraſmus.* See the note [*C*].

(5) *In Concinna Deſcriptione de Conventu Auguſtenſi* edita à *Conrado Adelmann de Adelmanusfelden*, Canonico Auguſtano, anno 1518 in 4to.

(6) *In Concinna Deſcript. &c.*

(7) *Operum*, pag. 370; he ſays *Tantum ingenio valuit, ut Epiſcopatum Plocenſem adipiſceretur.*

of Ploczko, which Vincent I Prozeræbeſki had enjoyed before him. Several charge him with having prompted his ſovereign to tyrannical counſels (*f*): but be this as it will, he gave teſtimonies of his fidelity, in ſeveral embaſſies undertaken by him to the Emperor Maximilian I; and by the good ſervices he performed at the Court of Rome (*g*): but his Patron, to whom he owed his preferment, died two years after (*b*), and was ſucceeded by Sigiſmund his brother, who alſo made uſe of his ſervices, in which he acted as faithfully and diligently as he had done with regard to King Alexander. He likewiſe deputed him ſeveral times to the Emperor and the Pope; and he, particularly, was preſent, anno 1518, in the great and famous Diet of Auſburg, as Embaſſador from the King of Poland, in conjunction with Raphael, Caſtellan of Denden, and Boguſlao Marſhal of Lithuania. It was there (as being the place where all the Grandees of Germany, ſeveral Embaſſadors and perſons of diſtinction of foreign countries met) that Ciolek diſplayed his great abilities; and ſpoke, on Friday the 20th of Auguſt (at a time when the aſſembly conſiſted of the moſt illuſtrious perſons) an Oration addreſſed by him to the Emperor and the States of the Empire, which was ſo vaſtly moving, that ſeveral of the auditors wept [*C*], and for theſe reaſons J. Spigelius cauſed it to be printed. In fine, Ciolek died in his embaſſy at Rome (*i*); for, after having been deputed to that Court by King Sigiſmund I, to negotiate ſome ſecret affairs with Pope Leo X, and having obtained ſome privileges from that Pope in favour of his Church, he died there the ſame year with the Pope, viz. in 1521, and was buried in the Church of S. Maria del Popolo. Raphael Leſczynſki ſucceeded him in his Biſhoprick (*k*).

(*f*) Lubienski, *Operum*, pag. 370.

(*g*) Though it appears probable to me, that Cromer *l. c.* is miſtaken; and has here tranſpoſed the embaſſies he undertook under Sigiſmund I.

(*b*) Anno 1504.

(*i*) See the cloſe of the remark [*C*].

(*k*) Lubienski, *Operum*, p. 370.

would imagine that Lubienſki did not believe what Spiegelius relates of Ciolek's integrity, ſince he ſays (8), *Vafrum fuiſſe hominem & callidum, & qui Regi, cujus gratia florebat,* (Alexandro) *tyrannidem ſuaderet, plerique credidere:* i. e. "Moſt people thought him a ſubtle man; and that he inſpired King Alexander, in whoſe favour he had a great ſhare, with tyrannical counſels."

(8) Ibid.

[*C*] *That ſeveral of the Auditors wept.*] This is a very ſingular circumſtance, as related by J. Spiegelius, Counſellor and Secretary to the Emperor (9); and I am of opinion, that few Orators could have effected by their ſpeeches, what Ciolek did by his, eſpecially in ſuch an Aſſembly. J. Spiegelius was ſo fully perſuaded of the ſtrength of this Oration, that he did not doubt but it would draw tears from the readers of it. As the words written by him, in a Letter to Eraſmus (10), are difficult to be met with, and he therein gives an ample deſcription of this circumſtance; of Ciolek's eloquence; and of his chief hearers, I will inſert them here at full length. *Reverendiſſimus Dominus Eraſmus Vitellius Epiſcopus Plocenſis, ſingulari integritate vitæ, raraque doctrina, Romanaque facundia inſignis; vel eo mihi nomine præcipue colendus, quia cognominis, de te perquam egregiam frequenter facit mentionem. Primam (ut anticus antico utar verbo) audientiam coram Cæſare, ſacri Imperii, electoribus omnibus, & cæteris Germaniarum principibus proceribuſque obtinuit. Sic ornate, ſic graviter oravit, ut ad intima uſque præcordia auditorum vehementia ſententiarum penetraverit, pluresque ad fletum concitaverit, ei vero docto ſimul & facundo omnes docti & eloquentes palmam tribuunt. Aderant enim viri non pauci, tum exquiſite docti, tum in judicando naris emunctiſſimæ, Antiſtes Torgeſtinus, Peutingerus, Huttenus, Bartholinus, Spalatinus, & Statius in nullo doctrinæ genere non verſatus, Henricus Stromer Medicus, & Laurentius Zochius Juriſconſultus, Cardinalis Moguntini, florentiſſimi Principis, cancellarius. Igitur facta mihi primum præ cæteris elegantiſſimæ hujus orationis copia. Quia digna multorum lectione viſa fuit eruditorum calculo, & ab omnibus deſiderata, imprimendam curavi ſub auguſto tuo nomine; non dubito quin ut audientibus lacrymas commovit, ita hæc eadem legentibus magis copioſas excutiet, & in rem Chriſtianam protenſiores eorum animos reddet.* i. e. "The right reverend Eraſmus Vitellius, Biſhop of Ploczko, a perſon of ſingular integrity of life, uncommon erudition and perfectly well ſkilled in the Roman eloquence, merits a particular eſteem from me, becauſe of the frequent and honourable mention he makes of you; this Biſhop I ſay, was admitted to his firſt audience (to ſpeak in the ſtyle of Courts) before the Emperor, all the Electors of the Empire, and the reſt of the Princes and Noblemen of Germany. He delivered himſelf on this occaſion with ſuch force and elegance, that his expreſſions pierced the very hearts of the auditors, and threw many of them into tears. All who are themſelves learned and eloquent, decree the prize to this learned and eloquent man. There were preſent on this occaſion, perſons of very great erudition, judgment, and ſagacity, as the Preſident of Torgau, Peutinger, Hutten, Bartholinus, Spalatinus and Statius, who is ſkilled in all the branches of Literature, Henry Stromer the Phyſician, and Laurence Zochius the Civilian, Chancellor to that moſt renowned Prince and Cardinal of Mentz. Being therefore ſo fortunate, as to procure this moſt elegant Oration; and as in the opinion of the learned it was judged worthy the peruſal of the public, and was eagerly deſired by every one, I preſumed to ſhelter it under your great name; not doubting but that, as it forced tears from the eyes of the auditors, it will draw them more abundantly from the readers; and cauſe their minds to be more intent to the cauſe of Chriſtianity." To conclude; to heighten the relation of the magnificence of the Aſſembly, before which Ciolek ſpoke, I ſhall here inſert what John Muller, an eminent Printer at Auſburg who printed Ciolek's Speech, added inſtead, or by way of Appendix. *Aderant,* ſays he, *in hoc conventu tres reverendiſſimi Domini Cardinales, Cajetanus, Gurænſis & Moguntinus, pluresque Regum oratores, & omnes fere Germaniæ Duces, cum magna parte Epiſcoporum & Nobilitatis ſuæ primariæ; quales in imperio ſupra triginta annos viſus non eſt:* i. e. "In this Aſſembly, the like of which had not been ſeen for thirty years paſt in the Empire, were three moſt reverend Cardinals, many Embaſſadors of Kings, moſt of the Commanders of Germany, with a great number of Biſhops and of their prime Nobility." With regard to the edition of this Speech, J. Spiegelius, as we have already obſerved, had it printed in 4to, at Auſburg, anno 1518, under the title of, *Oratio per R. P. Dominum Eraſmum Vitellium Epiſcopum Plocenſem in celeberrimo Auguſtenſi Conventu ad Cæſarem Maximil.* nomine victorioſiſſimi *Regis Poloniæ Sigiſmundi habita coram omnibus S. Imp. Electoribus plurimiſque Germaniæ Principibus, die veneris, 20 Aug. A. Dom.* 1518. It was afterwards reprinted *ex Bibliotheca Joh. Piſtorii in Corpore Hiſtoriæ Polonicæ* (11). Marquardus Freherus (12) ſays alſo, that it is inſerted in Reuſneri Anti-Turcico.

(9) *In Epiſt. ad Eraſmum Roter. Orationi Vitellii* præmiſſa.

(10) *Ex Auguſta Vindelic. prid. Kal. Sept. an.* 1518.

(11) At Baſil, in 1582, folio.

(12) *In Indice Autorum*, tom. 2. *Rer. German. Scriptorum* præmiſſo.

CIPIERRE (PHILIBERT DE MARCILLI, Lord of) was a native of * Maconnois (*a*). He gave ſo many proofs of his courage and prudence in the ſervice of Henry II, both in France and Italy, that this Prince appointed him Governor of the Duke of Orleans his ſecond ſon, who was afterwards Charles IX, King of France. It is ſaid, that had not others depraved the excellent education he had beſtowed on that young

(*a*) Le Labourcur, *Addit. to Caſtelnau*, tom. 1. pag. 526.

* [A country in Burgundy. *Addit. by the Tranſlator.*]

young Prince, he would have made him a great Monarch [*A*]. On Charles IXth's acceſſion unto the throne, it was thought proper to do him the greater honour, to have a Prince of the blood always near his perſon, in order that he might have an eye to his conduct; and this employment was given to the Prince de la Roche-ſur-yon (*b*); notwithſtanding which Cipierre ſtill kept his employment [*B*]. There was a very good underſtanding between theſe two Governors. The Prince *paid great deference to Cipierre's judgment, knowing him to be a Nobleman of as great abilities as any in France; and on the other ſide Cipierre, being a perſon of great prudence, paid great honour and reverence* to the Prince, ... *and it was a pleaſing ſight to ſee theſe two Governors about the King, holding their reſpective ranks in a due manner; the one in an exalted way, and the other a little beneath him.* Cipierre was made Knight of the Order by Francis II, anno 1560 (*c*). It is related, that finding himſelf afflicted with a mortal diſeaſe, and preparing to go and drink the waters of Aix, he earneſtly exhorted the Queen-mother, to pacify the diſſenſions which reigned between the Guiſes and the Colignis, and by that means, cut away the root of the factions and troubles, whoſe evil conſequences might be ſo dreadful as to quite ſubvert the Government (*d*). He died in Liege in September 1565, before he could have an opportunity of drinking the waters. The French Proteſtants were not ſatisfied with his conduct [*C*]; and therefore wrote ſome ſatyrical pieces againſt him in verſe both in his life-time, and after his death (*e*). It was from him that the Prince of Conde received advice in Orleans, anno 1560, that de la Renaudie's plot had been diſcovered (*f*). And it was he alſo who was appointed, ſome months after, to ſecure the city of Orleans (*g*); the fidelity of whoſe inhabitants was ſuſpected. He commanded, during ſome days, the French army at the ſiege of that city, after the Duke of Guiſe had been killed (*h*); and obtained,

(*b*) Ibid. Extracted from Brantome.

(*c*) Le Laboureur, *Addit. a Caſtelnau*, tom. 1. pag. 374.

(*d*) Thuan. lib. 38.

(*e*) Le Laboureur quotes ſome of them. *Addit. to Caſtelnau*, tom. 1. pag. 374.

(*f*) Mezerai, *Abregé Chronol.* tom. 5. pag. m. 19.

(*g*) Beze, *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. 3. pag. 290. Thuan. lib. 26.

(*h*) Brantome, cap. Etrangers, tom. 1. pag. 132.

[*A*] *Had not others depraved the excellent education he had beſtowed on this young Prince, he would have made him a great Monarch.*] Brantome aſcribes to Court-Favourites, and not to the Governor, the two ill qualities of Charles IX, viz. ſwearing and diſſimulation. He affirms, that Cipierre was "the moſt excellent Nobleman that ever was Governor to a King; upright and ſincere both in word and thought; neither a liar nor a diſſembler; and that he had given the King an excellent education, and was far from having taught him to diſſemble (1)." He adds, that Cipierre, among other things, taught King Charles the IXth to ſpeak eloquently. "Mr. de Cipierre, *ſays he* (2), in my opinion, ſpoke French, Spaniſh, and Italian better than any Gentleman or Soldier I ever knew. This reaſon prompted the King to conform himſelf to Cipierre's beautiful language, rather than to that, or as it was ſaid, of Du Perron, afterwards Marſhal de Retz, who certainly was maſter of a very graceful expreſſion." He ſays elſewhere, "that no man in the world could relate a ſtory ſo well as Cipierre; and that he could repreſent it with the fineſt grace, and the moſt noble expreſſion that could be uſed; ſo accompliſh'd was he in all things."

(1) Brantome, quoted by Le Laboureur, *Additions aux Memoires de Caſtelnau*, tom. 1. pag. 374.

(2) Cited ibid. tom. 2. pag. 260.

(3) Idem cited tom. 1. pag. 528.

[*B*] *Notwithſtanding which Cipierre ſtill kept his employment.*] The words above cited of Brantome prove this; but yet we muſt believe, that he loſt his place for ſome time, and was afterwards reſtored to it: for Languet affirms, that he was removed from the King; and that the interceſſion of the King of Navarre, to get him reſtored, was to no purpoſe. Languet took notice of theſe particulars not above two days after they had happened, in a Letter dated from Paris, the 1ſt of February 1562. The account he gives of the cauſe of this Governor's diſgrace is ſo curious and ſo little known, that I think myſelf obliged to relate it. The affair is this; Charles the IXth was ſo incenſed at Cipierre, for taking a Book of Divinity from him, that he declared he ſhould no longer be his Governor. The words employed by Languet a little before, make me conclude, that the Book taken from the young Monarch was heretical, in Cipierre's opinion; for this Author had juſt before ſaid, that it was imagined Charles IX and his two brothers would ſoon declare themſelves Proteſtants; &c. *Regina cautius ſua adminiſtrat, nam accommodat ſe tempori, & oſtendit ſe nobis addictiorem quam antea. Rex & fratres videntur brevi tranſituri ad noſtras partes. Hæc ſi non fiunt matre impellente, fiunt ſaltem ipſa non nolente, nam ſi vellet poſſet hoc impedire. Aurelianenſis jam ſatis oſtendit ſe eſſe a noſtris partibus. Andegavenſis planè puer, nuper petiit a matre coram plurimis, ne deinceps daret ei miniſtros, qui non eſſent Lutherani. Hæc verba mater excepit riſu. Rex habuit gubernatorem nobilem virum (nomine Sipierre) natum in Burgundia, ex tenui fortuna ſua induſtria pervenit ad magnas opes, & fuit admodum charus Regi Henrico. Is cum nuper Regi librum theologicum eripuiſſet, ita offendit eum, ut diceret matri, ſe nolle amplius habere eum gubernatorem. Mater itaque eum removit à filii gubernatione, & ei ſuffecit Principem de la Roche ſur Yon. Cum Navarrus pro remoto apud reginam deprecaretur, illa reſpondit hoc non ſua, ſed filii voluntate eſſe factum, qui nolit eum habere gubernatorem. Hoc nudius tertius primum accidit. Referunt & alias cauſas, quare ſit remotus; nam fuit valde addictus Guiſiis* (4). i. e. "Her Majeſty acts "with great caution, accommodates herſelf to the "times, and ſeems to favour our intereſt more than "formerly. The King and his brother ſeem inclined "to come ſoon over to us: if this ſhould not be by "the Queen's advice, it at leaſt is not againſt her conſent, ſince ſhe could prevent it if ſhe pleaſed. "The Duke of Orleans has already ſufficiently ſhewn "that he ſides with us. The Duke of Anjou, tho' a "child, lately entreated the Queen his mother, before "ſeveral perſons, that for the future he might have "none but Lutheran domeſticks, which made her Majeſty ſmile. The King's Governor was one Sipierre, "a perſon well deſcended, and born in Burgundy, "who by his induſtry and application raiſed himſelf "from an humble condition of life to an exalted ſtation and great riches. This Gentleman, having "not long ſince taken a book of Divinity out of the "King's hand, the latter was ſo much offended, that "he declared to her Majeſty, that this man ſhould no "longer be his Governor. The Queen thereupon removed him from his employment, and gave it to the "Prince de la Roche ſur Yon. The King of Navarre "deſiring the Queen to reſtore Cipierre, ſhe replied "what had been done was not by her direction, but "by that of her ſon, who abſolutely refuſed to have "him for his Governor. This circumſtance happened "but three days ago. His removal is alſo aſcribed "to other cauſes; for he was ſtrongly attached to the "Guiſes." If the reader conſults the paſſage in the Queen of Navarre's Memoirs, inſerted in her article (5), he will be of opinion that Languet was well acquainted with the tranſactions of the Court of France.

(4) Languet. Epiſt. 68. lib. 2. pag. 201, 202.

(5) In the note [*B*].

[*C*] *The French Proteſtants were not ſatisfied with his conduct.*] Le Laboureur gives only the following reaſon for it; viz. the order which Sipierre had received, to diſarm the people of Orleans (6); but the verſes he quotes, intimate, that this City met with a barbarous treatment; and that Cipierre's cruelty extended not only to the walls but alſo to the inhabitants. Thuanus, who in other reſpects beſtows encomiums on this Nobleman, ſays that he was devoted to the Guiſes (7). In a word, when the Proteſtants made their complaints, after the concluſion of the firſt peace, they took notice, not only of the cruel treatment of Burgundy by Tavannus, and of Guienne by Monluc, but likewiſe what Orleans had ſuffered from Cipierre (8).

(6) *Additions à Caſtelnau*, tom. 1. pag. 529.

(7) Thuan. lib. 26. pag. m. 520.

(8) *Vraie Hiſt. des Troubles*, folio 4 *verſo, ad ann.* 1563.

tained, from the Pope's Legate, leave for the ſoldiers to eat fleſh in Lent [*D*]. He married Louiſa de Halluin (*i*), by whom he had but one daughter, who was wife of Francis de la Magdeleine, Lord of Ragni, grandfather to the Ducheſs of Leſdiguieres (*k*). His father had married N.... de Saint Amour, Lady de Cipierre (*l*).

(*i*) Le Laboureur, *Addit. aux Mem. de Caſtelnau*, tom. 1. pag. 374.

(*l*) Le Laboureur, *Addit. à Caſtelnau*, tom. 1. pag. 374.

(*k*) She died in Paris the 2d of July 1656, according to Father Anſelme, *Hiſt. des Officiers*, pag. 243.

[*D*] *He obtained from the Pope's Legate leave for the ſoldiers to eat fleſh in Lent.*] The Cardinal of Ferrara, the Pope's Legate, was then in the camp with the Queen-Mother. He was very much ſhock'd at the requeſt which was made him, at the very time that they were engaged in war againſt *Hereticks, the enemies of Lent: But after reflecting a little, he anſwered, that as to fleſh, no mention muſt be made of it, as being a deteſtable thing*; and that he would permit them to eat only *butter, cheeſe, or things made of milk* (9). Here follows Cipierre's anſwer. "Sir, do not pretend "to direct our ſoldiers, in the ſame manner as you do "your Eccleſiaſticks; for there is a wide difference "between ſerving God, and ſerving Bellona: ſhall "I tell you the truth; it is not at this time, nor in "this army, compoſed of various kinds of people, "that you ought to raiſe ſuch ſcruples; for as to your "butter, cheeſe, &c, our French Soldiers will not eat "any of them, tho' your Italians and Spaniards are "well ſatisfied with ſuch food; they will have good "fleſh-meats in order to ſupport themſelves the bet-"ter. They will eat it in this, as well as any other "Country; and in private, how ſtrongly ſoever it "may be prohibited them. I therefore adviſe you "to better things; order them to eat fleſh; and "give them a diſpenſation, ſince, ſhould they give it "themſelves, it will leſſen your authority; but, on "the contrary, it will be increaſed, ſhould you in-"dulge them your permiſſion; and then all of them "to a man will cry, *that excellent man the Legate has "given us a diſpenſation*, which will ſound much bet-"ter (10)." The Legate, approved of ſo judicious an admonition, and accordingly granted Cipierre's requeſt (11). The paſſage which Brantome had related a little before, is ſo well adapted to confirm the judgment which all worthy, pious, and prudent perſons form of war, that I find myſelf under a neceſſity of tranſcribing it. Charles V, *to excuſe ſuch brave and gallant men as himſelf, uſed to ſay, that he being couragious, ambitious, and a great Warrior, could not be religious and conſcientious. And here follows what the famous Marquis of Peſcayre, in the wars of Lombardy, obſerved once to the Legate, who was afterwards Pope Clement, with regard to the riotous exceſſes and diſorders committed by his ſoldiers.* Mon Sennor Legado, no ay coſa mas difficultoſa a los que exercen la guerra, que con igual diſciplina ſervir en un miſmo tiempo à Mars y à Chriſto, porque el uſo de la guerra en eſta corruption de militia parece ſer todo contrario a la Juſtitia y Religion. That is, *Moſt noble Legate; nothing is more difficult to thoſe who are devoted to a military life, than to ſerve at the ſame time with the like order and diſcipline Mars and Chriſt, becauſe the corruption which reigns in the practice of war, is quite repugnant to Juſtice and Religion* (12). This is the judgment which thoſe who are acquainted with war form of it; and ſince *unicuique in ſua arte credendum eſt*, that is, "every one ought to be believed in his own profeſſion," we muſt conclude, that an army conducted according to the laws of the Chriſtian Religion, is a Platonic Idea, an Eutopia, and the Philoſopher's Stone, which will never be found.

(9) Brantome, *Capit. Etrangers*, tom. 1. pag. 132.

(10) Ibid. pag. 133.

(11) Ibid. pag. 134.

(12) Ibid. pag. 151.

CIPIERRE (RENATUS DE SAVOY, Lord of) was ſon to Claude of Savoy, Count de Tende, Governor and great Seneſchal of Provence, who married, for his ſecond wife, Frances de Foix, who brought him a ſon and a daughter, whom their mother educated in the Proteſtant Religion. Her huſband was very much ſuſpected to favour theſe principles, either on account of his Lady's profeſſing them openly, or becauſe he would not ſuffer thoſe under his government, who were branded with the name of Heretics, to be treated with the leaſt violence. This moderation occaſioned his own ſon, Count de Sommerive, whom his firſt Lady had brought him, to rebel againſt him; ſo that he was obliged to defend himſelf, ſword in hand, againſt the man to whom he had given birth. He was worſted, and forced to abandon his government to this unnatural ſon. Cipierre, who had exerted himſelf to the utmoſt to maintain the rights of his father, whoſe poſt of Colonel of Horſe was beſtowed upon him (*a*), at the ſame time that Cardet, his brother-in-law (*b*), commanded a regiment of foot, was unhappily aſſaſſinated by a band of mutineers in Frejus [*A*], anno 1568. He was returning from Nice, whither he had been to pay his compliments to the Duke of Savoy. The ruffians way-laid him in a wood; and not being able to prevent his reaching Frejus, with all his followers, they purſued him into it, ſounded the alarm, and beſieged him in the houſe where he had fled for refuge. The Conſuls endeavoured to ſave him, and prevailed ſo far with Marquis d'Arci, who headed this rebellious crew, as to agree to his going away, upon condition that Cipierre and his ſervants ſhould give up their arms. However, the mutineers returned a little after, and killed all the unfortunate ſervants, who were no longer able to defend themſelves. But the Marquis not ſeeing the dead body of Cipierre among the reſt, (the Conſuls having lodged him in a place of ſafety) pretended to be afraid that Cipierre's life was in danger, and proteſted that the only way to ſave it would be to deliver him into his, d'Arci's, hands; and this being done, they covered his body with wounds [*B*]. *Tantum*

(*a*) Beze, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 12. pag. 319.

(*b*) He was of the Houſe of Saluzzo, and married the daughter of Count de Tende, and of Frances de Foix. Beza, ibid. pag. 318.

[*A*] *He was unhappily aſſaſſinated.... in Frejus.*] Thus I tranſlate the *Forum Julii* of Thuanus. Daubigné (1) calls this place *Forques* (2), and aſſerts, that *Arci* who was Governor of it cauſed Count de Tende, with twenty nine others to be aſſaſſinated, and *cried aloud, that he had orders for every thing he did.* It is no eaſy matter to reconcile this Hiſtorian with Thuanus; for if Gaſpar de Villeneuve, Lord of Ars, or Arci, *Arcii Regulus*, had been Governor of the city where this maſſacre was perpetrated, as d'Aubigné pretends; would he have been obliged to employ artifice with reſpect to the Conſuls, to get this Count delivered up to him, after he had entered the city at the head of the mutineers, as Thuanus relates?

(1) Tom. 1. liv. 5. chap. 1. pag. 370.

(2) He ſhould have ſaid Frejus, as Mezerai does, *Abregé Chronol.* tom. 5. pag. 110.

[*B*] *They covered his body with wounds.*] Thuanus aſcribes this cowardly aſſaſſination to the mutiny of the rabble (3). Brantome, who had but a confuſed notion of this infamous butchery charges one man only with it. *He was killed* ſays he (4), *whilſt the peace was ſubſiſting, in a city of Provence, by a wretch whom I have ſeen an hundred times carry lemons every year to the Queen-Mother; I have forgot both his name, and that of the city where this maſſacre happened. The Huguenots*, adds he, *of Provence repoſed great confidence in him; and had he lived, he would have occaſioned great diſturbances; for he was valiant and a very great Lord in this country.* He had juſt before obſerved, *that he was a brave Gentleman; that he was a Huguenot; and that* Count de Sommerive, his half-brothers, and himſelf, *uſed to be often at variance; and nevertheleſs that they ſometimes behaved courteouſly to one another.*

(3) *Ab irruente multitudine innumeris pugionum ictibus confoditur, deboneſtato etiam poſt mortem repetitis vulneribus cadavere.* Thuanus, lib. 44. pag. 895. col. 1.

(4) Brantome, *Diſcours du Connétable de Montmorenci.*

tum religio potuit ſuadere malorum! i. e. "Such horrid acts Religion could perſuade." It was not doubted but that the Court, and Count de Sommerive had a hand in this wicked attempt, and that Cipierre had been treated thus inhumanly, out of hatred to the Proteſtant Religion. This gave great uneaſineſs to the Prince of Conde, the Admiral, and their whole party (*c*).

(*c*) *Ex* Thuano, lib. 44. *ad ann.* 1568.

CLARKE (SAMUEL) was born in the City of Norwich October the 11th 1675. His father was Edward Clarke Eſq; Alderman of that City, and one of the Repreſentatives of it in Parliament for ſeveral years. His mother was Hannah, the daughter of Mr. Samuel Parmenter, Merchant, of the ſame City. He was educated in the Free-School at Norwich under the Reverend Mr. Burton. In the year 1691 he was removed to Caius-College in the Univerſity of Cambridge, and placed under the tuition of Mr. Ellis, afterwards Sir John Ellis (*a*). Though the Philoſophy of Des Cartes was at that time the eſtabliſhed Philoſophy of the Univerſity, and Mr. Clarke's Tutor extremely devoted to that ſyſtem, yet our Author ſoon made himſelf maſter of the chief parts of Sir Iſaac Newton's Philoſophy [*A*], and in order to his firſt degree performed a public exerciſe in the ſchools upon a queſtion taken from thence, which ſurprized the whole audience both for the accuracy of knowledge, and clearneſs of expreſſion, which appeared through the whole (*b*). In 1697 he publiſhed a Latin Tranſlation of Monſieur *Rohault's Phyſics*, with large Annotations [*B*]. Immediately after this he turned his thoughts to Divinity, which he propoſed to make the peculiar ſtudy and profeſſion of his life; for the proſecution of which deſign he ſoon met with a very favourable opportunity (*c*), being in the end of 1698, or beginning of 1699 (*d*), appointed Chaplain to Dr. John Moore, then Lord Biſhop of Norwich, who treated him with all the marks of the higheſt friendſhip and eſteem [*C*]. His firſt ſtudies, in order to qualify himſelf for the office which he propoſed to undertake, were the Old and New Teſtament in the Original Languages, and the primitive Chriſtian Writers [*D*]; and the reſult of his application appeared ſo early as the year 1699 in two Treatiſes, one intitled, *Three Practical Eſſays on*

(*a*) Preface to the 1ſt volume of Dr. Clarke's *Sermons*, giving ſome Account of the Life, Writings, and Character of the Author, by Benjamin, Lord Biſhop of Salisbury, pag. 1, 2. edit. London 1730, in 8vo.

(*b*) Ibid. pag. 3, 4.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 5, 6.

(*d*) *Hiſtorical Memoirs of the Life of Dr. Samuel Clarke; being a Supplement to Dr.* Sykes's *and Biſhop* Hoadly's *Accounts; including Memoirs of ſeveral of Dr. Clarke's Friends. By* William Whiſton, *M. A. ſometime Profeſſor of the Mathematicks in the Univerſity of Cambridge*, pag. 9. edit. London 1730, in 8vo.

[*A*] *Our Author ſoon made himſelf maſter of the chief parts of Sir Iſaac Newton's Philoſophy.*] The Biſhop of Saliſbury, now of Wincheſter, obſerves (1), that the great Sir Iſaac had indeed then publiſhed his *Principia*; but that this book was but for the few, both the manner and matter of it placing it out of the reach of the generality even of learned readers, and ſtrong prejudice, in favour of what had been received, working againſt it. "But neither the diffi- "culty of the taſk, nor the reſpect Mr. Clarke paid "to the Director of his Studies, nor the warmth and "prejudice of all around him, had any effect upon his "mind. Not at all ſatisfied therefore with *Hypotheſes* "arbitrarily adapted to appearances, he ſet himſelf "immediately to the ſtudy of what was real and ſub- "ſtantial. And in this ſtudy he made ſuch uncommon "advances, that he was preſently maſter of the chief "parts of the Newtonian Philoſophy." Mr. Whiſton likewiſe informs us (2), that from a converſation, which he had with our Author at Norwich about the year 1697, he was greatly ſurprized, that ſo young a man as Mr. Clarke then was, *not much*, ſays he, *above twenty two years of age, ſhould know ſo much of thoſe ſublime diſcoveries, which were then almoſt a ſecret to all, but a few particular Mathematicians. Nor did I*, continues he, *remember above one or two at the moſt, whom I had then met with, that ſeemed to know ſo much of that Philoſophy, as Mr. Clarke.*

(1) *Preface* to the 1ſt volume of Dr. *Clarke's Sermons*, pag. 3. edit. London 1730, in 8vo.

(2) *Hiſtorical Memoirs of the Life of Dr. Samuel Clarke*, pag. 7. edit. London 1730, in 8vo.

[*B*] *In* 1697 *he publiſhed a Latin Tranſlation of Monſr.* Rohault's Phyſics, *with large Annotations.*] The Syſtem of Natural Philoſophy then generally taught in the Univerſity was that written by Monſr. Rohault, entirely founded on the Carteſian Principles, and very ill tranſlated into Latin. Mr. Clarke juſtly thought, that Philoſophical notions might be expreſſed in pure Latin. But his aim was much higher than the making a better Tranſlation of it. He reſolved to add to it ſuch Notes, as might lead the young Students inſenſibly and by degrees to other and truer notions, than what could be found there. *And this certainly*, ſays the Biſhop of Saliſbury (3), *was a more prudent method of introducing truth unknown before, than to attempt to throw aſide this Treatiſe entirely, and write a new one inſtead of it. The ſucceſs anſwered exceedingly well to his hopes; and he may juſtly be ſtiled a great Benefactor to the Univerſity in this attempt. For by this means, the true Philoſophy has without any noiſe prevailed, and to this day his Tranſlation of Rohault is generally ſpeaking the ſtanding text for Lectures, and his Notes the firſt direction to thoſe, who are willing to receive the reality and truth of things in the place of invention and romance. And thus before he was much above twenty years old, he furniſhed the Students with a Syſtem of Knowledge, which has been ever ſince, and ſtill continues to be, a public benefit to all, who have the happineſs of a liberal and learned education in that Univerſity.* Mr. Whiſton (4) tells us, that it was his tutor, who put him upon this Tranſlation; which was firſt printed in 1697 in 8vo. There have been already four editions of it, in every one of which improvements have been made eſpecially in the laſt in 8vo 1718, which has the following title: *Jacobi Rohaulti Phyſica. Latinè vertit, recenſuit, & uberioribus jam Annotationibus ex illuſtriſſimi Iſaaci Newtoni Philoſophiâ maximam partem hauſtis, amplificavit & ornavit* S. Clarke, *S. T. P. Accedunt etiam in hac quartâ editione novæ aliquot tabulæ æri inciſæ, & Annotationes multum ſunt auctæ.* His Notes were likewiſe tranſlated into Engliſh by his brother John Clarke D. D. Dean of Sarum, in his Tranſlation of Rohault, publiſhed at London in two volumes in 8vo under this title; Rohault's *Syſtem of Natural Philoſophy; illuſtrated with Dr. Samuel Clarke's Notes taken moſtly out of Sir Iſaac Newton's Philoſophy; with Additions. Done into Engliſh by John Clarke, D. D.*

(3) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 4, 5.

(4) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 5.

[*C*] *Appointed Chaplain to Dr. John Moore, then Lord Biſhop of Norwich, who treated him with all the marks of the higheſt friendſhip and eſteem.*] He received our Author into his familiarity and friendſhip to ſuch a remarkable degree, that he lived for twelve years in that ſtation, with all the decent freedom of a brother and an equal rather than an inferior. There was no mark of confidence, as well as eſteem, which that Prelate did not ſhew him as long as he lived; and at his death the higheſt mark of confidence he could give him was, the leaving all the concerns of his family ſolely in his hands, a truſt, which he executed with the moſt faithful exactneſs, and to the entire ſatisfaction of every perſon concerned (5).

(5) Biſhop of Salisbury, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 6, 7.

[*D*] *His firſt ſtudies . . . were the Old and New Teſtament in the Original Languages, and the primitive Chriſtian Writers.*] The Old Teſtament he then read with that exactneſs of judgment, which very few have ſhewn after a much longer application, and which furniſhed him with many obſervations written at that time with his own hand in the margin, relating to the miſtakes of the common Tranſlation of it. The New Teſtament he read with a true critical accuracy; and with great care purſued his deſign farther thro' the Writers of the earlieſt Ages, in order to diſcover, if poſſible, the genuine ſentiments and cuſtoms of antiquity, as well as to ſupport the authority and true interpretation of the ſacred Books (6).

(6) Idem, ibid. pag. 7.

on Baptiſm, Confirmation, and Repentance [*E*], and the other intitled, *Some Reflexions on that part of a book called,* Amyntor, *which relates to the Writings of the Primitive Fathers, and the Canon of the New Teſtament* [*F*]. In 1701 was publiſhed his Paraphraſe upon the Goſpel of St. *Matthew*; which was followed in 1702 by the *Paraphraſes* upon the Goſpel of St. *Mark*, and St. *Luke*, and ſoon after by a third volume upon St. *John*. They were afterwards reprinted together in two volumes in 8vo, and are univerſally admired [*G*], ſo that a fourth edition of them has been publiſhed. He had actually begun a *Paraphraſe* upon the *Acts of the Apoſtles* immediately after the others were publiſhed; and had certainly propoſed to go through all the remaining books; but ſomething accidental interrupted the execution; "and it is now, ſays the Biſhop of Saliſbury (*e*), only "to be lamented that any thing firſt diverted him from it; or that he did not afterwards "prevail upon himſelf to reſume and compleat ſo excellent a work, which his friends "often preſſed upon him, and to which he would ſometimes anſwer, that it was made leſs "neceſſary by the labours of ſeveral worthy and learned perſons, ſince the appearance "of his work upon the *Four Goſpels*." Biſhop Moore, his Patron, having formed a juſt notion of Mr. Clarke's great abilities, reſolved to uſe all his intereſt to fix him in a more conſpicuous ſtation in the Metropolis of the Kingdom; but in the mean while gave him the Rectory of Drayton near Norwich, and procured for him a pariſh in that City, both together of very inconſiderable value; and theſe he ſerved himſelf in the ſeaſon, when the Biſhop reſided at Norwich (*f*). His preaching at firſt was without notes, and ſo continued till he was Rector of St. James's [*H*]. In the years 1704 and 1705 he preached, and ſoon after publiſhed his ſixteen Sermons at Mr. Boyle's Lecture [*I*], containing

(*e*) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 18.

(*f*) Idem, pag. 10, 11.

[*E*] *His* Three Practical Eſſays &c.] The whole Title is, *The Practical Eſſays on Baptiſm, Confirmation, and Repentance; containing full Inſtructions for a holy life, with earneſt Exhortations, eſpecially to young perſons. Drawn from the conſideration of the ſeverity of the diſcipline of the Primitive Church.* There have been five Editions of this printed. The Biſhop of Saliſbury tells us (7), that he mentions this, and our *Author's Reflections* on *Toland's Amyntor*, not to put them upon a level with his other performances; but only as having "upon them the plain marks of a Chriſtian "frame of mind, and as proofs of his knowledge in the "writings of thoſe early Ages, even at his firſt ſetting "out into the World." Mr. Whiſton (8) eſteems the *three practical Eſſays the moſt ſerious Treatiſe, that Mr. Clarke ever wrote, and one, that with a little correction will be ſtill very uſeful in all Chriſtian families. And I venture,* continues he, *to ſay, the judicious ſagacity, as well as Chriſtian temper of Mr. Clarke in his youth, are moſt eminently ſhewn therein.*

(7) Pag. 8.

(8) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 10.

[*F*] *The other intitled,* Some Reflexions on that part of a Book called *Amyntor*, which relates &c.] This Tract was publiſhed in 1699 without a name; and ſince added to Dr. Clarke's *Letter to Mr. Dodwell, &c.*

[*G*] *They . . . are univerſally admired.*] Dr. Sykes in his *Elogium* upon our Author (9) obſerves, that the ſeveral Editions of them ſhew plainly how well the world has read them; and that every impartial reader ſees with what truth our Author ſaid, that he had "endeavoured to expreſs the full ſenſe of the Evan-"geliſt in the plaineſt words, and to continue the ſenſe "without interruption, by the cleareſt tranſitions he "could;" and that "through the whole he had ſin-"cerely endeavoured to repreſent the doctrine of our "Saviour in its original ſimplicity without reſpect to "any controverſies in Religion." The ſame Writer remarks, that if he had finiſhed the *Epiſtles* in the ſame manner as he has done the *Goſpels*, (which he had engaged to do, if his life had been continued,) *we had had the ſenſe of the* New Teſtament *in the greateſt plainneſs and perſpicuity, the hard places of Scripture moſt probably made eaſy, and what appears to many to be inconcluſive rambling, would have been ſhewn to be calm, conſiſtent reaſoning.* The Biſhop of Saliſbury (10) tells us, that our Author had chiefly in his eye the underſtanding the Phraſeology of the Holy Scriptures, and the explaining the meaning of them ſo, as to make them uſeful to all, who are concerned in them; and that his *Paraphraſes* are written *with a manly plainneſs and perſpicuity*, and accompanied with a very few ſhort Notes, where any critical explication was neceſſary. *Of how great benefit,* continues the Biſhop, *theſe have been, and always will be to Engliſh readers, who have ſenſe and goodneſs enough to be pleaſed with a juſt repreſentation of the true meaning of what is recorded in the Goſpel, I need not ſay; experience has already ſaid enough of the uſefulneſs of ſuch a manner of interpretation from ſo maſterly an hand.*

(9) Publiſhed in *The Preſent State of the Republick of Letters*, for July 1729, Art. 4. pag. 61, 62.

(10) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 8, 9.

[*H*] *His preaching at firſt was without Notes, and ſo continued till he was Rector of St. James's.*] He was peculiarly happy in this method, not by truſting to his memory entirely, and ſpeaking a Sermon compoſed before, in which ſome have excelled; nor by heating himſelf gradually into any ſort of paſſion, to which others have owed all their fluency of language; but by a certain ſtrength and coolneſs of head, which could not eaſily be ſurprized or deceived, and a certain faculty of expreſſion, which was hardly ever at a loſs for plain and proper words (11).

(11) Idem, ibid. pag. 11.

[*I*] *In the years* 1704 *and* 1705 *he preached and ſoon after publiſhed his ſixteen Sermons at Mr. Boyle's Lecture.*] They were printeſt in two diſtinct Volumes, the former in 1705, and the latter in 1706. Since that they have been printed together in one volume, and have paſſed through ſeveral editions. In the 4th and 5th editions were added ſeveral Letters to Dr. Clarke from a *Gentleman in Glouceſterſhire* †, relating to the firſt part of this Book, with the Doctor's Anſwers. In the 6th and 7th Editions were added, *A Diſcourſe concerning the Connection of the Prophecies in the Old Teſtament, and the Application of them to Chriſt*, and *an Anſwer to a ſeventh Letter concerning the Argument* a priori. Dr. George Smalridge, afterwards Biſhop of Briſtol, ſaid of one or both theſe volumes, that *it was the beſt book on thoſe ſubjects, that had been written in any language* (12). Dr. Sykes in the *Elogium* quoted above has given us an account of the ſucceſs of our Author in his *Demonſtration of the Being and Attributes of God*, and of the *Obligations of Natural and Revealed Religion*; and obſerves (13), that the Chriſtian World has all agreed in the Unity of the ſupreme Cauſe; but that none have been very ſucceſsful in the proof, that there *could* be but *one* Cauſe of the univerſe. The Heathens acknowledged *one ſupreme God*; nor doth it appear, that any of the more underſtanding men amongſt them aſſerted a multitude of eternal, independent, underived Gods. They worſhipped indeed a multitude of inferior, ſubordinate Deities; and they erected ſtatues and images to them; and even theſe ſymbols were often, abuſively, called Gods. But yet *one* Mind, *one* ſupreme Cauſe of all things, was the general notion of all their Philoſophers and men of learning. Revelation has fully confirmed this notion, and has made it inconteſtable by *Jews* and *Chriſtians*. But notwithſtanding all that are agreed in this, that there is but *one God*, *one* ſupreme Cauſe of all things; yet it has been found a difficulty to *prove*, that there may not be *many* finite and independent Cauſes of the ſeveral Syſtems, or Parts of Syſtems in the Univerſe. It is certain, that a finite cauſe is ſufficient to produce a finite effect. *The Phænomena of Nature*, ſays Dr. Clarke, *which come within the reach*

† Dr. Joſeph Butler, *Author of* Fifteen Sermons preached at the Rolls Chapel, *the ſecond edition of which was printed at London* 1729 *in* 8vo.

(12) Whiſton, pag. 11.

(13) Pag. 56, & *ſeq.*

taining Diſcourſes concerning the Being and Attributes of God, the Obligations of Natural Religion, and the Truth and Certainty of the Chriſtian Revelation. It was about this

reach of our obſervation, prove indeed demonſtrably, that there is a ſupreme Author and Director of that Nature, or of thoſe Phænomena, whereof we have any knowledge. But that this Supreme Author and Governor of this nature, *or of* theſe *Phænomena, is likewiſe the Supreme Author and Governor of* univerſal *Nature, cannot be proved by us from our partial and imperfect knowledge of a few Phænomena, in that ſmall part of the univerſe, which comes within the reach of our ſenſes.* To find out a medium then, whereby to prove *one only, infinite, immenſe Author and Governor of the Univerſe,*

(14) Idem, ibid. pag. 57. *was an attempt worthy,* continues Dr. Sykes (14), *the genius, and worthy the pains of the moſt ſagacious man on earth.* All agreed that the *Unity of God* is a principle of Natural Religion, as well as Revealed; and yet to be unable to *prove* ſuch a leading principle, was in effect to give up to its adverſaries all that depended upon it. The Unity of God is juſtly eſteemed the foundation of all Morality; becauſe without this, men may be involved in abſurdities; and with this, no inconſiſtency appears in the whole Moral Syſtem. If this principle be admitted, men may reaſon ſolidly, and proceed in direct conſequences from juſt premiſes, till they have proved the neceſſity of every duty, and have demonſtrated the obligation of virtue in its fulleſt extent. "Now Dr. Clarke ſeeing the inſufficiency of the arguments drawn *a poſteriori* to prove this point, attempted, and has ſucceeded in the argument *a priori*; and has demonſtrated that there is and can be but *one* Author and Governor of the *Univerſe*. If ever man was bleſſed with ſagacity, ſtrength of parts, clearneſs of reaſoning upon the moſt abſtract metaphyſical ſubjects, it was this man, who was capable of treating upon ſuch ſublime ſubjects, ſo as to to make them intelligible by men of moderate underſtandings (15)." When he had demonſtrated the *Being* and *Unity of God*, and had cleared up the ſubject of *Liberty*, in oppoſition to the doctrine of *Neceſſity* and *Fate*, his next view was to give us the *Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion. The unalterable obligations of the one, and the truth of the other, were ſubjects of the greateſt importance in a ſceptical and irreligious Age; and the Doctor had that happineſs, that he could not treat upon any ſubject, to which he did not bring new light. He had clear and diſtinct ideas in his own mind, and the cleareſt manner of expreſſion. And being deſirous that things ſhould appear what they really are, and not being warp'd by the hopes of pleaſing others, or by fame, or riches, or power, he purſued the way that truth led him. He conſidered and proved the eternal and neceſſary relations of things to one another. And ſince men are made capable of perceiving theſe relations, it follows that it is the will of God that they ſhould act according to them. They are under obligations as reaſonable creatures, ſo to act; and a moral Governor of the Univerſe cannot be careleſs or indifferent, whether men follow theſe obligations or not* (16). His next labour was to prove the *Truth of Chriſtianity*, and to vindicate it from the objections, which have been made, not only againſt the application of the *Prophecies* to Chriſt, but againſt the *Prophecies* themſelves. "The things, "*ſays Dr. Sykes* (17), which the generality of Chriſtiſtians have ſaid upon theſe topics, have certainly "been very precarious and inconcluſive. It required "therefore the abilities of the exacteſt critic, and the "cleareſt reaſoner, to make good the connection of "the Prophecies of the Old Teſtament, and to ſhew "how they were applicable to Jeſus of Nazareth." Our Author therefore undertook to ſhew, that as a promiſe appeared in the Old Teſtament, *that truth and virtue ſhould finally prevail over the ſpirit of error and wickedneſs: ſo there are direct predictions, that all the great promiſes of God ſhould receive their final accompliſhment by means of a particular perſon anointed by God for that purpoſe.* And that when "Jeſus had proved "himſelf to be ſent of God, by the works, which "he did in his Father's name, and it appeared, that "there was wanting in him no circumſtance, no *ſine "qua non*, no character, appropriated by any of the "antient Prophets to the promiſed Meſſiah; he then "had a clear right to apply to himſelf all the Pro"phecies, which ſpoke of the Meſſiah, or pointed at "him." Dr. Sykes obſerves (18), that this method of proving the truth of Chriſtianity is certainly clear and rational; and that it is certain, that the places of Scripture, from whence the proofs of Chriſtianity are to be collected, are here to be found together. The only points therefore are, Whether Jeſus had not a right to appropriate to himſelf certain prophecies in the manner he did? And whether there be not ſufficient motives to believe that he did it juſtly? And laſtly, whether the exact coincidence of things, in ſo many of the inſtances the Doctor produced, does not ſhew very clearly, that neither enthuſiaſm nor chance can poſſibly account for ſuch an agreement (19)? The Biſhop of Saliſbury likewiſe in his Account of the Sermons about the Being and Attributes of God tells us (20), that he *exceeded the expectations even of thoſe, who knew him enough to expect great things from him, and laid the foundations of true Religion too deep and ſtrong to be ſhaken either by the ſuperſtition of ſome, or the infidelity of others.* That in thoſe diſcourſes "he began "with ſelf-evident propoſitions. From them he ad"vanced to ſuch as received their proof from the for"mer. In theſe he took no ſtep till he had ſecured "the way before him. Throughout the whole no "word is uſed, but what is intelligible to all, who "are at all verſed in ſuch ſubjects, and what expreſſes "the clear idea in the mind of him, who makes uſe of "it; and all is one regular building, erected upon "an unmoveable foundation, and riſing up from one "ſtage to another with equal ſtrength and digni"ty (21)." In his *Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion*, as the Biſhop obſerves (22), he laid the foundations of Morality deep, in the mutual relations of things and perſons, one to another; in the unalterable fitneſs of ſome actions, and the unfitneſs of others; and in the will of the great Creator of all things, evident from his making man capable of ſeeing theſe relations, and this fitneſs; of judging concerning them; and of acting agreeably to that judgment. *He then proceeded to demonſtrate the Chriſtian Religion to be worthy of God, from the internal evidence, taken from the perfect agreeableneſs of its main deſign to the light of nature, and to all the moral obligations of eternal reaſon; without which agreeableneſs all the arguments in the world could never conclude in its favour; and after this to prove it to be actually recommended to the world by God, from all the external evidence of Prophecy going before it, and miraculous works performed expreſly for the honour and propagation of it. All which he executed with ſuch maſterly ſenſe and perſpicuity of expreſſion, as recommended both the Preacher and the ſubject to all who heard him* (23). The Biſhop concludes his Account of theſe Sermons with remarking (24), that "every Chriſtian "in this Country, in which they firſt ſaw the light, "ought to eſteem them as his Treaſure, as they con"tain the true ſtrength not only of *Natural*, but of *Re"vealed* Religion; which, if ever it be removed "from ſuch a foundation, or ſeparated from ſuch an "alliance with reaſon and uncorrupted nature, will "not long ſubſiſt in the belief of underſtanding perſons "after ſuch a ſeparation. And therefore, *What God "hath joined together, let no man put aſunder.*" Mr. Edmund Law, in his *Notes* upon Archbiſhop King's *Eſſay on the Origin of Evil tranſlated from the Latin*, having animadverted upon our Author's Demonſtration of the Being and Attributes of God, there was publiſhed at London in May 1732 in 8vo, *A Defence of Dr. Clarke's Demonſtration of the Being and Attributes of God. Wherein is particularly conſidered the Nature of Space, Duration, and neceſſary Exiſtence. Being an Anſwer to a late Book intitled,* A Tranſlation of Dr. King's Origin of Evil, *and ſome other Objections. Together with a Compendium of a Demonſtration of the Being and Attributes of God.* Mr. Law having ſubjoined a *Poſtſcript* to the ſecond Edition of this Tranſlation of Archbiſhop King's *Eſſay on the Origin of Evil*, it occaſioned in September the ſame year, *A ſecond Defence of Dr. Clarke's Demonſtration of the Being and Attributes of God. In anſwer to a* Poſtſcript *publiſhed in the ſecond Edition of Mr. Law's Tranſlation of Dr.* King's Origin of Evil. *By the Author of the firſt Defence.* In anſwer to this and the former Defence of Dr. Clarke

(15) Idem, ibid. pag. 58.

(16) Idem, ibid. pag. 58, 59.

(17) Pag. 59.

(18) Pag. 60.

(19) Idem, ibid.

(20) Preface, pag. 12.

(21) Idem, ibid. pag. 13.

(22) Ibid. pag. 14.

(23) Idem, ibid. pag. 14, 15.

(24) Ibid. pag. 15.

this time, or not much later, that Mr. Whiſton diſcovered that our Author had been looking into the primitive writers, and began to ſuſpect that the *Athanaſian* Doctrine of the Trinity was not the Doctrine of the early ages (*g*) [*K*]. In 1706 he publiſhed his *Letter to Mr. Dodwell* concerning the Immortality of the Soul, and this was ſoon followed by *four Defences* of it in *four* ſeveral Letters to the Author of the *Remarks* on that Letter [*L*]; which were all printed together in a fifth edition, and the Anſwer to *Toland's Amyntor* added to them. The ſame year he tranſlated Sir Iſaac Newton's Optics into elegant Latin, which ſo highly pleaſed that great man, that he gave him five hundred pounds, or one hundred pounds for each of his children (*b*). This Tranſlation was printed at London 1706 in 4to, and reprinted in 1719 in 8vo. In 1706 Biſhop Moore procured him by his intereſt the Rectory of St. Bennet's Paul's-Wharf (*i*). Not long after the Biſhop brought him to Court, and procured him to be made one of the Chaplains in ordinary to Queen Anne; to whoſe greater favour his own merits recommended him ſo ſoon and ſo powerfully, that upon the vacancy of St. James's Weſtminſter, ſhe immediately conſented to the requeſt of the Biſhop, and preſented him to that Rectory (*k*) [*M*]. Upon his advancement to this ſtation he took in 1709 his Degree of Doctor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Cambridge, where the public exerciſe, which he performed, was prodigiouſly

(*g*) Whiſton's *Hiſtorical Memoirs*, pag. 12.

(*b*) Idem, ibid. pag. 13.

(*i*) Biſhop of Salisbury's Preface, pag. 16.

(*k*) Idem, ibid. pag. 18, 19.

there was publiſhed in November the ſame year a pamphlet, intitled, *Dr. Clarke's Notion of Space examined. In Vindication of the Tranſlation of Archbiſhop* King's Origin of Evil. *Being an Anſwer to two late Pamphlets, intitled, the one,* A Defence of Dr. Clarke's Demonſtration &c. *and the other,* A ſecond Defence, &c. In January 1734 Mr. John Jackſon publiſhed at London in 8vo a Pamphlet, entitled, *The Exiſtence and Unity of God proved from his Nature and Attributes. Being a Vindication of Dr. Clarke's Demonſtration of the Being and Attributes of God.* In June following there appeared two Pamphlets, printed at Cambridge, one intitled, *An Enquiry into the Ideas of Space, Time, Immenſity, and Eternity, as alſo the Self-Exiſtence, neceſſary Exiſtence, and Unity of the Divine Nature. By* Edmund Law, *M. A.* the other intitled, *A further Examination of Dr. Clarke's Notion of Space. By* Joſeph Clarke, *M. A.* Mr. John Clarke, the Author of the two Defences of Dr. S. Clarke's Demonſtration, having publiſhed a third *Defence* of it, Mr. Joſeph Clarke publiſhed in December 1734 *a Further Examination of Dr. Clarke's Notions of Space, with ſome Conſiderations on the Poſſibility of Eternal Creation. In Reply to Mr.* John Clarke's Third Defence of Dr. Samuel Clarke's Demonſtration, &c. *To which are added ſome Remarks on Mr. Jackſon's Exceptions to Dr. Clarke's* Notions of Space examined *in his* Exiſtence and Unity, &c. *By* Joſeph Clarke, *M. A. Fellow of Magdalen-College Cambridge.*

[*K*] *That our Author . . . . began to ſuſpect, that the* Athanaſian *Doctrine of the Trinity was not the Doctrine of the early ages.*] Mr. Whiſton, who informs us of this particular (25), adds theſe words: *Whether Mr.* Newton (26) *had given Mr.* Clarke *yet any intimations of that nature, for he knew it long before this time; or whether it aroſe from ſome enquiries of his own, I do not directly know; tho' I incline to the latter. This only I remember to have heard him ſay, that he never read the* Athanaſian *Creed in his Pariſh at or near Norwich, but once, and that was only by miſtake, at a time when it was not appointed by the rubrick.*

(25) *Hiſtorical Memoirs*, pag. 12, 13.

(26) Afterwards Sir Iſaac Newton.

[*L*] *In* 1706 *he publiſhed his* Letter to Mr. Dodwell *concerning the Immortality of the Soul, and this was ſoon followed by* four Defences *of it in* four *ſeveral Letters to the Author of the* Remarks *on that* Letter.] Mr. Henry Dodwell had publiſhed at London in 1706 *An Epiſtolary Diſcourſe proving from the Scriptures and the firſt Fathers, that the ſoul is a principle naturally mortal, but immortalized actually by the pleaſure of God to puniſhment or to reward by its union with the divine baptiſmal ſpirit. Wherein is proved that none have the power of giving this divine immortalizing Spirit ſince the Apoſtles but only the Biſhops.* In anſwer to this our Author publiſhed at London 1706 in 8vo, *A Letter to Mr. Dodwell, wherein all the arguments in his* Epiſtolary Diſcourſe *againſt the Immortality of the Soul are particularly anſwered, and the judgment of the Fathers concerning that matter truly repreſented.* The Biſhop of Saliſbury obſerves (27), that in this Letter he anſwered Mr. Dodwell "in ſo excellent a manner, both with "regard to the Philoſophical part, and to the opi- "nions of ſome of the primitive Writers, upon whom "theſe Doctrines were fixed, that it gave univerſal ſa- "tisfaction." Mr. Anthony Collins having taken this opportunity of coming into this controverſy, as a ſecond to Mr. Dodwell, went much farther into the Philoſophy of the diſpute, and indeed ſeemed to produce all that could plauſibly be ſaid againſt the Immateriality of the Soul, as well as the liberty of human actions. This enlarged the ſcene of the diſpute; into which our Author entered, *and wrote with ſuch a ſpirit of clearneſs and demonſtration, as at once ſhewed him greatly ſuperior to his adverſaries in Metaphyſical and Phyſical Knowledge, and made every intelligent Reader rejoice that ſuch an incident had happened to provoke and extort from him that plenty of ſtrong reaſoning and perſpicuity of expreſſion, which were indeed very much wanted upon this intricate and obſcure ſubject. And I am perſuaded,* continues the Biſhop (28), *that as what he has writ in this controverſy, comprehends the little that the Antients had ſaid well, and adds ſtill more evidence than ever clearly appeared before, and all in words that have a meaning to them; it will remain the ſtandard of good ſenſe on that ſide of the queſtion, on which he ſpent ſo many of his thoughts, as upon one of his favourite-points.* Mr. Henry Grove tells us (29), that *the argument from the Diviſibility of Matter* in proof of the Immateriality of the Soul, "tho' an old "one, ... hath yet of late years been managed to "greater advantage than ever; particularly by the "learned Dr. *Clarke* in his admirable *Letters*, which "for ſtrength of reaſoning and fair controverſy have "not been often equalled."

(27) Preface, pag. 17.

(28) Ibid. pag. 18.

(29) *Preface* to his *Eſſay towards a Demonſtration of the Soul's Immateriality*, pag. 5. edit. London 1718, in 8vo.

[*M*] *Preſented him to that Rectory.*] He continued in that Rectory above twenty years; "and had as Dr. "Sykes informs us (30) ſuch an univerſal eſteem and "reputation in his pariſh, that whatever he ſaid or "propoſed to the Gentlemen of the veſtry, was not "only never oppoſed, or barely ſubmitted to, but in- "ſtantly approved." As ſoon as he was ſettled here, he left off his former way of preaching without notes, and made it one of his chief ſtudies to compoſe and write down as accurate Sermons as he could; not, ſays the Biſhop of Saliſbury (31), becauſe he could not proceed in the former method (32), with a copiouſneſs of good ſenſe and clear expreſſion, which the nobleſt audience might with pleaſure have attended to; but chiefly becauſe from that time it became his reſolution to prepare his Sermons in ſuch a manner, that they might hereafter be as uſeful from the preſs, as he wiſhed them then to be from the pulpit. From the time of his taking poſſeſſion of this pariſh, his reſidence was where his heart and his employment were, in the Rectory-houſe, in the midſt of his Pariſhioners, ſeldom leaving the place at all, unleſs for a few weeks in the long vacation, when the town was empty, which he ſpent in viſiting his friends at Norwich and other places; and towards the latter part of his life, in doing his duty as maſter of Wigſton's Hoſpital at Leiceſter. During the time of his being Rector of St. James's, beſides the regular performance of all the other offices of his profeſſion, he followed the cuſtom of his predeceſſors in reading lectures upon the Church-Catechiſm every Thurſday morning for ſome months in the year. In the latter part of his time he reviſed theſe with great care, and left them under the title of an *Expoſition* upon that Catechiſm completely prepared for the preſs (33).

(30) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 63.

(31) Preface, pag. 19, 20.

(32) See Note [*H*].

(33) Biſhop of Salisbury, idem, ibid. pag. 26, 27.

prodigiously applauded [N]. The same year he revised Mr. Whiston's Translation of the *Apostolical Constitutions* into English (*l*). In 1712 he published a beautiful and pompous edition of *Cæsar's Commentaries* [O], dedicated to the Duke of Marlborough; and the same year appeared his *Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity* [P], which gave occasion to a great number of books written upon that subject by himself as well as others [Q], and

(*l*) Whiston, *Historical Memoirs*, pag. 23, 24.

[N] *The public exercise which he performed, was prodigiously applauded.*] The two questions which he maintained, were, that *all Religion supposes the freedom of human actions*, and that *the Christian Religion contains nothing contrary to Reason* (33). I. *Nullum Fidei Christianæ Dogma in S. Scripturis traditum, est rectæ rationi dissentaneum.* II. *Sine Actionum Humanarum libertate nulla potest esse Religio* (34). The Royal Professor of Divinity, Dr. James, exerted himself beyond his common practice. He went first into a long examination of Dr. Clarke's Thesis, sifting every part of it with the strictest nicety; and afterwards pressed him with all the force of syllogism in its various forms thro' the course of the disputation. To the former Dr. Clarke made an *extempore* Reply in a continued discourse for near half an hour; in which, without any hesitation either for thought or language, he took off the force of all that the Professor had said, in such a manner, that many of the auditors declared themselves astonished, and owned, that if they had not been within sight of him, they should have supposed him to have read every word of this Reply out of a paper. After this thro' the course of the syllogistical disputation, he guarded so well against the arts, which the Professor was master of in perfection; he replied so readily to the greatest difficulties, that such an objector could propose, and pressed upon the Professor so close and so hard with his Answers, clear and intelligible to all, that perhaps never was such a conflict heard in these schools, never such a disputation kept up for so long a time with such spirit, nor ever any, which ended with greater, if equal honour to the Respondent (35). The Professor himself, who was a man of humour as well as learning, said to him aloud towards the end of the disputation, *Profecto, me probè exacuisti* (36), or *exercuisti*, as Mr. Whiston thinks it ought to be read (37), and he declared, that now he might well retire and leave the chair, since one so able to fill it appeared among them (38). The learned members of the University, who had with pleasure attended to every part of the whole *Disputation*, went away discoursing to one another of the unusual entertainment they had had in the schools; not a little pleased with such an ornament to their own University, and admiring particularly, that after an absence of so many years, and after a long course of business of quite another nature, they heard him now handling the subjects he undertook in such a masterly manner, as if this sort of academical exercise had been his constant employment; and with such fluency and purity of expression, as if he had been accustomed, thro' the whole time, to no other language in conversation but Latin (39).

(33) Whiston, *ubi supra*, pag. 18.

(34) Idem, pag. 178.

(35) Bishop of Salisbury, Preface, pag. 22, 23.

(36) Idem, ibid. pag. 22.

(37) *Hist. Memoirs*, pag. 158.

(38) Ibid.

(39) Bishop of Salisbury, pag. 22.

[O] *In* 1712 *he published a beautiful and pompous Edition of* Cæsar's Commentaries.] Mr. Addison (40) speaks of this Edition in the following terms: *The new Edition which is given us of* Cæsar's Commentaries, *has already been taken notice of in foreign Gazettes, and is a work, that does honour to the English Press. It is no wonder that an edition should be very correct, which has passed thro' the hands of one of the most* accurate, learned and judicious Writers *this age has produced. The beauty of the paper, of the character, and of the several cuts, with which this noble work is illustrated, makes it the finest Book that I have ever seen; and is a true instance of the English genius, which though it does not come the first into any art, generally carries it to greater heights than any other country in the world.*

(40) Spectator, vol. 5. num. 367.

[P] *His* Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.] The whole title is as follows: *The Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity. In three parts. Wherein all the texts in the New Testament relating to that Doctrine, and the principal passages in the Liturgy of the Church of England, are collected, compared and explained.* London 1712 in 8vo. Afterwards there was a second edition, with many alterations in 1719; and there has been since his death a third edition with very great additions left under the Dr's. hand ready prepared for the Press. The Bishop of Salisbury observes (41), that the Doctor in forming his own sentiments upon this important subject, proceeded in this manner: "He knew, and "all men agreed, that it was a matter of mere Re- "velation. He did not therefore retire into his closet, "and set himself to invent and forge a plausible hy- "pothesis, which might sit easily upon his own mind. "He had not recourse to abstract and metaphysical "reasonings, to cover and patronize any system he "might have embraced before. But, as a Christian, "he laid open the New Testament before him. He "searched out every text, in which mention was made "of the Three Persons, or of any one of them. "He accurately examined the meaning of the words "used about every one of them; and by the best rules "of Grammar and Critique, and by his skill in lan- "guage, he endeavoured to fix plainly what was de- "clared about every person, and what was not. And "what he thought to be the truth, he published under "the title of the *Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*." The Bishop likewise remarks (42), that *every Christian Divine and Layman ought to pay thanks to Dr.* Clarke *for the method into which he brought this dispute; and for that collection of texts of the New Testament, by which at last it must be decided, on which side soever the truth be supposed to lie.*

(41) Preface, pag. 23.

(42) Ibid. pag. 24.

[Q] *Which gave occasion to a great number of Books and Pamphlets written upon that subject by himself and others.*] We have an account of the progress of this dispute to the end of the year 1719, in a Pamphlet printed at London 1720 in 8vo, intitled, *An account of all the considerable Books and Pamphlets, that have been wrote on either side in the controversy concerning the Trinity since the year* 1712. *In which is also contained an account of the Pamphlets writ this last year on each side by the Dissenters, to the end of the year* 1719. Dr. Clarke's Tracts upon this subject are as follow: I. *A Letter to the Reverend Dr.* Wells, *in answer to his* Remarks. London 1714 in 8vo. Dr. Wells's *Remarks* were dated May the 30th 1713. He wrote an Answer to Dr. Clarke, intitled, *A Letter to the Reverend Dr.* Clarke, *in answer to his Letter to Dr.* Wells. Dr. Clarke in his *Reply to the objections of* Robert Nelson *Esq;* (43) takes notice of this Letter of Dr. Wells, as wholly referring to other modern Authors, whose arguments the Dr. had answered in his first Book; and of his writing in so particular a style and manner, that it could not be thought the Dr. was under any obligation to have any further controversy with him. II. *A Reply to the Objections of* Robert Nelson *Esq; and of an anonymous Author against Dr.* Clarke's Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity. *Being a Commentary on forty select texts of Scripture. To which is added an Answer to the* Remarks *of the Author of* some Considerations upon the Trinity, and the ways of managing that Controversy. *By* Samuel Clarke *D. D.* London 1714 in 8vo. The anonymous Author to which this Book of Dr. Clarke is a Reply, is supposed to be Mr. James Knight, afterwards D. D. and late Vicar of St. Sepulchre's in London, and it was published at London 1714 in 8vo. *The Scripture-Doctrine of the most holy and undivided Trinity vindicated against the misrepresentations of Dr.* Clarke. *To which is prefixed a Letter to the Reverend Doctor by* Robert Nelson *Esq;* The *Remarks on Dr.* Clarke's Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, *by the Author of* Some Considerations concerning the Trinity &c. were written by Dr. Gastrell Bp. of Chester. III. *Three Letters to Dr.* Clarke *from a Clergyman, concerning his* Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, *with the Doctor's Replies. Published by the Author of the said three Letters.* London 1714 in 8vo. IV. *A Letter to the late Reverend Mr.* R. M. [Richard Mayo] *concerning his plain Scripture-Argument.* V. *A Letter to the Author of a Book entitled,* The true Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, continued and vindicated, *recommended first by Mr.* Nelson, *and since by Dr.* Waterland. The two last pieces were published in 1719 in 8°, at the end of a Tract of another Author entitled, *The modest*

(43) Pag. 213.

and was complained of in 1714 by the Lower Houſe of Convocation [*R*], though the Members of the Upper Houſe afterwards declared themſelves ſatisfied with his explanations upon the ſubject of the complaint. However the Biſhop of Saliſbury aſſures us (*m*), "that from the time of the Doctor's publiſhing that book, to the day of his death, he "found no reaſon, as far as he was able to judge, to alter the notions, which he had "there profeſſed, concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, towards any of thoſe "ſchemes, which ſeemed to him to derogate from the honour of the Father on one ſide, "or from that of the Son and Spirit on the other." Before the publication of this work, there was a meſſage ſent him from the Lord Godolphin, and ſome others of Queen's Anne's Miniſters, that "the affairs of the public were with difficulty then kept "in the hands of thoſe that were for liberty; that it was therefore an unſeaſonable time "for the publication of a book, that would make a great noiſe and diſturbance; and "that therefore they deſired him to forbear till a fitter opportunity ſhould offer itſelf." *Which meſſage*, ſays Mr. Whiſton †, *Dr. Clarke had no regard to, but went on, according to the dictates of his own conſcience, with the publication of his book notwithſtanding.* About the year 1712 he had a conference with Dr. Smalridge, afterwards Biſhop of Briſtol, concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity, at Thomas Cartwright's Eſq; at Aynho in Northamptonſhire [*S*]. In 1715 and 1716 he had a diſpute with the celebrated Mr. Leibnitz relating to the principles of Natural Philoſophy and Religion; and a Collection of the papers which paſſed between them was publiſhed at London in 1717 [*T*]. In 1718

(m) Preface, pag. 25.

† Hiſtor. Memoirs, pag. 179.

modeſt Plea for the Baptiſmal and Scripture Notion of the Trinity, wherein the Schemes of the Reverend Dr. Bennet *and Dr.* Clarke *are compared.* VI. *The Modeſt Plea &c. continued; or a brief and diſtinct Anſwer to Dr.* Waterland's *Queries relating to the Doctrine of the Trinity.* London 1720 in 8vo. VII. *Obſervations on Dr.* Waterland's *Second Defence of his* Queries. London 1724 in 8vo.

[*R*] *Complained of in* 1714 *in the Lower Houſe of Convocation.*] We have an account of the whole affair in two Pamphlets, one ſuppoſed to be written by the Reverend Mr. John Lawrence, M. A, and printed at London 1714 in 8vo. intitled, *An Apology for Dr.* Clarke, *containing an account of the late proceedings in Convocation upon his Writings concerning the Trinity. Being a Collection of ſeveral Original Papers:* the other intitled, *A full Account of the late Proceedings in Convocation relating to Dr. Clarke's Writings about the Trinity, and containing true copies of ſeveral original Papers; with ſome ſhort Remarks.* London 1714 in 8vo.

[*S*] *In* 1712 *he had a Conference with Dr. Smalridge .... concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity at Thomas Cartwright's Eſq; at Aynho in Northamptonſhire.*] The Conference was propoſed by Dr. Smalridge in order to the conviction of Dr. Clarke. "And if any perſon "in England, ſays Mr. Whiſton (44), was able to "convince upon that head, it muſt have been Dr. "*Smalridge*, who had fully conſidered my fourth volume (45), and was a thorough maſter of thoſe "Books of Chriſtianity, whence the arguments were "to be taken; and who wanted no ſagacity nor good-"will to inforce them. However he failed of ſuc-"ceſs; and on the contrary the company were ge-"nerally ſatisfied, that the evidence on Dr. Clarke's "ſide was greatly ſuperior to the other. And whe-"ther Dr. *Smalridge* did not himſelf ſomewhat feel it, "I cannot certainly tell. So far I think will appear "hereafter, that, excepting his condemnation of the "groſs Arians, whom neither Dr. Clarke nor I ever "ſupported, he after this choſe rather to refer to "others, who had managed the *Athanaſian* Cauſe, than "ever to enter directly into its Vindication. Nor did "he eſcape the ſuſpicion of being himſelf inclina-"ble to what has been of late called *Arianiſm*, eſpeci-"ally at Oxford."

(44) *Hiſtorical Memoirs*, pag. 67.

(45) *Of Primitive Chriſtianity reviv'd.*

[*T*] *A collection of the Papers which paſſed between them was publiſhed at London in* 1717.] They were printed in 8vo, under the following title. *A Collection of Papers, which paſſed between the late learned Mr.* Leibnitz *and Dr.* Clarke, *relating to the principles of Natural Philoſophy and Religion. To which are added Letters from Cambridge to Dr.* Clarke *concerning liberty and neceſſity, with the Doctor's Anſwers. And Remarks upon a Book, entitled,* A Philoſophical Inquiry concerning human liberty. The *Letters from Cambridge*, which the Doctor anſwers in this volume, were written by *Richard Bulkeley* Eſq; Author of a Poem in twelve Books, intitled, *The Laſt Day.* He died in September 1718 at about twenty four years of age. *The Philoſophical Inquiry concerning Human Liberty* was written by *Anthony Collins* Eſq; (46). All the pieces contain'd in this volume were tranſlated into French, and publiſhed by Mr. Des Maizeaux in the firſt volume of *Recueil de diverſes Pieces ſur la Philoſophie, la Religion Naturelle, l'Hiſtoire, les Mathematiques, &c. Par Mrs.* Leibniz, Clarke, Newton, *& autres Autheurs celebres*, printed at Amſterdam 1720 2 Vol. in 12mo. Dr. Sykes in his account of this Book (47), having obſerved, "that it is *Natural Philoſophy*, which enables "us to determine the Queſtions concerning *Liberty* and "*Neceſſity*, which teaches us the extent of the *Powers* "*of Matter* and *Motion*, which gives us the ſtrongeſt evi-"dence of God's continual government of the world, and "which, as it ſtands oppoſed to all hypotheſes, ſo "wonderfully confirms Natural Religion, and demon-"ſtrates that there muſt be ſome *free* intelligent Be-"ing, by whoſe *Will* all things are directed;" proceeds to tell us, that from hence it was that Dr. Clarke ſaw clearly, that *if all things were puſhed on by a certain* Fate, *or by a blind* Neceſſity, *there could be no ſuch thing as perſonal merit or demerit in intelligent Beings; that ſuch creatures could not be the objects of rewards or puniſhments; that therefore God would be unjuſt, if he inflicted any puniſhments upon mere paſſive inſtruments, who were not maſters of themſelves; and laſtly, if he beſtowed happineſs upon ſuch Beings, it muſt be the reſult of mere arbitrary pleaſure in the donor, and not a regard to behaviour in the receiver.* "The "foundation of all Religion, both *Natural* and *Re-*"*vealed*, depends upon the right determination of theſe "points; and therefore Dr. Clarke truly judged, that "unleſs men were *Agents*, no conduct of theirs could "make them acceptable or unacceptable to God; "and that the firſt principles of all morality were de-"ſtroyed, if there were no difference of men's actions. "On this account he wrote thoſe *Letters* to Mr. *Leib-*"*nitz*, and publiſhed his *Remarks* upon a Book en-"titled, *A Philoſophical Enquiry concerning Human Li-*"*berty*." The Biſhop of Saliſbury likewiſe informs us (48), that the Controverſy between our Author and Mr. *Leibnitz* laſted long in a private manner, and paſſed thro' the hands of her preſent Majeſty, *who was the witneſs and judge of every ſtep of it*; and that it related chiefly to the important and difficult ſubjects of *Liberty* and *Neceſſity*. *This* Liberty *or* Moral Agency *was a darling point to him. He excelled always, and ſhewed a ſuperiority to all, whenever it came into private diſcourſe, or public debate. But he never more excelled; than when he was preſſed with the ſtrength this learned adverſary was maſter of; which made him exert all his talents to ſet it once again in a clear light, to guard it againſt the evil of metaphyſical obſcurities, and to give the finiſhing ſtroke to a ſubject, which muſt ever be the foundation of morality in man, and is the ſole ground of the accountableneſs of intelligent creatures for all their actions.* "And "as this was the laſt of Dr. *Clarke*'s Works relating "to a ſubject, which had been by the Writings of "cloudy

(46) See the Article of COLLINS (Anthony).

(47) *Elogium of Dr. Clarke*, pag. 54.

(48) Preface pag. 30.

1718 his alteration in the forms of Doxology of the ſinging Pſalms occaſioned a conſiderable controverſy concerning the primitive Doxologies [V]. About this time he was preſented by the Lord Lechmere, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaſter, to the Maſterſhip of Wigſtan's Hoſpital in Leiceſter, *which requiring*, ſays Mr. Whiſton (n), *no* Athanaſian *Subſcription, nor* Athanaſian *Creed, nor* Athanaſian *Worſhip, was a piece of preferment very acceptable to him.* In 1724 he publiſhed in 8vo ſeventeen Sermons on ſeveral occaſions, eleven of which were never before printed; and the year following his *Diſcourſe concerning the Connexion of the Prophecies in the Old Teſtament, and the Application of them to Chriſt*, in anſwer to Mr. Collins's *Grounds and Reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion*; and a *Sermon preached at the Pariſh-Church of St. James*, April the 18th 1725, *upon the erecting a Charity-School for the education of Women-Servants.* In 1727, upon the death of Sir Iſaac Newton, he was offered by the Court the place of Maſter of the Mint, worth *communibus annis* twelve hundred or fifteen hundred pounds a year, which he abſolutely refuſed (o). In 1728 he wrote *a Letter to Mr.* Benjamin Hoadly, F. R. S. *occaſioned by the Controverſy relating to the proportion of Velocity and Force in Bodies in Motion*; printed in the *Philoſophical Tranſactions*, N° 401. And in the beginning of the year following he publiſhed at London in 4to the twelve firſt books of Homer's *Iliad*, with the Latin Verſion accurately corrected, and learned notes [W], dedicated to the Duke

(n) Pag. 100. See likewiſe the *Biſhop of Saliſbury's Preface*, pag. 26.

(o) Whiſton, pag. 135, 136.

" cloudy or artful men rendered ſo intricate; I ſhall " take the liberty, *continues he* (49), to ſay, with re- " gard to all of the ſame tendency, from his *firſt diſ- " courſe* about the *Being of God* to theſe *Letters*, that " what he has written to clear and illuſtrate this " cauſe, does now ſtand, and will for ever remain, " before the world, a laſting monument of a genius, " which could throw in light where darkneſs uſed to " reign, and force good ſenſe and plain words into " what was almoſt the priviledged place of obſcurity " and unintelligible ſounds. For ſuch indeed had the " ſubject before us been under the hands of moſt, " who had written upon it, either thro' a deſire of " darkening it by words without meaning, or thro' " an inability of diſcourſing clearly and conſiſtently " about it." Mr. Whiſton acquaints us (50), that Sir Iſaac Newton once pleaſantly told the Doctor, that *he had broke Leibnitz's heart with his Reply to him.* Mr. Trenchard in one of his *Letters* (51), concerning the Neceſſity of Human Actions has given us ſome animadverſions upon a paſſage or two of the Doctor's *Remarks upon a Philoſophical Enquiry concerning human liberty*, tho' at the ſame time he ſtiles him *a very great and juſtly celebrated*, and a *truly worthy and learned Author.* The Doctor wrote Remarks upon theſe Letters which are ſtill extant in manuſcript.

(49) Pag. 31, 32.

(50) *Hiſtor. Memoirs*, pag. 132.

(51) Sign'd *Diogenes*, and publiſhed in the *Britiſh Journal*, num. 17. Jan. 12, 1723.

[V] *In* 1718 *his alteration in the Forms of Doxology of the Singing-Pſalms occaſioned a conſiderable controverſy concerning the primitive Doxologies.*] *Select Pſalms and Hymns* having been reprinted that year for the uſe of the Pariſh-Church and Chapels belonging to the Pariſh of St. James Weſtminſter, a great number of paſſages were changed, as others had been done by the former Rectors of that Pariſh, and ſome Doxologies altered in this manner:

To God, thro' Chriſt, his only Son,
Immortal Glory be &c.

To God, thro' Chriſt, his Son, our Lord,
All Glory be therefore &c.

(52) *Hiſtor. Memoirs*, pag. 99.

Mr. Whiſton obſerves (52), that as the uſual Forms of Doxology " are not eſtabliſhed by any legal authority, " eccleſiaſtical or civil, they ſeemed within the care of " preſent Stewards of Charity-Schools, and of the pre- " ſent Incumbents of Pariſhes. Dr. Clarke's Alteration, I think, was this; *To God, through Chriſt, his Son our Lord, All Glory be.* Which is the moſt undoubted old Chriſtian Form, that is now extant in the Church, and is the moſt uſual Form at the end of the Prayers and Thankſgivings in our own publick Liturgy." A conſiderable number of theſe *Select Pſalms and Hymns* having been diſperſed by the *Society for promoting of Chriſtian Knowledge*, before the Alteration of the Doxologies was taken notice of, Complaint was made to that Society by ſome of their correſpondents in the Country. Upon this Dr. Clarke was charged by ſeveral Members thereof with having made thoſe Alterations with a deſign to impoſe upon the Society; but the affair being ſtrictly examined into, it was found that the Edition had been prepared by him for the uſe of his Pariſh only, before the Society had any thoughts of purchaſing any of the copies, and therefore he was cleared from all imputation by a majority of the Members. However the Biſhop of London thought proper to publiſh *a Letter to the Incumbents of all Churches and Chapels in his Dioceſe, concerning their not uſing any New Forms of Doxology*, dated December 26th 1718. It begins thus, " *Reverend " Brethren*, There is an inſtance of your care and duty, " which I conceive my ſelf at this time highly ob- " liged to offer, and you to regard, as neceſſary for " the preſervation of the very foundations of our Faith. " Some perſons, *ſeduced, I fear, by the ſtrong deluſions " of pride and ſelf-conceit*, have lately publiſhed *new " Forms of Doxology*, entirely agreeable to thoſe of " ſome ancient hereticks, who impiouſly denied a Tri- " nity of Perſons in the Unity of the Godhead. I do " therefore warn and charge it upon your ſouls, as you " hope to obtain mercy from God the Father, thro' the " merits of Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, and by the ſanctifica- " tion of the Holy Ghoſt, Three Perſons and One " God bleſſed for ever, that you employ your beſt " endeavours to prevail with your ſeveral Flocks to " have a great abhorrence for the abovementioned new " Forms, and particularly that you do not ſuffer the " ſame to be uſed, either in your Churches, or in any " Schools, where you are able to prevent that moſt pe- " nicious abuſe, &c." This Letter was animadverted upon in *Mr. Whiſton's Letter of Thanks to the Right Reverend the Lord Biſhop of London, for his late Letter to his Clergy againſt the Uſe of* new Forms of Doxology, &c. dated Jan. 17, 1718; and in *An humble Apology for St. Paul, and the other Apoſtles; Or a Vindication of them and their Doxologies from the charge of hereſy.* By Cornelius Paets. London 1719 in 8vo. Soon after was publiſhed an Ironical Treatiſe, entitled, *A Defence of the Biſhop of London, in anſwer to Mr.* Whiſton's Letter of Thanks, *addreſſed to the Archbiſhop of Canterbury. To which is added, A Vindication of Dr. Sacheverell's late Endeavour to turn Mr. Whiſton out of his Church.* To Mr. Whiſton's *Letter of Thanks* there were the following anſwers: *The Lord Biſhop of London's* Letter to his Clergy *defended. Wherein the conſtant Worſhip of Son and Holy Spirit with the Father during the firſt Ages is ſet forth, and the Antiquity of the Doxology uſed by the Church of England aſſerted. By a Believer.* London 1719 in 8vo: and *A ſeaſonable Review of Mr. Whiſton's Account of Primitive Doxologies in his late* abuſive Letter of Thanks to the Right Reverend the Lord Biſhop of London &c. *Together with ſome occaſional Remarks on the 4th volume of his* Primitive Chriſtianity revived. *By a Preſbyter of the Dioceſe of London.* London 1719 in 8vo. This latter is ſaid to be written by Dr. William Berriman. To this laſt piece Mr. Whiſton replied in his *Second Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Biſhop of London, concerning the primitive Doxologies: Wherein the* Seaſonable Review *of his* Account *of them is conſidered.* Dated March 11, 1718. The Author of the *Seaſonable Review* anſwered him in *A ſecond Review of Mr. Whiſton's Account of the Primitive Doxologies, occaſioned by his* Second Letter to the Biſhop of London.

[W] *He publiſhed at London in 4to the twelve firſt Books of* Homer's Ilias, *with the Latin Verſion accurately*

Duke of Cumberland. In the midſt of all theſe labours and ſtudies he had enjoyed a firm ſtate of health, without any indiſpoſition bad enough to confine him, except that of the Small-pox in his youth, till on Sunday May the 11th 1729 he went out in the morning to preach before the Judges at Serjeant's-Inn, and there was ſeized with a pain in his ſide, which made it impoſſible for him to perform the office which he was called to, and quickly became ſo violent that he was obliged to be carried home. He went to bed, and thought himſelf ſo much better in the afternoon, that he would not ſuffer himſelf to be blooded, againſt which remedy he had indeed entertained ſtrong prejudices. But the pain returning very violently about two the next morning made the advice and aſſiſtance of a very able Phyſician abſolutely neceſſary, who, after twice bleeding him, and other applications, thought him, as he alſo thought himſelf, to be out of all danger, and ſo continued to think till the Saturday morning following, when, to the inexpreſſible ſurprize of all about him, the pain removed from his ſide to his head, and after a very ſhort complaint, took away his ſenſes, ſo as that they never returned any more. He continued breathing till between ſeven and eight in the evening of that day, May the 17th 1729, and then died. He married Catherine, the only daughter of the Reverend Mr. Lockwood, Rector of Little Maſſingham in the County of Norfolk, by whom he had ſeven children, two of which died before him, and one in a few weeks after him (*p*). We ſhall give his character in the note [*X*]. Her preſent Majeſty, from her firſt acquaintance with his character to the day

(*p*) *Biſhop of Salisbury's Preface*, pag. 32, 33, 34. *See likewiſe* Dr. Sykes's *Elogium of Dr. Clarke*, printed *in the Preſent State of the Republick of Letters*, for July 1729. Art. 4. pag. 63.

rately corrected, and learned Notes.] It was printed under the following title; *Homeri Ilias, Græcè & Latinè. Annotationes in uſum ſerenisſimi Principis Guliel-mi Auguſti Ducis de Cumberland, &c. regio juſſu ſcripſit atque edidit S. Clarke, S. T. P.* The Biſhop of Saliſbury tells us (53), that the Tranſlation is almoſt new. And Dr. Sykes obſerves (54), that his Notes have had not only the approbation of the Maſters of the great Schools of England, ſuch as Eaton, Weſtminſter, St. Paul's, &c. but alſo the higheſt commendation of Dr. Bentley, who declared the performance to be *ſupra omnem invidiam*, and its Author to have deſerved the compliment of *longè omnium Princeps*. The Biſhop of Saliſbury tells us (55), that Homer was his admired Author even to a degree of ſomething like Enthuſiaſm hardly natural to his temper. "In this he went "a little beyond the bounds of Horace's judgment; "and was ſo unwilling to allow the Favourite-Poet "even to nod, that he has taken remarkable pains to "find out, and give a reaſon for every paſſage, word, "and tittle, that could create any ſuſpicion. The "Tranſlation with his Corrections may now be ſtiled accurate; and his Notes, as far as they go, "are indeed a treaſury of grammatical and critical "knowledge. He was called to this taſk by Royal "Command; and he has performed it in ſuch a manner as to be worthy of the young Prince, for whoſe "uſe it was laboured." Mr. Whiſton (56) remarks, that he had begun this work, when he was in his younger years, and that *the Notes were rather tranſcribed than made new*. We find from Dr. Sykes's *Elogium* upon our Author (57), that he was finiſhing the remainder of Homer, and had compleated almoſt four Books, when he was ſeized with his laſt ſickneſs. The laſt twelve Books were publiſhed, by his ſon at London 1732 in 4to under the following title: *Homeri Ilias Græcè & Latinè cum Annotationibus Samuelis Clarke S. T. P. nuper defuncti. Vol. II. Edidit atque imperfecta ſupplevit Samuel Clarke Filius S. R. S.* Mr. Clarke tells the Reader in his Preface that his father had finiſhed his *Notes* upon the three firſt Books of this volume, and to the 359th verſe of the fourth Book; and had reviſed the text and verſion to line 510. There has been a ſecond Edition publiſhed at London 1735 in two volumes in 8vo.

(53) Preface, pag. 28.

(54) *Elogium*, pag. 62.

(55) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 28.

(56) *Hiſtorical Memoirs*, pag. 142.

(57) Pag. 63.

[*X*] *We ſhall give his character in the Note.*] It is drawn to great advantage in the following paſſage of *The Difficulties and Diſcouragements, which attend the ſtudy of the Scripture, in the way of private judgment*, ſaid to be written by Dr. Hare, the preſent Biſhop of Chicheſter. "Dr. Clarke is a man, *ſays that Writer* * "who has all the good qualities, that can meet "together to recommend him. He is poſſeſt of all "the parts of learning that are valuable in a Clergyman, in a degree that few poſſeſs any ſingle one. "He has joined to a good ſkill in the three learned "languages a great compaſs of the beſt Philoſophy "and Mathematics, as appears by his Latin Works, "and his Engliſh ones are ſuch a proof of his own "piety and of his knowledge in Divinity, and have "done ſo much ſervice to Religion, as would make "any other man, that was not under the ſuſpicion of "hereſy, ſecure of the friendſhip and eſteem of all good "Churchmen, eſpecially of the Clergy. And to all "this piety and learning and the good uſe that has "been made of it, is added a temper happy beyond "expreſſion; a ſweet, eaſy, modeſt, inoffenſive, obliging behaviour adorn all his actions; and no paſſion, vanity, inſolence, or oſtentation, appear either "in what he writes or ſays; and yet theſe faults are "often incident to the beſt men, in the freedoms "of converſation, and in writing againſt impertinent and unreaſonable adverſaries, eſpecially ſuch as "ſtrike at the foundation of virtue and religion. This "is the learning, this the temper of the man, whoſe "ſtudy of the Scriptures has betrayed him into a ſuſpicion of ſome heretical opinions." Dr. Sykes in his Elogium upon him tells us (58), that *he excelled in Natural Philoſophy, in Mathematics, in Divinity, in Critique, as if he had made but one of them his ſole ſtudy*; and that *whatever ſcience, or whatever branch of knowledge he applied himſelf to, he was ſo great a maſter of, that had another excelled in any one of thoſe extenſive parts of Literature in the ſame degree as he excelled in every one of them, he would on that ſole account have deſerved the reputation of a great man.* That *as he was eminent in all theſe branches of Literature, no one can read his writings without obſerving how each of them was conſtantly by him applied to the uſe and ſervice of virtue and religion* (59). That *as a Critic, he was perfectly acquainted with the niceties of the Greek and Latin Tongues* (60), and as a Preacher, had the peculiar "art of explaining the moſt intricate texts of "Scripture. He was wont to compare together "and illuſtrate one text by another, and always "ſhewed how a clear and rational ſenſe ran through "the whole Bible. He had fully conſidered the true "import of the ſacred Phraſeology, and was a perfect "maſter of the language and ſtyle of Scripture (61)." The Biſhop of Saliſbury has given his character at large (62), and obſerves, that he was a perſon of a natural genius excellent enough to have placed him in the ſuperior rank of men, without the acquirements of learning, and of learning enough to have rendered a much leſs comprehenſive genius very conſiderable in the eyes of the world. That "the firſt ſtrokes of "knowledge, in ſome of its branches, ſeemed to be "little leſs than natural to him, for they appeared to "lie right in his mind, as ſoon as any thing could "appear, and to be the very ſame, which afterwards "grew up with him into perfection, as the ſtrength "and cultivation of his mind increaſed (63)." Mr. Whiſton (64) mentions an inſtance of this from the Doctor's own mouth. One of his parents aſked him, when he was very young, Whether God could do every thing? He anſwered, Yes. He was aſked again, Whether God could do one particular thing, could tell a lie? He anſwered, No. And he underſtood the queſtion to ſuppoſe that this was the only thing that God could not do; nor durſt he ſay, ſo young was he then, that he thought there was any thing elſe, which God could not do; while yet well he remembred, that

* Pag. 20.

(58) Pag. 53.

(59) Idem, ibid. pag. 53, 54.

(60) Ibid. pag. 62.

(61) Idem, ibid. pag. 64.

(62) Preface, pag. 34, *& ſeqq*

(63) Ibid. pag. 35.

(64) *Hiſtor. Memoirs*, pag. 22, 23.

day of his death, expreſſed the high eſteem ſhe had of his comprehenſive capacity and uſeful learning, by very frequent converſations with him upon many of the moſt important and entertaining points of true Philoſophy and real knowledge. And ſeldom a week paſſed, in which ſhe did not with pleaſure receive ſome proof of the greatneſs of his genius, and of the force of his ſuperior underſtanding. Since his death there have been printed his *Expoſition of the Church-Catechiſm* [Y], London 1729 in 8vo, and *Ten Volumes of Sermons*. They were publiſhed by his brother Dr. John Clarke, Dean of Sarum. His ſcruples about Subſcription were great [Z]. As he had taken much pains in the ſtudy of the Prophetical Writings, eſpecially thoſe of the New Teſtament, he uſed to expreſs his fears, that the face of Proteſtantiſm would once more be covered by as foul a corruption, as ever was that of Popery, before the happy liberty and light of the Goſpel would take place (q). His wiſdom, and knowledge, and inſtructive way of converſation, his readineſs to diſcourſe upon any ſubjects of Literature, and his affability made him admired and loved, as well as much courted by all. He had a ſecrecy, as to other matters, impenetrable (r). In the former part of his life he made no ſcruple of writing Letters upon any ſubject to any ſerious perſons, who were willing to enquire after truth; and with his uſual openneſs and innocent freedom he wrote his *Letters* to the Reverend Mr. Mayo.

(q) Dr. Sykes's *Elogium*, pag. 64.

(r) Idem, ibid. pag. 63.

that he had even then a clear conviction in his own mind, that there was one other thing, which God could not do, viz. that he could not *annihilate* that *ſpace*, which was in the room, wherein they were. Which impoſſibility now appears even in Sir Iſaac Newton's own Philoſophy. The Biſhop remarks (65), that he had one happineſs very rarely known "amongſt the greateſt men, that his memory was almoſt equal to his "judgment, which is as great a character as can well "be given of it. It did not indeed appear in trifles, "nor in every part of knowledge. But in thoſe particularly which regarded the claſſical and pureſt "Writers of the ancients, or any part of real and "experimental Philoſophy, as well as what can truly "be called *Theology*, it was ſurprizingly excellent, and "of wonderful uſe to him, through all his ſtudies "and all his converſation." The Biſhop proceeds to obſerve, that in *Divinity*, it was his great aim to ſettle beyond all contradiction what muſt be the ſupport of true Religion, and then to ſhew the evidences for what muſt rely upon that ſupport (66); and in *Natural Philoſophy* and the *Mathematical Knowledge* neceſſary to it, amidſt all his other employments, he excelled, as if theſe had been his darling ſtudy. *Not that he could poſſibly find time himſelf to make all the proper experiments or neceſſary calculations. But he had I know not what happineſs of genius, by which he immediately comprehended what coſt others a great deal of pains; and ſuch a faculty of judging of any new Syſtems or Propoſitions from what he knew certainly before, and theſe ſupported by a memory, which hardly ever failed him upon theſe ſubjects, that he was eſteemed by the knowers to be one of the beſt judges to apply to for a quick determination about the force or failure of any arguments, or appearing demonſtrations in theſe ſtudies* (67). The Biſhop afterwards (68) remarks, that "his preaching "was what one would naturally expect from a perſon "of ſo critical a genius and ſo ſedate a judgment. "The deſign and tendency of it was not to move the "paſſions, nor had he any talent this way. He wiſely "never attempted it, becauſe he was ſenſible he ſhould "not ſucceed if he did. And if this was a defect, it "was a defect in his original frame and conſtitution. "But then his ſentiments and expreſſion were ſo maſterly; his way of explaining the Phraſeology of "Scripture, by collecting and comparing all the parallel places truly relating to any ſubject was ſo extraordinary and convincing, that ſuch a delight of "ſatisfaction went along with it, as more than made "amends for the want of the other." The Biſhop concludes with obſerving (69), that "what added a "force to his preaching and inſtructive diſcourſe, was "his own unblameable example and perſonal conduct, "in all the duties of a man and a Chriſtian. His piety "was manly and unaffected, built upon the moſt ſolid "grounds, and free from all pomp and ſhew. The "charity of his temper and good will was as extenſive as the whole rational creation of God. The "charity of his aſſiſtance and beneficence as extenſive as "the circumſtances of his family would prudently admit. His love of the religious and civil liberties "of mankind was a ruling and powerful principle in "his heart and practice. In a word, his morals from "the firſt of his days to the laſt were without reproach. "There was an innocence and inoffenſiveneſs remarkable thro' his whole behaviour; and his whole life, "when he came into the view of the great world, "was an ornament and ſtrength to that Religion, "which his pen ſo well defended."

(65) Pag. 35.

(66) Ibid.

(67) Idem, ibid. pag. 38.

(68) Pag. 41.

(69) Pag. 44, 45.

[Y] *His* Expoſition of the Church-Catechiſm.] This was attacked ſoon after the publication of it, by Dr. Daniel Waterland in his *Remarks upon Dr. Clarke's* Expoſition of the Church-Catechiſm. London 1730 in 8vo. To this piece an *Anſwer* was immediately publiſhed by Arthur Aſhley Sykes, D. D. in a pamphlet entitled, *An Anſwer to the* Remarks &c. London 1730 in 8vo. This occaſioned Dr. Waterland's Pamphlet, entitled, *The Nature, Obligation, and Efficacy of the Chriſtian Sacraments conſider'd: As alſo the comparative Value of moral and poſitive Duties diſtinctly ſtated and cleared. By the Author of the* Remarks. London 1730 in 8vo. This was anſwered by Dr. Sykes in his *Defence of the* Anſwer *to the* Remarks *upon Dr.* Clarke's Expoſition of the Church-Catechiſm. *Wherein the Difference between moral and poſitive duties is fully ſtated. Being a Reply to a Pamphlet, entitled,* The Nature, Obligation &c. London 1730 in 8vo. And by an anonymous Writer in a Pamphlet, intitled, *The comparative Excellence and Obligation of moral and poſitive Duties fully ſtated and conſidered. In anſwer to a Pamphlet, entitled,* The Nature, Obligation &c. *As alſo,* The comparative Value of moral and poſitive Duties diſtinctly ſtated and cleared. London 1730 in 8vo. Dr. Waterland having publiſhed a *Supplement* to his Treatiſe, entitled, *The Nature, Obligatiion &c. of the Chriſtian Sacraments, wherein the Nature and Value of poſitive Inſtitutions is more particularly examined, and objections anſwered.* London 1730 in 8vo. Dr. Sykes wrote a *Reply* to it, entitled, *The true Foundations of Natural and Revealed Religion aſſerted. Being a Reply to the* Supplement *to the Treatiſe, entitled,* The Nature, &c. *London* 1730 in 8vo. Dr. Waterland having animadverted upon this piece in the *Poſtſcript* to his *ſecond part* of *Scripture vindicated*, Dr. Sykes publiſhed *An Anſwer to the* Poſtſcript *of the* Second Part *of* Scripture Vindicated. *Wherein is ſhewn, that if reaſon be not a ſufficient guide in matters of Religion, the bulk of mankind for four thouſand years, had no ſufficient guide at all in matters of Religion.* London 1731 in 8vo.

[Z] *His ſcruples about Subſcription were great.*] This we are informed of by Dr. Sykes (70), who obſerves, that he would often wiſh, that thoſe things, which were ſuſpected by many, and judged unlawful by ſome, might be ſeriouſly conſidered, and not made Terms of Communion. He thought that it would be the greateſt happineſs to ſee the occaſions of good and learned men's ſcruples removed out of the public forms of divine ſervice, and the doctrines of Chriſtianity reduced to the New Teſtament only; and that it would be right to have nothing required from the Preachers of the Goſpel, but what was purely primitive. This he thought to be the only means of making the minds of ſincere Chriſtians eaſy and quiet. This he believed would make men much more charitable to one another; and make the Governors of the Church and State tranſact their important affairs with greater eaſe and freedom from diſturbances.

(70) *Elogium*, pag. 63, 64.

Mayo. But when he found the uſe which was made of his freedom, and thoſe Letters, which were written in confidence as to a private friend, publiſhed to the world, he reſolved no more to engage in Epiſtolary Conferences upon ſuch Theological ſubjects for fear of the like inconveniences (s). He had a ſurprizing readineſs and quickneſs of diſpatch in what he was about, and wrote all that he did in the midſt of continual interruptions, being never denied to any, who came to him. And conſidering him at the head of ſo populous a pariſh, in the midſt of ſo much acquaintance, and of ſo much neceſſary public buſineſs, beſides his own private affairs, had he not been able to do as much in one hour, as other men could do in many, he could not poſſibly have written what he did (t). Mr. Whiſton informs us (u) that our Author, as well as Sir Iſaac Newton, was of the ſame ſentiments with him with regard to the notion of the eternity of the torments of hell, which Mr. Whiſton had declared againſt in his *Sermons and Eſſays* [AA].

(s) Idem, ibid. pag. 64, 65.

(t) Idem, ibid. pag. 65.

(u) *Hiſtor. Memoirs*, pag. 98.

[AA] *Mr. Whiſton informs us, that our Author, as well as Sir Iſaac Newton, was of the ſame ſentiments with him with regard to the notion of the Eternity of the torments of hell, which Mr. Whiſton had declared againſt in his* Sermons and Eſſays.] The paſſage in the *Sermon and Eſſays*, in which that Writer has delivered his ſentiments upon this ſubject, is as follows (71): "As "to the *Eternity* of the puniſhments of Hell, I own it "to be certain, ſo far the import of αἰώνιος, to which "the word anſwers, does extend; i. e. "it is cer"tain thoſe puniſhments ſhall continue the whole du"ration of the wicked, who are the ſubjects of it, or "through all thoſe αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, long and unde"terminate periods of Being, to which their lives "ſhall be preſerved by the divine power; ſo that no"thing ſhall put an end to their torment, but what "ſhall do ſo to their lives and their ſtate for ever alſo. "Whether the Scripture means any more by this *E*"*ternity* of the Torments of Hell, I ſhall not here "poſitively determine: but ſince I find the moſt pri"mitive Writers of the Church inclined to this Ex"plication of this point, and ſince this is abundantly "ſufficient for all the ends of Religion, and ſeems "moſt agreeable to the divine goodneſs, if not alſo en"forced by his juſtice, and prevents even the cavils of "the Sceptics themſelves, nay is, I really think, the ge"nuine meaning of the Scripture-Expreſſions alſo, I "ſhall at preſent acquieſce in it, leaving it ſtill to "thoſe, who think the Scripture means more than is "here aſſerted, to juſtify their own opinions and the "reaſonableneſs of them as they think convenient." The ſame Gentleman tells us (72), that about the year 1717 he wrote a ſmall Paper not yet publiſhed, containing very briefly the reaſons of the abovementioned opinion; and that Dr. Clarke thought, that *few or no thinking men were really of different ſentiments in that matter*. Mr. Whiſton adds, that as to himſelf he had many years thought, that "the common opinion in "this matter, if it were for certain a real part of "Chriſtianity, would be a more inſuperable objection "againſt it, than any or all the preſent objections of "unbelievers put together. T.

(71) Pag. 220, 221. edit. London 1709.

(72) *Hiſtorical Memoirs*, pag. 98.

CLARUS (JULIUS) one of the ableſt Lawyers of the ſixteenth Century, was a native of Alexandria in the Milaneze, and of a Patrician family. He undertook a great work, on what is called, in the ſtyle of the Lawyers, *receptæ ſententiæ* (received opinions) which are thoſe that moſt of the Doctors commonly follow. The public employments to which he was raiſed not allowing him the leiſure neceſſary for compleating this work [A], he detached ſome parts of it, and printed them [B]; and at laſt he declared that he would quite lay aſide the remainder (a), ſince the journies he undertook in the Spaniſh King's train, did not allow him time to reviſe his writings, which required a numberleſs multitude of books, and theſe he had not an opportunity of taking along with him in his travels (b). He ſet out for Madrid, in order to travel into Italy; and was got as far as

(a) Julius Clarus, *Præfat.* lib. 5. *recept. Sententiarum.*

(b) Idem, ibid.

[A] *He undertook a great Work . . . the public employments to which he was raiſed, not allowing him the leiſure neceſſary for compleating this Work.*] The war having obliged him to retire to Mantua, he employed himſelf wholly in reviſing his Work, in order to fit it for the preſs; but hearing that the King of Spain had appointed him Counſellor in the Senate of Milan, he diſcontinued this reviſal (1). Some years after, he was made Preſident of the extraordinary Queſtors, Prefect of the Annona (2), and chief Juſtice in Eyre. Whilſt he was exerciſing theſe employments with the utmoſt care and aſſiduity, he was ſent for to Spain, where King Philip II had appointed him Counſellor in the Supreme Council of Italy: upon this he left his country, his wife, and children; and was obliged to travel into Spain, France and Flanders, and to leave moſt of his works unfiniſhed (3).

(1) Julius Clarus, *Epiſtola Dedicatoria Tractatus de Teſtamentis, &c.*

(2) A kind of Purveyor-General.

(3) Julius Clarus *in Præfatione libri* 5 *recept. ſententiarum.*

[B] *He detached ſome parts of it, and printed them ſeparately.*] His deſign was, to publiſh a work entitled *receptarum Sententiarum*, divided into VII Books. In the Ift, he treated *de legibus & conſtitutionibus*; in the IId, *de Jure Perſonarum*; in the IIId, *de materia Succeſſionum & ultimarum Voluntatum*; in the IVth, *de Contractibus*; in the Vth, *de Maleficiis*; in the VIth, *de civilibus Judiciis*. The VIIth was to contain a copious Index of the whole Work; with ſome Treatiſes which could not be properly interwoven with the ſix preceding Books. Here follow the parts publiſhed by him.

In the firſt place, he publiſhed the Treatiſe *de Feudis*, three years (4) after he had been appointed Counſellor of Milan. This was a fragment of the IVth Book. Some time after, he publiſhed the Treatiſe *de Teſtamentis*, part of the IIId Book, and dedicated it to Anthony Perrenot, Biſhop of Arras. The Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated from Milan, May the 1ſt, 1559. This was followed by the Treatiſe *de Donationibus & de Jure Emphyteutico*; parts of the IVth Book. In fine, he publiſhed the whole Vth Book, relating to criminal matters. Theſe Treatiſes were all printed together, in the Frankfort Edition of 1572 in folio, which John Fichard Counſellor, and Syndic of that city procured. This Edition was followed by ſeveral others (5) printed in different places, and ſometimes with additions borrowed from other Writers. Morerl, in copying Ghilini, tho' he does not cite him, gives a very imperfect account of the titles of Julius Clarus's Works. Here follow his words: "He writ ſeveral "Treatiſes: *Opera Juridica. Receptarum Sententiarum* "*Opera omnia. Volumen in quo omnium Criminum ma*"*teria ſub acceptis ſententiis copioſiſſime tractatur.*" This is ſaying almoſt nothing with regard to the particular titles of his Works, and only repeating the ſame thing three or four times over in different words. The worſt circumſtance is, that it was imagined, all the works which were particularly ſpecified by him, differ from one another; but this is an egregious miſtake. The encomiums which John Fichard beſtows on our Julius Clarus are very juſt (6); and ought not to be ſuſpected of flattery, upon pretence that he had adviſed his dear friend Sigiſmund Feyrabend to reprint the works of that Author. Such a pretence is ſometimes very juſt; for, when a man is engaged to beſtow encomiums, for the honour of his own judgment as well as for the advantage of a Bookſeller whom he favours and directs, he does not always proportion, to the merit of Authors, the expreſſions he makes uſe of in applauding them.

(4) Idem, ibid.

(5) I uſe the Frankfort edition of 1582, in folio.

(6) *Inter illos jam recitatos* (Juriſperitos) *cum hic Julius Clarus vir multis certe nominibus inſignis, ſive genoroſos natales . . . ſive eruditionem (in Jure potiſſimum civili) plane raram, ſive dexteritatem denique in his quæ tractanda ſibi ſumit feliciſſimam ſpectemus facile princeps ſit &c.* Jo. Fichard. *Epiſtola Dedicatoria Operum Julii Clari.* i. e. "Greatly ſupe"rior to all the "Lawyers a"bove cited, was "Julius Clarus, "a man conſpi"cuous on ſeve"ral accounts, "for his high "birth, his rare "and uncom"mon know"ledge, particu"larly in the "Civil Law; "and laſtly, for "the peculiar fe"licity with "which he treat"ed his ſubjects.

as Carthagena, when he was ſeized with a fit of ſickneſs which carried him off the 13th of April 1575. He was buried in Milan, in the Church *della Pace* or of Peace, in the ſepulchre he had cauſed to be made for himſelf, anno 1566 (c). He was born the 6th of January 1525 (d).

(c) Konig, miſled by this date, which is found in the epitaph of Julius Clarus, imagined falſely that he died in 1566; but this is only the date of the erecting of the monument.

(d) Extracted from Ghilini, Part 1. pag. 131, 132.

CLAUDE (JOHN) a Miniſter of the Church of Paris, and born in 1619, at Sauvetat in Agenois, was one of the greateſt men of the Eccleſiaſtical profeſſion. He ſtudied as far as Philoſophy under his father (a), and after going through a courſe of it, together with Divinity, at Montauban he was ordained in 1645, and was made Miniſter of a Church of Fief, called la Treine. He performed the functions of a Miniſter there a twelve-month, and afterwards was Miniſter of a Church of St. Africk in Rouergue, and eight years after, Paſtor of that of Nimes. As the Proteſtants had an Univerſity in the laſt mentioned city, Mr. Claude had an opportunity of diſplaying one of his chief talents, viz. that of explaining very happily a theological ſubject. He uſed to read to ſuch as were candidates for the Miniſtry, private Lectures, which were ſo well adapted to the pulpit, and the underſtanding of the Scriptures, that great benefit was reaped from them. He had undertaken to refute the piece entitled the *Method*, written by Cardinal de Richlieu [A]; but hearing that Mr. Martel, Profeſſor of Divinity in Montauban, had a ſynodical commiſſion for that purpoſe (b), he laid aſide his deſign. Having oppoſed, in a ſynod of the Lower Languedoc, a man whom the Court had won over to attempt a reunion, he was puniſhed for it by a decree of Council, which forbad him the exerciſe of the functions of a Miniſter in Languedoc; he having exerciſed them eight years at Nimes. Mr. Claude went to Paris to get, if poſſible, this reſolution taken off; and it was during his journey that he wrote a little book, which occaſioned the moſt famous diſpute that was ever carried on in France between the Proteſtants and Roman Catholicks [B]. After ſtaying ſix months to no purpoſe in Paris, he took a journey to Montauban, where he

(a) He was a Miniſter, and after being Paſtor of the Church of Sauvetat, he was Paſtor over that of Montbaziliac and of Cours near Bergerac.

(b) Mr. Martel's Anſwer was printed at Roan in 1673, 4to.

[A] *He had undertaken to refute the piece, entitled* the Method, *written by Cardinal de Richelieu.*] It will not be improper to inform the reader, that this *Method* was quite printed off the firſt of February 1651; this, I ſay, will not be improper, becauſe ſeveral perſons might otherwiſe think that it was finiſhed at a different time, when they read, that it was publiſhed, when Mr. Claude was already Miniſter of the Church of Nimes. *In hac filium Iſaacum ſuſcepit 5 Mart.* 1653, *eoque tempore ad Eccleſiam Nemauſenſem . . . vocatus fuit, ſed taboriоſiſſimum erat munus illud, tum quod conciones quotidie habendæ eſſent, tum ob alia negotia paſtoralia. Nihilominus ingenium & aſſiduitas viri non tantum occupationibus illis ſuffecit, ſed & ſtudiis continuandis; ita ut editum* TUNC *à Cardinale Richelio contra Reformatos librum qui* Methodus *dicitur, refutandum ſuſceperit* (1). i. e. "In this place his ſon Iſaac was "born, March 5, 1653, and at that time he was called "to the Church of Niſmes, which was an extremely "laborious employment, as well becauſe Sermons were "preached every day in that Church, as on account of "other eccleſiaſtical functions. Nevertheleſs, ſo happy was Mr. Claude's genius, and his aſſiduity ſo "great, that he not only diſcharged thoſe various duties, but even purſued his ſtudies; ſo that he under-"took to refute the book which was publiſhed at that "time againſt the Proteſtants, entitled *the Method*, and "written by Cardinal Richelieu." He could not have been in that employment before the year 1654, for before he was Preacher at Nimes, he had been eight years Miniſter of St. Africk (2); and, a year before that, Paſtor of la Treine (3). Theſe nine years added to 1645, which was the date of his being ordained Miniſter (4), make 1654.

(1) *Acta Eruditor. Lipſ.* 1687, pag. 658. Take notice that the following words, *conciones quotidie habendæ eſſent*, are not to be underſtood as if Mr. Claude had preached every day, for the *Abridgment of his Life* ſays only, that Sermons were preached every day in the church of Nimes, there being three or four Miniſters at leaſt, belonging to it.

(2) *Abregé de ſa Vie*, pag. 15.

(3) Idem, pag. 10.

(4) Idem, ibid.

When Mr. Claude's Library was ſold at the Hague, it was found, that he had wrote a great many particulars in his copy of this book of Cardinal Richelieu; on which account many people were eager to purchaſe it. I have been told, that it was ſent to France ſoon after, to be lodged in the King's Library.

[B] *He wrote a little Book, which occaſioned the moſt famous diſpute, that was ever carried on in France, between the Proteſtants and Roman-Catholicks* (5).] Meſſieurs de Port-Royal were at that time uſing their utmoſt endeavours, to make a convert of Mr. de Turenne to the Romiſh Religion; and for that purpoſe they employed an argument which was pleaſant enough, viz. to ſhew, that the Proteſtant Churches had always believed, what is taught in that of the Romaniſts, concerning the Real Preſence. The latter preſented him with a little piece, in which they pretended to prove, that a change of belief, ſuch as the Proteſtants ſuppoſe, is impoſſible. Mr. de Turenne's Lady, who always dreaded what happened after her deceaſe, viz. that her huſband would turn Roman Catholic, did all that lay in her power to confirm him in the Proteſtant Faith. For this reaſon, ſhe cauſed an anſwer to be made to the piece of Meſſieurs de Port-Royal. Mr. Claude was appointed to write it, and he acquitted himſelf admirably well on this occaſion. It was thought to be ſo very ingenious, ſo delicate and ſtrong, that ſeveral copies were taken of it (6). Meſſieurs de Port-Royal hearing this, thought themſelves abſolutely obliged to anſwer it, which they did, by publiſhing in 1664, the famous work, entitled, *La Perpetuité de la Foi de l'Egliſe Catholique touchant l'Euchariſtie.* i. e. "the Perpetuity of the Catholick Church with regard "to the Euchariſt." It contains the firſt piece, and a reply to Mr. Claude's anſwer. This Miniſter, who was then at Montauban, wrote a reply, which was printed with his firſt anſwer in 1666 (7). This work is entitled, *Réponſe aux deux Traitez intitulez, la Perpetuité de la Foi de l'Egliſe Catholique touchant l'Euchariſtie.* i. e. "An Anſwer to the Perpetuité &c." It made a prodigious noiſe, ſo that every Country-Parſon who had never heard of Du Moulin or of Daillé, knew very well that Mr. Claude, the Proteſtant Miniſter, had attacked the holy Sacrament in a very dangerous manner. The Country-Preachers, from thoſe of the greateſt fame to ſuch as were moſt obſcure among 'em, affected to preach, during the Sacrament-week, and on all other occaſions, againſt the poſſibility of this innovation. The pulpits at that time rung with nothing but Paſchaſius, Lanfrank, Ratramnus &c. It is certain, that the beautiful turn, the politeneſs and good ſenſe, which accompanied the ſolid arguments of Mr. Claude, contributed vaſtly to the great fame, which his Book acquired: but nevertheleſs, the ſtate in which Janſeniſm was at that time, was one of the chief cauſes of the mighty noiſe this work made. Several Biſhops were profeſſed friends to Meſſieurs de Port-Royal; many others favoured them ſecretly; this party had, in all places, a choſen number of learned men, who dared to ſpeak their thoughts (for men were not prohibited ſpeaking on theſe matters till 1668;) and words could never deſcribe the warmth with which the Janſeniſts extolled the Books of their party. Hence it happened, that in labouring for their own glory, they ſpread in all places the name and merit of Mr. Claude. Their enemies, on the other ſide, endeavoured very ſtrenuouſly, tho' by indirect and hidden practices, to ſet off the work of this Miniſter (8): they conſidered his triumph as nothing, provided it could but leſſen the joy of Meſſieurs de Port-Roial. This doubtleſs contributed very much to heighten the reputation which Mr. Claude's Book obtained; ſo neceſſary it is for ſome books to appear at certain ſeaſons (9), and to be wrote againſt certain perſons, rather than in other junctures.

(5) See the Remark [O] of the Article ARNAUD (Anthony) Doctor of the Sorbonne.

(6) Here follows what is ſaid in the Preface of the *Perpetuité &c.*
"His party extolled it in an extraordinary manner, and took ſo many written copies of it, which they ſpread every where, both in Paris and in the Provinces; ſo that, had it been printed, it could not have been made much more public."

(7) See citation (58) of the Article (ARNAULD (Anthony) Doctor of the Sorbonne.

(8) This work was ſold by the Bookſeller of the Archbiſhop of Paris. See the Preface of Mr. Claude's book againſt Father Nouet.

(9) *Quantum intereſt in quæ tempora cujuſque virtus incideriт!*

he preached the day after his arrival (*c*), and accepted the offer which the people of that Church made him. Four years after he was forbid by the Court to exercise his functions in Montauban, which obliged him to go a second time to Paris. He continued there near nine months, *without being able to remove the weighty obſtacles which oppoſed his return to Montauban.... During this interval, he was invited to the Church of Bourdeaux*, but the Congregation of Charenton being unwilling *to loſe a perſon of Mr. Claude's abilities* (*d*), invited him to it in 1666. From that time, till the revocation of the Edict of Nantz, he did very great ſervice to that Church, and to the whole body, by his excellent works, and by the detail he deſcended to, with regard to the affairs which the Deputies of Provinces communicated to him. No man was ever better qualified to head either a Conſiſtory or a Synod [*C*], or to diſpute off-hand. He diſcovered this latter talent in the laſt conference which Mademoiſelle de Duras deſired to hear [*D*]. He was diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the Miniſters, by the manner in which the Court ordered him to leave the Kingdom [*E*]. He made Holland his aſylum, where he met with a very kind reception, and was honoured with a conſiderable penſion by the Prince of Orange. He uſed to preach from time to time at the Hague, and his laſt Sermon was on Chriſtmas day 1686. He diſplayed his excellent talent at that time, to as great or greater advantage than ever, and the Princeſs of Orange was extremely well pleaſed with his Sermon. He fell ill that very day of a ſickneſs, of which he died the 13th of January 1687. Being on his death-bed, he gave ſeveral teſtimonies of his piety, and the ſincerity with which he had profeſſed the Proteſtant Religion (*e*). His death was a great grief to the whole

(*c*) It was a Sacrament Day.

(*d*) *Abregé de ſa Vie de Mr. Claude*, pag. 43.

(*e*) Extracted from the *Abridgment of his Life*, written by Mr. de la Deveze, Paſtor at the Hague. I have corrected the error with regard to the date of the year of Mr. Claude's birth.

Mr. Arnauld undertook to refute Mr. Claude's book, and publiſhed a large quarto volume in 1669. Some time after, two more volumes were made public. But before the firſt volume in queſtion appeared, Father Nouet, a famous Jeſuit, engaged in the controverſy, and publiſhed a book againſt Mr. Claude, who wrote an anſwer to it (10), that ſome prefer to his other pieces, and which was his favourite piece (11). Father Nouet made no reply, but publiſhed a Letter containing ſixty pages in 8vo (12). The Author of the *Journal des Savans* diſcharged his artillery againſt Mr. Claude, by inſerting the Extract of that Jeſuit's Book (13). He expatiated very much on the qualities and manner of diſputing (which he ſays was one of the characteriſtics of that Miniſter's genius) and as he ſpoke of him in very unhandſome terms, Mr. Claude was not endued with patience enough to be ſilent on this occaſion. He accordingly publiſhed a very witty *Provinciale* (14) againſt the Author of the Journal, which was anſwered by the latter ſome time after (15). This conteſt went no farther; but with regard to Mr. Arnauld, Mr. Claude was forced to engage in a very laborious ſtudy, in order to examine the tenets of the Greek Church, and thoſe of the Eaſtern Schiſmaticks. He alſo was obliged to read a great many Travels, and to build a multitude of hypotheſes. Mr. Claude ſhewed all the learning and abilities he had ever diſplayed in the Anſwer he publiſhed to Mr. Arnauld's firſt volume. The Janſeniſts have only made a general Reply to this Book of Mr. Claude. It is true indeed that, with regard to the opinion of the Greeks, Father Paris Friar of St. Genevieve came to their aſſiſtance, and took up the pen againſt this Miniſter. The ſubject of the diſpute was changed ſome time after: The Janſeniſts publiſhed their *Préjugez légitimes contre le Calviniſme*. i. e. "Juſt Prejudices againſt Calviniſm," which Mr. Claude refuted by one of the beſt works, that either himſelf or any other Proteſtant Clergyman ever compoſed; and which was not anſwered till 1684 (16) by Mr. Nicolle in his *Prétendus Reformez convaincus de Schiſme*: i. e. "The Proteſtants proved "Schiſmaticks."

(10) It was printed in 1668.

(11) See *l'Abregé de ſa Vie*, pag. 49.

(12) It is directed to Mr. Claude, and dated the 1ſt of Oct. 1668; whence we do not know what he means in page 5. where he aſſerts, that the anſwer which he wrote to Mr. Claude, had employed that Miniſter near three years, for F. Nouet's work was not publiſhed before the latter end of 1666; the Booksellers put 1667 in the title.

(13) In the *Journal of June the 28th* 1667.

(14) It is an anonymous Letter, and entitled, *Lettre d'un Provincial à un de ſes Amis ſur le ſujet du Journal du 28 Juin* 1667.

(15) In the *Journal of December the 26th* 1667.

(16) It is entitled, *Defenſe de la Reformation*. It was firſt printed in 4to at Roan anno 1673; and afterwards at the Hague, in 1682, 12mo.

[*C*] *No man was ever better qualified to head either a Conſiſtory or Synod.*] This cannot be deſcribed better than by the following words. "Mr. Claude ſhone "chiefly when at the head of an Aſſembly, as was "manifeſt during the ſeveral years that he preſided in "the Conſiſtory of Charenton, and in more Synods "than one of the Iſle of France, where he aſſiſted in qua"lity of a Moderator .... Whenever matters of a "difficult nature in themſelves, (and ſtill more per"plexed by the cloud which the ignorance or cun"ning of the parties threw over it,) were propoſed in "the Synod, Mr. Claude was poſſeſſed of ſo ſagaci"ous a faculty, that he in a moment would clear up "all theſe confuſed ideas, and lay down a clear and "exact propoſition; and give his opinion thereupon in "the moſt perſpicuous manner, as tho' the opinions "had really depended only on a negative or an affirmative; a characteriſtick by which we may al"ways form a true judgment of a perſon who preſides "in an Aſſembly; ſince the choice of ſubjects, and "the beautiful light in which they are placed, are a "ſure proof of the ready wit, clearneſs, and ſtrength of "a great genius (17)."

(17) *Abregé de ſa Vie*, pag. 75, *& ſeq.*

[*D*] *Or to diſpute off-hand. He diſcovered this latter talent in the laſt Conference which Mademoiſelle de Duras deſired to hear.*] This Lady (18) would not forſake her Religion till ſhe had heard the Biſhop of Meaux and Mr. Claude diſpute in her preſence: ſhe accordingly had her wiſh, for theſe two brave and illuſtrious Champions diſputed together at the Counteſs de Roie's her ſiſter's, the firſt of March 1678. Each Diſputant wrote the relation of his conference, and aſcribed the victory to himſelf. Theſe relations were at firſt only handed about in manuſcript; but at laſt the Biſhop of Meaux publiſhed his Relation anno 1682, and that of Mr. Claude followed ſoon after. The Authors of the *Acta Eruditorum* have not diſtinguiſhed the date of the Conference, from that in which thoſe Relations were publiſhed. *Poſtea*, ſay they (19), *anno* 1683, *occaſione illuſtris* Duraſiæ *à Reformata ad Romanam religionem tranſeuntis, colloquium cum Epiſcopo Condomenſi, poſtea Meldenſi, habuit, cujus relationem, ut notum eſt, uterque edidit.* i. e. "Afterwards, *ſay they*, "in 1683, on occaſion of the moſt illuſtrious Made"moiſelle de Duras's forſaking the Proteſtant Religion "and turning Roman Catholic, Mr. Claude had a "conference with the Biſhop of Condom, afterwards "Biſhop of Meaux. 'Tis well known that both diſ"putants publiſhed their reſpective Relations of this "Conference."

(18) Siſter of the Marſhal de Duras, & de Lorge.

(19) *Acta Eruditor.* 1687, pag. 661.

[*E*] *He was diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the Miniſters, by the manner, in which the Court ordered him to leave the Kingdom.*] Here follows a paſſage from pag. 100 of the Epitome of his Life. *He, like the other Miniſters, had a fortnight allowed him to leave the Kingdom: but the Romiſh Clergy found means to ſhorten even that time; for on Monday the 22d of October* (20) 1685, *the day on which the Edict of the Revocation of that of Nantz was regiſtred in the Parliament of Paris, Mr. Claude, at ten in the morning, was ordered to leave France in four and twenty hours* (21). *He obeyed with the utmoſt ſubmiſſion, and ſet out, attended by one of the King's footmen, that was ordered to conduct him to the frontiers of France, and who, tho' he executed his orders faithfully, yet treated Mr. Claude with civility; ſo true it is, that exalted merit has a great influence even on the hearts of thoſe, who do not love the Proteſtant Religion ..... He ſet out from Paris, in the Bruſſels coach; and his fame flying before him, procured him ſeveral obliging offices from many perſons in his journey* (22). *He paſſed thro' Cambray where he lay; and was there preſented with ſome refreſhments by the Jeſuits; the Father Rector did Mr. Claude the honour to pay him a viſit, which Mr. Claude returned; and the difference of Religion did not interrupt this obliging correſpondence and marks of a reciprocal eſteem.*

(20) It is December in *l'Abregé de ſa Vie*. In the Extract which the Authors of *Acta Erudit.* gave of his life in 1687, pag. 662, there's *die 7 Decemb.*

(21) This he himſelf declares in pag. 92, 93. of the *Plaintes des Proteſtans.*

(22) *Abregé de ſa Vie*, pag. 101.

whole party, and affected all the judicious among them ſo much the more, as ſcarce any one but himſelf was capable of removing the errors into which ſome raſh writers led perſons of credulous diſpoſitions, and of ballancing the faction of thoſe people. Many have ſaid, that had he lived longer, ſo many ſcandalous quarrels would not have broke out, which have ſince given ſo much pleaſure to the Roman Catholics; but many others believe and aſſert, that it would have been impoſſible for any man to have ſtopt the motion which that wheel had already taken before Mr. Claude died. I cannot ſay which of theſe two opinions is the moſt juſt (*f*). He left a ſon, a Miniſter [*F*], who publiſhed ſeveral fine pieces of his deceaſed father. I would expatiate in the commendation of Mr. Claude, and againſt the rude efforts of ſlander, did I not find that the Editors of Moreri in Holland, ſay all that can be advanced on this head. I ſhall cite ſome errors of the ſuppldment of Moreri, printed in France [*G*]. Monſr. Paulian has treated Mr. Claude very injuriouſly

(*f*) *Non noſtrum inter vos tantas componere lites.* Virgil. Eclog. 3. ver. 108. i. e. "It is not for us "to end ſuch "mighty ſtrife."

[*F*] *He left a ſon, a Miniſter.*] Mr. Claude married at Caſtres in 1648 (23), and his wife brought him Isaac Claude, who was born at St. Afrique the 5th of March 1653 (24). "His father was very fond "of him, and very well pleaſed to find that his incli-"nations led him to the Miniſtry; and that the choice "he made, and which ought to be free and uncon-"ſtrained, correſponded ſo well with his deſires. He had "had the ſatisfaction to find his ſon capable of im-"proving from his learning as well as example. He "ſtudied in the Univerſities of France under the ableſt "Maſters, who inſtructed him very carefully; after "which he returned to his father, who compleated "him in his ſtudies, eſpecially in thoſe relating to the "Pulpit; after which he was examined at Sedan in "September 1678, and judged very worthy of being "admitted into the Miniſtry. He was invited by the "Congregation of the Church of Clermont in Beau-"voiſis, fourteen leagues from Paris, in the Synod of "the Iſle of France; and his father had the ſatisfac-"tion to impoſe his hands on him the 9th of Octo-"ber 1678 (25)," and to ſee him Miniſter of the Walloon Church at the Hague, when he retired to Holland in 1685. Isaac Claude died at the Hague, July the 29th 1695. He was the fourth of his family, who, from father to ſon, had exerciſed the miniſterial functions, for his great grandfather was a Miniſter. Mr. de la Deveze has omitted this circumſtance. Mr. Claude left one or two ſons who are now purſuing their ſtudies.

(23) Idem, pag. 14.

(24) Idem, pag. 15.

(25) Idem, pag. 74, 75.

[*G*] *I ſhall cite ſome errors of the Supplement of Moreri, printed in France.*] Firſt, Salvetat (26) the native place of Mr. Claude, is not *a ſmall Town of the upper Languedoc, at a little diſtance from Caſtres.* II, It is an error to aſſert, that Mr. Claude's father *wiſhing earneſtly to ſee his ſon ſoon in the pulpit, ordained him before he was 25 years of age.* Mr. Claude was appointed Miniſter in 1645, and conſequently was 26 years old when he began to exerciſe his vocation. Now, at this age, thoſe who are deſigned for the pulpit, and are not yet admitted into the Miniſtry, begin to be look'd upon as veteran Candidates for it (27). It is therefore a falſe aſſertion to ſay, that Mr. Claude's father was impatient about his ſon. III, It is abſurd to ſuppoſe, that, to ſatisfy his impatience, he was obliged to employ his credit and intereſt in upper Guienne and upper Languedoc: for, had he been impatient, this circumſtance muſt have been founded merely on his ſon's having been admitted to Orders, when he had ſtudied Divinity during three years only; but a Candidate for Orders of ſo much good ſenſe as Mr. Claude, and of his age, makes a greater progreſs in three years than others in four or five. IV, Mr. Claude did not read *public Lectures of Divinity at Nimes.* He never was Profeſſor, and only read private Lectures there: this is declared expreſly in the Epitome of his Life (28). V, He did not declare, that he undertook his firſt journey to Paris, *with this view only, viz. to ſhew that he had no exception to make againſt the project of a reunion, which was concerting in France.* VI, The ſuppoſition made by the Author of the Supplement, viz. that Mr. Claude was prohibited the exerciſe of the functions of a Miniſter in Languedoc, by a Decree of the Council, on account of his averſion to the intended reunion, is conformable to the relation of Mr. de la Deveze (29). But to ſuppoſe, that the King's Arret or Decree contained this reaſon, would be a groſs miſtake. Now, this muſt have been ſuppoſed, ſince it was aſſerted, that Mr. Claude could not pretend to juſtify himſelf, but by ſhewing ſome inclination for a reunion. Let the reader examine carefully the paſſage of the Supplement, wherein the Author endeavours to ſhew that Mr. Claude was guilty of a knaviſh artifice, during this journey; and which this Writer ſtrives to prove by the following remark, viz. Mr. Claude wrote a Book againſt the Piece, entitled, *La Perpetuité de la Foi.* Let the reader, I ſay, examine this attentively, and he will find that Moreri's Continuator ſuppoſes evidently, that Mr. Claude employed no other means to get his prohibition taken off, but by declaring, that it had been obtained by ſurprize; and that it was not true, as was ſuppoſed in the Decree, that he oppoſed the intended deſign of a reunion. A Miniſter who ſhould have ſpoke in this ſtrain at Court, and who nevertheleſs had wrote a controverſial Treatiſe like that of Mr. Claude, would certainly have been a knave. But it is a falſity to aſſert, that he endeavoured to clear himſelf at Court by ſuch a method. VII, I think that reaſon a very falſe one, which is given in the Supplement, for his not accepting the offer of the Univerſity of Groninguen. I have always heard, that the invitations of the Conſiſtory of Charenton, and the entreaties of ſeveral particular perſons, were the only motives which determined Mr. Claude to refuſe civilly the offer made him by the States of Groninguen. VIII, It is not true, that *even the French Proteſtants themſelves never look'd upon his Sermons as excellent ones*; for they contained all thoſe things which the Proteſtants in queſtion could deſire: ſuch as the greateſt regularity and order, a deep ſearch into Divinity, much ſublimity and majeſty, a nervous, maſculine eloquence, and a juſtneſs of argument. The Proteſtants pay no regard to thoſe worldly ornaments, nor to that effeminate kind of Rhetorick, of which the Romiſh Preachers make ſo great a parade. All that can be ſaid on this ſubject, is, that Mr. Claude had not a pleaſing voice; which gave occaſion to a ſmart ſaying of Mr. Morus (30), which however did not leſſen the great fame and the eſteem in which his Sermons were had. IX, It is an errant falſhood to aſſert, that *the perſons of the greateſt learning among the Calviniſts* have owned, that the diſtinguiſhing characteriſticks of Mr. Claude, *were properly, that of an able ſophiſter, and of an artful declaimer.* X. Nothing can be more ſurprizing, than their pretending to prove this by ſome particulars which the *illuſtrious Viſcount de Turenne* might have ſaid; for it is univerſally known, that this Hero, who poſſeſſed a wonderful genius with regard to all parts of the ſcience of war, and the functions of a General, did not pretend to be a ſcholar; and could not be conſidered as a competent judge in controverſial writings. XI. Nothing can have more the air of a romance, I mean of that kind of romance, the incidents of which are moſt repugnant to truth and veriſimilitude, than this pretended project of Mr. Claude, in which the Proteſtant Miniſters were *to deſire a conference with the Romiſh Biſhops.* It is univerſally known, that under the reign of Mr. Claude (if I may ſo expreſs my ſelf) both himſelf and the reſt of the Proteſtant Miniſters look'd upon all propoſals, with regard to a controverſy or conference, as ſo many ſnares. One of them (31) publiſhed a work on this ſubject (32), wherein he ſhewed, that great care ought to be taken, not to fall into this ſnare. XII. I have nothing to obſerve, with regard to the myſterious conference, which it is pretended Mr. Claude deſired to have with the Archbiſhop of Paris. This is refuted in a Memoir which the ſon of that great man inſerted in the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages*

(26) It ſhould be *Sauvetat.*

(27) The age of 27 years, which the Authors of *Acta Eruditorum* diſcovered from the Relation of Mr. de la Deveze, ſhould have made them attend to the paſſage which they have tranſlated in the following manner. *Manus imponente patre qui filium functioni ſacræ* Maturæ *addici ceptabat.* Acta Erudit. 1687, pag. 658.

(28) Pag. 18.

(29) In the *Abrégé de la Vie de Mr. Claude*, pag. 19.

(30) When Mr. Claude was firſt deſigned for a Miniſter of the Church of Charenton, he preached a Sermon there, which being ended, Mr. Morus ſaid, "All "the voices will "be for him, "except his "own."

(31) The ſame who afterwards publiſhed "*Hiſtoire de l'Edit. de Nantes.*

(32) It is mentioned in the *Republique des Lettres*, for May 1685, pag. 574. of the 2d edition. See alſo the month of December of the ſame year, pag. 1333.

injuriouſly, in his Critique of Mr. Jurieu's Paſtoral Letters; and has falſely aſcribed to him a book, and the idea or deſign of another [*H*]. He has even preſumed to aſſert in print, that his death gave great ſatisfaction to the Author of thoſe Paſtoral Letters.

(33) For Nov. 1689, pag. 133, *& ſeq.*

vrages des Savans (33). See alſo the Dutch Edition of Moreri. It is a ſhame to our age, that any perſons ſhould have been ſo bold, as to inſert in an Hiſtorical Dictionary printed at Paris, ſo very improbable a romance; and that this boldneſs ſhould have been ſuffered to paſs uncenſured. XIII. Mr. Claude left Paris to go to the Hague, the 22d of October, and not the 22d of December 1685. XIV. Laſtly, it is falſe to declare, that Mr. Claude ever admitted the infallibility of the Church.

[*H*] *Paulianus has falſly aſcribed to him a Book, and the idea or plan of another.*] He aſcribes to him the Letter concerning ſome pacific Proteſtants, publiſhed in 1685. He aſſerts, that Mr. Claude owns himſelf the Author of it, in ſome Letters; and that a Lady, his particular friend, had lately owned this publickly. He cites in the margin, *Lettre à Mademoiſelle Dangeau, & Madame de la Garde* (34). Theſe proofs ſeem very ſtrong, and nevertheleſs, Mr. Claude did not write the Letter concerning the pacific Proteſtants, I am fully perſuaded, that he never informed any perſon in writing, that he was the Author of the Letter in queſtion. The Author of the critique of the Paſtoral Letters has committed as great a miſtake, in aſſerting (35), that Mr. Claude undertook to write the Hiſtory of the Perſecution, under the title of *Hiſtoire Dragonale*, but died before he had finiſh'd it. Mr. Claude had too fine a pen to chooſe ſuch a title: beſides, he was not writing the Hiſtory of the laſt perſecution; but that of the Princes of Orange.

(34) This is about the end of the Book.

(35) Pag. 16.

CLAUDIUS, in Latin *Tiberius Claudius Druſus*, a Roman Emperor, aſcended the throne after the death of Caligula his nephew, the year of Rome 794 (*a*). Moreri has enlarged very much on this Emperor. I ſhall leave to another opportunity the examination of what this writer relates concerning him, and the additions I my ſelf could furniſh on that head. I ſhall now obſerve only that this Emperor would not ſuffer any perſon who was ignorant of the Latin Tongue to poſſeſs an employment. It was for this reaſon that he removed a Magiſtrate, ſprung from one of the moſt illuſtrious families of Greece, and reduced him to the condition of a ſtranger or foreigner. Rome had long before diſcovered this jealouſy for the majeſty of its language; and the like paſſion has been ſeen in other countries [*A*]. This Emperor however ſet a high value on the Greek

(*a*) That is, the 41ſt of the Chriſtian Æra.

[*A*] *He would not ſuffer any perſon who was ignorant of the Latin tongue, to poſſeſs an employment. . . . Rome had long before diſcovered this jealouſy for the Majeſty of its language and the like paſſion has been ſeen in other countries.*] I have prepared my Reader (1) to expect ſome particulars relating to the zeal and veneration which nations have for their reſpective languages. We will begin with the proof of what we have advanced concerning the Emperour Claudius. *Splendidum virum, Græciæque Provinciæ Principem, verum Latini ſermonis ignarum non modo albo judicum evaſit, ſed etiam in peregrinitatem redegit* (2). i. e. "He not only erazed out of the roll of Judges, but "even deprived of his freedom, a very conſiderable "man, and deputy of a Province of Greece, who was "ignorant of the Latin tongue." In judging an affair of importance, which related to the Lycians, he aſked ſome queſtion in Latin of one of their Deputies who was born in Lycia, and had been made a citizen of Rome: but finding that the Deputy did not underſtand the Latin tongue, he took away his freedom; for, added he, thoſe who are ignorant of the language of Rome, cannot be Romans. Εἰπὼν μὴ δεῖν Ῥωμαῖον εἶναι τὸν μὴ κ᾽ τὴν διάλεξιν σφῶν ἐπιστάμενον (3). I ſhall take notice by the way of a miſtake of Caſaubon: he ſuppoſes that this Deputy was born in Rome (4), and he probably conſulted the Latin tranſlation with more attention than the original Greek; for had he duly weighed the import of the following words: Ἀνὴρ μὲν τὸ ἀρχαῖον ὢν ὁς, Ῥωμαῖος ϗ γεγονὼς. . . . i. e. "A "Lycian originally, but a citizen of Rome at that "time," he would have found, eſpecially by what follows, that they were ill tranſlated, *Lycium quidem origine, Romanum tamen natum* i. e. "ſprung from "a Lycian family, but born in Rome." The tranſlator of Xiphilinus has ſucceeded better, he explaining them as follows, *Qui olim Lycius, tum civis Romanus erat* (5).

(1) In the note [*F*] of the Article ATTILA.

(2) Sueton. *in Claudio*, cap. 16.

(3) Dio, lib. 59. *ad ann.* 796. pag. m. 777.

(4) *De legato Lyciorum quodam, oriundo quidem è Lycia, ſed nato Romæ.* Caſaub. *in Sueton. Claud.* cap. 16.

(5) Xiphil. *in Claudio*, pag. m. 148.

Valerius Maximus obſerves, as a proof of the ancient gravity of the Romans, that their Magiſtrates always anſwered the Greeks in Latin, and obliged them to make uſe of an interpreter. They did this, not only at Rome, but alſo in Greece and Aſia. To ſhew my readers the full extent of their policy, I will quote the paſſage of this Author, by which he will ſee, how ambitious the Romans were to ſpread their language. *Magiſtratus vero priſci quantopere ſuam populique Romani majeſtatem retinentes ſe geſſerint, hinc cognoſci potaſt, quod inter cetera obtinendæ gravitatis indicia, illud quoque magna cum perſeverantia cuſtodiebant, ne Græcis unquam niſi Latine reſponſa darent. Quinetiam ipſa linguæ volubilitate, qua plurimum valent, excuſſa, per interpretem loqui cogebant, non in urbe tantum noſtra, ſed etiam in Græcia, & Aſia; quo ſcilicet Latinæ vocis honos per omnes gentes venerabilior diffunderetur. Nec illis deerant ſtudia doctrinæ, ſed nulla non in re gallium togæ ſubjici debere arbitrabantur, indignum eſſe exiſtimantes, illecebris, & ſuavitate literarum imperii pondus & auctoritatem domari* (6). i. e. "How greatly zealous "the Magiſtrates of antient times were, to retain their "own majeſty and that of the Roman people, may "be known from this circumſtance, that, among the "examples of enforcing their grandeur, they obſerv-"ed the following cuſtom inviolably; viz. to never "to treat with the Greeks, unleſs theſe would conſent "do it in Latin. Farther, they obliged thoſe people "to explain by an interpreter all ſuch expreſſions as "had flowed from the great volubility of their tongues, "for which they are noted. This was enjoined, not "only in Rome, but likewiſe in Greece and Aſia; "in order that the glory of the Latin Tongue might "be ſpread in the moſt auguſt manner poſſible thro' "all Nations of the univerſe. Nor were they un-"ſkilled in learning; but it was their opinion that "Greece ſhould always give way to the Romans, and "that it was inglorious for the face and majeſty of "Empire, to ſubmit to the delicacies and ſweets "of language." He obſerves ſoon after, that Molo the Rhetorician, who taught Cicero eloquence, was the firſt man that was allowed to ſpeak Greek in the Senate, which afterwards became a cuſtom. *Quis ergo huic conſuetudini, qua nunc Græcis actionibus aures curiæ exſurdantur, januam patefacit? ut opinor, Molo rhetor, qui ſtudia M. Ciceronis acuit. Eum namque ante omnes exterarum gentium in ſenatu ſine interprete auditum conſtat. Quem honorem non immerito cepit, quoniam ſummam vim Romanæ eloquentiæ adjuverat* (7). i. e. "Who therefore firſt brought in this cuſtom, by which "the ears of the Court are deafened with pleadings "in Greek? If I miſtake not, it was Molo the Rhe-"torician, who improved Cicero in his ſtudies. For "it is certain that he was the firſt Foreigner whom the "Senate permitted to ſpeak without employing an "interpreter. Molo was worthy of this honour, he "having added the greateſt ſtrength to the Roman "eloquence." Dion confirms what Valerius Maximus ſays on this occaſion, viz that cauſes were pleaded in the Greek tongue at Rome, under the Empire of Tiberius (8); nevertheleſs, this Emperor would not permit any ſoldier born in Greece, to give evidence in his native

(6) Val. Maxim. lib. 2. cap. 2. num. 2. pag. m. 140, 141.

(7) Idem, ibid. nnm. 3. pag. 142.

(8) Dio, lib. 57. pag. 702. *ad ann.* 769.

(b) Sueton. *in Claudio*, cap. 42.

Greek tongue (*b*), and even ſpoke it, when he himſelf anſwered the Embaſſadors in the Senate.

CLAVIUS

native language before a Judge (9). Dion informs us of this particular. Suetonius mentions it; but it is not probable, that he wrote theſe words, which are found in his Book, *Militem quoque Græce teſtimonium interrogatum niſi Latine reſpondere vetuit* (10). i. e. "He enacted, that when a ſoldier ſhould be interrogated or examined in Greek, he ſhould make his anſwers only in Latin." It is better to read *Græcum* than *Græce*; for it was no leſs unworthy the Majeſty of Rome, to examine witneſſes in the Greek tongue, than to permit them to anſwer in that language; for which reaſon we ought to conclude, that had Tiberius allowed the one, he would not have prohibited the other; and that ſince he forbid the anſwers to be made in Greek, he would not permit interrogatories to be made in that language. His ſcruples, when he was obliged to employ a Greek term in the Senate, are related by Suetonius (11). He would rather have the thoughts expreſt paraphraſtically in decrees, than have a foreign word employed in them (12). However, this rule was not ſo general, but that it admitted of ſome exceptions; a perfect uniformity was never ſeen in the adminiſtration of the beſt governed States. The Reader muſt therefore not be ſurprized, to hear that the Roman Embaſſador made a ſpeech to the Tarentines in Greek. As he did not pronounce this language well, they laughed at him. This was one of the affronts that were put upon him, and which the Republic of Rome reſented very much to their coſt (13). The Romans were not then ſo powerful as when Cicero was reproached, as tho' he had been guilty of an unpardonable error, for having ſpoke in Greek, before a Grecian Senate. *Ille negat & ait indignum facinus eſſe quod ego in Senatu Græco verba feciſſem, quod quidem apud Græcos Græce loquutus eſſem, id ferri nullo modo poſſe* (14). "He declares that it was an unworthy action in me, to ſpeak in a Grecian Senate; and that I did an unſufferable thing in addreſſing the Greeks in their own language." This was the ſubject of the complaint; and not for his diſcourſing in Greek, at his own houſe, with Carneades, and the reſt of the Embaſſadors of Greece. The Author of the latter relation (15), has committed a wretched blunder. Cicero was not born till long after Carneades's Embaſſy; but this is not the only blunder I could point out in the above cited words of the Sieur le Bret. I muſt not omit a circumſtance, that furniſhes us with an example, which Caſaubon made an ill uſe of. Paulus Æmilius having ſubdued Macedonia, ſignified his orders, in Latin, to the vanquiſhed Macedonians; but Octavius the Prætor explained them preſently after in Greek. *Silentio per præconem facto Paulus Latine quæ Senatui, quæ ſibi ex conſilii ſententia viſa eſſent pronunciavit, ea Cn. Octavius Prætor (nam & ipſe aderat) interpretata ſermone Græco referebat* (16). Caſaubon pretends to prove by this paſſage of Livy, that the Magiſtrates of Rome employed their own tongue, becauſe they generally could not ſpeak Greek (17); for, adds he, thoſe who ſpoke Greek fluently, uſed it occaſionally; and he immediately gives an inſtance of this in Octavius the Prætor. This is plainly ſuppoſing, that Æmilius could not ſpeak Greek; and that had he been able, he would have ſignified his orders in that language: but this is a miſtake, for he ſpoke it fluently (18); and the reaſon why he at that time ſpoke Latin, was merely to give his words an air of authority, and becauſe it was the language of the Supreme Power or Republic of Rome.

A multitude of Authors have taken notice of a paſſage of St. Auſtin, which I ſhall cite here, concerning the policy of the ancient Romans, who at the ſame time that they ſubdued a people, obliged them to ſpeak their language, whence there was occaſion for a great number of interpreters. *Opera data eſt ut imperioſa civitas non ſolum jugum, verum etiam linguam ſuam domitis gentibus per pacem ſocietatis imponeret. Per quam non deeſſet imo & abundaret etiam interpretum copia* (19). We find by a paſſage of Gregory Thaumaturgus, that in his time the law was always ſtudied in Latin; for he ſays, that he himſelf had almoſt forgot the Greek tongue, becauſe the Roman Laws were written in a language which perplexed him very much. Ἐκφρασθέντες δὲ καὶ παραδοθέντες τῇ Ῥωμαίων φωνῇ καταπληκτικῇ μὲν καὶ ἀλαζόνι καὶ συσχηματιζομένῃ αὐτῶν τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τῇ βασιλικῇ, φορτικῇ δὲ ὅμως ἐμοὶ (20). i. e. "They are written and delivered in the Roman tongue, that haughty and formidable language, expreſſive of the power they have obtained; but to me, it is perplexing and barbarous." Triphonius the Civilian obſerves, that all the decrees of Prætors were to be made in Latin (21).

The pains which the Romans took to ſpread their language, had met with ſuch ſucceſs, that in Plutarch's time, there were few perſons but ſpoke Latin (22); and Libanius was very much afraid, leſt the Greek language ſhould be loſt, becauſe the Supreme Authority was lodged in the hands of thoſe, whoſe native tongue was the Latin (23). The Popes joined with Princes in the ſame deſign; and, if we find the Emperour Marcian, a Grecian born, prefer the Latin tongue to his own, in the Council of Chalcedon, where he firſt made a ſpeech in Latin and afterwards in Greek (24); we alſo ſee, that the Deputies of Popes, in the Councils, always read their diſpatches in Latin; and uſed to think it was an act of condeſcenſion in them, when, at the intreaty of all the fathers, they permitted theſe diſpatches to be explained in Greek (25). The public records were, during ſeveral ages, written in Latin, in moſt parts of the Weſtern World; even after it was no longer ſubject to Rome, with regard to Temporals. This will be ſeen hereafter, where I take notice of ſome nations which have aboliſhed this cuſtom. I refer the Reader to Melchior Inchofer's Book entitled, *Hiſtoria ſacræ Latinitatis*, where he will meet with ſeveral curious particulars, and among others, the following; viz, that it is probable, Jeſus Chriſt ſpoke Latin ſometimes, ſince, as he paid ſo ſtrict an obedience to the Civil Laws, and, as the Romans had eſtabliſhed their language in all places, it is not probable that Chriſt ſhould have diſpenſed with the obſervation of that Law. Beſides, as he was examined in Latin by Pontius Pilate, we are not to doubt but that he anſwered in Latin (26). This is not very conformable to the opinion of Arnobius, who affirms that our Saviour ſpoke but one language, which every one of the Auditors tho' of moſt different countries, took for his native tongue, *Unus fuit e nobis qui cum unam emitteret vocem, ab diverſis populis & diſſona oratione loquentibus, familiaribus verborum ſonis & ſuo cuique utens exiſtimabatur eloquio* (27).

I will now take notice of the zeal which other nations have ſhewn for their native tongue. The Greeks were famous for it; and I could relate ſeveral ſingular particulars on this head, but the following may ſerve as a ſpecimen. They applauded Themiſtocles (28) for ſentencing to death the Interpreter, who had attended the Embaſſadors of Perſia; and who explained in Greek, the command of thoſe Barbarians, viz, that the Grecians ſhould deliver up the land and ſea to their Sovereign (29). In Themiſtocles's opinion, ſuch a profanation of the Greek tongue, employed to expreſs the arbitrary will of a Barbarian, could be expiated no otherwiſe than by the death of the Author of ſo heinous an innovation. The Greeks were doubtleſs very much grieved when they heard what was ordered at Carthage under the firſt Dionyſius. A decree was there enacted, to forbid all the Carthaginians the ſtudy of the Greek tongue. The cauſe and deſign of this prohibition, was Suniatus's having writ a letter in Greek to Dionyſius the tyrant; and to prevent any perſon from writing or ſpeaking to the enemy, without uſing an interpreter. *Dux belli Hanno Carthaginienſis erat; cujus inimicus Suniatus, potentiſſimus ea tempeſtate Pœnorum, cum odio ejus, Græcis literis, Dionyſio adventum exercitus, & ſegnitiem ducis familiariter prænuntiaſſet, comprehenſis epiſtolis, proditionis damnatur: facto ſenatus conſulto, ne quis poſtea Carthaginienſis, aut literis Græcis aut ſermoni ſtuderet; ne aut loqui cum hoſte aut ſcribere ſine interprete poſſet* (30). i e. "Hanno, the Carthaginian had the ſupreme command in this war. His enemy, Suniatus, (at that time very powerful in Carthage) out of hatred to him, ſent advice to Dionyſius, in Greek, of the coming of the Army and the

(9) Idem, ibid.

(10) Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. 71.

(11) Idem, ibid.

(12) Idem, ibid.

(13) Dion. Hal. *in Excerptis Legat.*

(14) Cicero. *Orat. 4. in Verrem*, cap. 66.

(15) *In Verrinis etiam invenimus Marco Tullio quaſi crimen objectum quod domi cum Carneade cæteriſque Græciæ legatis Græce colloquutus fuiſſit.* Bretus, *in Ordine perantiquo Judiciorum Civilium*, cap. 43. folio 85 *verſo.*

(16) T. Livius, lib. 45. cap. 29.

(17) Caſaub. *in Baronii Exercitat. IX.* Art. 3. pag. m. 199.

(18) *Hæc Græco ſermone Perſeo* (Paulus) *Latine deinde ſuis, exemplum inſigne cernitis, inquit &c.* Livius, lib. 45. cap. 8.

(19) Auguſt. *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 19. cap. 7.

(20) Gregorius Thaumaturgus, *in Laudatione Origenis*, apud *Caſaubonum Exercit. XIX in Baron.* pag. 199.

(21) Triphon. lib. 48. *ff. de re judic.*

(22) Ὥστ μὲν (Ῥωμαίων) λέγω νῦν ὁμοῦ τι πάντες ἄνθρωποι χρῶνται. Plutarch. *in Quæſt. Platonicis circa fin.* pag. 1010. D. i. e. "Which "tongue (the "Roman) is "now ſpoke by "all men."

(23) Libanius, *de ſua Fortuna*, *apud* Caſaub. *Exercit. XIX. in Baron.* pag. 201, 202.

(24) *See* Baronius *ad ann.* 16. num. 8.

(25) Idem, ibid.

(26) *See* Melchior Inchofer, *Hiſtor. ſacræ Latinitatis*, pag. 230. edit. Monach. 1638.

(27) Arnobius, lib. 1. pag. m. 27.

(28) Plut. *in Themiſt.* pag. 114.

(29) Ἑρμηνέα ὄντα συλλαβὼν διὰ ψηφίσματος ἀπέκτεινεν ὅτι φωνὴν Ἑλληνίδα βαρβάροις προστάγμασι ἐτόλμησε χρῆσαι. Idem, ibid.

(30) Juſt. lib. 20. *in fine.*

"the

CLAVIUS (CHRISTOPHER) a German Jeſuit, and born in Bamberg, excelled in the knowledge of the Mathematics, and was one of the chief perſons employed to rectify the Calendar, the defence of which he alſo undertook againſt thoſe who criticized it, and eſpecially Scaliger. I am not of opinion that the latter laid down his pen with the humility related by a modern writer [*A*], nor that Clavius died in the manner related by another modern [*B*]. The extraordinary humility which Alegambe declares that Clavius

" the indolence of the General; but his Letters having been ſeized, he was condemned as a betrayer " of his country; and a decree was enacted, that " henceforward no Carthaginian ſhould preſume to " ſtudy Greek, in order that they might not be able " to ſpeak or write to an enemy without employing " an Interpreter." I have taken notice elſewhere (31), of what we are told concerning the ambition of Attila for the glory of his native language. The ſame circumſtance is related of ſome Saracen Princes: " The " Greek tongue began to be a little diſuſed in Egypt, " after the conqueſts of the Arabians, in the reign of " the Khaliff Valid, who reſided at Damaſcus: because this Prince forbid the Greeks to employ any " other tongue but Arabick in their public inſtruments; " which prohibition very much increaſed the ignorance " (32) that then became ſo profound in Greece and " Italy (33). The veneration which the Turks have for their tongue, is very ſingular, If what I have read in the life of Bajazet II be true. This Sultan, *threatning the Venetians with war: the Republick ſent him an Embaſſador to ſue for peace, Bajazet granted his requeſt, and accordingly the articles of peace written in Latin, were delivered to the Embaſſadors: but Andrew Gritti a Venetian Gentleman, who was acquainted with all the cuſtoms of the Turks, (he having reſided a long time in Conſtantinople) informed the Embaſſador that the Turks never ſtood to any agreement which was not written in their own language. For which reaſon, this Embaſſador was very urgent to have the treaty tranſlated into the language of the country, but in vain. Accordingly, he was no ſooner gone, but Bajazet's fleet ſet ſail, in order to attack the ſtrong holds which the Venetians poſſeſſed in the Morea* (34). According to another Author, *the Turks aſſert, that* their *language only is of good uſe in this ſublunary world; that, in Paradiſe, the Arabick tongue will be ſpoke; and that the jargon of the Perſians, their mortal enemies, will be employed in hell* (35). Here follows a prerogative of the Sclavonian language. A Gentleman who is ignorant of it, cannot inherit any eſtate, nor enjoy certain lands in Moravia and Bohemia. *Apud* Bohemos & Moravos lex *eſt ne cui illuſtri vel equeſtri ordine nato cujuſquam hæreditatem cernere, prædiave quæ nos* Landgutter *appellamus, poſſidere liceat, niſi linguæ Sclavonicæ perito* (36). The Author who informs us of this, had juſt before ſaid, that in the 16th Century, the King of Spain forced the Moors to leave off ſpeaking their native tongue, and uſe the Spaniſh.

But on the other ſide, ſome nations have been ſo careleſs and indifferent with regard to their own language, that it was very long before they employed it in publick inſtruments. The Spaniards (37) and the Germans (38) began to do this in the XIIIth Century, and the French in the XVIth (39).

[*A*] *I am not of opinion, that the latter laid down his pen with the humility related by a modern Author.*] *Joſeph Scaliger appeared to be one of the moſt judicious and learned* Criticks of the new Calender . . . *But Clavius gave him ſuch convincing reaſons for it, that this learned Critick did not refute any longer Clavius's opinions, and even declared, that he thought it glorious to ſubmit to a perſon of ſo great reputation* (1). I wiſh Bullart had cited the Book, wherein Scaliger declared this; for was the citation faithful and exact, we ſhould there find an act of modeſty, and at the ſame time, of contradiction. With regard to that of modeſty, the thing ſpeaks itſelf; and as to the other point, if the reader conſults the Scaligerana, he will find that litttle account is there made of Clavius. He is called, Aſs, Dunce, tunbelly'd German (2); a thick ſkull'd Fellow who breakfaſted twice in a morning, and was a great Drinker. He is not treated much better in Scaliger's Letters; *Infantiorem, imperitiorem, & magis ridiculum reperies neminem* (Chriſtophoro Clavio) *ſi quidem unius Geometræ ſcientiam excipias, quam in eo etiam ſi ſtipes eſſet propter longum tempus quo illud ſaxum volvit aliquam oportet eſſe. Quinquaginta enim annos publicè Euclidem legit. Hoc unum excipe, tantus eſt ſtupor hominis ut in iis etiam quæ ad Matheſin ipſam pertinent* λιθωδῶς τοφλώτερος *ſit* (3). i. e. " You will not find any man more " childiſh, ignorant and ridiculous than Chriſtopher " Clavius, if we except Geometry, which ſcience he " has ſtudied ſo many years, that he could not but " have made ſome progreſs in it, tho' he were a mere " block, for he has read public Lectures on Euclid " theſe fifty years. If you therefore except this circumſtance, he is ſo very dull a fellow, that, even " in thoſe things which relate to Mathematicks, he " is as blind as a beetle." Here follows what he ſays in another Book. *Certe non video quid mathematica ſtudia Clavio contulerint, qui in his adeo inſans eſt, ut mediocriter literis humanioribus tinctus hæc melius intelligat, quam ille qui toto vitæ ſuæ tempore nihil præter mathematica tractavit* (4). i. e. " I really cannot " ſee what advantage Clavius has made of his mathe- " matical ſtudies, ſince he is ſo little ſkilled in them, " that a perſon but indifferently converſant in polite " Literature, may underſtand them better than this " man, tho' he has drudged all his life at nothing but " mathematicks." Perhaps it will be objected, that notwithſtanding all this abuſe, Scaliger may have allowed, that Clavius had maintained the cauſe of the Gregorian Calender admirably well, and this is the ſubject of Bullart's words; but this objection will be ſoon refuted. *Nihil vidi ineptius, jejunius, falſius, & impudentius libro Clavii in Elenchum noſtrum de anno Juliano.* i. e. " I never ſaw any thing more ſilly, " jejune, falſe and impudent, than the Treatiſe which " Clavius publiſhed againſt my piece concerning the " Julian year." In this manner Scaliger ſpeaks of Clavius in his XXIXth Letter; and, in another place, he writes as follows. *Clavius has behaved ſo meanly with regard to the Papal year; de his ad Euſebium: and has even committed miſtakes in his correction: he has ſucceeded worſe than before. . . . . Quæ ſcripſeram graviora tacuit, leviora refutavit, ſed nunc omnia oſtendam in Euſebio* (5). i. e. " He has taken no notice " of my ſolid arguments; has refuted thoſe of leſs " conſequence; but now I will prove all to him by Eu- " ſebius."

If Bullart depended on the authority of Richeome, 'tis evident, he did not exactly underſtand the Author's meaning; for this Jeſuit mentions but one Treatiſe antecedent to Clavius's Anſwer, and in which, conſequently, Scaliger did not own, that he acquieſced with the ſolutions of his antagoniſt. Here follow Richeome's words. *I ſhall omit . . . all the mathematical works of Chriſtopher Clavius, who is not only applauded by the late Mr. de Candal, the Euclid of our age: but alſo by Joſeph Scaliger *, who goes ſo far as to ſay, that he had rather be cenſured by him, than praiſed by another; an encomium which is given him by a Proteſtant, no friend to our ſociety; and whoſe teſtimony in favour of a Jeſuit, is conſequently the more worthy of belief* (6).

[*B*] . . . *Nor that Clavius died in the manner related by another modern.*] Paganinus Gaudentius affirms, that Chriſtopher Clavius, viſiting the ſeven Churches of Rome, was thrown down by a mad Bull, who trod over his body and killed him. *Chriſtophorus Clavius dum ſeptem urbis templa inviſit à bubalo humi afflictus conteritur & occiditur* (7). Such a kind of death befalling a famous Jeſuit, who was ſeventy five years of age, is too ſingular not to have been taken notice of by thoſe who wrote the Elogium of this famous Mathematician. Now it is certain, that neither Alegambe, Southwell, Lorenzo Craſſo, Janus Nicius Erythræus, nor Bullart, have made the leaſt mention of this incident. The following words of Nicius Erythræus prove evidently, that Gaudentius has aſſerted a falſity. *Verum in iſtud etiam tantum atque immortalitate dignum ingenium, ſæva mors, cui nihil eſt eximium, nihil intactum, nihil ſanctum, vim & crudelitatem ſuam exercuit; ſed in eo ſevitiæ ſuæ modum adhibuit, quod non antea eſt illi auſa manus afferre, quam*

(31) In the laſt Remark of the Article ATTILA.

(32) Compare this with the paſſage from Mariana inſerted in the Remark [*E*] of the Article CASTILLE (Alphonſo).

(33) Father Rapin's *Compariſon of Plato, and of Ariſtotle*, Part 4. chap. 3. pag. m. 388.

(34) Du Verdier, *Abregé de l'Hiſtoire des Turcs*, in the Life of Bajazet II. *See alſo* Bembo, *Hiſtoria Venet.* lib. 3. folio 91, *verſo* edit. Pariſ. 1551.

(35) La Mothe le Vaier, tom. 13. pag. 259. He cites *Relat. de Thev. le jeune.*

(36) Forſtnerus, *in Tacitum*, pag. m. 179.

(37) See the Remark [*E*] of the Article CASTILLE (Alphonſo).

(38) See the Remark [*AA*] of the article FRANCIS I.

(39) See the ſame Remark.

(1) Bullart, *Academie des Sciences*, tom. 2. pag. 118, 119.

(2) Cardinal du Perron forms the ſame judgment of him. Clavius, ſays he, in his *Perroniana*, whom the Jeſuits eſteem ſo much, is a heavy blundering fellow, having neither acuteneſs or politeneſs, in ſhort; he is a German looby.

(3) Joſeph. Scaliger. *Epiſt.* 106.

(4) Idem, *Canon. Iſagog.* lib. 3.

(5) *In Scaligerana.*

* Scaliger *in Caſtig. Calendar.*

(6) Richeome, *Plainte Apologetique*, pag. 31.

(7) Paganinus Gaudentius in *Oratione de Philoſophorum quorundam luctuoſo exitu.*

Clavius poſſeſſed [C], does not coincide with other qualities which Lorenzo Craſſo has aſcribed to him; he repreſenting him as very much wedded to his own opinion, and ſtrongly affected by cenſure (a).

(a) Lorenzo Craſſo, *Elog.* Part 1. pag. 143.

maturitatem ſuam adeptum eum eſſe vidiſſet; nam ſenex Romæ in collegio ſuæ ſocietatis eſt mortuus (8). i. e. "But cruel death, who pays no reſpect to greatneſs or "holineſs, exerciſed his ſavage power even on this "noble genius, who ſo well deſerved to be immortal; "however, he put ſuch bounds to his barbarity, that "he did not dare to give the fatal ſtroke, till he ſaw "him arrived at full maturity; for he died in an ad"vanced age at Rome, in the college of the Order to "which he belonged." Would an Author, who moralizes in this manner on the mitigated cruelty of death, have omitted the tragical incident mentioned by Gaudentius? Here follow alſo the words of Alegambe: *Tandem ætate meritiſque gravis Romæ vita defunctus eſt die ſexto Februarii anno M. DXII ætatis LXXV.* i. e. "At laſt, being bowed down with years, and poſſeſſed "of the greateſt merit, he died in Rome, the ſixth of "February, 1612, aged 75." Lorenzo Craſſo is to be corrected here, he having fixed it to the ſixth of January.

(8) N. Erythræus, *Pinacoth. I.* pag. 177, 178.

[C] *The extraordinary humility which Alegambe declares that Clavius poſſeſſed.*] *In quo illud maxime admirandum extiterit, quod cum tanta eruditionis fama ac nominis ſui claritudine tam inſignem pietatem ac modeſtiam perpetuo conjunctam retinuerit, ut nullum ſibi hominem unquam, ſeipſum aliis omnibus poſtponeret* (9). i. e. "This circumſtance is chiefly to be admired in him, "viz. that altho' he was ſo much renowned for his "vaſt erudition, yet ſo great was his piety and mo"deſty, that he always preferred other men to him"ſelf."

(9) Alegambe, *in Bibliotb. Soc. Jeſu*, pag. 74.

CLEOFIS, or CLEOPHIS, an Indian Queen, was diſpoſſeſſed of her dominions by Alexander the Great, but was reſtored to them upon conſenting to yield her ſelf to his embraces; and in this manner ſhe preſerved, by her uncleanneſs, a throne in which ſhe was not able to ſupport her ſelf by courage (a). The ſon this Queen brought to Alexander, was called by that Conqueror's name, and was King of India [A]. With regard to his mother ſhe was called the Royal Strumpet, from the time that ſhe proſtituted her ſelf to Alexander (b). Thus Juſtin relates this incident (c). See alſo Quintus Curtius, Book VIII. chap. x.

(a) *Concubitu redemptum regnum ab Alexandro recepit, illecebris conſecuta quod virtute non potuerat.* Juſtin. lib. 12. cap. 7.

(b) *Propter proſtratam pudicitiam, Stortum regium ab Indis exinde appellata eſt.* Juſtin. lib. 12. cap. 7.

(c) Ibid.

[A] *The ſon this Queen brought Alexander . . . was King of India.*] Aſſacan, her eldeſt ſon, was dead before Alexander invaded her Dominions (1). She had another ſon whom ſhe preſented to that Prince (2). He died before her ſon, by the Conqueror, was of age to aſcend the Throne: perhaps too Alexander's ſon was preſerved, on account of his father's fame. It is aſſerted in Moreri's Dictionary, that the ſon of Alexander and Cleophee (3) was aſſaſſinated or poiſoned by Caſſander; but neither Diodorus Siculus, or Q. Curtius, who are cited on this occaſion, mention this incident.

(1) Q. Curtius, lib. 8. cap. 10.

(2) Idem, ibid.

(3) She is ſo called in Moreri's Dictionary.

CLEONICE, a young Lady of Byzantium, whom Pauſanias deſired to enjoy, and afterwards killed through miſtake. It is related, that the ghoſt of this maiden tormented him every night [A], as will be ſeen more amply in the remark.

[A] *Pauſanias . . . killed thro' miſtake. It is related that the ghoſt of this maiden tormented him every night.*] It is related that Pauſanias, being one day in Byzantium, ſent for a noble young maiden, Cleonice by name, in order to have his will of her. This young Lady's relations did not dare to refuſe him, knowing his haughty temper; and therefore ſuffered him to carry her off. The young maiden deſired the ſervants to take away all the lights; but as ſhe was creeping ſoftly in the dark to the bed of Pauſanias, who was aſleep, ſhe had the misfortune to throw down the lamp, which ſtartled Pauſanias out of his ſleep; and he, ſuddenly imagining that it was ſome ruffian, who was come to murther him treacherouſly, he thereupon immediately ſeized his dagger, which lay under his bolſter, and wounded the young Lady in ſuch a manner, that ſhe died ſoon after: however her Ghoſt never ſuffered Pauſanias to be at reſt, but appeared to him every night, juſt as he was going to ſleep, repeating aloud to him, in an angry tone of voice, ſome heroic verſes, the ſubſtance of which is as follows:"

Walk upright, and revere the laws of juſtice,
Or dread the worſt of ills.

"This outrage incenſed all the Allies to ſuch a degree, "that they beſieged Pauſanias, under the conduct of "Cimon, in Byzantium, from whence he nevertheleſs eſcaped privately. And as the ghoſt of the "maiden ſtill tormented him, and did not allow him "a moment's reſt, he fled to the city of Heraclea, "where was a Temple, in which the ſouls of deceaſed "perſons uſed to be invoked; and he there called upon that of Cleonice, to beſeech her to mitigate her "anger. The ghoſt of this maiden appeared immediately to him, and ſaid, that as ſoon as he ſhould "be come to Sparta, he would be freed from all his "torments, by which, in my opinion, was tacitly "underſtood the death he was to ſuffer in that city: "thus ſeveral Hiſtorians relate the abovementioned in"cident (1)." Nothing like this is told of poor Dido, who had ſuffered more than Cleonice; for Æneas not only was the cauſe of her laying violent hands on herſelf, but alſo robbed that Queen of her honour. She deſigned to revenge herſelf on him after her death, and to return back from hell, to haunt him from place to place. Nevertheleſs, it is not ſaid, that her ghoſt tormented Æneas. Here follows the menace ſhe made him before her death; it is expreſſed in ſuch a manner as may be liable to cenſure.

(1) Plutarch, in the *Life of Cimon*, pag. 482. *See alſo* Pauſanias, lib. 3. cap. 17. pag. m. 252.

Sequar atris ignibus abſens;
Et cum frigida mors animâ ſeduxerit artus,
Omnibus umbra locis adero; dabis, improbe, pœnas;
Audiam, & hæc manes veniet mihi fama ſub imos (2).

(2) Virgil. *Æn.* lib. 4. ver. 384.

That is,

"Dido ſhall come, in a black ſulph'ry flame,
"When death has once diſſolv'd her mortal frame.
"Shall ſmile to ſee the traitor vainly weep;
"Her angry ghoſt ariſing from the deep,
"Shall haunt thee waking, and diſturb thy ſleep.
"At leaſt my ſhade thy puniſhment ſhall know,
"And fame ſhall ſpread the pleaſing news below."

Dryden.

If Dido's Ghoſt was to be preſent in all places with Æneas, was there any occaſion for her to wait in hell, for the relation of Æneas's misfortunes! Could not ſhe have been informed of them in our upper world, in proportion as any calamity had befallen the faithleſs man! The reader may object, that Dido muſt be ſuppoſed to have been ſo diſorder'd in her ſenſes, that Virgil was obliged to make her ſpeak without minding what ſhe ſaid. Be it ſo. Servius the Grammarian will point out another evaſion.

CLEONYMUS, contemporary with Pyrrhus King of Epirus, left Lacedæmonia on account

account of ſome diſcontents of a public as well as private nature. He was ſon to Cleomenes II King of Sparta (*a*); but being of a violent and imperious temper, the Lacedæmonians had no friendſhip for, or confidence in him, and devolved the whole royal authority on Areus his mother's ſon. This related to the public diſcontents, and here follows thoſe of a domeſtic kind. Being already advanced in years, he had married Chelidonis [*A*], a Princeſs of the blood, the daughter of Leotychides a very beautiful woman, but who was paſſionately in love with Acrotatus, an exquiſitely handſome youth, and ſon to King Areus. This marriage brought the utmoſt ſorrow and infamy on Cleonymus; for the ill conduct of his wife, and the contempt ſhe had for him were univerſally known. Thus tortured with grief and anger he left Lacedæmonia, and went and ſollicited Pyrrhus to make war on the Lacedæmonians. Pyrrhus drew near the city with a numerous body of forces (*b*), and would have taken it by ſtorm, had he followed the counſels of Cleonymus, which was, to attack it immediately, without giving the few inhabitants whom Areus had left in it, time to recover their ſurprize; Areus, I ſay, who was then in the iſland of Crete, to ſuccour the Gortynians. Pyrrhus fearing the city would be plundered, in caſe he ſhould enter it by night, ſuſpended the aſſault till next day. But he was ſo vigorouſly repulſed in all his attacks, either before or after the return of Atreus, that he was forced to lay aſide his enterprize. We muſt not omit the courage which the Lacedæmonian women ſhewed on this occaſion [*B*]. A reſolution had been taken to ſhip them off for Crete all that night; but they oppoſed it; and Archidamia coming into the Senate with a drawn ſword, complained, in the name of all the women, againſt the men, for thinking they could ſurvive the deſtruction of their country. They worked, in the night, at the trenches which were oppoſed to the enemy. Chelidonis was the only woman who did not ſtir abroad, ſhe keeping always a rope about her neck, in order that ſhe might not be taken alive by her huſband. Acrotatus, her gallant, performed wonders; and as he was returning from the quarter where he had repulſed the aſſaults of the enemy, being elated by his victory, he appeared to be of a more majeſtic ſtature, and handſomer than ever in the eyes of the Lacedæmonian women, inſomuch that they cried aloud; happy is Chelidonis, to be beloved by ſo charming a man. The old men followed him with millions of acclamations; and exhorted him in the ſtrongeſt terms, to continue his warm careſſes to Chelidonis (*c*) [*C*].

(*a*) Plutarch. *in Agid. & Cleom.* Pauſan. *in Lacon.* Father Labbe, *Chronol. Franc. ad ann.* Romæ 481, ſays falſly that Areus was brother to Cleonymus.

(*b*) The year of Rome 480; the 3d of the 126th Olympiad.

(*c*) Extracted from Plutarch's *Life of Pyrrhus.*

[*A*] *He had married Chelidonis.*] Parthenius ſpeaks of this Princeſs, and of her amours with Acrotatus, in his XXIIId chapter; but ſhe is there called Chilonis, either thro' the forgetfulneſs of Parthenius, or the miſtake of his copyiſts.

[*B*] *We muſt not omit the courage which the Lacedæmonian women ſhewed on this occaſion.*] Calviſius aſcribes to them all the reſiſtance which was made the firſt day; and relates, that on the morrow the men returned back, and ſlew Ptolemy the ſon of Pyrrhus, and deſtroyed the greateſt part of his army (1). He cites Juſtin and Plutarch; but neither of theſe Authors relate what he aſcribes to them. Juſtin does not mention the return of the men, nor the two ſucceſſive aſſaults: he only ſays, in general, that the women made a more vigorous defence than the men; and that Pyrrhus loſt at this ſiege, Ptolemy his ſon, and the flower of his army (2). With regard to Plutarch (3), he tells us, that the women worked only at the intrenchments, animated the ſoldiers, and performed ſuch other ſervices of the ſecond rank; and he does not ſuppoſe Ptolemy to be killed, till the King of Lacedæmonia charged the rear of Pyrrhus's army in the way to Argos, that is when Pyrrhus left Laconia. This Prince fully revenged the death of his ſon, by making a great ſlaughter of the Lacedæmonians. He is ſaid to have performed ſuch actions in this battle, as have a little the air of romance. This Ptolemy was ſo bold and intrepid, that when Pyrrhus heard of his death, he ſaid, *that he had been killed a little later than his raſhneſs deſerved, or he (his father) expected* (4).

(1) Calviſ. *ad ann. Mundi* 3677.

(2) Juſtin. lib. 25. cap. 4.

(3) Plut. *in vita Pyrrhi.*

(4) *Aliquanto tardius cum quam timuerit ipſe, vel temeritas ejus meruerit, occiſum eſſe.* Juſtin. lib. 25. cap. 4.

[*C*] *The old men . . . . exhorted him in the ſtrongeſt terms to continue his warm careſſes to Chelidonis.*] Here follows the tranſlation, according to Amiot. *Go ſpruce Acrotatus; careſs warmly Chelidonis, and beget fine children for Sparta.* The Greek is as follows: Ὄγχιτε Ἀκρότατε, καὶ οἵφι τὰν Χελιδονίδα (5). Theſe muſt have been downright blunt people, to make ſuch acclamations in the open ſtreets. See the margin (6).

(5) Plutarch, *in Pyrrho*, pag. 402, C.

(6) The Greek term employed by Plutarch is ſo vulgar, that our Clowns do not ſpeak more ſmutty ones at their weddings.

CLEOPATRA, ſiſter of Alexander the Great. See the Remark [*A*] of the Article DIONYSIUS.

☞CLERC (JOHN LE) was the ſon of Stephen Le Clerc, a learned and eminent Citizen of Geneva, who firſt practiſed Phyſic, but was afterwards made Greek Profeſſor in that Academy, and Senator of the Republic. Our Author's mother was Suſanna Gallatin, of an illuſtrious family; her father Marinus Gallatin being alſo a Senator at Geneva. John Le Clerc was born March the 19th 1657. He had two brothers, Daniel an eminent Phyſician and Senator at Geneva, who wrote the Hiſtory of Phyſic as far as Galen's time, a book highly valued amongſt the Profeſſors of that Science; and Francis, who ſettled at Leipſic in the condition of a Merchant. Their father took great care of their education, and ſent his ſon John, when about eight years old, to the grammar-ſchool, where he ſoon diſcovered a ſtrong inclination to reading, and a genius for Poetry which did not leave him even in the courſe of his more ſerious ſtudies, and more advanced years [*A*]. When

[*A*] *He had a genius for Poetry, which did not leave him even . . . . in his more advanced years.*] We are told in his Latin life, which was certainly written by himſelf, and is annexed to his Philoſophical Works, that he wrote verſes with ſo much readineſs, that when he was at ſchool, he performed not only his own taſk, but even that of his ſchool-fellows: It is added, that if he had cultivated his poetical talents, he would probably have gained a great reputation that way. But the more ſerious ſtudies to which he applied himſelf, made him entirely neglect Poetry, ſo that he never wrote any verſes but on ſome particular occaſions, and to be added to other men's Works: thus having tranſlated two Sermons of Biſhop Burnet, preached before King William, he ſubjoined to the one a ſmall Poem in heroic, and to the other an Epigram in Elegiac

When he was about ſixteen years old, he was removed from the grammar-ſchool, and placed under Mr. Chouët a very learned man, to ſtudy Philoſophy (*a*), and learned chiefly the principles of Carteſius, yet he did not admit afterwards all the conſequences which Carteſius drew from his principles (*b*), as appears from our Author's Philoſophical Works. He alſo applied himſelf under the ſame Profeſſor to Natural Philoſophy, and held a Theſis *de Materiæ Natura*; (concerning the Nature of Matter.) Having finiſhed his courſe of Philoſophy in two years time, he would not go immediately upon the ſtudy of Divinity, but thought it proper to ſpend a year longer in the ſtudy of the *belles Lettres*, and the principles of the Hebrew Tongue, which he learned from his uncle James Gallatin, there being then no Profeſſor of the Hebrew Tongue in the Academy of Geneva. From that time he read all the books that could any ways improve him in thoſe Sciences to which he applied himſelf, and it was this aſſiduity and conſtant application to which he inured himſelf in his youth, that enabled him afterwards to go through the uninterrupted fatigue of reading and writing, and to publiſh ſo many books as he has done. In the nineteenth year of his age he began to ſtudy Divinity under Philip Meſtrezat, Francis Turretin, and Lewis Tronchin, and he attended their Lectures for above two years. Some time before great diſputes had aroſe at Geneva concerning the *Univerſality of Grace* and the *Extent of the Efficacy of Chriſt's death*; ſeveral of the moſt eminent men both at Geneva and at Saumur favoured thoſe opinions, and our Author alſo embraced them afterwards. But as no perſon could be admitted into the holy Miniſtry, without ſubſcribing the *Conſenſus Helveticus* (*c*), which contained a contrary doctrine, few young men entered deep into this controverſy, for fear of falling into opinions that might exclude them from the ſacred function; nor could they well examine the opinions contrary to thoſe that were eſtabliſhed by Law, except perhaps in the *Theſes Salmurienſes*, which Mr. Le Clerc ſtudied with the utmoſt care, as well as ſome other books of Divinity. After he had gone through the uſual forms of ſtudy at Geneva, and had loſt his father in 1676, he reſolved to go for ſome time into France, whither he went in 1678; the next year he returned to Geneva, and was ordained with the general applauſe of all his Examiners. But upon reading the works of Curcellæus, which were publiſhed ſoon after, he was perſuaded, that in the Controverſies between the Remonſtrants, and the other Proteſtants, the former had much the better of the argument, and thereupon reſolved to leave both his own country and France, where the contrary principles were profeſſed, and, as he thought, too eagerly maintained. In the latter end of the year 1680 he went to Saumur, a Proteſtant Academy of great repute, but which was then ſunk and gone to decay: here it was that he firſt read the works of Epiſcopius, with whoſe learning and eloquence, and wonderful ſagacity he was greatly pleaſed. He alſo began to make Notes and Obſervations upon the Old Teſtament, which he read in the Polyglots. Theſe Notes were of great uſe to him, when he came afterwards to write the Commentaries which he has publiſhed. During his ſtay at Saumur there was publiſhed a book intitled, *Liberii de Sancto Amore Epiſtolæ Theologicæ, in quibus varii Scholaſticorum errores caſtigantur*; that is, "Theological "Letters, in which ſeveral errors of the Schoolmen are corrected." This book was aſcribed to Mr. Le Clerc, and though he did never poſitively own it, yet he ſpeaks of it in ſuch a manner as to make us believe he was really the Author of it. As it is become very ſcarce, we ſhall give ſome account of it below [*B*]. In the year 1682 our Author intending

(*a*) Joh. Cleric, *Vita & Opera*, pag. 7-14.

(*b*) Parrhaſiana, tom. 1. pag. 344, and 393, 394.

(*c*) The Confeſſion, or Articles of Faith amongſt the Swiſs.

giac verſe, *de Anglia Liberata*, whereby the reader may perceive, that even at that time his poetic faculty had not deſerted him (1). Tho' Mr. le Clerc ſpoke thus of himſelf in the year 1711, yet he had had ſeveral years before but an indifferent opinion of thoſe Poets, who pretend to write Latin or Greek Verſes. "Moſt of the Moderns, ſays he (2), who wrote Greek "and Latin Verſes, have imitated the Antients as Apes "imitate Men; that is, by copying their faults rather than their beauties; ſo that it is dangerous to "follow either the ſtyle or the thoughts of the Moderns. For inſtead of noble and ſublime ſentences, "they offer us nothing but low and inſipid reflections, "inſtead of a pure and conciſe ſtyle, we only meet in "their verſes with indifferent phraſes, and tedious repetitions of ſynonymous expreſſions, borrowed indeed from the Ancients, but very ill-placed. Moſt "of the modern Greek and Latin Poets labour under theſe defects. . . . And if the Ancients ſhould "happen to riſe from the dead, they could not but "laugh at our Greek and Latin Poems, and would "be amazed that men ſhould loſe ſo much time to "write ſo indifferently." Mr. le Clerc had probably forgot, that he made this reflection in 1699, when he ſaid in 1711, that it appeared by his Latin Verſes, that if he had cultivated his genius for Poetry, he might have ſucceeded that way. Let us obſerve, that the paſſage we have juſt now tranſcribed, drew a very heavy cenſure upon him from a German Author, named George Lizelius, who undertook the defence of the modern Greek and Latin Poets (3).

(1) Joh. Clerici, *Vita & Opera*, printed at Amſterdam in 1711, pag. 10, 11.

(2) Parrhaſiana, tom. 1. pag. 4, 5. printed for the firſt time in 1699, and reprinted with the addition of a ſecond volume in 1701.

(3) See the *Journal Literaire*, tom. 16. Part 1. pag. 212.

[*B*] *He was really the Author of the* Epiſtolæ Theologicæ, *of which we ſhall give an account below.*] He tells us in his Life, that when the Profeſſors of Saumur heard that Henry Deſbordes a Bookſeller was printing that Book, they endeavoured to diſſuade him from it, but in vain; and the Work was ſoon finiſhed and ſent over to Holland. Some perſons aſcribed it immediately to Mr. le Clerc, thinking they obſerved his genius in it; others thought it was too learned to have been written by a young man of four and twenty. A famous Lutheran Divine publiſhed in print, that Mr. le Clerc had owned to him that he was the Author of that Book, but our Author ſays, that this Divine's memory failed him, or that he miſtook his meaning: tho' there be nothing in that Book, adds he, of which Mr. le Clerc ought to be aſhamed, eſpecially if it be conſidered at what age he muſt have wrote it. Now this ſeems to be a pretty plain confeſſion; but that the reader may the better judge of it, we ſhall tranſcribe Mr. le Clerc's own words; but it muſt be obſerved, that he ſpeaks as tho' a friend of his, and not himſelf had wrote his life. *Scio non eſſe incelebrem Auguſtanæ Confeſſionis Theologum, qui poſtea ſcripſerit, faſſum ſibi eſſe Clericum, libellum a ſe ſcriptum: ſed & hoc certo ſcio memoriam eum Theologum fefelliſſe, aut Clerici verba male ab eo intellecta: quamvis alioqui nihil ſit, cur Clericum Libelli pudeat, præſertim ſi quâ ejus ætate ſcribi oportuerit reputes* (4). Obſerve alſo that F. Simon having openly aſcribed (5) this

(4) Joh. Clerici, *Vita & Opera*, pag. 28.

(5) *Réponſe aux Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande*, chap. 2. pag. m. 9.

intending to go to England took his way through Paris and arrived in London about the latter end of May, with a design to learn the English Tongue. He preached several times in the French Churches at London, and visited several Bishops and other men of learning; but as the air of this country did not agree with his constitution, he went into Holland, and visited Philip Limborch at Amsterdam, from whom he learned the condition of the Remonstrants in the United Provinces; he also discovered his real sentiments to Limborch, with whom he entered into a particular friendship, which lasted till that great man's death. He had not been long in Holland before his friends and relations entreated him to return to Geneva, which he accordingly did. But as he could not dissemble his opinions [C], which were contrary to those established by Law, he was obliged to leave his native country again, and arrived in Holland the latter end of the year 1683. The next year he preached sometimes in French in the Church of the Remonstrants (d), but he was soon obliged to leave off preaching [D]; and the Remonstrants holding that same year (1684) a Synod at Rotterdam, he preached once before them, and was admitted Professor of Philosophy, the Hebrew Tongue, and Polite Literature in their school at Amsterdam (e). The remainder of his life offers nothing to us but the history of his works and the controversies in which he was engaged. The first year he lived at Amsterdam he published some books, which we shall mention below [E]: and the following year

(d) Taken from Mr. Le Clerc's Life written in Latin.

(e) *Lettres de Mr. Bayle*, tom. 1. pag. 212. *Let.* 47. à Mr. Lenfant du 9 May 1684. *and* Joh. Clerici, *Vita & Opera*, pag. 37.

this Book to Mr. le Clerc, the latter did not deny the charge, for he answered nothing to it; and we are told in another Work (6), that amongst his intimate friends, he used to call that Book *his Romance*. We must now give a short account of this Piece.

(6) *Hist. de Mr. Bayle & de ses Ouvrages*, pag. 123.

It was printed in 1679, probably at Saumur; it is said in the title-page. *Irenopoli Typis Philathianis:* It contains 320 pages in 8vo, and consists of eleven Epistles or Letters. 1. The first treats of the *Hypostatical Union of the two Natures in the Person of Christ*. The Author endeavours to prove in this Epistle, that the Hypostatical or Personal Union of God with Christ, consists only in a mutual consent or agreement between them, in such a manner, that they both make up but one whole (*totum*), so that the proprieties and actions of both, and the passions of the created or human nature may be ascribed to the whole compound. That the Reader may judge whether we have well expressed his meaning, we shall set down his own words. *Deus non potest aliter uniri cum Spiritu creato quam consensu unicum totum componendi cum eo, adeo ut utriusque proprietates & actiones, & creaturæ passiones toti compositio tribui possint* (7). As this union, which consists only in a mutual consent is easily understood, the Author observes, that it may be objected, there is no mystery according to him, in the hypostatical or personal union of the two Natures in Christ. To which he answers, that the word mystery (μυστήριον) does not signify in the Scriptures, a thing in its own nature unconceivable; but only a thing which was hidden and unknown, before it was revealed (8). 2. The second Epistle contains a story of two young men, who before they had received any instruction concerning the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, endeavoured to find out by themselves, what the Scripture teaches concerning them. The one by his enquiries found the Orthodox system in the Scripture, the other found the Unitarian or Socinian scheme. Whence the Author infers, that the Scripture does not teach any of these doctrines with such a clearness and evidence as is sufficient to make them articles of faith, and necessary to salvation (9); and that it is not easy to guess, whether the Socinians or the other Christians are in the right. *Divinitas æterna Filii, & Spiritus Sancti Personalitas, ita æquivocè traditæ videntur, ut vix aut ne vix quidem divinare possis, utri verum dicant, Socinianine an cæteri Christiani* (10). 3. In the third Epistle he endeavours to explain the Mystery of the Holy Trinity. He observes (11), that the Jews did not make the least objection against that Mystery, whence he concludes, either that his Mystery was easily understood, or that the Apostles did not teach such a Mystery, which is the opinion of the Socinians; and if we admit it, every thing in Scripture is plain, and there are no obscure Mysteries to explain. However, he endeavours to give us a clear and distinct notion of the Trinity even in the Orthodox System. Tho' God be but one, says he, yet as he is infinite, he can form several *series* of thought, so that there can be several persons in him. God thinking after a certain manner is stiled the Father, the same God thinking after another manner is stiled the Son, and after another manner the Holy Ghost. *Deus certo modo cogitans Pater dicitur, alio Filius, alio Spiritus Sanctus* (12). The Author endeavours afterwards to shew, that his opinion differs very much from that of Sabellius. 4. The fourth Epistle treats of the Creation of Man, and of his state before the Fall. 5. The fifth treats of the Fall. 6. The sixth of Original Sin; which our Author explains chiefly according to the Pelagian System. 7. The seventh Letter contains a method of studying Divinity. 8. In the eighth the Author undertakes to prove that the Miracles of the Wise Men were no illusions, and that the only method for distinguishing true Miracles from false ones, is to examine the doctrine of the performer. 9. In the ninth Epistle he explains the word περπερεύεται, which occurs 1 Cor. xiii. 4. which he thinks, signifies *to boast*; our Translators have rendered it, *Charity vaunteth not itself*, which is the same sense. 10, In the tenth he treats of the word κίφαλις Heb. x. 7. 11. In the eleventh and last Epistle, he shews that the writings of the ancient Heathens are of great use towards understanding the Bible.

(7) *Liber. de Sto. Amore*, Ep. Theol. Ep. 1. pag. 9.

(8) Ibid. pag. 10.

(9) Ibid. Ep. 2. pag. 87, 88, 89, &c.

(10) Ibid. pag. 94.

(11) Idem, Ep. 3. pag. 98, 99.

(12) Ibid. pag. 103.

[C] *He could not dissemble his opinions.*] He declared to his friends that he would return to Holland, where "he could fully enjoy the liberty of speaking his mind. "He said, that he did not condemn those who differ- "ed from him, and were sincere in the opinions they "had embraced: but that he looked upon it as a "great crime, to speak otherwise than he was per- "suaded from his heart. That it was intolerable for "a lover of truth, or what is the same thing, for one "who adheres to what seems true to him, to hear his "opinions publickly exclaimed against in Sermons and "conversations, as tho' they were dangerous and per- "nicious, and the contrary opinions eagerly main- "tained, at the same time that no person was allowed "the liberty of making the least objections against "them even in the most modest way. He added, "that this was to slight and betray the truth, which "would soon have been banished the world, if they who "first taught it had acted after the same manner. . . . "Since therefore he could not profess and maintain "what he took to be the truth, without finding mo- "lestation, he thought it was best for him to return "into Holland, that he might not bring his friends "and relations into any trouble on his account (13)."

(13) Joh. Clerici, *Vit. & Oper.* pag. 35, 36.

[D] *He was obliged to leave off preaching.*] He has not thought fit to tell us the reason of this; but we know that as a great many French resorted to the Church of the Remonstrants to hear him, this raised the jealousy of the Walloon Ministers; who finding their audience very thin, when Mr. le Clerc preached, prevailed upon the Magistrates to forbid him to preach any more. This is confirmed by Mr. Bayle, who says in the letter quoted above (14), that Mr. *le Clere has not there* (at Amsterdam) *the liberty to preach.* We forbear making any reflections upon this conduct of the Magistrates, which was not very consistent with their usual toleration.

(14) In the text, quotation (e).

[E] *Some Books, which he published in* 1684.] The first is intitled, *Davidis Clerici, in Genevensi Academia olim Linguarum Orientalium Professoris, Quæstiones sacræ; in quibus multa Scripturæ loca, variaque Linguæ*

S. Ido-

year he had a famous controverſy with Father Simon, of which we ſhall give an account in the remark [*F*]. This controverſy was carried on with great animoſity on both ſides; but

S. Idiomata explicantur. Acceſſerunt ſimilis Argumenti Diatribæ Stephani Clerici. Edidit & Annotationes adjecit Joannes Clericus. Amſt. in 8vo, 1685 (15). This work contains critical Diſcourſes upon ſeveral ſubjects, for the moſt part taken from Scripture; to which he has added ſome Notes of his own, wherein he makes no ſcruple to differ from his father and uncle, wherever he thinks they are miſtaken; being of opinion, that truth is always to be preferred before the ſtricteſt ties of conſanguinity. He prefixed to this volume the Lives of the Authors. Two years after he publiſhed another volume of theſe two brothers, containing ſome *Speeches* and *Poems*, and a *Computus Eccleſiaſticus* of David Le Clerc, and ſome *Philological Diſſertations* by Stephen, to which our Author added a Preface (16), printed at Amſterdam, in 8vo. Mr. Le Clerc alſo publiſhed in 1684 a Book of his friend Charles le Cene a French Miniſter; it was intitled, *Entretiens ſur Diverſes Matieres de Theologie:* "Dialogues upon ſeveral Theological Subjects." And becauſe it was too ſmall a volume of itſelf, he added a ſecond part to it made up of five Dialogues. In the three firſt he treats of the extent of our metaphyſical knowledge, and of its uſe in Religion. He ſhews by ſeveral inſtances, that the Metaphyſicians have often obſcured Divinity, and ſtarted a thouſand difficulties, by reaſoning about things of which they had no ideas. The Author's opinion is, that we are in danger of being continually miſtaken, when we extend the uſe of our natural faculties, which we have received from God, beyond the bounds he has preſcribed them. He thinks, that as our ſenſes do not acquaint us with the properties of bodies, but ſo far as is neceſſary for the preſervation of our Lives, ſo our ſpiritual knowledge does not extend farther than is neceſſary to regulate our conduct according to the will of God, and to lead us to the ſupreme felicity. So that whenever we pretend to go beyond theſe bounds, we expoſe our ſelves to a thouſand errors, and do but raiſe doubts in our minds which it is impoſſible for us to clear. In the fourth Dialogue he examines ſeveral paſſages of the Holy Scripture, which have been miſapplied by the Metaphyſicians, in making them ſubſervient to their abſtruſe and ill-grounded notions. In theſe four Dialogues he often cenſures Father Mallebranche. His deſign in them is to ſhew, that in religious ſubjects, we ought to ſtick to Revelation, and muſt not think, that we have compleat and adequate notions of the things, which are mentioned there, and not pretend to draw inferences from what we know but imperfectly. If the Chriſtian Divines had always followed this rule, if they had not invented new words, as tho' they were more proper, than thoſe which the Holy Ghoſt made uſe of, we ſhould not have heard of that vaſt number of controverſies and hereſies, either real or pretended, which have diſturbed the Church ever ſince the time of the Apoſtles; and Chriſtian Divinity had been infinitely more beautiful than it is now, and more proper to perſuade men to a pious and holy life. The fifth Dialogue contains an expoſition of the IXth, Xth, XIth Chapter of the Epiſtle to the Romans, taken chiefly from Dr. Hammond's Paraphraſe.

(15) It is known, that when a Book is publiſhed towards the end of the year, the Bookſellers date it from the following year.

(16) Parrhaſiana, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 354. & Jo. Cleric. *Vit. & Oper.* pag. 43, 44.

* Mr. Le Clerc publiſhed a ſecond edition of it in 1711, with an Advertiſement in which he explained ſome paſſages of that work.

[*F*] *An Account of his Controverſy with Father Simon.*] Father Simon having publiſhed his Critical Hiſtory of the Old Teſtament, Mr. le Clerc read it with the utmoſt care and attention, and in 1685 he publiſhed a Criticiſm upon it, intitled, *Sentimens de quelques Théologiens de Hollande ſur l'Hiſtoire Critique du Vieux Teſtament, compoſée par le Pere Richard Simon de l'Oratoire: Où, en remarquant les fautes de cet Auteur, on donne divers Principes utiles pour l'intelligence de l'ecriture Sainte.* Printed at Amſterdam, in 8vo. This work contains twenty letters, in which Mr. le Clerc ſays (17), that he only relates the opinions, which ſeveral perſons had of F. Simon's work, and gave an account of ſome conferences, in which he repreſents ſome friends ſpeaking very freely of the critical Hiſtory, and of ſeveral other ſubjects, which have ſome affinity with thoſe, that Father had treated of. It would be too long to give a particular account of this Book, and of F. Simon's anſwer, and Mr. le Clerc's Reply. We ſhall therefore make only a few obſervations.

(17) Parrhaſiana, tom. 1. pag. 358.

Mr. le Clerc endeavours to prove in his ſixth Letter, that Moſes is not the Author of the Pentateuch; he pretends to ſhew this by obſerving, that thoſe five Books contain a great many things, which could not have been written by Moſes: he tells us afterwards (18), "that the Hiſtories we read in the Pentateuch have been "taken from ſome ancient Books, written by private "perſons.... and what renders this conjecture more "probable is, that we find in the Pentateuch a quotation from a Book, which if we may gueſs by the title, "contained an account of the firſt wars of the Iſraelites: I mean *the Book of the Wars of the Lord*, "which is mentioned Numb. xxi. 14. This and "other ſuch Books, which, might have been written "in Moſes's time, but in all likelihood were become "very ſcarce in after Ages, (ſince even the Law, of "which ſeveral copies had been taken, had been unknown a long while) theſe Books, I ſay, were the "Memoirs, which the Author of the Pentateuch made "uſe of, to write down the Hiſtory of thoſe times. "But he muſt have had more ancient Memoirs, in order to write the Hiſtory of the Creation, and the "Lives of the Patriarchs, wherein we find ſeveral "numbers, and a great many proper names, which "Tradition alone could not have long preſerved. "There are ſome paſſages, by which it clearly appears, that thoſe Memoirs were very imperfect, "ſince we find in thoſe Books ſome circumſtances, "which are not connected with the reſt of the Hiſtory; as for inſtance, what is ſaid of Lamech Gen. "iv, and of Hebron, Numb. xiii. There are ſeveral "other paſſages, in which the Author of the Pentateuch relates things very obſcurely, becauſe the Memoirs, whence he took his accounts, were imperfect (19)." Father Simon has not objected any thing material againſt this chapter; he even acknowledges, that the Pentateuch has been compoſed from ancient Memoirs; but he thinks that Moſes is the Author of thoſe five Books; and Mr. le Clerc himſelf has at laſt acknowledged it in a Diſſertation prefixed to his Commentary on Geneſis, in which he has anſwered the chief arguments, by which he pretended to prove, that Moſes was not the Author of the Pentateuch.

(18) *Sentimens de quelques Theol. de Hol. Let. VI.* pag. m. 122, &c.

(19) Ibid. pag. 123, 124.

But the moſt remarkable part of Mr. le Clerc's Book againſt Father Simon, is a Treatiſe of the Inſpiration of the Holy Scripture, in which the Author endeavours to prove, that the Writers of the old and New Teſtament were not inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, in the ſenſe in which it is generally underſtood. This Treatiſe, which takes up the eleventh and twelfth Letter, contains a great many bold obſervations. Let us tranſlate only what he ſays of the Inſpiration of the Prophets; that the reader may from thence have ſome notion of his whole Syſtem. "God made himſelf known to the "Prophets, *ſays Mr. le Clerc* (20), ſeveral ways, "which I think may be reduced to the three following. 1. They had viſions by day or by night; "2. They heard voices; 3. or They were inwardly "inſpired.... The Prophecies have been written by "God's expreſs command, by the Prophets themſelves, or by others; for it is not poſſible to know, "whether the Prophets always wrote or dictated them, "or whether their Diſciples collected them, and wrote "them down as exactly, as their memory would ſuffer it. However it be, we cannot doubt, but God "revealed to the Prophets thoſe things, which we "find now in their Books, and we ought to believe "St. Peter, who ſays, *the Prophecy came not in "old time by the will of man &c* (21). But in order "to relate what appeared to them in their viſions, "whether it was wrote down by themſelves, or by "others who heard them relate it, nothing was wanted but a good memory.....Hence it is, that every "Prophet has a peculiar ſtyle; whence it appears, "that they related what they had ſeen after the ſame "manner as they uſed to relate all other things..... "We may ſay the ſame with regard to the words, "which they heard: a good memory was ſufficient "to remember them. But we cannot be poſitive, that "they have always related the very words they heard, "and that ſometimes they did not content themſelves "with ſetting down the ſenſe only.... Their diffe-

(20) Ibid. Let. 11. pag. 222.

(21) 2 Pet. i. 21.

but Father Simon pretended, that Mr. Le Clerc had attacked him out of jealouſy and revenge, and Mr. Le Clerc did not think fit to reply any thing to this charge [G]. We ſhall give below Mr. Bayle's judgment of our Author's anſwer to Father Simon [H]. In the

" rent ſtyle proves, that every Prophet expreſſed what " he heard, after his own manner. . . . It is commonly " ſuppoſed, that the Prophets relate the very words, " which they heard, becauſe they repreſent God ſpeak- " ing immediately, *thus ſaith the Lord*. But this is " not a good argument, for it is the cuſtom of the " Hebrew, and even of the Greek Writers to repre- " ſent thoſe, whoſe thoughts they relate, as ſpeaking " directly, tho' they do not ſet down their own words. " Here follows a convincing proof of this; it is the " manner in which the Decalogue is related in Exo- " dus, and in Deuteronomy; in both places God is " repreſented as ſpeaking himſelf immediately, and " yet there are conſiderable differences between the " Decalogues as we find them in theſe two places. . . .

" The third manner in which God revealed his will " to the Prophets, was by the way of inſpiration without " viſion or voice. We may conceive two ſorts of theſe in- " ſpirations; 1. God might inſpire the Prophecies and " Predictions word for word, as when the Prophet was to " mention ſome name unknown before; 2. God might " inſpire only the ſenſe of them, which they after- " wards expreſſed after their own manner . . . &c."

The reader may eaſily gueſs by this, what our Author's opinion was concerning the Inſpiration of the Apoſtles. He ſuppoſed that they wanted only a good memory, to relate the Hiſtory of our Saviour, and the doctrines they had learnt from him; and that they had no occaſion for an immediate and inward inſpiration.

Let us obſerve, that Mr. le Clerc endeavours to prove, that the Book of Job, the Proverbs, Eccleſiaſtes, and the Song of Solomon were not inſpired by God, and he ſeems to look upon them as only the works of men (22).

(22) Ibid. Lett. 12. pag. 271, &c.

Father Simon anſwered at large theſe two Letters; but as his anſwer is grounded only upon common topicks, and contains nothing new, it is needleſs to give an account of it: nay, he even admits, that generally ſpeaking the ſenſe and not the words was revealed to the ſacred Writers: ſo that Mr. le Clerc had very little to reply on this ſubject; but as his opinion had given great offence, he endeavoured to vindicate himſelf, or his friend, who, he ſuppoſes, wrote the two Letters concerning Inſpiration. He makes a kind of declaration of his faith; which is to this purpoſe; *That the Prophets of the Old and New Teſtament, ſaid nothing as from God, but what he really commanded them to ſay. That there are no facts of any conſequence related in Scripture, but what really happened: and ſuppoſing the Hiſtorians were miſtaken in ſome trifling circumſtances, yet we ought to look upon the ſacred Hiſtory as the moſt true, and moſt holy, that ever was. That all the Doctrines, which the ſacred Writers propoſed to the Jews or to the Chriſtians are really heavenly Doctrines, tho' it might be ſuppoſed that theſe Writers did not always receive them immediately from Heaven. That Chriſt was infallible, free from all errors, as well as from all ſins. That God often dictated to the Prophets and Apoſtles the very words they were to make uſe of* (23). After ſuch a Declaration, it would be unfair and unjuſt to charge Mr. le Clerc with infidelity, notwithſtanding the great liberty, with which he delivered himſelf in his firſt Book againſt Father Simon. Mr. le Clerc's Reply to this Father is intitled: *Defenſe des Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande, contre la Reponſe du Prieur de Bolleville.* Amſterdam, 1686, 8vo. It contains ſeventeen Letters.

(23) *Defenſe des Sentimens ſur l'Hiſtoire Critique*, Lett. 9. pag. 223, 224.

[G] *Father Simon pretended, that Mr. le Clerc had attacked him out of jealouſy . . . . . Mr. le Clerc did not reply any thing to this charge.*] Some time before Mr. le Clerc undertook to write againſt Father Simon, there had been publiſhed a Letter under the name of Origenes Adamantius, containing a propoſal for printing a new Polyglot Bible, the undertaker of which deſired the learned Criticks to ſend him their advice in writing. Mr. le Clerc, who, ſays Father Simon (24), thinks he is perfectly acquainted with thoſe ſubjects, wrote a long Letter in Latin, which he ſent to a Bookſeller at Rotterdam, in order to have it conveyed to the Author of the Propoſal; and as he took Father Simon to be that Author (as he really was) he praiſed very much the Critical Hiſtory of the Old Teſtament, and ſaid he paſſionately longed to ſee that of the New, which had been promiſed a great while. But it happened that the perſon to whom he had written, ſhewing a very great deſire to have his Letter printed, adviſed him charitably not to publiſh it, till he had carefully corrected it. It was this, according to Father Simon, that exaſperated Mr. le Clerc againſt him. He gives us part of the Letter which our Author ſent him, and a tranſlation of the Anſwer that was ſent to Mr. le Clerc in Dutch. He aſſerts that he has Mr. le Clerc's Letter, written in his own hand, ſtill by him. It begins thus. *Hiſtoriam Criticam Librorum Veteris Teſtamenti avidiſſime & cum ſumma voluptate jam dudum legi. Atque uti libenter me in eorum numero eſſe profiteor, quamvis cum auctore ubique non ſentiam, qui ea lectione multum ſe in ſacrarum Literarum cognitione profeciſſe agnoſcunt; ita quoſdam alios labores, quibus ſe inſudare teſtatus eſt vir doctiſſimus Richardus Simon, non ſine impatientia hactenus expectavi. Sperabam me brevi poſtea lecturum ſimilem Hiſtoriam Librorum Novi Teſtamenti, ...* i. e. " I have read long ago the Critical Hiſtory of the " Old Teſtament with the utmoſt pleaſure and delight: " And though I do not approve all the Author's ſenti- " ments, yet I muſt own that I am one of thoſe, " who by reading his book, are very much improved " in the knowledge of the Bible: ſo that I expect im- " patiently the other works, in which that moſt learn- " ed man Richard Simon is employed, as he has told " us. I was in hopes, that I ſhould ſoon ſee ſuch an- " other Hiſtory of the Books of the New Teſtament, " &c." How could a man, who wrote thus, deſpiſe Father Simon afterwards, as Mr. le Clerc does in his *Sentimens &c.* where he pretends, that Father Simon's Book is proper only to inſtruct thoſe, who have but a ſmall ſtock of learning? And yet Mr. le Clerc has not taken the leaſt notice of all this in his Reply to Father Simon. What the conſequence is, that may be inferred from his ſilence, we leave the reader to judge.

(24) *Reſponſe aux Sent. de quelques Theol. de Hol.* chap. 1. pag. 1, 2.

[H] *Mr. Bayle's judgment of our Author's Anſwer to Father Simon.*] " Mr. le Clerc, *ſays he to Mr. Len-* " *fant* (25), has lately publiſhed a Book againſt F. " Simon; it contains very good things, but too bold. " You ſhould let him know, that inſtead of promot- " ing the intereſt of that party, which he follows, I " mean the Arminians, he will only render them more " odious: for he will confirm the world in the notion " they have already, that all the learned Arminians " are Socinians *at leaſt*. I ſay *at leaſt*, and not with- " out reaſon; theſe Gentlemen have no prudence nor " policy; for if they had ſhewed themſelves leſs pre- " poſſeſſed in favour of Socinianiſm, with which they " poiſon all their Books, it would not have been diffi- " cult to ſuppreſs the Schiſm, which the Synod of Dort " has occaſioned. But, to ſpeak the truth, our Cal- " viniſts think it glorious and praiſe-worthy, not to " join with a Sect, which is the common ſink of all " the Atheiſts, Deiſts and Socinians of Europe." In the firſt edition of Mr. Bayle's Letters, publiſhed in 1714, it was obſerved in a Note, that by the *bold Things*, Mr. Bayle *meant the two Letters concerning Inſpiration*, of which we have given an account above (26), *and which it is believed were written by Mr. le Clerc himſelf*. When Mr. le Clerc read this and the whole paſſage, which we have quoted, he thought he could do no leſs, than anſwer ſomething in his own vindication, and did it in the firſt volume of his *Bibliotheque ancienne & moderne* (27). He does neither own nor deny that he was the Author of the Letters concerning Inſpiration, but ſays, that he thought he might publiſh them becauſe they contain the opinion of Grotius; but he adds, that he did not approve thoſe Letters, tho' he publiſh'd them. He inveighs afterwards bitterly againſt Mr. Bayle, and does not ſcruple to call him a downright Atheiſt (28), as tho' he would confirm what Mr. Bayle ſays in another place (29): *If you will continue to be Mr. le Clerc's friend, you muſt take a particular care, how you behave yourſelf towards him; for he is ſoon angry, and pardons nothing: he exclaims continually againſt the* Odium Theologicum, *and does not obſerve,*

(25) *Lettres de Mr. Bayle*, Lett. 58. du 6 Juillet, 1685, tom. 1. pag. 244, 245.

(26) In the Remark [F].

(27) Pag. 208, &c.

(28) Pag. 212.

(29) *Lett. de Mr. Bayle*, tom. 1. pag. 270. à Mr. Lenfant, du 9 Juillet, 1686.

the year 1686 Mr. Le Clerc undertook to write a journal in imitation of thoſe that were publiſhed in ſeveral parts of Europe. He entitled it, *Bibliotheque Univerſelle & Hiſtorique*. He wrote it firſt with Mr. De la Croſe, and afterwards alone [*I*]. In the year 1698 he took care of the new edition of Cotelerius's Collection of the Apoſtolic Fathers [*K*], and the next year he publiſhed the firſt volume of his *Parrhaſiana* (*f*), in which he undertook to anſwer, according to Origen's ſyſtem, the objections againſt the goodneſs of God, which Mr. Bayle had publiſhed in ſeveral Articles of his Dictionary. Mr. Bayle replied in the ſecond edition of his Dictionary (*g*), which occaſioned a long controverſy between them, of which we ſhall give ſome account below [*L*], as we have promiſed in Mr. Bayle's Article.

(*f*) See in the Notes quot. (2).

(*g*) Article ORIGEN.

obſerve, that he is all the while drawing his own picture. In a Letter to Mr. Minutoli Mr. Bayle has the following paſſage: *Mr. le Clerc continues to diſtinguiſh himſelf more and more every day, by his boldneſs in printing hereſies, and in condemning abſolutely and with the utmoſt ſlander, in Bookſellers ſhops, all the Authors he does not like; and this is ſaying a vaſt number, and almoſt all the world; for if you except Epiſcopius, Curcellæus, and Dr. Hammond, and a few more, all the reſt are good for nothing, according to him* (30). Upon which Mr. le Clerc obſerves (31), that "when Mr. Bayle "wrote this, the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle* was already "begun, two volumes of it having been publiſhed: "this work, which ſeveral people eſteemed more than "Mr. Bayle's *Republique des Lettres*, becauſe they were "better improved by it, exaſperated him againſt Mr. "le Clerc." Let thoſe who can compare the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* written by Mr. Bayle, with Mr. le Clerc's Journals, judge whether the latter had ſo much reaſon to boaſt, and whether the former could be jealous of him. We muſt not omit a circumſtance, which we meet with in the Hiſtory of Mr. Bayle and of his works, tho' we cannot aſſert the truth of it. We are told there, that Mr. Bayle's Letter to Mr. Lenfant, quoted above (32), fell firſt into Mr. le Clerc's hands, who opened it before he conveyed it to Mr. Lenfant; and it is pretended, that this Letter was the firſt ſpring of Mr. Le Clerc's hatred againſt Mr. Bayle (33).

(30) Ibid. pag. 266, 267. Let. 8 Juillet, 1686.

(31) *Bibl. Anc. & Mod.* tom. 1. pag. 215, &c.

(32) Quotation (25).

(33) *Hiſt. de Mr. Bayle & de ſes Ouvrages*, pag. 119, 120.

[*I*] *He wrote his* Bibliotheque *firſt with Mr. de la Croſe, and afterwards alone.*] He wrote the eight firſt volumes together with Mr. de la Croſe. They were alſo both concerned in the ninth, but as Mr. de la Croſe would not follow Mr. le Clerc's advice, they diſtinguiſhed their reſpective articles in that volume. The Xth is entirely Mr. le Clerc's, and the XIth Mr. de la Croſe's. The reſt to the nineteenth inclusive are Mr. le Clerc's. The remainder to the XVth, which is the laſt, were written by Mr. Bernard, as we have obſerved in his article.

[*K*] *His new Edition of Cotelerius's Collection of the Apoſtolick Fathers.*] It is intitled, *S. S. Patrum, qui temporibus Apoſtolicis floruerunt, Barnabæ, Clementis, Hermæ, Ignatii, Polycarpi Opera edita & inedita, vera & ſuppoſititia, unà cum Clementis, Ignatii, & Polycarpi actis atque martyriis. J. Bapt. Cotelerius, Societatis Sorbonicæ Theologus, ex MSS. Codd. eruit ac correxit, verſionibuſque & notis illuſtravit. Acceſſerunt in hac nova Editione Notæ integræ aliorum virorum Doctorum, qui in ſingulos Patres memoratos ſcripſerunt, & quorum nomina in Præfatione habentur; item Gulielmi Beveregii Codex Canonum primitivæ Eccleſiæ vindicatus, Jacobi Uſſerii Diſſertationes Ignatianæ, & Johannis Pearſonii Vindiciæ Epiſtolarum S. Ignatii. Recenſuit, & notulas aliquot adſperſit Joannes Clericus.* Amſterdam; 2 vol. folio, 1698. There are ſome copies of this Edition, the Preface of which differs very much, with regard to the Elogium of Mr. Cotelier. In ſome copies Mr. le Clerc ſays, that Mr. Baluze had beſtowed exorbitant praiſes upon Cotelier, that his Epiſtle concerning him is too flattering, and that he (Mr. le Clerc) thought it was neceſſary to give the readers notice of this, leſt ſuch a commendation might be prejudicial to Cotelier in the minds of thoſe, who upon reading his works ſhould find, that he did not deſerve ſuch praiſes. But in ſome other copies, Mr. le Clerc gives a ſummary but compleat account of all the praiſes, that have been beſtowed upon Cotelier, and ſays, that he deſerves them all (34). But Mr. le Clerc declared, that this difference between the copies of the Apoſtolic Fathers ought not to be aſcribed to him; he had beſtowed moderate praiſes upon Cotelier; and ſuch as he thought were ſufficient. But they, who ſent Cotelier's Life to the Bookſeller, tho' they had not been in the leaſt concerned in this Edition, were not ſatisfied with what Mr. le Clerc had ſaid; they gave the Bookſeller to underſtand, that the work would not ſell well at Paris, if he did not prefix that encomium to it, which Mr. le Clerc thought was exorbitant. The Bookſeller out of complaiſance cauſed the ſheet, which contained the Preface, to be reprinted, and added to it the encomium which had been ſent him, without acquainting Mr. le Clerc with it, till a long while after. Mr. le Clerc therefore diſowned thoſe words, which contained an exceſſive flattery, and which he never wrote (35). In the year 1724 Mr. le Clerc publiſhed a new edition of that work with ſeveral improvements; and gave a large account of it, in the volumes XXI and XXII of his *Bibliotheque ancienne & moderne*.

(34) *Memoires de Mr. Ancillon*, pag. 381, 382.

(35) *Biblioth. Choiſie*, tom. 18. pag. 426, 427.

[*L*] *Some account of his controverſy with Mr. Bayle concerning the puniſhment of the wicked.*] Mr. le Clerc had endeavoured in his *Parrhaſiana* to refute the objections of the Manichees, according to the ſyſtem of Origen: and Mr. Bayle anſwered Mr. le Clerc's arguments in the ſecond edition of his Dictionary, in the Remark [*E*] of the Article Origen: to which Mr. le Clerc replied in his *Bibliotheque Choiſie* (36). Mr. Bayle had aſſerted, that it is impoſſible in the ſyſtem of Origen, to reconcile the permiſſion and all the conſequences of ſin, with the notion of God's eſſential and perfect goodneſs. Upon which Mr. le Clerc obſerved; 1. That God was not obliged to create man ſo perfect, as that it ſhould be impoſſible for him to ſin; but that it is a great ſign of God's goodneſs that he furniſhed man with the means of obtaining happineſs, if he would but follow the rules that were preſcribed to him, and which he was not in the leaſt neceſſitated to tranſgreſs. 2. That Mr. Bayle exaggerated the evils which are a conſequence of man's free-will, and which he would have avoided, had he been created ſo, as not to have it in his power to ſin. 3. That to prevent the ill uſe which man might make of his liberty, God out of his infinite goodneſs, was pleaſed to propoſe to him in the Goſpel eternal rewards, and unlimited puniſhments: and that man may if he will, avoid the latter and obtain the former. 4. That God knew what would happen, but was not obliged to prevent by his infinite power the evil which he foreſaw would be occaſioned by the fault of man, becauſe that evil was not to laſt long either in itſelf, or with regard to its conſequences, and becauſe it occaſioned no diſorder in the Univerſe, but what God could reform in a moment, and what he will really reform at laſt for ever. 5. The inconveniency of man's ſuffering evil before he arrives to a ſtate of perfect happineſs, reſults from his very nature, which could not be in that imperfect ſtate in which it is, without being liable to what has really happened. 6. God, who foreſaw that man would fall, does not damn him merely becauſe he falls, but only becauſe he does not return to his duty, which it is in his power to do. 7. The duration of the evils which man ſuffers in this world, or will ſuffer in the next, is nothing if compared with eternity.

(36) Vol. 7. Art. 8. pag. 330, &c.

Mr. Bayle replied to all this at large, in the third volume of his *Réponſe aux Queſtions d'un Provincial* (37). The ſubſtance of his anſwer is, 1. That tho' man be naturally changeable, yet God could have furniſhed him with ſufficient or *congruous* Graces, which would have prevented his ſinning. Would you praiſe the goodneſs of a Prince, who ſhould ſuffer a great many diſorders to diſturb his Kingdom, becauſe it is in his power to ſuppreſs them when he pleaſes; and tho' he really ſhould ſuppreſs them, would he not have been a better Prince if he had prevented thoſe diſorders, as it was in his power to do? 2. The ſuppoſition that hell-torments will not be eternal, does not remove the difficulty entirely. Would a father who loves his children, and deſigns to raiſe them

(37) Chap. 17. &c. pag. m. 1146, &c.

(b) In the Remark (oo) and in the text, quotation (tt).

Article (b). We must also say something of their dispute concerning Dr. Cudworth's *Plastic Natures* [M], which we have also referred to this Article (i); and we shall give a catalogue of the rest of his works in the remark [N]. It appears by the vast number of

(i) Ibid. quotation (ll).

them to high dignities, suffer them first to commit several faults and to be punished for them, if he could help it; and if it were in his power to make them equally happy without those previous faults and punishments? Since therefore God could make man happy the very moment he created him; how does it agree with his infinite goodness, to suffer them to pass first thro' a scene of sin and misery, since as he is infinitely powerful, he could easily have made them happy without all this?

Mr. le Clerc wrote an answer to this, and printed it in his *Bibliotheque Choisie* (38), with this title, *A Defence of the Goodness and Holiness of God against Mr. Bayle's Objections.* Mr. le Clerc did no longer personate an Origenist, but pretended to speak as an Orthodox Divine. Let the Reader judge how orthodox his opinion is. "I would answer, says he (39), that we do "not well know what is the nature of future punishments; we do not know whether there will not "be at first several very sharp sufferings, and yet diversified according to the greatness of men's sins; "and whether God will not afterwards put an end to "those sharp sufferings, and be content to leave those who "have constantly made an ill use of his favours, to "be tormented by their own conscience, which will "continually reproach them with their sins, and will "also torment them by this consideration, that they "lost by their own fault that happiness which they "will see others enjoy. This is perhaps *the worm that "dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched* (40). "There is nothing in this I think, but what is just. "The sinner might have avoided that misery by his "repentance; and since he did not repent, he deserves "some punishment." Mr. le Clerc does not determine how long this punishment will last, and he thinks that the damned will be in a suffering condition (41). Mr. Bayle replied to this in a Pamphlet intitled, *Réponse pour Mr. Bayle à Mr. le Clerc* (42), in which he observes, that Mr. le Clerc did in a manner give up the question, since he left off speaking in the character of an Origenist, and since he spoke doubtfully about the nature and duration of hell-torments; which was the same thing as to acknowledge that they were liable to unanswerable objections; and indeed Mr. le Clerc had been obliged to own that this is a subject, concerning which we ought to confess our ignorance (43). So that we think it needless to pursue this controversy any farther.

(38) Tom. 9. Art. 3. pag. 103, &c.

(39) Ibid. pag. 143.

(40) Mark ix. 44.

(41) *Bib. Choif.* tom. 9. pag. 144.

(42) It is annexed to Mr. Bayle's 4th volume of the *Reponse aux Questions d'un Provincial.*

(43) *Réponse à Mr. Le Clerc*, pag. 27, 28. *Bibl. Choisie*, tom. 9. pag. 148.

[M] *We must say something of their dispute concerning Dr. Cudworth's Plastic Natures.*] Mr. Bayle had observed (44), that "the Atheists are very much perplexed how to account for the formation of animals, "which they ascribed to a cause which was not conscious "of what it did, and yet followed a regular plan, "without knowing according to what laws it went to "work. But Dr. Cudworth's *plastick form*, and Dr. "Grew's *vital principle* are exactly in the same case, "and thus they take away the whole strength of this "objection against the Atheists. For if God could "communicate such a plastic power, it follows, that "it is not inconsistent with the nature of things that "there be such *Agents*; they may therefore exist of "themselves, will the adversary say; whence it would "also follow, that the regularity we observe in the "universe may be the effect of a blind cause, which "was not conscious of what it did." Mr. Bayle however observed, that these two learned Gentlemen were not aware of the consequence, which according to him followed from their system. Mr. le Clerc replied in his *Bibliotheque Choisie* (45); he said, that the vital or plastic natures which these Gentlemen admit, cannot in the least favour the Atheists, because these natures are but instruments in the hands of God, and have no power of efficacy, but what they receive from him who rules and directs all their actions: that they are but instrumental causes, produced and employed by the Chief and first Cause: and that it cannot be said, that a Palace has been built up without art, because not only the hammers, rules, saws &c. but even the arms of men which made use of these instruments, are destitute of knowledge. It is sufficient that the mind of the Builder directed all these things, and employed them according to his design. It is therefore plain, adds he, that the Atheists who deny the being of an intelligent Cause, cannot return our two Philosophers argument upon them.

(44) *Continuation des Pensees Diverses*, § 21. pag. m. 91.

(45) Tom. 5. pag. 283, &c.

Mr. Bayle endeavoured to shew in his answer (46), that if these Gentlemen had considered the Plastic Natures only as instruments in the hands of God, this system would have been exposed to all the difficulties to which the Cartesian hypothesis is liable, and which they intend to avoid: that therefore we must suppose their opinion was, that these natures are active principles, which do not want to be continually set on and directed, but that it is enough if God does but put them in a proper place, and overlook their actions to set them right if it be necessary. This being the case, Mr. Bayle pretends that the argument may be returned against these Gentlemen. For, says he, since when the order and regularity of this world is alledged as a proof of the Being of God, it is supposed that a Being cannot produce a regular work, without having an idea of it. And yet according to Dr. Cudworth, the Plastic Natures, which produce plants and animals, have not the least idea of what they do. If it be answered that they have been created by a Being who knows all, and whose ideas they only put in execution, the Stratonician will reply, that if they do it only as efficient Causes, this is as incomprehensible as that which is objected to him; since it is as difficult for any Being to perform a scheme which it does not understand, but which another understands, as it is to perform a scheme, which no Being at all has any notion of. Since you acknowledge, will the Stratonician say, that God could endow some creatures with a power of producing excellent works, tho' without any knowledge; you must also confess that there is no necessary connection between the faculty or power of producing excellent works, and the idea and knowledge of their essence, and of the manner of producing them; consequently, you ought not to assert, that these things cannot subsist separately in nature, and that nature cannot have of itself, what, according to you, the Plastic Beings received from God. In a word, Mr. Bayle asked, *whether these Gentlemen maintained that the Plastic and Vital Natures are but instruments in the hands of God*, as Mr. le Clerc seemed to suppose, by his comparison of an Architect.

(46) *Hist. des Ouvr. des Savans*, Août 1704 Art. 7. pag. 380, &c.

Mr. le Clerc answered (47), that according to Dr. Cudworth, the *Plastic Natures* were not passive instruments; but that they are under God's direction, who conducts them, tho' we cannot explain after what manner. Nor can the Atheists, added he, retort the argument, because God is the Author of the regularity and order, with which the Plastic Natures act; whereas, according to the Atheists, matter moves of itself without any cause to direct it, and to give it a power of moving regularly. This dispute was carried on still farther with some heat and a great many repetitions on both sides. But what we have said appears to us sufficient to give the Reader a notion of this controversy: they who desire to know more of it, may consult the Books to which we refer in the margin (48). We must acquaint the Reader, that both in this Remark and in the preceding, we have acted only the part of an Historian, without pretending to approve or to condemn either Mr. le Clerc's or Mr. Bayle's opinions.

(47) *Bibl. Choif.* tom. 6. Art. 7. pag. 422.

(48) *Hist. des Ouvr. des Savans*, Dec. 1704, Art. 12. *Bibliot. Choisie*, tom. 7. Art. 7. *Repon. aux Quæst. d'un Provincial*, tom. 3. chap. 179, &c. *Biblioth. Choisie*, tom. 9. Art. 10. *Réponse pour Mr. Bayle à Mr. Le Clerc*, pag. 31. annexed to the 4th vol. of the *Rép. aux Quæst. d'un provincial.*

[N] *A Catalogue of the rest of his Works.*] He hardly passed one year without publishing some Book. In 1690 he translated in Latin the last Book of *Thomas Stanley's Philosophical History*, which contains the History of the Eastern Philosophy, whereof our Author had published Extracts in the seventh volume of his *Bibliotheque Universelle*. In the year 1691 he printed his Logic, his Ontology, and Pneumatology, and to compleat his course of Philosophy, he published in the year 1695 his Natural Philosophy. He had dedicated his Logic to that great Philosopher Robert Boyle, but he dying before it came to his hand, in the next edition the Author addressed it to his friend Mr. Locke, as he had likewise done his Ontology and Pneumatology.

of books which Mr. Le Clerc publiſhed, that he was a very laborious and learned man; and though moſt of his works are uſeful, yet they would have been much more ſo, had he written leſs, and taken more pains with what he wrote. He enjoyed a very good health till about the year 1730, when he began viſibly to decay; his memory and attention failed him, and though what he ſaid in converſation was ſtill reaſonable and well connected, yet it was ſeldom to the purpoſe, and quite different from the ſubject of the converſation. He was almoſt childiſh the five laſt years of his life, and died January the 8th 1736, N. S. Though he often declared, that he firmly believed the Divinity of our Saviour, yet his enemies would abſolutely have him to be a Socinian. It is true that in his *Epiſtolæ Liberii de Sancto Amore* (*k*) he ſeems to favour the Socinians or Unitarians; but this is a book which he wrote when he was very young; and he has often declared ſince, that

(*k*) See the Remark [*B*].

logy. Theſe Philoſophical Works were reprinted the fourth time at Amſterdam in 1710, in four volumes 8vo, with the life of Mr. le Clerc, which makes the fifth volume. They have been more than once printed here in England, and his Natural Philoſophy has even been tranſlated into Engliſh, and is of all his Works, that which this nation eſteemed moſt till the year 1705, if we may believe the Author who tells us this circumſtance (49). Our Author had alſo publiſhed in 1690, *Lettre à Mr. Jurieu, ſur la maniere dont il a traité Epiſcopius dans ſon Tableau du Socinianiſme*. i. e. "A letter to Mr. Jurieu concerning his "uſage of Epiſcopius, in his picture of Socinianiſm." 8vo. This letter has alſo been tranſlated into Dutch, and Mr. Bayle has given ſome extracts of it, with his reflections upon it in the Article EPISCOPIUS (50). In 1693, Mr. le Clerc publiſhed the firſt volume of his Commentaries on the Bible; it contained only Geneſis; and in 1695 he publiſhed his Commentary upon the four following Books, in which he inſerted a Commentary upon the firſt Chapter of St. John's Goſpel: it appears by this Commentary, that he was very far from admitting the opinion of the Unitarians. His Commentaries upon the Hiſtorical Books of the Old Teſtament were not publiſhed till the year 1708, and thoſe upon the *Hagiographa* and the *Prophets*, were publiſhed in 2 Vol. fol. in 1731. The Reader may find an account of them in the *Bibliotheque Raiſonnée* (51), and in the *Hiſtoria Literaria* (52). In 1696 he publiſhed the two firſt volumes of his *Ars Critica*, and in 1699 (53) he publiſhed his *Epiſtolæ Criticæ & Eccleſiaſticæ*, which make up the third volume of that Work. In theſe Epiſtles he maintains what he had aſſerted in the tenth volume of his *Biblioth. Univerſ.* viz. that Dr. Cave in his *Hiſtoria Literaria of Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, had concealed many things in the lives of Clement and Euſebius, in order to inhance their credit: and he treats of the uſe and authority of eccleſiaſtical antiquity, and fully expoſes the diſſimulations and pious frauds which ſo frequenly occur in Church-Hiſtory. He had publiſhed in 1694 the life of Cardinal de Richelieu in French, 2 volumes 12mo. This Hiſtory was univerſally approved as ſavouring of no kind of partiality, but repreſenting the actions of that great man in a true light. There was a ſecond impreſſion of it in the year 1696, and a third corrected and enlarged in 1714: to this laſt Mr. le Clerc prefixed his name. We had almoſt forgot to obſerve, that in 1693 he publiſhed at a Bookſeller's requeſt *Hiſtoire d'Emeric Conte de Tekeli, ou, Mémoire pour ſervir à ſa vie; où l'on voit ce qui s'eſt paſſé de plus conſiderable en Hungrie, depuis ſa Naiſſance, juſqu' à préſent*. But this being only compiled out of the Gazettes, and other public News, he never owned it as his Work, nor mentioned it in the catalogue of his Writings. He wrote a Work of more uſe and moment; it was his French Treatiſe *de l' Incredulité*, which was publiſhed in 1696. He inquires therein into the general reaſons and motives, which induce unbelievers to reject the Chriſtian Religion. The next year he publiſhed a ſhort account of Univerſal Hiſtory in Latin from the beginning of the world to the time of Charles the Great, with a brief expoſition of Chronology: but this Book is not much eſteemed, tho' it may be uſeful to young beginners. In the beginning of the year 1698 he publiſhed his Latin Tranſlation of Dr. Hammond's Annotations on the New Teſtament †, with ſome Notes of his own, wherein he either gently confutes the Doctor, or confirms his aſſertions, or ſupplies his omiſſions. Theſe Notes have been tranſlated into Engliſh, and make up one volume in 4to.

(49) *Nouv. de la Rep. des Lett.* 1705, Aout, pag. 227.

(50) Remark [*H*].

(51) Tom. 6. Part 2. pag. 362. and tom. 7. pag. 5.

(52) Num. 13. pag. 26. of the 3d vol. This is an Engliſh Journal.

(53) That ſame year the two firſt volumes were reprinted. They were alſo reprinted in England.

† It was reprinted at Francfort in 1714, corrected and enlarged by Mr. Le Clerc.

In 1699 was printed his *Harmonia Evangelica* in Greek and Latin, to which he added a Paraphraſe upon the whole, and at the end ſome diſſertations upon the ſubject, and ſhort notes on the Harmony itſelf. In 1700 he took care of a new edition of Dionyſius Petavius's *Dogmata Theologica*, together with ſome other Books in Divinity which were written by that learned Jeſuit at different times, and the ſame year he publiſhed his *Quæſtiones Hieronymianæ*, in anſwer to F. Martinai a Benedictine Monk, who not long before had publiſhed an edition of St. Jerom, and treated both our Author and his uncle with great ſeverity, becauſe they happened to diſagree with him in relation to that Father's character and Writings: and therefore Mr. le Clerc plainly ſhews that St. Jerom was not that critick in the Greek and Hebrew tongues, as is pretended, nor his Editor any ways competent for the Work, ſince almoſt in every page he makes egregious blunders. In 1701 when the Bookſellers in Holland deſigned to print all the Works of Heſiod in two volumes, our Author took care of the whole impreſſion, both in Latin and Greek, added the Notes of Joſeph Scaliger, Daniel Heinſius, Francis Guietus, and Stephen le Clerc. J. Geo. Grævius's various readings and editions; Daniel Heinſius's introduction to the Book *Operum & Dierum*, and his own Animadverſions upon the *Theogonia*. In the ſame year he wrote an Etymological Diſſertation by way of Preface to Mat. Martinius's Philological *Lexicon*. In 1702 he publiſhed Pedo Albinovanus's Elogies and fragments, and P. Cornelius Severus's *Ætna* and fragments, with the Notes and Interpretations of Joſeph Scaliger, Nic. Heinſius and others; to which he prefixed a Preface, wherein he lays down the right manner of interpreting an Author. In 1703 a Bookſeller of Amſterdam intending to publiſh St. Auguſtin's Works according to the Paris Edition, was adviſed by our Author to ſubjoin the Diſſertation of John Garnier relating to the Pelagian Hiſtory, Pelagius's Commentaries on the Epiſtles of St. Paul, the Cenſures, Prefaces, Notes and Diſſertations, which Eraſmus and other learned men had made upon that Father; and himſelf at the ſame time, under the name of Joannes Phereponus, wrote critical and theological Animadverſions upon St. Auguſtin, wherein he illuſtrates many places, and commends others; tho' he is not afraid to cenſure ſome wherein he conceived that this father had deviated from the rules both of reaſon and revelation, which ought to guide him as well as any other Author; and accordingly we find him refuting ſeveral of his Expoſitions of Scripture, the falſe Miracles he relates, the perſecution of Hereticks which he maintains, and the Doctrine of Predeſtination as he expounds it. Nor can we ſee why errors ſhould not be condemned in the Ancients as well as in the Moderns: nay, in the Ancients the rather, becauſe as their authority is greater, the contagion of their Doctrine is more dangerous. That ſame year (1703) our Author publiſhed a French tranſlation of the New Teſtament, with explanatory Notes. This Work made a great noiſe, and ſeveral French Miniſters exclaimed loudly againſt it, and amongſt others the Reverend Mr. Philip Meſnard Preacher at the French Chapel in St. James's Palace, charged him openly with Socinianiſm, in a Book publiſhed in 1709, and intitled *Eſſai ſur le Socinianiſme* (54). But Mr. Bernard, in the account he gave of this Work of Mr. le Clerc had the following paſſage. "As to "Socinianiſm, with which Mr. Le Clerc has been charged, it is true that we do not find in his Notes the words "*Perſon*, *Incarnation*, *Trinity*, *Satisfaction*, which have "been conſecrated by the Church, and which might it "ſeems,

(54) See *Bibl. Choiſie*, tom. 18. pag. 401, &c.

that he was of the ſame opinion with all the Chriſtians as to the doctrine of the holy Trinity, and that he was of the opinion of Remonſtrants concerning Chriſt's ſacrifice (*l*). However the leaſt charge of Socinianiſm exaſperated him exceedingly, as has been obſerved by ſeveral perſons, and appears by his paſſionate anſwer to ſome paſſages in Mr. Bayle's Letters (*m*).

(*l*) See *Bibliotb. Choiſie*, tom. 8. pag. 403.

(*m*) See the Remark [*H*].

" ſeems, be employed very innocently and even uſe-
" fully, tho' we do not find them in the Scriptures;
" It is alſo true, that Mr. le Clerc does not explain
" ſome paſſages as we uſe to do; but it is certain, that
" he often ſpeaks of Chriſt's Divinity, and that he
" finds it in ſeveral paſſages, and even in ſome in which
" all the Orthodox Divines do not find that Doctrine (55)." Some Miniſters of Amſterdam did all that lay in their power to prevail upon the Magiſtrates to prohibit this tranſlation of the New Teſtament; the Walloon Synods alſo endeavoured to have it ſuppreſſed, but none of them could ſucceed in their attempts (56). That ſame year 1703 Mr. le Clerc began his *Bibliotheque Choiſie*, which he continued to the year 1714, when the death of the Bookſeller obliged him to diſcontinue that Journal which was ſwelled up to twenty ſeven volumes. He then began another upon the ſame plan, intitled, *Bibliotheque Ancienne & Moderne*, which he wrote till it made up twenty eight volumes. In 1705 he digeſted into a proper order, and amended from ſeveral groſs faults the Copper Plates of the *Atlas antiquus &c.* publiſhed by a famous Map-ſeller at Amſterdam; but thro' his negligence and parſimony, who would not be at the expence of correcting the Plates, the Maps are ſtill full of errors and miſtakes. In 1707 were publiſhed all the Works of Eraſmus in ten volumes in *folio*, to which our Author, in conjunction with ſome other learned men, added ſhort Notes and diſtinct Prefaces before each volume, in which he endeavoured to give that learned and ingenious writer his juſt commendation, and the Reader a proper character of all his Works. In the year 1709 he reviſed and added ſome Notes to the new edition of *Sulpitius Severus* (57). In the ſame year he reviſed and added large Notes to the new edition of Grotius's Book, *de Veritate Chriſtianæ Religionis*, and joined a treatiſe to it, intitled, *De eligenda inter Chriſtianos diſſentientes Sententia*. That ſame year he publiſhed *Menandri & Philemonis Reliquiæ, quotquot reperiri potuerunt, Græcè & Latinè, cum Notis Hug. Grotii, & Joan. Clerici, qui etiam novam omnium Verſionem adornavit, indiceſque adjecit*. 8vo. Amſterdam, 1709. This Work was vigorouſly attacked by Dr. Bentley under the name of *Phileleutherus Lipſienſis*, and it is ſaid that his cenſure vexed Mr. le Clerc to ſuch a degree, that it made him fall into a fit of ſickneſs, which laſted ſeveral days. He wrote a Defence of himſelf in 1711, in 8vo. In 1710 he publiſhed a new edition of Livy, in ten volumes 8vo, with Notes of his own, and all the Supplements of Freinſhemius corrected and amended. The ſame year when Mr. Joſeph Waſſe intended to publiſh a beautiful edition of Salluſt, our Author ſent the Editor a ſhort life of that Roman Hiſtorian, which he had chiefly collected out of the Writings of the Ancients. In 1711 Mr. le Clerc publiſhed three Epiſtles which are found at the end of Plato's Works, and are commonly aſcribed to Æſchines, Socrates's ſcholar, in a ſmall volume, and with plain and eaſy Notes, to which he added a Piece of his, entitled, *Sylvæ Philologicæ*. The learned Mr. Limborch dying in 1712 Mr. le Clerc made his Funeral Oration, and printed it with this title. *Oratio Funebris in Obitum Rever. & Clariſſ. Viri Philippi a Limborch S. Theologiæ apud Remonſtrantes Profeſſoris, defuncti die* 30 *Aprilis, Anno* 1712. *Habita a Joanne Clerico die ſexto Maii, quo ſepultus eſt, in* 4*to*. In 1716 he publiſhed *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtica duorum primorum à Chriſto nato Sæculorum, è veteribus Monumentis deprompta*. This Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory is very valuable, and the *Prolegomena* which the Author has prefixed to it are not the leaſt conſiderable and uſeful part of the Work. Some great men on the Arminian ſide prevailed upon our Author to write the Hiſtory of the United Provinces, and he publiſhed the firſt volume in the year 1723, with this title, *Hiſtoire des Provinces Unies depuis la naiſſance de la Republique, juſqu' a' la Paix d'Utretcht, & le Traitè de Barrière conclu en* 1716. Folio. The ſecond and third Volume came out in 1724.

(55) *Nouvell. de la Rep. des Lett.* 1703, Juillet 43.

(56) *Let. de Mr. Boyle*, tom. 3. pag. 939, 394, and not. 2. *Let. à Mr. Minutoli.* du 16 Dec. 1703.

(57) See the *Bibl. Choiſie*, vol. 20. Part 2. Art. 6.

Beſides theſe Books, there are ſome others of our Author, as a French tranſlation of Biſhop Burnet's criticiſm on the IXth Book of Varillas's Hiſtory, wherein he treats of the Revolutions of Religion in England; of the Biſhop's defence of that criticiſm; of three Sermons of the ſame Prelate. There is alſo a Book, which our Author publiſhed in 1696, intitled *du Bonheur & du Malheur en matiere de Lotteries*. " Of good " and bad luck in Lotteries." He has alſo reviſed Moreri's Dictionary, and written ſeveral Diſſertations, Prefaces, and Notes, upon great and valuable Works reprinted in Holland.

Mr. le Clerc having made ſome Remarks againſt Dr. Mill's New Teſtament in the account he gave of it in *his Bibliotheque Choiſie* (58); Dr. Wotton wrote a pretty ſevere anſwer, which may be ſeen in a Book, intitled, *Remarks on ſome Books lately publiſhed*. Printed at London in 1709. See page 174, &c. P.

(58) See tom. 14. Art. 10. and tom. 16. Art. 6.

COCHLEUS (JOHN) Doctor of Divinity, Canon of Mentz and of Worms, and Dean of our Lady in Francfort, was born in Wendelſtein near Nuremberg, about the year ... (*a*) .., Though he employed himſelf very much in controverſial writings, he nevertheleſs compoſed ſome pieces of another kind, he drawing up an hiſtory of Theodoric King of the Oſtrogoths [*A*], printed at Ingolſtad in 1544; and an hiſtory of Totila that was never publiſhed (*b*).

(*a*) In the *Nova Maris Baltbici*, Feb. 1699, pag. 41, it is ſaid to be anno 1502.

(*b*) He mentions this in the Preface to the *Hiſtory of Theodoric.*

[*A*] *He drawing up an Hiſtory of Theodorick King of the Ostrogoths.*] The Author of the Journal of the Baltick, for February 1699, ſays, that the following Book was printed at Stockholm. *Vita Theodorici Regis Oſtrogothorum & Italiæ, Auctore Joanne Cochlæo, Germano, cum additamentis & annotationibus, quæ Sueo-Gothorum ex Scandia expeditiones & commercia illuſtrant, operâ Johannis Peringſkioldi.* This work of Cochlæus was become very ſcarce. The perſon who has undertaken to give a new edition of, and add notes to it, has compared that of Ingolſtad with a copy taken from the manuſcript of Prague, and collated with that in the Hamburg Library (1). The ſame Author informs us in his Journal for November 1699, that the new edition in queſtion was finiſhed.

(1) Extracted from *Nova Literaria maris Baltbici, & Septentrionis, Mens, Feb.* 1699, pag. 41.

(*a*) So his name is written in a great many manuſcript papers of his own time. Leigh in his *Fœlix Conſortium, or a fit Conjuncture of Religion and Learning*, B. 3. cap. 13. pag. 170. and David Lloyd, in his *State-Worthies*, pag. 820. 2d edit. London 1670 call him *Cook*.

☞ COKE or COOKE (*a*) (EDWARD), Lord Chief Juſtice of the King's-Bench in the reign of King James I, was deſcended from an antient family in the county of Norfolk (*b*), and ſon of Robert Coke of Mileham in that county Eſq; by Winifrid, daughter and one of the heirs of William Knightley of Morgrave-Knightley in Norfolk (*c*). He was born at Mileham (*d*) about the year 1549, and at ten years of age ſent to the grammar-ſchool at Norwich, from whence he was removed to Trinity-College in Cambridge, where he ſtudied four years, and went from thence to Cliffords-Inn in London (*e*), and the year after was entered a Student in the Inner-Temple (*f*). The firſt occaſion of his diſtinguiſhing himſelf was his ſtating of the caſe of the Cook belonging to the Temple ſo exactly, that all the

(*b*) *Peerage of England. By* Arthur Collins Eſq; vol. 3. pag. 507, 508. edit. London 1735.
(*c*) Idem, ibid. pag. 508.
(*d*) Fuller's *Worthies in Norfolk*, and Lloyd, *ubi ſupra*.
(*e*) Lloyd, *ubi ſupra*.
(*f*) Collins, pag. 509.

the Houſe, who were puzzled with it, admired him; and his pleading it ſo, that the whole Bench took notice of him (g). Here he made ſo great a progreſs in the Study of the Law, that at the end of ſix years, (which was exceedingly early in that ſtrict age,) he was called to the Bar [A], and ſoon after, for three ſucceſſive years, choſen Reader of Lyon's-Inn, where his learned Lectures procured him ſo great a reputation, that crouds of clients came to him for counſel (h), and the report of his more than ordinary gains in his practice gave him opportunity of paying his addreſſes with ſucceſs to Bridget, daughter and coheir of John Paſton of Huntingfield-Hall in Suffolk Eſq; [B], whoſe portion amounted to thirty thouſand pounds (i). After his marriage with her preferments flowed in upon him, the Cities of Coventry (k) and Norwich (l) chooſing him for their Recorder, the County of Norfolk one of their Knights in Parliament, and the Houſe of Commons their Speaker (m), in the thirty fifth year of Queen Elizabeth (n). The Queen likewiſe appointed him Sollicitor-General in 1592, and Attorney-General the year following (o). Several of his Letters written, while he was in this poſt, to the Lord Treaſurer Burghley are ſtill extant [C]. In 1598 he married for his ſecond wife Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Lord Burghley, afterwards Earl of Exeter, and Relict of Sir William Hatton, at a private Houſe without Bans or Licence; upon which they, together with Mr. Henry Bothwell, Rector of Oakeover, who married them, and Thomas Lord Burghley, and ſeveral other perſons of diſtinction, who were preſent, were proſecuted in Archbiſhop Whitgift's Court, and upon their ſubmiſſion by their proxies abſolved from the cenſures incurred [D]. In 1603 he was knighted by King James I (p); and in November the ſame year, upon the trial of Sir Walter Raleigh &c. at Wincheſter, he treated that Gentleman with a fury and ſcurrility of Language hardly to be parallel'd [E]. On Monday January the 27th 160⅘ at the trial of the Gun-powder Conſpirators, and on Friday March the 28th following at the trial

(g) Lloyd, pag. 820.

(h) Idem, ibid.

(i) Idem, ibid. *and* Fuller, *ubi ſupra.*

(k) Collins, pag. 510.

(l) Lloyd, *ubi ſupra, and* Fuller, *ubi ſupra.*

(m) Lloyd and Fuller, *ubi ſupra.*

(n) Collins, pag. 510.

(o) Idem, ibid.

(p) Idem, ibid.

[A] *Called to the Bar.*] The firſt cauſe that he moved in the King's Bench was in Trinity-Term in the 20th year of Elizabeth when he was Council for Denny Vicar of Northlinham in the County of Norfolk, in an action of *Scandalum Magnatum* brought againſt him by Henry Lord Cromwell (1).

(1) *Coke's Reports*, Part 4. 12, b; and 14, b.

[B] *Paying his addreſſes with ſucceſs to Bridget, daughter and coheir of John Paſton of Huntingfield-Hall in Suffolk Eſq;*] This Lady was related to many noble families, her aunt Eleanor, ſiſter to her father, being married to Thomas Earl of Rutland, by whom ſhe had Henry Earl of Rutland; Gertrude married to George Talbot Earl of Shrewſbury; Anne, to Henry Nevil Earl of Weſtmorland; and Frances, wife to Henry Nevil Lord Abergavenny (2).

(2) *Peerage of England. By* Arthur Collins Eſq; vol. 3. pag. 509. edit. London 1735.

[C] *Several of his Letters, written while he was in this poſt, to the Lord Treaſurer Burghley, are ſtill extant.*] There are ſome of them amongſt the valuable collections of the very learned and ingenious James Weſt of the Middle-Temple Eſq; particularly one dated October the 27th 1593 concerning Mr. Swynerton's Leaſe of Wines; another dated May 20th, which from the Endorſement appears to be written in 1596, relating to the Spreader of the ſlanders againſt the Lord Admiral; another dated from his houſe in Holborne April 7th 1597, concerning the State of Mr. John Stanhope's Manor of Barleburgh and Kynnoldmarſhe in the County of Derby, and the lands in Ratcliff upon Trent in the County of Nottingham; another dated the laſt of June 1597, relating to his *drawing of Mr. Pagett's Book*; another dated from the Temple Octob. 21ſt 1597 concerning Mr. Peter Tuke's Petition for diſcharge of 1200 *l.* 4 *s.* 8 *d.* charged upon Sir Brian Tuke's account; and another dated from Godwike Auguſt 3d 1597; which is as follows:

" Right Honorable, My dutie moſt humbly remem-
" bred, I thought it my dutie to offer my humble ſer-
" vice to your Lordſhip, wherein it ſhall pleaſe your
" Lordſhip to commaunde me, and to give your Lord-
" ſhip moſt humble thankes (amongſt many other fa-
" voures) for this preſent libertie. I would to God,
" your Lordſhip's Bodye (whereof your Lordſhip ſome-
" what complayned when I laſt attended on you) were
" of ſuch ſtrength and vivacitie as the admirable me-
" morie and other inward guifts be, wherewith God
" hath moſt abundauntly bleſſed your Lordſhip with
" all. This unſeaſonable Wynde and Rayne (which
" our Countrie hath taſted in ſo great abundance) is
" to be feared will continue this preſent dearth, where-
" with our Countrie (which is exceedingly repleniſhed
" with poore) is grievouſlie afflicted, unles God of his
" mercy do ſend a more ſeaſonable tyme to ripen, and
" inne corne and other commodities. And thus I moſt
" humblie take my leave and reſt in all things at your
" Lordſhip's commaundment with all thankful readi-
" neſs. From Godwike this 3d of Auguſt 1597.
" Your Lo. moſt humble at comaundment,
" Edw. Coke."

[D] *Proſecuted in Archbiſhop Whitgift's Court, and upon their ſubmiſſion by their proxies abſolved from the cenſures incurred.*] The Inſtrument dated Novemb. 7th 1598 is preſerved among the Records in the Regiſtry at Lambeth (3), and ſets forth that by their overlooking the authority of the Church they had all fallen under the greater excommunications and the conſequent penalties, but that they were abſolved, becauſe they had offended not out of contumacy, but through ignorance of the Law in that point. *Nos igitur conſiderantes quod errore tantum, ac jurium in eâ parte ignorantiâ, animo minimè obdurato, nec contemptui dedito, in diverſas pœnas incidiſtis, quodque in veræ veſtræ recipiſcentiæ Teſtimonium nobis in hac parte vos ſubmiſiſtis, ac unuſquiſque veſtrum per Procuratorem ſuum ſupraſcript. ſe ſubmiſit &c.* Mr. Collier obſerves (4), that there is another abſolution in the ſame form granted to Sir Thomas Egerton Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, and Alice Counteſs of Derby; and another to the Earl of Hertford, not to mention the reſt in the ſame Regiſter; and that the regiſters of the ſucceeding Archbiſhops have likewiſe inſtances of the ſame kind.

(3) *Regiſt. Whitgift*, Part 3. fol. 108. A. D. 1598. *See* Collier's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Great Britain*, Part 2. B. 7. pag. 662. and *Collection of Records*, pag. 102.

(4) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 662.

[E] *He treated that Gentleman with a fury and ſcurrility of language hardly to be paralleled.*] This raiſed ſo general a reſentment againſt him, that he was expoſed for it upon the public Theatre (5). He was likewiſe reproached with this kind of behaviour, after his own fall by Sir Francis Bacon, who in a *Letter Admonitory* to the Lord Coke, M. S. ſigned A. B. in a volume of State-Letters among the Collections of the Lord Coleraine (6), and printed in the *Cabala* with Sir Francis Bacon's name prefixed to it, and an Extract of it in Arthur Wilſon's *Hiſtory of King James* (7), writes as follows: *As your pleadings were wont to inſult over miſery, and inveigh bitterly againſt the perſon, ſo are you ſtill careleſs in this point, to praiſe and diſgrace upon ſlight grounds, and that ſuddenly; ſo that your reproofs or commendations are for the moſt part neglected and contemned, when the cenſure of a Judge coming ſlow, but ſure, ſhould be a brand to the guilty, and a crown to the virtuous. You will jeſt at any man in publick, without any reſpect to the perſon's dignity or your own. This diſgraces your gravity more than it can advance the opinion of your wit; and ſo do all actions, which we ſee you do directly with a touch of vain-glory. You make the Laws too much lean to your opinion; whereby you ſhew your ſelf to be a legal Tyrant &c.* The Author of the Life of Sir Walter Raleigh in *Lives Engliſh and Foreign* (8), having ſhewn with what temper Sir Walter behaved under all the ſcurrilities of the Attor-

(5) See Mr. Theobald's edition of Shakeſpear, 8vo 1733, vol. 2. in the Comedy called, *The Twelfth-Night*, Act. 3. pag. 503.

(6) Fol. 772. See Mr. Oldys's *Life of Sir Walter Raleigh*, pag. 153. Note (c).

(7) Pag. 96, 97. edit. London 1653, in fol.

(8) Vol. 1. pag. 124. edit. 1704, in 8vo.

ney-

trial of Henry Garnet, Superior of the Jeſuits, at Guildhall in the City of London, he made two very elaborate ſpeeches, which were ſoon after publiſhed [F]. Cecil, Earl of Saliſbury, obſerved in his ſpeech upon the latter trial, that the *Evidence had been ſo well diſtributed and opened by the Attorney-General*, that he had never heard *ſuch a maſs of matter better contracted, nor made more intelligible to the jury*. June 27th the ſame year he was appointed Lord Chief Juſtice of the Common-Pleas (*q*); and October the 25th 1613 he was made Lord Chief Juſtice of the King's-Bench (*r*), and November the 4th was ſworn of his Majeſty's Privy-Council (*s*). In 1615, the King deliberating upon the choice of a Lord Chancellor, when that poſt ſhould become vacant by the death or reſignation of Egerton, Lord Elleſmere, Sir Francis Bacon wrote to his Majeſty a letter dated February the 12th 1615 † upon that ſubject, wherein he has the following paſſage relating to the Lord Chief Juſtice: "If you take my Lord Coke, this will follow. Firſt your "Majeſty ſhall put an *over-ruling Nature* into an over-ruling place, which may breed an "extreme. Next, you ſhall blunt his induſtries in matter of Finances, which ſeemeth "to aim at another place. And laſtly, popular men are no ſure mounters for your "Majeſty's ſaddle." In the latter end of the ſame year he was very vigorous in the diſcovery and proſecution of the perſons employed in poiſoning Sir Thomas Overbury in the Tower in September 1612 [G]. His conteſt not long after with the Lord Chancellor Egerton,

(q) Camden's *Annals of King James I, ad ann.* 1608. printed at the end of *Guil. Camdeni & illuſtr. Viror. ad G. Camden. Epiſt. edit. Lond.* 1691 *in* 4to.

(r) Idem 1613.

(s) Idem, ibid.

† Publiſhed in the *Cabala, ſive Scrinia ſacra*, pag. 29. edit. London 1663, in fol.

ney-General, proceeds thus: "We have given the rea- "der a taſte of the eloquence of the Bar in that reign, "to ſhew how far the hopes of places and preferment "will ſometimes carry men of ſenſe and learning from "reaſon and juſtice. This Billingſgate-way of ar- "guing is the more remarkable in a perſon of the "Lord Coke's character, whoſe writings are ſtill Ora- "cles in Weſtminſter Hall, &c." The Author of the Preface to the Collection of *State-Trials* in ſix volumes in folio, having ſpoken of ſuch Council as are wont to preſs nothing illegal or unreaſonable againſt the priſoner, nor uſe any artifices to deprive him of his juſt defence, adds; *Theſe will appear in a different light from thoſe; who with rude and boiſterous language abuſe and revile the unfortunate priſoner; who ſtick not to take all advantages of him, however hard and unjuſt, which either his ignorance or the ſtrict rigour of the law may give them; who by force or ſtratagem endeavour to diſable him from making his defence; who brow-beat his witneſſes as ſoon as they appear, tho' ever ſo willing to declare the whole truth; and do all they can to put them out of countenance, and confound them in delivering their evidence, as if it were the duty of their place to convict all who are brought to trial, right or wrong, guilty or not guilty; and as if they, above all others, had a peculiar diſpenſation from the obligations of truth and juſtice. Such methods as theſe ſhould be below men of honour, not to ſay men of conſcience; yet in the peruſal of this work ſuch perſons will too often ariſe to view; and I could wiſh, for the credit of the Law, that that great Oracle of it, the Lord Chief Juſtice* Coke *had given leſs reaſon to be numbered among this ſort.* The Author then refers us to the Trial of Sir Walter Raleigh, as a moſt flagrant example of this.

[F] *Made two very elaborate Speeches, which were ſoon after publiſhed.*] They are printed in a Book, entitled, *A true and perfect Relation of the whole proceedings againſt the late moſt barbarous Traitors, Garnet a Jeſuit, and his Confederats: Contayning ſundry Speeches delivered by the Lords Commiſſioners at their Arraignments, for the better ſatisfaction of thoſe, that were hearers, as occaſion was offered; the Earl of Northampton's Speech having bene enlarged upon thoſe grounds, which are ſet downe. And laſtly, all that paſſed at Garnet's execution* (9).

(9) Imprinted at London by Robert Barker, Printer to the King's moſt excellent Majeſtie 1606, in 4to.

[G] *In the latter end of the year* 1615 *he was very vigorous in the diſcovery and proſecution of the perſons employed in poiſoning Sir Thomas Overbury in the Tower in September* 1612.] Sir Francis Bacon, then Attorney-General, in his Speech in the Star-Chamber againſt Mr. Lumſden, Sir John Hollis, Sir John Wentworth, has the following paſſage: "Mr. Lumſden plays his part "firſt, who in the time between Weſton's ſtanding "mute and his trial, frames a moſt odious and libel- "lous relation, containing as many untruths as lines, "ſets it down in writing with his own hand, and de- "livers it to one of the Bed-Chamber to be put into "the King's hands, falſifying all that was done the "firſt day of Weſton's arraignment, turning the pike "and point of his imputations upon the Lord Chief "Juſtice of England, whoſe name thus occurring, I "cannot paſs by, and yet I cannot ſkill of this ſame "flattery or vulgar attribute; but this I will ſay of "him, and I would ſay as much to Ages, *That never "man's perſon and his place were better met in a buſi- "neſs, than my Lord Cook and my Lord Chief Juſtice in the "cauſe of Overbury* (10)." Sir Anthony Weldon introduces his account of this affair with theſe words (11). *And now begins the game to be plaid, in which Somerſet muſt be the loſer, the cards being ſhuffled, cut, and dealt between the King and Sir Edward Coke, Chief Juſtice (whoſe daughter Purbeck, Villiers his brother had married, or was to marry, and therefore a fit Inſtrument to ruin Somerſet,) and Secretary Winwood. Theſe all play'd: the ſtake Somerſet's life and his Lady's, and their fortunes, and the Family of Suffolk. Some of them play'd booty; and in truth the game was not played above-board.* Having afterwards obſerved (12), that Franklin upon his arraigment confeſſed, that Overbury *was ſmothered to death, not poiſoned to death, tho' he had poiſon given him*, he proceeds thus (13): "Here was "Cooke glad how to caſt about to bring both ends to- "gether, Mrs. Turner and Weſton being already hang- "ed for killing Overbury with poiſon. But he being "the very quinteſſence of Law, preſently informs "the Jury, that if a man be done to death with pi- "ſtols, poniards, ſwords, halter, poiſons, &c. ſo he "be done to death, the Indictment is good, if but in- "dicted for any of thoſe ways. But the good Lawyers "of thoſe times were not of that opinion, but did be- "lieve, that Mrs. Turner was directly murthered by "my Lord Cooke's Law, as Overbury was without "any Law." The ſame Writer likewiſe informs us (14), that it was verily believed, that when the King *made thoſe terrible imprecations upon himſelf, and deprecations of the Judges* at Royſton (15), when the proſecution was firſt ſet on foot, *it was intended the Law ſhould run in its proper channel, but was ſtopt and put out of courſe by the folly of that great Clerk, though no wiſe man, Sir Edward Cooke, who in a vain-glorious ſpeech, to ſhew his vigilancy, enters into a rapture as he then ſat on the Bench, ſaying,* God knows what became of that ſweet Babe Prince Henry, but I know ſomewhat. *And ſurely in ſearching the Cabinets he lighted on ſome papers, that ſpoke plain in that, which was ever whiſper'd; which had he gone on in a gentle way, would have fallen in of themſelves, not to have been prevented; but this folly of his tongue ſtopt the breath of that diſcovery of that ſo foul a murder, which, I fear, cries ſtill for vengeance.* Arthur Wilſon alſo having obſerved, that Sir Thomas Monſon, one of the Agents of the Counteſs of Somerſet, had paſt one day's trial at Guildhall, tells us (16), that the Lord Chief Juſtice Coke in his rhetorical flouriſhes at the arraignment of Sir Thomas vented ſome expreſſions, (which he either deduced from the Earl of Northampton's aſſuring Sir Gerwas Elways, the Lieutenant of the Tower, that *the making away of Overbury would be acceptable to the King, or from ſome other ſecret hint received,*) as if he could diſcover more than the death of a private perſon; intimating, tho' not plainly, that Overbury's untimely remove had ſomething in it of Retaliation, as if he had been guilty of the ſame crime againſt Prince Henry, bleſſing himſelf with admiration at the horror of ſuch actions. *In which he flew to ſo high a pitch, that he was taken down by a Court-Lure, Sir Thomas Monſon's Trial laid aſide, and he ſoon after ſet at liberty, and*

(10) *Hiſtory of Great Britain, being the Life and Reign of King James the Firſt, relating to what paſſed from his firſt acceſs to the Crown till his Death. By Arthur Wilſon, Eſq;* pag. 87. edit. London 1653, in fol.

(11) *Court and Character of King James: whereunto now is added the Court of King Charles: continued unto the beginning of theſe unhappy times. With ſome Obſervations upon him inſtead of a Character. Collected and perfected by Sir A. W. Publiſhed by Authority.* pag. 91, 92. edit. London 1651.

(12) Ibid. pag. 100.

(13) Ibid. pag. 100, 101.

(14) Pag. 113, 114.

(15) See pag. 92, 93.

(16) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 89.

Egerton, with ſome other cauſes, haſtened the ruin of his intereſt with the Court [*H*]; ſo that he was brought upon his knees before the Council at Whitehall June the 26th 1616, and his offences charged upon him by Yelverton, the Sollicitor-General [*I*], and on June the 30th following he was ſequeſtered from the Council-Table, and the Office of Lord Chief

and the Lord Chief Juſtice's wings were clipt for it ever after. And it was rumoured, that the King, heightened to ſo much paſſion by this eruption of Sir Edward Cook's, went to the Council-Table, and kneeling down there, deſired God to lay a curſe upon him and his poſterity for ever, if he were conſenting to Overbury's death. *But this cannot be aſſerted, being above our ſphere; yet as Mathematicians do propoſe to themſelves imaginary circles, for the ſeveral motions in the heavens, and though there be none diſcovered, yet they find the effects of what they apprehend; ſo the ſudden ſtopping of Monſon's Trial put ſtrange imaginations into men's heads, and thoſe ſeconded by reports too high for private diſcovery, their operation only falling under the common notion. But the Lord Chief Juſtice was blamed for flying out of his way; that having enough to proſecute the buſineſs, he would graſp after more, till he loſt all* (16).

(16) Pag. 90.

[*H*] *His conteſt with the Lord Chancellor Egerton, with ſome other cauſes, haſtened the ruin of his intereſt with the Court.*] Arthur Wilſon tells us (17), that Sir Edward had heard and determined a cauſe at the Common Law; and *ſome report there was jugling in the buſineſs*. The witneſs that knew and ſhould have related the truth, was wrought upon to be abſent, if any man would undertake to excuſe his non-appearance. A pragmatical fellow of the party undertook it, went with the witneſs to a Tavern, called for a gallon-pot full of ſack, bid him drink, and ſo leaving him went into the Court. This witneſs is called for as the prop of the cauſe; the undertaker anſwers upon oath, that *he left him in ſuch a condition, that if he continues in it but a quarter of an hour, he is a dead man*. This evidencing the man's incapability to come deaded the matter ſo, that it loſt the cauſe. The plaintiffs, who had received the injury, bring the buſineſs into Chancery. The defendants having had judgment at Common Law refuſe to obey the orders of that Court; whereupon the Lord Chancellor for contempt of the Court commits them to priſon. They petition againſt him in the Star-Chamber; the Lord Chief Juſtice joins with them, foments the difference, threatening the Lord Chancellor with a *Præmunire*. The Chancellor makes the King acquainted with the buſineſs, who ſent to Sir Francis Bacon his Attorney-General, Sir Henry Montagu, and Sir Randolph Crew his Serjeants at Law, and Sir Henry Yelverton his Sollicitor, commanding them to ſearch what precedents there have been of late years, wherein ſuch as complained in Chancery were relieved according to equity and conſcience after judgment at Common Law. Theſe being men well verſed in their profeſſion, after canvaſſing the matter throughly, returned anſwer to the King, that "there hath been a "ſtrong current of practice and proceeding in Chan"cery after judgment at Common Law, and many "times after execution, continued ſince Henry VII's "time to the Lord Chancellor that now is, both in "the reigns *(ſeriatim)* of the ſeveral Kings, and the "times of the ſeveral Chancellors, whereof divers "were great learned men in the Law; it being in "caſes, where there is no remedy for the ſubject by "the ſtrict courſe of the Common Law, unto which "the Judges are ſworn." *This*, ſays Wilſon (18), *ſatisfied the King, juſtified the Lord Chancellor, and the Chief Juſtice received the foil; which was a bitter potion to his ſpirit, but not ſtrong enough to work on him as his enemies wiſhed. Therefore to humble him the more, he is brought on his knees at the Council-Table; and three other ingredients added to the doſe of a more active operation.* Among Sir Francis Bacon's Letters printed in the *Cabala* *, we have ſeveral relating to this affair; and particularly one to the King, dated February 15th 1615, relating to the difference begun between the Chancery and the King's-Bench; another to Sir George Villiers, dated Feb. 19th, upon the ſame ſubject; and another to the King, dated Feb. 21ſt, in which he has this paſſage: *My opinion plainly is, that my Lord Coke at this time is not to be diſgraced, both becauſe he is ſo well habituate for that which remaineth of theſe capital cauſes, as alſo for that which I find is in his breaſt touching your finances and matters of repair of your eſtate. And (if I might ſpeak it) as I think it were good his hopes were at an end in ſome kind; ſo I could wiſh they were raiſed in ſome other* †. Roger Coke (19) gives us a different account of the occaſion of the Chief Juſtice's being in diſgrace, and informs us, that he was one of the firſt, who felt the effects of the power of the riſing favourite, Sir George Villiers, afterwards Duke of Buckingham, and *at this time* (20) *ſat very looſe and uneaſy*. He had highly diſguſted the Court and High-Church Party in oppoſing Bancroft's Articles againſt granting prohibitions at Common Law (21). He oppoſed the Chancellor's taking notice of a cauſe in the Bench after judgment given, contrary to the Act 4, Henry 4, 28. and refuſed to give any opinion in the caſe of Commendams, being a Judge, before it came judicially before him. *And however*, ſays Mr. Coke, *Egerton, upon the ſwearing Sir Henry Montague, when he ſucceeded Sir Edward Coke in the office of Chief Juſtice, declared Sir Edward's depoſing was for being ſo popular; yet I have it from one of Sir Edward's ſons, that the cauſe of his removal was this.* Sir Nicholas Tufton, being very aged, and having a Patent for life of the Green-Wax Office in the King's Bench, Villiers by his Agents dealt with Sir Nicholas, that if he would ſurrender his Patent, the King would make him Earl of Thanet, and in the mean time Sir Francis Bacon treated with Sir Edward to know whether in caſe Sir Nicholas ſurrendred his Patent the Viſcount ſhould prefer another to the Office. Sir Edward would give Sir Francis no other anſwer, than this, that *he was old, and could not wreſtle with my Lord*. However after Sir Nicholas had ſurrendred, Sir Edward refuſed to admit of a Clerk by Villiers's nomination, but ſtood upon his right, and thought the Judges of the King's-Bench ſerved the King to their loſs, and therefore he would ſo diſpoſe of the office, that the ſalaries of the other Judges of the King's-Bench ſhould be advanced. Upon this he was removed from his poſt, and Montague put in, who diſpoſed of the office as the Favourite pleaſed. *But tho' the Favourite's diſpleaſure*, ſays Mr. Coke, *began here with Sir Edward, it did not end ſo... However Sir Edward might have been reſtored again to his place, if he would have given a bribe; but he anſwered*, "A Judge ought not to take a bribe, nor give "a bribe." The Author of the Notes on Wilſon's *Life of King James*, publiſhed in the ſecond volume of Kennet's *Complete Hiſtory of England*, tells us *, that Sir Edward *loſt the King's favour, and ſome time after his place*, for letting words fall upon one of the Trials, "importing his ſuſpicion that Overbury had been poi"ſoned to prevent the diſcovery of another crime of "the ſame nature, committed upon one of the high"eſt rank, whom he termed a *ſweet Prince*; which "was taken to be meant of Prince Henry."

(17) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 94, 95.

(18) Ibid, pag. 95.

* Pag. 30, & ſeqq.

† Ibid. pag. 32.

(19) *Detection of the Court and State of England*, vol. 1. pag. 91, 92. edit. London 1719, in 8vo.

(20) In the year 1616.

(21) This happened in Michaelmas-Term, 1605. *See* Collier's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Great Britain*, Part 2. B. 8. pag. 688, 689.

* Pag. 689. edit. London 1706.

[*I*] *Brought upon his knees before the Council... and his offences charged upon him by Yelverton, the Sollicitor-General.*] The Letter of the Lords of the Council as publiſhed by Mr. Francis Peck (22) from the MS. Collections of the Reverend Mr. Thomas Baker, is as follows: "It may pleaſe your moſt excellent Majeſtie, "the Lord Chief Juſtice preſenting himſelf on his "knees at the Board, your Sollicitor ſignifyed, that "he was by your commandement to charge him for "certen Acts and Speeches, wherein your Majeſtie "was much unſatisfied, which were in number three: "I. *An Act done.* II. *Speeches of high contempt ut*"*tered in the Seat of Juſtice.* III. *Uncomely and un*"*dutiful carriage in the preſence of your Majeſtie, the* "*Privye Councell, and Judges.* Concerning the *firſt*, "which was the *Act*, it was done when he was in a "place of truſt, and concealed a Statute of 12000 *l.* "taken of Sir Chr. Hatton, to the uſe of Sir Ed. Cooke, "when he was your Majeſtie's Attorney General, not "to pay a debt of good value due unto your Majeſtie, "nor to accept of a diſcharge for the ſame. And for "the better ſtrengthening of the Stat. there was like"wiſe a Bond taken of 6000 *l.* with ſuerties to the "ſame effect. So that Sir Chr. Hatton lay charged "under the penalty of 18000 *l.* not to pay the debt, "nor agree to no Surrender, Diſchar[illegible], or Releaſe, "nor

(22) *Deſiderata Curioſa*; *or a Collection of divers ſcarce and curious pieces relating chiefly to Matters of Engliſh Hiſtory*, vol. 1. lib. 6. Num. 6. pag. 18, 19, 20. edit. London 1732 in fol.

Chief Juſtice [*K*]. October the 3d he was called before the Chancellor, and forbid Weſtminſter-Hall, and ordered to anſwer ſeveral exceptions againſt his *Reports* (*t*). In the beginning of November the King removed him from the Office of Lord Chief Juſtice (*u*), in which he was ſucceeded by Sir Henry Montague. Upon his diſgrace, Sir Francis Bacon wrote an admonitory Letter to him, in which he remonſtrates to him the errors of

(*t*) Idem, *ad ann.* 1616.

(*u*) Idem, ibid.

" nor any wayes to aſſent thereunto. That this offence " was aggravated by the denial and proteſtation made " of late by the Lord Chief Juſtice, that he was not " privye to the condition of the Defeaſance; whereas " the Stat. was taken to himſelf by Indenture, where- " of Sir Chr. Hatton's part was found, but the other " was not found. That he was privye to the penning " of it, incerted wordes with his own handes; and " that Mr. Walter and Mr. Bridgman his own Coun- " cell were witneſſes unto. The *ſecond*, wordes " ſpoken in the King's-Bench the laſt day of Hillarie- " Terme laſt, at a caſe of Glanvill and Allen, where- " of the Sollicitor made a narrative relation, and " charged the Lord Chief Juſtice to have given too " much hart and encouragement to that cauſe; and " that he had too conſtantly directed the Jury, turning " them thrice from the Barre, that if they ſett their " hand to a Bill after Judgment, he would foreclоſe " them the Court. And further, in another cawſe the " ſame day, ſaid, that the Common Lawe of England " would be overthrown without, the light of the Law " would be obſcured. And that all this was confirm- " ed by good witneſſes. The *third* and laſt point was " his undecent behaviour before your Majeſtie, your " Councell, and your Judges. And that conſiſted of " two points. Firſt, the exception that he tooke at " your learned Counſell in your preſence, for ſpeak- " ing at your commandment. The ſecond, that your " Majeſtie having open'd your ſelf in the caſe of *Com-* " *mendams*, and ſatisfied the Judges, that your Maje- " ſties ſending to them had no intent to delay juſtice, " and the queſtion being put to the reſt of the Judges, " whether they did not hold it for a delay of juſtice, " that your Majeſtie had ſent in the caſe; or if your " Majeſtie ſhould ſend hereafter in a like caſe, where- " in your Majeſties Progenitors were intereſted? the " reſt of the Judges ſubmitting themſelves, he only " diſcented from all the reſt. This being the effect of " your Sollicitors charge, your Lord Chief Juſtice " made anſwere, that he would by your Lordſhip's " favour begin with the laſt. And ſaid, for the part " of challange and taking exception at your Majeſties " Councell learned ſpeaking in the caſe by your Ma- " jeſties commandement, he acknowledged it for an " error, and ſubmitted himſelf. To the part, that " upon the queſtion aſked the Judges touching Stay of " Proceedings, he denied, when all the reſt did yield: " his anſwere was, that the queſtion yielded many par- " ticulars, which ſuddenly occurred to his mind, and " cawſed him to make his anſwere, that when the " tyme ſhould be, he would doe that which ſhould " become an honeſt and juſt Judge. For the Bond he " ſaith, that that aſſurance was in hammering a yeare " and a half; they were *Elephanti Libelli*; and now, " twelve years being paſt, it was no great marvaile if " his memory were ſhort. Eſpecially ſince about that " time he was imployed, firſt in the great ſervice of " the *Prieſt Treaſon*, and *Cobham*, and in the next " yeare in the *Powder Treaſon*. And that if any " things have ſlipped in the multitude of buiſineſs, " that theis ſervices blott out his errors. Secondly, " *ab impoſſibili*, which was, that the debt remayninge " at the tyme was 33000 *l.* and that young Mr. Hat- " ton's men were very meane, and not above 100 " markes a year. And as ſoon as it came to the poſ- " ſibilitie, when he firſt heard of Sir Robert Riches " offer, he then ſubmitted it, before ſuch tyme as he " remembred the Stat. or Defeaſance. Thirdly, *Cui* " *Bono?* He ſaid, he had never any profit by it, but " the preſentation to a Benefice, and all the reſt was " his wife's. Fourthly, that the Crowne was content " with the eſtabliſhment, and he did but take Bond " to continue it. And throughout all this he did ſub- " mit himſelf to your Majeſtie and the Board, ſaying, " *Actus non facit reum, niſi mens ſit rea*. For his " Speech in the King's-Bench, &c. he ſaith, that firſt, " whatſoever was done, was by the common conſent. " And for thoſe Speeches, many of them were ſpoken, " and he knew by whom they were ſpoken, but not " by himſelf. And then offered four conſiderations. " I. That the Court, unto which nevertheleſs he did " except, was *ad informandum, non ad convincendum.* " II. They were witneſſes but on one ſide. III. That " the Interrogatories might be drawne too ſhort. IV. " That it was concerning words ſpoken four months " agoe; which being ſpoken amongſt many, may " be diverſly reported. And thereupon produced a " paper written by himſelf, conteyninge, as he ſaith, " the true paſſage of the day: (which paper we pre- " ſent unto your Majeſtie herewithall;) being, as he " ſaith, ſet down by himſelf the day after, *ſedato a-* " *nimo*. And touching thes words, that the Common " Lawe would be overthrowne, and the Judges would " have but little to do at the Aſſiſes, becauſe the Light " of the Lawe would be obſcured: he confeſſeth the " wordes, but ſaith, they were not ſpoken the ſame " day, but at another tyme in the caſe of Sir An- " thony Mildmaies. And added, that he would not " maynteine a difference between the two Courts, nor " bring it into queſtion, yet, if it were an error, he " may ſay, *Erravimus cum Patribus*. And thereupon " alledged the examples. Firſt, the article againſt " Cardinal Wolſey, 20 H. 8. wherein the ſame wordes " are uſed, viz. that ſuch proceedings in the Chan- " cery tended to the ſubverſion of the Common Lawe. " Art. 20. Secondly, the Booke intituled, *The Doc-* " *tor and Student*. Thirdly, an opinion of the Judges " in Throgmorton's caſe in Q. Eliz. tyme. And ad- " ded alſo further, that for the tyme to come noe man " ſhould ever make any oppoſition. Soe that the " Judges having received your Majeſties commande- " ment by the Atturny Generall, that noe Bill of that " Nature ſhould be hereafter received, hee and his " brethren have cauſed the ſame to be entered as an " order in the ſame Court, which ſhall be obſerved. " Which being the effect of his Anſwere, we have " thought to add withall, that before us, as well in " ſpeech as in action he behaved himſelf modeſtly and " ſubmiſſively."

[*K*] *On June 30th following he was ſequeſtered from the Council-Table, and the office of Lord Chief Juſtice.*] We have the following account of this affair publiſhed by Mr. Peck (23) from Mr. Baker's MS. Collections. Sir Edward Coke preſenting himſelf that day at the Council Table upon his knees, Secretary *Winwood* ſignified unto him, that the Lords had made their report unto his Majeſty of that which paſſed on Wedneſday before at Whitehall, for which he was charged by his Majeſty's Sollicitor with certain things, wherein his Majeſty was much diſſatisfied; which report contained a juſt and true relation, as well of thoſe things, which were objected againſt him, as of his anſwer thereunto in particular, and that rather to his advantage than otherwiſe. Which being delivered in writing, and duely weighed and conſidered of by the King, his Majeſty was no way ſatisfied with his anſwer to the parts or any of them, wherewith he ſtood charged; viz. neither in that, which he made concerning the bond and defeaſance upon the extalment of a debt of Sir *Chr. Hatton*'s late Lord Chancellor of England; neither in that which he maketh concerning his ſpeeches of high contempt, uttered as he ſat in the Seat of Juſtice, concerning the overthrow of the Common-Law; nor laſtly in the anſwer he offereth to excuſe uncivil and undiſcrete carriage before his Majeſty being aſſiſted with his Privy Council and his Judges. But the charge lieth ſtill upon him, notwithſtanding any thing contained in his ſaid anſwer. Nevertheleſs ſuch was his Majeſty's clemency and goodneſs, that he was pleaſed not to proceed heavily againſt him, but rather to look upon the merit of his former ſervices, and accordingly decreed: I. That he be ſequeſtered from the Council-Table, until his Majeſty's pleaſure be further known. II. That he forbear to ride his ſummer-circuit, as

(23) Ibid. num. 7. pag. 21, 22.

Juſtice

of his former conduct [*L*]. In 1617 there happened a prodigious diſpute between him and his wife, the Lady Hatton, about marrying their daughter Frances to Sir John Villiers, brother to the Earl of Buckingham [*M*]. September the 15th the ſame year he was readmitted into the Privy Council (*w*), the King being unwilling to loſe his abilities (*x*), and was afterwards employed in ſeveral commiſſions (*y*). February the 6th 1621 he vigorouſly

(*w*) Idem, ibid. *ad ann.* 1617.

(*y*) Collins, pag. 512.

(*x*) *Hiſtory of Great Britain, being the Life and Reign of K. James the Firſt &c. By Arthur Wilſon, Eſq;* pag. 97. edit. London 1653, in fol.

Juſtice of Aſſiſe. III. That during this vacation, while he had time to live privately, and diſpoſe himſelf at home, he take into his conſideration, and renew his Books of Reports, wherein, as his Majeſty is informed, be many extravagant and exorbitant opinions ſet down and publiſhed for poſitive and good Laws. And if in reviewing and reading thereof, he find any thing fit to be altered and amended, the correction is left to his diſcretion. Amongſt other things the King was not well pleaſed with the title of thoſe Books, wherein he ſtiled himſelf Lord Chief-Juſtice of England, wherein he could challenge no more but Lord Chief Juſtice of the King's Bench. And having corrected what in his diſcretion he found meet in theſe reports, his Majeſty's pleaſure was, he ſhould bring the ſame privately to himſelf, that he might conſider thereof, as in his Princely judgment ſhould be found expedient. Hereunto Mr. Secretary adviſed him to conform himſelf in all duty and obedience as he ought; whereby he might hope, that his Majeſty in time would receive him again to his gracious and princely favour. Thereunto the Lord Chief Juſtice made anſwer, that he did in all humility proſtrate himſelf to his Majeſty's good pleaſure; that he acknowledged that decree to be juſt, and proceeded rather from his Majeſty's exceeding mercy, than from his juſtice; gave humble thanks to their Lordſhips for their favours and goodneſs towards him, and hoped that his behaviour for the future time ſhall be ſuch as ſhould deſerve their Lordſhip's favours. The Lords having thus far proceeded, the Lord Treaſurer told him, that he had one thing more to let him know, which belonged to the Earl Marſhal to take notice of; which was that his Coachman uſed to ride bare-headed before him; which was more than any ways he could aſſume or challenge to himſelf; and required him to forbear it for the future. To which the Lord Chief Juſtice anſwered, that his Coachman did it only for his own eaſe, and not by his commandment. And ſo with the like ſubmiſſion and acknowledgment of favour departed.

[*L*] *Upon his diſgrace,* Sir Francis Bacon *wrote an admonitory Letter to him, in which he remonſtrates to him the errors of his former conduct.*] We have given a paſſage from this Letter in the Note [*E*]; and it is aſcribed to Bacon in *the Cabala* *, where it is printed, and by Lloyd in his *State-Worthies* †. In this *Letter* he adviſes Sir Edward to be humbled for this viſitation, and obſerves, that affliction only levels the mole-hills of pride in us, ploughs up the heart, and makes it fit for wiſdom to ſow her ſeed, and grace to bring forth her increaſe. He afterwards ſhews him the errors in his conduct. *In diſcourſe,* ſays he, *you delight to ſpeak too much, not to hear other men. This ſome ſay, becomes a Pleader, not a Judge. For by this ſometimes your affections are entangled with a love of your own arguments, though they be the weaker, and rejecting of thoſe, which, when your affections were ſettled, your own judgment would allow for ſtrongeſt. Thus while you ſpeak in your element, the Law, no man ordinarily equals you; but when you wander (as you often delight to do,) you then wander indeed, and give never ſuch ſatisfaction as the curious time requires. This is not cauſed by any natural defect, but firſt for want of election, when you having a large and fruitful mind, ſhould not ſo much labour what to ſpeak, as to find what to leave unſpoken. Rich ſoils are often to be weeded. Secondly, you cloy your auditory. When you would be obſerved, ſpeech muſt either be ſweet or ſhort.* " Thirdly, you converſe " with books, not men, and books ſpecially humane, " and have no excellent choice with men, who are " the beſt books. For a man of action and employ- " ment you ſeldom converſe with, and then but with " underlings, not freely, but as a Schoolmaſter, ever " to teach, never to learn. But if ſometimes you " would in your familiar diſcourſe hear others, and " make election of ſuch as know what they ſpeak, " you ſhould know many of thoſe tales, which you " tell to be but ordinary, and many other things " which you delight to repeat and ſerve in for no- " velties, to be but ſtale. As in your pleadings you " were wont to inſult even miſery, and inveigh bit- " terly againſt the perſon; ſo are you ſtill careleſs " in this point &c. *." *Your too much love of the world is too much ſeen, when having the living of* 10,000 *l, you relieve few or none. The hand that hath taken ſo much, can it give ſo little? Herein you ſhew no bowels of compaſſion, as if you thought all too little for yourſelf, or that God had given you all that you have (if you think wealth to be his gift, I mean, that you get well; for I know ſure the reſt is not) only to that end you ſhould ſtill gather more, and never be ſatisfied, but try how much you could gather, to account for all at the great and general audit-day. We deſire you to amend this, and let your poor tenants in Norfolk find ſome comfort, where nothing of your eſtate is ſpent towards their relief, but all brought up hither, to the impoveriſhing of your country.* He then tells him, that in the caſe of *Overbury* he uſed too many delays, till the delinquents hands were looſe, and his own bound; and that he was too open in his proceedings, and ſo taught them how to defend themſelves. " But that, *continues* " *he,* which we commend you for are thoſe excellent " parts of nature and knowledge in the Law, which " you are indued withall. But theſe are only good " in their good uſe. Wherefore we thank you heartily for ſtanding ſtoutly in the Commonwealth-behalf, " hoping it proceedeth not from a diſpoſition to op- " poſe greatneſs, (as your enemies ſay,) but to do juſtice, " and deliver truth indifferently without reſpect of " perſons."

* See the reſt of this Paragraph above in the note [*E*].

* *Cabala ſive Scrinia ſacra, Myſteries of State and Government, in Letters, &c.* pag. 219. edit. London 1663, in fol.

† Pag. 825.

[*M*] *In* 1617 *there happened a prodigious diſpute between him and his wife, the Lady* Hatton, *about marrying their daughter* Frances *to Sir* John Villiers, *brother to the Earl of* Buckingham.] We have given ſome account of this affair, in the Article of BACON (*Francis*) (24), to which we ſhall refer the Reader; and ſhall here preſent him with ſome original papers amongſt the collections of *James Weſt* of the Middle-Temple Eſq; The firſt is a paper of Sir Edward Coke's dated the 15th of June 1617, and is as follows,

(24) Note [*H*], vol. 2. pag. 553.

Brief Articles to be performed on my part.

1. *During my life two thouſand markes by the yeare for the preſent maintenance of Sir John and my daughter Frances.*

2. *There is allready conveyed of mannors and Landes of myn own inheritance after the deceaſe of me and my wife fifteen hundred pounds* per annum *to the uſe of my daughter. And I am to convey three hundred pounds more* per annum *of like eſtate,* in toto 1800 *l.* per annum.

3. *I will give ten thouſand pound to be layed out in Lands to the uſe of Sir John and my daughter Frances.*

15 *Junii* 1617

EDW. COKE.

On my Wives part.

My wife hath lands of inheritance, which ſhe hath purchaſed ſince ſhe was my wife, as followeth.

1. *The Caſtle and Iſle of Purbeck in the countie of Dorſet.*

2. *The Mannor of Croſt in the county of Lincolne.*

3. *The Mannor of Wittleſea in the countie of Cambridge.*

4. *Hatton-Houſe in Holborne, and land in Middleſex.*

Alſo all the plate, houſhold ſtuffe, leaſes, goods, and chattels, which my wife brought with her, ſhall after our deceaſes be devided between them, and in the meane [*time*] *they ſhall not be ſold, given, or diminiſhed.*

EDW. COKE.

July the 15th 1617 he wrote a Letter, which is addreſſed, *To the Right Honorable his ſingular good Lord the Earl of Buckingham of his Majeſties moſt Honorable Privye Counſell, theis*; and is as follows;

vigorouſly maintained in the Houſe of Commons, that no proclamation is of any force againſt the Parliament (*aa*). In July a reconciliation was made between him and his wife, the Lady Hatton, by means of his Majeſty (*bb*). The ſame year being looked upon as one of the great incendiaries in the Houſe of Commons, he was removed from the Council-Table with diſgrace, the King ſaying, that he was the *fitteſt inſtrument for a Tyrant, that ever was in England.* "And yet, ſays Wilſon (*cc*), in the Houſe he called the "King's prerogative *a great over-grown Monſter.* And how can theſe agree; unleſs "becauſe the King would not take his counſel, he hanged himſelf on the other ſide? "But whether the King had cauſe to ſay the one, I know not; but he, it ſeems, "means found enough to ſay the other." December the 27th he was committed to the

(*aa*) Camden, *ad ann.* 1621.

(*bb*) Idem, ibid.

(*cc*) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 191.

"Right Honourable,

"After my wife, Sir Edmond Withipole, and the "Lady his wife, and other their confederates to pre-"vent this match betwene Sir John Villiers and my "daughter Frances (whereunto his Majeſtie had given "his conſent and bleſſynge) had conveyed away my "dereſt daughter out of my houſe in moſt ſecret man-"ner to a houſe near Oatland, which Sir Edmond "Withipole had taken for this ſommer of the Lord "of Arguile; I, by God's wonderful Providence, find-"inge where ſhe was, together with my ſonnes and "our ordinary attendants, did breake open two dores, "and recovered my daughter; which I did for theſe "cauſes: Firſt and principally leaſt his Majeſtie might "thinke that I was of confederacy with my wife in "conveying her away, or charge me with want of "government of my houſholde in ſuffering her to "be carried awaye, after I had engaged myſelf to his "Majeſtie for the furtherance of this match. 2. For "that I demaunded my childe of Sir Edmond and his "wife, and they denied to deliver hir to me. And "yet for this, warrant is given to ſue me in his Ma-"jeſtie's name in the Starre-Chamber with all expe-"dition, which tho' I feare not well to defend, yet "it wil be a great vexation. But I have juſt cauſe "to bring all the confederats into the Starre-Chamber "for conveyinge away my childe out of my houſe. "If I had not recovered my daughter when I did, "the match could never have proceeded; but nowe "(noble Lord) protect me from the mallice of men, "and I make no doubt of it. She is nowe ſequeſtred "by the Lords to Mr. Attornie's houſe for a time, "and after to my Lord Knevett's houſe, whereas by "Lawe the cuſtody and government of my childe be-"longeth to me; which I muſt obey until other order "be taken. And ſo reſtinge under the protection of "your honourable favour and ſupportation, I ſhall "ever remayne, your devoted ſervant

July 15, 1617. EDW. COKE."

The Lady Hatton's papers are without date. We ſhall firſt give three of her letters to the Earl of Buckingham. The firſt is directed *To the Right Honourable the Earle of Bokingham Maſter of the Hors and Prevey Counſelor to the Kinge*, and is as follows:

"My Lord,

"If your Lordſhip had not wrytt, by which I was "ſeurly engaged to a retorne, I had not bin ſo bolld "witth your leaſur. I had paſyently ſitten doune "witth thes violenſes ofred me, thou I be the firſt "Motther from whome a doufter hath bene poled out "of her fatther's hous, and by her fatther mayd a "preſoner in her halfe brothers. Neyther ſeeke I "the honour of this trety, and therefore controdictt "beecaus I ame nott wood, as your Lordſhip toucheth "in your letter. For if I had bene to bin treatted "withall, I ſhould as the laſt winter haue anſwered "clerely, a faror delyng then ſome now haue aforded "your Lordſhip's mother and brother, who breaking "the firſt, as you know, now meane as lytill truth, "thou to thir ends beetor diſgiſed. But I ame a wo-"man, and muſt ſofer, and les then a woman in be-"ing his wife. I will eaus my beſt paſiens and joy, "that thes violenſes I ſofer is for no other fault then "for obaying the Kinge in making good thatt bar-"gin the King hatth receued 10,000 *l.* I haue euer "reſpected your Lordſhip, and in all occaſyons haue "ſo expreſt my ſelfe, and dooe as much as any, "ſo evor deteſt thatt defamaſion layd upon Sir "John Velors your brother; which I only ſpeake from "the reſpectt I cary to your ſattisfaccion and my one "honor, beeing of a famyly thatt can acnowlege "your reſpectts to me, and would be aſhamed of ſuch "unworthynes in me. Your Lordſhip therefore vouch-"ſafe me plaſe in your good thofts, till I ſhall deſerue "the contrary, and judge me by your knolege, not "by others report; for I am,

"Your Lordſhip's reſpettfull Frend

Elizabeth Hatton."

The ſecond is addreſſed, *To the Right Honourable the Earlle of Bukingam Maſter of the Kinges Horſe:* and is as follows:

"My Lord,

"According to the reſolufion taken before your Lo: "your motther and brother demaunded the paper men-"tifioned. Sir E. C. anſwered thatt eyther Secretary "Winwood hade it, or itt was caſt by hee knew nott "where, witth ſome cuaſion beeſides. We are now "att a ſtand, I not daring to truſt my bade memory "doe now wryt my conſeauings. What ſeutts witth "the Kings menyng and yours, I pray may bee writ-"ten in a letter by the King's commaund to the King's "Attorney. I conſeaued by the Kinge's words that "Sir Edwarde Couke was aſked whatt he did or would "dooe more in this mach for the Kinges favor. Sir "E. C. anſevered thatt hee would aſſuer all the land "with this doufter, and give his elldor dofter an ho-"norable porſion in mony. The Kinge bad him "wryte it. Sir E. C. writt a paper, and putt in both "the doufters. The Kinge aſked whatt he had to "dooe witth the otther doufter; ſo as Sir E. C. "mended it; the ſame as wee remember was botth "repeted and avoued by your Lordſhip to myſelfe, "your mother, and brother; whos reſpectte I fynd ſo "to my contentte as I ſhall deſyer to bee enabled to "make demonſtraſion thereof, and euer to avow my-"ſelfe

"Your afeccionatt and loving Frend

"Elizabeth Hatton."

The third is ſign'd, tho' not written with her own hand, and is directed, *To the Right Honourable the Earle of Buckingham, Maſter of the Horſe, and one of his Majeſties moſt honourable Prevey Counſellors.*

"My Lord,

"I preſume to preſent this incloſed to your Lord-"ſhip, deſiereing you will pleaſe to deliuer it to "his Majeſtie, who, howſoever in my regard might "leſs reſpect it, yett cominge from you will vouchſafe "it the better acceptance: and I hope your Lordſhip "will leſſe blame mee hearin, if craveinge my hap-"pie returne into his Majeſties good opinion, I take "this the neareſt way, and intereſt you in an office "of no diſhonour to you, to her, who will acknow-"ledge the returne from you, and reſt your Lord-"ſhip's friend, if ſo you pleaſe to account mee

"Eliz. Hatton."

Her petition, addreſſed, *To the King's moſt excellent Majeſtie*, is as follows.

"Moſt gratious Soueraigne,

"Pleaſe to caſt downe your ſacred eye uppon the "greeſe which neareſt toucheth the afflicted minde of "your humble ſubject, which is, that I heare your "Majeſtie is offended with ſome errours comitted "by mee, a woman, and a mother, whoſe ſexe and "qualitie, as too weake to wraſtle with ſtronge ap-"prehenſions, whatſoever the cauſe bee, will I truſt "with the mercy of a juſt Kinge, receave a more "fauorable interpretation, and the rather in regarde "of my contricion and ſence I have of my fault, and

"of

the Towĕr, and the next day examined; and Sir Robert Cotton and Mr. Thomas Wilſon ſent to ſearch his papers (*dd*). Orders were likewiſe given for ſealing up the locks and doors of his chambers in London and in the Temple, and for ſeizing of his papers; and it

(*dd*) Camden, *ad ann.* 1621.

" of the loſſe of your Majeſties good opinion, which " as I value before all priuate reſpects, ſo ſhall I bee " moſt happy in recouering the ſame, which with " my uttermoſt I will indeavoure. God whoſe ſub- " ſtitute you are, requireth for the greateſt offences " but repentance, confeſſion, and a harte to amend, " all which I humbly preſent to your Majeſtie, and " lye at your royall foote for grace to her that is,

" Your Majeſtie's moſt humble and dutiful ſubject.
Eliz. Hatton."

Another Petition of hers to the King is as follows. *To the King's moſt excellent Majeſtie the humble Petition of the Ladie* Elizabeth Hatton.

That your Majeſtie would be pleaſed amongſt your many other buſſineſſes of greater importance to have in remembraunce her laſt petitions; wherein is conteyned in effect the ſumme of what ſhee deſireth. And that your Majeſtie would alſo vouchſafe to thinke upon the miſery of a poore woman; who for her obedience to your commandement is both left by her huſband, and deprived of her former allowaunce ſhee then enjoyed to mainteyne her familye: which now wantinge ſhee liveth in ſome neceſſitye, and alſo in contynuall feare of her life, being credibly informed that the ſame ſervant of his that putt a quarrell upon hers, hath uſed to weare a ſtiletto in his pockett, contrary to your Majeſties commandment: which ſaid ſervaunt he ſtill continueth and keepeth in his ſervice.

That in conſideration heereof your Majeſtie would be pleaſed ſome ſpeedye courſe may be taken to ſettle an eſtate upon her daughtere Villers, *according to his promiſe made unto your Majeſtie, and alſoe to releeve and ſupply the neceſſitye of her owvne preſent wamts, and alſo to ſecure her from the feare and danger of thoſe, that ſeeke after her (I feare) life.*

There is likewiſe a long repreſentation of hers to the King in anſwer to one of Sir Edward Coke's, from which we ſhall extract ſome paſſages. She anſwers firſt to Sir Edward Coke's allegation relating to the aſſignment of *Hatton-Houſe:* and ſecondly to his reaſons for detaining her allowance of 2000 *l*, a year. The firſt of the reaſons alledged by Sir Edward was, that ſhe had denied him acceſs to Hatton-Houſe; the ſecond, that when he was at New-Market with the King, ſhe had conveyed away all his goods and plate; *to which*, ſays ſhe, *my memory ſerves mee not; but ſuer I am, that it was when I hadd notice that there were certaine bills preferred againſt him in the Starre-Chamber that conteyned ſome foule miſdemeanour he hadd committed in his circuits; and that I was credibly informed by ſome of the late Lord Chauncellor's howſe, that inſteede of the* Premunire *Sir* Edward Cooke *pretended to bringe upon the ſaid Chauncellor, the ſaid Lord Chauncellor was confident to make good againſt Sir* Edward Cooke *in the like kynde. Therefore let him not blame me, if I meant to keepe ſomethinge for myſelf, who hadd brought it all unto him; wherein if I did offend, I humbly craue pardon of your Majeſtie, againſt whome the offence was committed, &c.* She then vindicates herſelf from the charge of having detained from him indentures and other writings of great value. With regard to her refuſing to be called by his name, ſhe ſays thus: "Sir William Cornewallis was the mann " that came from Sir Edward Cooke, by whome I " retourned this anſwere: that if Sir Edward Cooke " would bury my firſt huſband accordinge to his ownne " directions, and alſo paie ſuch ſmale legacyes as he " gave to divers of his friends, in all comminge not " to above 7 or 900 *l* at the moſt, that was left un- " performed, he having all Sir William Hatton's goods " and lands to a large proportion; then would I wil- " lingly ſtile myſelf by his name. But he never yield- " ed to the one; ſo I conſented not to the other. " The like anſwer I made to my Lorde of Exeter " and Lorde Burghley, when they ſpake to mee of " anie ſuch buſines. And whereas he accuſeth mee " to have called him *baſe, treacherous fellowe*, the " wordes I cannot deny, but when the cauſe is knowen, " I hope a little paſſion may be excuſed. It was when " he had ſigned awaye all my Livinge by my firſt " huſband, and ſold his daughter whoe was left to my " care and truſte by Sir William Hatton, and after- " warde he deceiued my children I hadd by himſelf of " their inheritance." *His ſixth accuſation of mee is the number of attempts I made the laſt ſommer againſt your Majeſtie's commaunde concerning this late marriadge of my ſonne Villers and my daughter. I muſt confeſs I ignorantly did many; for which I humbly crave pardonn for all ſuch offences as were by mee committed after your Majeſtie's pleaſure knowenn; and I give myſelf the happines to beleeve that your Majeſtie hath fully forgiven all thoſe whatſoever. Were it not to make this writinge too tedious for your Majeſties readinge, I could much leſſenn myne offences by the uncivill proceeding of Sir* Edw. Cooke *and Mr. Secretarie* Winwoode; *but the one being dead, I will forbeare, and the other out of the acknowledgment of that duety I owe unto a huſbaund will let ſlipp as many of his inhumane proceedinges as I cann, except ſuch wherein he calleth mee by a writinge of Mr. Sollicitor to the Marquis of* Buckingham; *wherein I finde how deſirous he is to rubb upp anie thing to make ill bloode betwixt my ſonne* Villers *and myſelfe, in that I ſhould be obſtinate againſt this marriadge; wherein I crave your Majeſtie's patience to heare my willingnes and unwillingnes thereto.* " Firſt for my " willingneſs, I call to witneſs my Lorde Haughton, " whome I ſent twyce to moove the matter to my " Ladie Compton, ſo as by mee ſhe would take it. " This was after he hadd ſo fondly broke of with " my Lorde of Buckingham, when he rated your Ma- " jeſtie's fauour ſcarſe at the valewe of a 1000 *l.* " After that my brother and ſiſter of Burghley offered " in the Gallerie-Chamber at Whitehall theire ſeruice " unto my Ladie Compton to further this marriadge " ſo as from mee ſhe would take it. Thirdly myſelf " cominge from Kingſtone in a coach with my Ladie " Compton, I then offered her that if ſhee would " leave Sir Edward Cooke, I would proceed with her " in this marriadge. But let me intreate that a favo- " rable conſtruction may be made of this, that I be not " adjudged an alien from Sir Edward Cookes will and " pleaſure, which I hold fitt and am ready to obey. " For the cauſe that made mee thus auerſe from him, " was when he had ſigned away my livinge himſelf; " yet would not by anie meanes give conſent to mee " to obey your Majeſtie; for neither myſelf nor any " of my friends could euer obteyne his allowaunce " thereto. But if I did ſigne it, he would (as he ſayed) " be revenged double and treble of mee. And when " he was tolde, that I ſhould but ſigne what he ſigned " before; his anſwer was, that what hee hadd donne " was woorth nothinge; for if he once came upon his " winge againe he would blowe all that awaye. Soe " longe I ſtayed in due reſpect to have obteyned " Sir *Edward Cooke's* leave till my brother of Burgh- " ley and myſelf had committed two contempts againſt " the Court of Chauncery, and that warrants were " reddy to committ us both. Neither durſt I haue " donne any thinge at all, hadd your Majeſtie's letters " not giuen me the aſſurance I ſhould not be toaren in " pieces by this man, as nowe I am. Secondly for " Mr. Sollicitor's Lattin ſentence from Sr. Edward " Cooke, I muſt lett paſſe as being altogether unlearn- " ed in that language; but I preſume it will not boe " thought fitt, that a huſbaund whoſe pleaſure it is to " leaue a wife, ſhould alſo take away all maintenance " from her and make her lyve of theſe poor gather- " ings that ſhee in her younger yeares hath ſpared " from her pleaſures for the good of her childrenn; " but your Majeſtie I preſume will be a juſt judge of " that yourſelf. Neither doe I thinke it will be " thought fitt that though he have five ſonnes to main- " teyne (as he alleadgeth in his writing) that a wife " ſhould therefore be thought unfitt to have mainte- " nance accordinge to her birth and fortune. And " concerninge the diſcourſe that ſeemeth to haue " paſſed betweene your Majeſtie and him, I dare not " preſume to meddle with: only I beſeeche your " Majeſtie to conceaue howe hee hath adventured to " deal indirectly with me in all my occaſions, that " dares preſume ſo to abuſe your Majeſtie in his pro- " miſes to yourſelf &c."

This Threate was approued at the Counſayle Table by witneſſes without any exception.

it was debated in Council, how he might be excluded from the benefit of the general pardon, that ſhould have paſſed this laſt Parliament (*ee*). January the 6th 1622 he was accuſed of having acted diſhoneſtly in the caſe of the Earl of Somerſet, by ſuppreſſing ſome true confeſſions, and obtruding falſe ones (*ff*). Upon the calling of a Parliament in 1625, the Court-party being jealous of his activity againſt them, to prevent his election as a Member, he was appointed Sheriff of Buckinghamſhire. To avoid this office, if poſſible, he drew up exceptions againſt the oath of a Sheriff, and ſent them to the Attorney-General, who by order of the Council attended the Judges, and received their opinion, that of the four articles objected by Sir Edward Coke, they found no reaſonable cauſe to make any alteration, except in one of the ſaid articles, viz. "You ſhall do all your pain "and diligence to deſtroy and make to ceaſe all manner of hereſies and errors commonly "called *Lollaries* within your Bailywick from time to time, to all your power, and be "helping to all Ordinaries and Commiſſioners of the holy Church, and favour and "maintain them as oftentimes as you ſhall be required." This part of the oath, as obſolete and irreligious, they agree ſhould be left out of the oath to be adminiſtred to Sir Edward Coke, and all other Sheriffs for the future. And an order of Council was accordingly made to that effect, which reformed the oath, but did not excuſe the perſons, ſo that Sir Edward was obliged to undertake the office (*gg*). This affair is related ſomewhat differently in Lloyd's *State-Worthies* [*N*]. In the Parliament in 1628, he ſpoke vigorouſly upon the grievances relating to the perſon of the ſubject (*hh*); and in April the ſame year was one of the managers in the conference with the Lords relating to liberty and property (*ii*); and upon a meſſage ſent from the King on the tenth of that month to deſire the Houſe of Commons not to make any receſs during the Eaſter-Holy-days, he declared, that *the King makes a prorogation, but the Houſe adjourns itſelf* (*kk*). On Thurſday June the 5th following he made a ſpeech, in which he affirmed that "the Duke of Buckingham is the cauſe of all our miſeries, and till the King be informed thereof we ſhall never go out with honour, or ſit with honour here. That man is the grievance of grievances &c. (*kk*)." However the Lord Clarendon aſſures us (*ll*), that he had before *blaſphemouſly* ſtiled the Duke *our Saviour*. While he lay upon his death-bed, his papers and laſt will were ſeized by an order of Council [*O*]. He died at Stoke-Poges on Wedneſday September the 3d (*mm*) 1634 (*nn*), in the eighty ſixth year of his age (*oo*), and was interred at Titleſhall in Norfolk, where he hath a monument erected to him (*pp*). His laſt words were, *Thy Kingdom come, thy will be done.* He publiſhed a great many works [*P*]. He was ſo excellent at improving a diſgrace, that King James uſed to compare him to a cat, that

(*ee*) Ruſhworth's *Collections*, tom. 1. pag. 55. *and* Franklin's *Annals of K. James I.* pag. 66.

(*ff*) Camden, *ad ann.* 1622.

(*gg*) Kennet's *Complete Hiſtory of England*, vol. 3. pag. 12. edit. London 1708.

(*hh*) Idem, ibid. pag. 39.

(*ii*) Idem, pag. 40.

(*kk*) Idem, pag. 43.

(*ll*) *Hiſtory of the Rebellion*, B. 1. pag. 7. edit. Oxon. 1704, in fol.

(*mm*) Lloyd, pag. 825.

(*nn*) *Deſiderata Curioſa.* By *Francis Peck, M. A.* vol. 2. B. 14. pag. 15. edit. London 1735 in fol.

(*oo*) *Collections relating to the Life of Lord Bacon*, pag. 63. vol. 1. edit. of his Works at London 1730, in fol.

(*pp*) Le Neve's *Monument. Angl.* vol. 5. pag. 151.

[*N*] *This affair is related ſomewhat differently in that part*, publiſh'd at St. Omers 1606 in 4to, under the following title, *An Anſwer to the* fifth Part *of* Reports *lately ſet forth by Sir Edward Coke Knight, the King's Attorney General, by a Catholick Divine.* The *firſt part* of his *Inſtitutes of the Laws of England* is only a Tranſlation and Comment upon the *Tenures of Sir Thomas Littleton*, one of the Juſtices of the Common Pleas in the reign of Edward IV; wherein all the corruptions and Additions, which were in the former prints, are ſaid to be removed. "I do not doubt, "*ſays Archdeacon Nicholſon* (28), but effectual care was "taken in that matter; and yet there have ſeveral "miſtakes (eſpecially in proper names) eſcaped the "Commentator himſelf in his own part, which will be "more troubleſome to the Hiſtorian than the Lawyer." The *ſecond part* of the *Inſtitutes* gives us *Magna Charta* and ſeveral other ſelect Statutes in the Original Languages, wherein they were firſt enacted, much more correctly than we have them in any other printed copies. Upon theſe he continually gives us his own Commentaries, very full of excellent learning; wherein he ſhews how the Common Law ſtood before the making of ſuch Statutes, whether they are introductory to any new Law, or only declaratory of the old; what were the cauſes and ends of their being enacted, what branches of them are now altered or repealed &c (29). The *third part* treats of the Pleas of the Crown, and in it the Author propoſes the ſame end, which he had in the *ſecond*, the comparing Statute-Law with Common, ſo as to diſcover, which Acts are only declaratory of former Laws, and which are new. Having run over all criminal matters and their legal puniſhments, he concludes with the nature of pardons and reſtitutions, ſhowing how far in each of theſe our Kings can proceed alone, and where they want the aſſiſtance and joint power of their Parliaments (30). The *fourth part* gives us an Account of the Inſtitution, Rules, Juriſdiction, &c. of all the Courts of England, from the Parliament down to a Court-Baron. The Author confeſſes, that in this work he amaſſed together every thing, that ſeemed ever ſo remotely to belong

(25) Pag. 822.

(28) Ibid. pag. 172.

(29) Idem, pag. 37.

(30) Idem, pag. 79, 80.

[*O*] *While he lay upon his death-bed, his Papers and laſt Will were ſeized by an order of Council.*] This we are informed of by Roger Coke (26), who writes, that Sir Francis Windebank, Laud's old friend, by an order of Council, came to ſearch for ſeditious and dangerous papers; by vertue whereof he took Sir Edward Coke's *Commentary upon Littleton*, and the Hiſtory of his Life before it, written with his own hand; his *Commentary upon Magna Charta*, &c. *the Pleas of the Crown*, and *Juriſdiction of Courts*, and his XI and XII *Reports*, in manuſcript, and fifty one other manuſcripts, with the laſt Will of Sir Edward, wherein he had for ſeveral years been making proviſions for his younger grand-children. The Books and Papers were kept till ſeven years after, when one of Sir Edward's ſons in 1641 moved the Houſe of Commons, that the Books and Papers taken by Sir Francis Windebank might be delivered to Sir Robert Coke, heir of Sir Edward, which the King was pleaſed to grant, and ſuch as could be found, were delivered. But Sir Edward's Will was never heard of more to this day.

(26) *Detection, &c. ad ann.* 1634.

[*P*] *He publiſh'd a great many works.*] His *Reports* have had ſeveral Editions. The *firſt part* of them contains caſes relating to Eccleſiaſtical Power and Juriſdiction; *and the falſe Grounds*, ſays Archdeacon Nicholſon (27), *whereon many of the Judgments are there given, have been ſhewn by Parſons in his Anſwer to*

(27) *Engliſh Hiſtorical Library*, Part 3. pag. 185. edit. London 1699, in 8vo.

(qq) Lloyd, pag. 826.

that whatever happened, would always light upon his legs (*qq*). When he was under a cloud at Court, and removed from his Judge's place, the lands of the Church of Norwich, which he had formerly recovered and ſettled thereon, being begged by a Peer, Sir Edward deſired him to deſiſt, telling him, that otherwiſe he would put on his gown and cap, and come into Weſtminſter-Hall once again, and plead there in Court in juſtification of what he had done (*rr*). The Reader may ſee his character in the note [*Q*].

(rr) Idem, pag. 825.

The foundation of Sutton's Hoſpital had been cruſhed by ſome Courtiers, if his care had not prevented it. The Free-School at Thetford in Norfolk owed its ſupport to him; and he founded another at Godwick in the ſame county at his own expence (*ſſ*). The many benefices in his own Patronage he freely gave to men of merit, declaring in his Law Language, that he would have Church-Livings paſs by *Livery* and *Seiſin*, and not by *Bargain* and *Sale* (*tt*). Five ſorts of people he uſed to fore-deſign to miſery and poverty, *Chymiſts*, *Monopolizers*, *Concealers*, *Promoters*, and *Rhyming Poets* (*uu*). He uſed to give ſolemn thanks to God, that he never gave his body to phyſic, his heart to cruelty, or his hand to corruption; and applauded his own ſucceſs in his fair fortune with his wife, his happy ſtudy of the Laws, and his obtaining all his offices, *nec prece nec pretio*, neither by ſollicitation nor bribe (*xx*). We ſhall give ſome account of his deſcendants in the note [*R*].

(ſſ) Idem, pag. 824.

(tt) Idem, pag. 822.

(uu) Idem, ibid.

(xx) Idem, pag. 822, 823.

COLLATIUS

long to any of the heads, under which he had firſt ranked the whole of his matter; *ſo that if there be ſome repetitions and tautologies, 'tis but what uſually happens in the prime draughts of all Common-Place Books. His great age, when he came to lick theſe papers over for the preſs, would not admit of nicety and exactneſs, and he died before they were publiſhed* (31). In William Prynne's *Animadverſions* upon this part of the *Inſtitutes*, printed at London 1669 in fol. a great many miſquotations of Records are noted, "and the learned Au-" thor is more ſeverely reflected on than he ought to " have been in a poſthumous work, wherein we know " not what injuſtice might be done him by the Pub-" liſhers of his Orphan-Labours." His *Speech and Charge at Norwich-Aſſizes*, was printed at London 1607 in 4to; and his *Book of Entries, containing Precedents of all Proceedings concerning the practique part of the Laws of England*, at London 1614. He wrote likewiſe the *Juriſdiction of Courts*, in fol. the *Compleat Copy-Holder*, in 8vo; the *Pleas of the Crown*, in fol. *Declarations and Pleadings*, in fol. 1659; *Pleadings in French*, 8vo, 1601; *Readings on Fines*, in 4to; on *Magna Charta*, in fol. on *Bail and Mainpriſe*, in 4to.

(31) Idem, pag. 74, 75.

(32) Idem, pag. 75.

[*Q*] *The reader may ſee his character in the Note.*] Camden (33) tells us, that *he was a perſon of admirable parts; than whom, as none ever applied himſelf cloſer to the ſtudy of the Common Law, ſo never did any one underſtand it better; of which he fully convinced England by his excellent adminiſtration for many years together, whilſt Attorney-General, and by executing the office of Lord Chief Juſtice of the Common Pleas with the greateſt wiſdom and prudence; nor did he give leſs proof of his abilities in his excellent Reports and Commentaries upon our Laws, whereby he has highly obliged both his own age and poſterity.* My Lord Bacon remarks (34), that if it had not been for our Author's *Reports, the Law by that time had been almoſt like a ſhip without ballaſt, for that the caſes of modern experience are fled from thoſe that are adjudged and ruled in former time.* Wilſon obſerves (55), that "he was a man of excellent parts, " but not without his frailties; for as he was a ſtore-" houſe and magazine of Common Law for the preſent " times, and laid ſuch a foundation for the future, " that poſterity may for ever build on; ſo his paſſions " and pride were predominant, that boiling over, he " loſt by them much of his own fulneſs, which ex-" tinguiſhed not only the valuation, but reſpect to his " merit; ſo often is that heat, that gives life to noble " parts, by a circular motion the ruin of them." Mr. Edward Leigh (36) obſerves, that he was "very ex-" pert in the municipal Laws of our Land, as his *Re-" ports, Commentary on Littleton's Inſtitutes*, and other " learned works in the Law ſhew." Lloyd informs us (37), that his parts were admirable, and that he had a deep judgment, a faithful memory, an active fancy, and a comely perſon.

(33) In his *Britannia* in Norfolk.

(34) In his *Propoſition to his Majeſty for the Compiling and Amendment of our Laws*, printed in the fourth vol. of his works, edit. London 1730 in fol.

(35) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 97.

(36) *Fœlix Conſortium, or a fit Conjuncture of Learning and Religion*, lib. 3. cap. 13. pag. 170. edit. London 1663.

(57) *State-Worthies*, pag. 823.

[*R*] *We ſhall give ſome account of his deſcendants in the Note.*] His two daughters by his laſt wife, the Lady Elizabeth Hatton, were Elizabeth, who died unmarried, and *Frances*, wife to Sir John Villiers, Viſcount Purbeck. His three daughters by his firſt Lady, Bridget, were *Elizabeth*, who died young, *Anne*, wife of Ralph Sadler Eſq; ſon and heir of Sir Thomas Sadler; and *Bridget*, married 22 James I, to William Skinner Eſq; This Gentleman, who was ſon and heir of Sir Vincent Skinner, had by that Lady Mr. Cyriack Skinner, an intimate friend of Milton, and to whom that Poet has addreſſed one of his Sonnets, in the beginning of which he pays the following compliment to the memory of Sir Edward Coke (38).

> Cyriack, *whoſe grandſire on the Royal Bench*
> *Of Britiſh* Themis, *with no mean applauſe,*
> *Pronounc't, and in his volumes taught our lawes,*
> *Which others at their Barr ſo often wrench.*

(38) See *Poems upon ſeveral Occaſions. By John Milton. Both Engliſh and Latin, &c. compoſed at ſeveral times. With a ſmall Tractate of Education to Mr. Hartlib.* pag. 60. edit. London 1673.

Of Sir Edward Coke's ſeven ſons, *Edward* the eldeſt died an infant; *Robert*, the ſecond, was knighted, and married Theophila, only daughter of Thomas Lord Berkeley, Anceſtor of the preſent Earl of Berkeley, and died aged 67 on July the 19th 1653, leaving no iſſue, and was buried at Epſom. *Arthur*, the third ſon, married Elizabeth, daughter and heir of Sir George Walgrave of Hitcham in Norfolk Knt. and died at St. Edmundſbury Decem. 6th 1629, leaving four daughters his heirs. *John*, the fourth ſon, was of Holkham, and married Moriel, daughter and heir of Anthony Wheatley, ſon of William Wheatley, Prothonotary of the Court of Common-Pleas, by whom he had iſſue ſeven ſons and ſeven daughters, whereof Edward, his heir apparent, died before him, leaving no iſſue by Elizabeth his wife, daughter of George Lord Berkley; whereby the inheritance devolved at length on *John Coke* of Holkham Eſq; his youngeſt ſon, who dying unmarried, the eſtate came to the heirs of *Henry Coke*, fifth ſon of the Lord Chief Juſtice Coke. But before we treat of the ſaid Henry, who is anceſtor of the preſent Lord Lovel, we ſhall give an account of *Clement*, the ſixth ſon of the Lord Chief Juſtice Coke; *Thomas*, the ſeventh and youngeſt ſon, dying an infant. The ſaid *Clement Coke* Eſq; married Sarah, daughter and coheir of Alexander Redich of Redich in Lancaſhire Eſq; by a daughter and coheir of Sir Robert Langley of Agecroft in the ſame County, whereby he made a great addition to the inheritance left him by his father, which was the ſeat and eſtate of Longford in Derbyſhire. He was bred to the Law in the Society of the Inner Temple, where he died May 23d 1619, leaving iſſue, as the inſcription on the monument erected for him in the Temple-Church ſhews, *Edward*, *Robert*, *Bridget* and *Avice*. *Edward*, his eldeſt ſon, born at Chelſea in March 1617, was created a Baronet December 30th 1641, being written of Longford in Derbyſhire. He married Catherine, daughter and coheir to Sir Lodowick Dyer of Great Stoughton in Huntingdonſhire Knt. by whom he had iſſue two ſons, *Robert* and *Edward*, and three daughters, *Catherine*, married to Cornelius Clarke of Norton in Scarſdale Eſq; *Anne*, who died unmarried, and *Theophila*, who died an infant. His eldeſt ſon, Sir *Robert Coke* Bart. ſucceeded to the title and eſtate, and ſerved in Parliament as one of the Knights of the Shire for the County of Derby 1 James II, and married Sarah, daughter and coheir to .... Barker of Abrightlee in Salop Eſq; and dying without iſſue in January 1687, the honour and eſtate devolved on *Edward* his only brother

(a) Moreri mentions him under *Apollonius Collatius*, pag. 294; after which, pag. 296. he juſt gives his name, and refers to Collatius.

COLLATIUS (a) (PETER APOLLONIUS) Prieſt of Novarra †, lived about the end of the fifteenth Century. This cannot be any longer doubted, ſince the journey which Father Mabillon made into Italy in 1686 [*A*]. Collatius compoſed Latin Poems, and one among the reſt on the deſcription of Jeruſalem, inſerted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* by Margarinus de la Bigne. It had already been printed at Paris [*B*] by the care of John Gagney Doctor of Divinity; and another edition was publiſhed at Leyden in 1586, under the direction of Adrian vander Burch, who corrected and reviſed the Text. This ſhews that Collatius was looked upon as a very antient Author. The elder Scaliger was not in this error; for he has ranked him (*b*) among the modern Poets, lower than Andrew Alciat, and Balthaſar Caſtiglione; and above Lancinus Curtius, Fauſtinus Andrelinus, and Eraſmus. We find that he did not intend to rank theſe writers in an exact chronological order; however, he has ſhewn evidently enough, that Collatius was a modern Poet. He declares him Author of a book of *Faſti*, of which he does not give a very good character [*C*]. Many learned men have taken ſo little notice of this paſſage in Scaliger

† [A City of Italy, eight leagues from Milan.] *Addit. by the Tranſlator.*

(b) Jul. Cæſ. Scaliger, *Poet.* lib. 6.

brother and heir, who reſided at Longford; but dying Auguſt 25th 1727 unmarried, the title of Baronet became extinct, and he left his eſtate to *Edward Coke* Eſq; brother to Thomas, now Lord Lovell, lineally deſcended from *Henry Coke*, fifth ſon of the Lord Chief Juſtice Coke. Which *Henry* was ſeated at Thurrington in Suffolk, and having married Margaret, daughter and heir of Richard Lovelace of Kingſdown in Kent Eſq; had iſſue four ſons; whereof only *Richard* the eldeſt, and *Cyriac Coke* were married; but from Cyriac no iſſue is remaining. *Richard Coke* Eſq; was of Thurrington and by Mary his wife, daughter of Sir John Rous of Henham-Hall in Suffolk Bart. loſt an only ſon, *Robert Coke* of Holkham Eſq; who married Anne, daughter of Thomas Oſborn Earl of Danby, and afterwards Duke of Leeds, and died January 16th 167⅞ in the 29th year of his age, and was buried in the Church of Tittleſhall in Norfolk. By his Lady he had iſſue *Elizabeth*, a daughter, who died in her infancy, and a ſon, *Edward*, who married *Carey*, daughter of Sir John Newton of Barrows Court in Glouceſterſhire Bart. He died April 13th 1707, and ſhe ſurvived him but a ſhort time, deceaſing on the 4th of Auguſt following, and were both buried in Tittleſhall in Norfolk. They had iſſue three ſons and two daughters; *Thomas*, now Lord Lovell, *Edward Coke* of Longford in Derbyſhire Eſq; who dying at his ſeat at Longford in Auguſt 1733 unmarried, left his eſtate to his youngeſt brother *Robert Coke*, late Vice-Chamberlain to the Queen, who in June 1733 married the Lady Jane, eldeſt ſiſter and coheir of Philip late Duke of Wharton, and Relict of John Holt of Redgrave in Suffolk Eſq; The two daughters were *Carey*, wife of Sir Marmaduke Wyvil of Conſtable-Burton in Yorkſhire Bart. and *Anne*, married to Philip Roberts Eſq; Major in the ſecond Troop of Horſe-guards. *Thomas*, the eldeſt ſon, May 27th 1725 was elected Knight of the Bath, and May 28th 1728 advanced to the dignity of a Peer of Great Britain by the ſtile and title of Baron Lovell of Minſted Lovell in Oxfordſhire. In 1733 he was conſtituted Poſtmaſter-General of Great Britain and Ireland, jointly with the honourable Edward Carteret Eſq; His Lordſhip married the Lady Margaret Tufton, fourth daughter and coheir of Thomas Earl of Thanet, and by her has an only ſon named *Edward*. His Arms are Party per Pale, Gules and Azure, three Eagles diſplay'd, Argent, Creſt, on a Chapeau, Gules turn'd up Ermine, an Oſtrich with an Horſe-ſhoe in its beak, all Argent, Supporters, two Oſtriches, Argent, each gorg'd with a ducal Coronet Party per Pale, Azure and Gules, and a Line thereto of the latter. Motto, *Prudens qui patiens* (39). T.

(39) *Peerage of England.* By *Arthur Collins Eſq*; vol. 3. pag. 513, &c.

[*A*] *He lived about the end of the XVth Century. This cannot be any longer doubted, ſince the journey which Father Mabillon made into Italy.*] Magliabecchi preſented to Father Mabillon a Poem of Apollonius, in Epick Verſe, on David and Goliah; and ſhewed him that this Poem is dedicated to Lawrence of Medicis, and that there are added to it ſome Epigrams of the ſame Author; one of which is the Epitaph of Paul II, and the other of Sixtus IV. Father Mabillon inſerting this particular in the relation of his journey, obſerves very juſtly that it cannot be any longer doubted, but that Peter Apollonius lived about the end of the XVth Century. But what he relates concerning Voſſius, is not ſo juſt as I could wiſh. Here follow his words. *Quo ex carmine diſcimus ætatem hujuſce auctoris, quem alii ad ſæculum ſeptimum, alii ad decimum, alii ad alia tempora referunt, ut videre licet apud Gerardum Voſſium de Hiſtoricis Latinis, ubi* Petrus Apollonius Collutius *appellatur* (1). i. e. "Which Poem informs us "of the age of this Author, which ſome Writers "place in the VIIth Century, ſome in the Xth, and "others again in other periods, as may be ſeen in "Gerard Voſſius, where he is called Petrus Apollonius "Collutius." In the firſt place, Voſſius does not call him *Collutius* but *Collatius* (2); and ſecondly, he does not ſay that ſome Authors declare Collatius to have lived in the VIIth Century; others in the Xth, and others again in different periods. He only ſays, that Margarinus de la Bigne (3) has placed Collatius towards the cloſe of the VIIth Century, about the year 690; and that ſome very learned men of our age cite him as an antient Author. He adds, that in his opinion Apollonius is a modern Writer, cotemporary, and lower than the year 1490, and that Barthius (4) alſo believes him to be a modern. Voſſius's reaſon is grounded on his thinking that Collatius ſhould not be diſtinguiſhed from the Apollonius Collatius mentioned by Scaliger in his Poeticks. It is therefore evident, that Father Mabillon has cited Voſſius erroneouſly.

(1) Mabillon, *Muſæ Ital.* tom. 1. pag. 194.

(2) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 811.

(3) *In Indice Chronologico veterum Eccleſiæ Scriptorum, in* tom. 1. *Bibliath. Patrum.*

(4) *Adverſar.* lib. 23. cap. 27.

[*B*] *His Poem . . . . on the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, as it had already been printed at Paris.*] I have not ſet down the year of this edition, becauſe I find that Mr. de Launoi (5) and Daumius (6) vary from one another; the latter, who believes it was but the ſecond, and that the firſt had been publiſhed in Italy, fixes it to 1546; the former dates it at 1540 (7). Daumius looks upon Margarinus's de la Bigne's edition as the third (8); and as the fourth, that of Hadrian Vander Burch, whom he cenſures for having declared that his Leyden Edition of 1586 was the ſecond. Daumius pretends, that he ſhould have ſaid the fourth. But even this would have been an error, becauſe of the edition of 1540, mentioned by de Launoi, and that of Paris printed in 1575, inſerted in the catalogue of the Bodleian Library. I do not allude to the Edition which Voſſius took to be the firſt (9); which according to him is the edition that was publiſhed at Paris in 1516 by the care of John Gagney; for it is manifeſt, that he is miſtaken with regard to the time. Gagney did not begin to ſtudy Divinity, till the year 1524 (10), and therefore it is not probable, that he ſhould have undertaken to publiſh Collatius in 1516. Voſſius ſpeaks of an Edition printed at Antwerp by Chriſtopher Plantin, and reviſed by Vander Burch: this doubtleſs is the ſame with that printed at Leyden in 1586; and if Voſſius ſaw Antwerp in the title of his copy, this muſt be aſcribed to the cuſtom which Bookſellers have of printing ſeveral titles; and of making them vary as much as they pleaſe in the dates of the year, and the names of the cities where they are ſaid to be printed. How many times have they by this method, made Bibliographers increaſe the number of the editions of a Book? Daumius had reaſon to believe that the Paris Edition was preceded by an Italian one; for the Work in queſtion had been printed at Milan in 1481 (11).

(5) *Hiſtor. Colleg. Navarr.* pag. 685.

(6) *Epiſt. ad Reineſium*, pag. 27.

(7) The Authors of *Acta Eruditorum*, 1692, pag. 558. put the ſame date as de Launoi.

(8) In the *Bibliotheque des Peres.*

(9) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 811.

(10) Launoius, *Hiſt. Gym. Navar.* pag. 681.

(11) *Acta Erud. Lipſienſ.* 1692, pag. 558.

[*C*] *He declares him Author of a Book of Faſti, of which he does not give a very good character.*] Here follows what he ſays of it. *Apollonius Collatius Faſtos edidit, in quibus pietatem laudes, frigidiuſculus tamen poëta eſt; & cum diſcedit ab elegiaco etiam infelix* (12). i. e. "Apollonius Collatius publiſhed a Book of Faſti, "in which he diſcovers a piety that is laudable, but "his verſification is flat; and when he leaves the ele"giac meaſure his poetry alſo very bad."

(12) Jul. Cæſar. Scalig. *Poetic.* lib. 6.

Scaliger, that they cite Collatius as an antient Author [*D*]. Voſſius (c) is ſurpriſed, that Gyraldi has not mentioned this Prieſt of Novarra. Father Briet ſpeaks of him in ſuch a manner, as will oblige me to take notice of his errors [*E*]. Not long ſince there was printed in Milan a Poem of our Apollonius on the combat between David and Goliah, together with ſome Elegies and Epigrams [*F*].

(c) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 812.

[*D*] *Many learned Men . . . cite Collatius as an antient Author.*] Voſſius without quoting any one, ſays only, that the learned men of this age, generally cite Collatius as ſuch (13). But Barthius is not ſo cautious; he aſſerts, that Collatius had been cited, as an ancient Chriſtian Poet by Joſeph Scaliger in his notes on Euſebius; by Caſaubon in his Commentary on Suetonius; by Francis Juret in his Notes on Paullinus; by Chriſtopher Colerus in his obſervations on Tacitus; by Thomas Dempſterus in his Notes on Coripppus; by Meurſius in his Gloſſary; by John Savaron in his Commentary on Sidonuis Apollinaris; by Bulengerus in his Treatiſe *de Imperatore*, and elſewhere (14). The learned Reineſius, who was not ſorry to meet with an opportunity of cenſuring Barthius ſays (15), that there was no reaſon to cenſure theſe learned men, ſince they did not mention the age of Collatius; and that they might very well have cited a perſon, who in their opinion was a modern Author; that it was particularly abſurd to introduce in this criticiſm Joſeph Scaliger, who could not have forgot what his father had told him, concerning the age in which Collatius lived. If the Reader conſult Daumius's anſwer to theſe objections of Reineſius (16), I am certain he will find that Barthius was in the right.

(13) *Ut antiquus à ſummis ſeculi hujus viris paſſim laudatur.* Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Latin.* pag. 811.

(14) Barth. *Commentar. ad Claudian.* pag. 795. In his *Commentary on Statius*, tom. 2. pag. 436. he cites the laſt *Commentators of Petronius*, I am of opinion that he means *Galdaſius*.

(15) *Epiſt. ad Daumium*, pag. 15, 16.

(16) Ibid. pag. 27.

A Carmelite, called Daniel of the Virgin Mary, has alſo taken Collatius to be an antient Chriſtian Poet (17), and even ſeems to have ſupported himſelf on the authority of Caſaubon. The Marquis of Agropoli cenſures him on this account, and at the ſame time invalidates what the Carmelites would infer from a paſſage of this Poet.

(17) *Daniel à Virgine Maria, Vinea Carmeli*, Part 3. cap. 16. num. 358. *apud* Marchionem Agropolitanum, *in Examine Divinit. in Carmelo conſultæ*, Art. 12. pag. m. 11.

[*E*] *Father Briet ſpeaks of him in ſuch a manner, as will oblige me to take notice of his errors.*] He does not determine with regard to the age in which Collatius lived, but he has committed ſome miſtakes. In the 1ſt place, he ſays that Margarinus de la Bigne fixes him under Charlemagne &c. that he is made to flouriſh about the year 690 (18). It is Margarinus de la Bigne who fixes him to that year: for what reaſon then does Father Briet charge him with declaring that Collatius lived under Charlemagne, whoſe reign did not begin till the 786 year, and the Empire till 800, or 801? It is evident that this Jeſuit (Briet) ſuppoſed the year 690, and the æra of Charlemagne's reign, to be the ſame, which is a miſtake. II. He ſays, that Voſſius rejects the opinion of Margarinus de la Bigne, and fixes Collatius to the beginning of the XVth Century; which is making him cotemporary with Politian. Voſſius ſets down expreſly the year 1490, which is about the cloſe, and not the beginning of the XVth Century; and it would be a Chronological error, to aſſert that an Author who lived in the beginning of the XVth Century, had been of the ſame age with Politian. IIIdly, Father Briet rejects the opinion of Voſſius, becauſe he does not think that Collatius's ſtyle is ſtrong and elegant enough for the age Politian lived in, at which period polite literature was revived. He finds ſome faults relating to the quantity in Collatius's verſes, and ſuch an ignorance of the Greek tongue as does not ſuit the age in which Politian flouriſhed. This reaſon is of no force; for all the Authors of the XVth Century, did not improve equally, by the great advances which had been made in polite Literature in Italy. Some of thoſe Writers who ſtudied the refinement of their Diction, either in proſe or verſe, made a very inconſiderable improvement, and learnt the Greek Tongue but very imperfectly. IVthly. This Jeſuit thinks that the ſtile of Collatius is a little more noble and polite than that of the Writers under Charlemagne, from whence he infers, that Voſſius and Barthius fix him too far back, *eum nimis deprimunt*. If he means, that they have him in too great contempt, he is in an error; for they only take him to be a modern Poet. If he ſuppoſes that they bring him a little too low, he refutes himſelf; for according to his way of reaſoning, in our third obſervation, the higher a Poet has raiſed himſelf above the ignorance of the eighth Century, the more he deſerves to be placed in the age in which Politian lived.

(18) Briet. *de Poet. Latin.* lib. 5. pag. 63.

[*F*] *There was printed at Milan a Poem . . . on the combat between David and Goliah together with ſome Elegies &c.*] I have already mentioned, what Father Mabillon had heard concerning this Poem, from the illuſtrious Magliabecchi, I ſhall here inſert what the Authors of the *Acta Eruditorum* relate on this head (19). We there find, that Magliabecchi made a preſent of ſome Poems of Apollonius to Puſterla, Keeper of the Ambroſian Library at Milan; and that the latter gave them to Lazarus Auguſtin Catta, a Civilian of Novarra, who got them printed at Milan, anno 1692 in 8vo. This Collection contains the combat between David and Goliah, and a complaint of our Saviour againſt the Jews in epick verſe; an Elegy on the pleaſures of the Country, and ſeveral Epigrams; but the Epitaphs of Paul II, and Sixtus IV, which were in Father Mabillon's copy, are ſuppreſſed. Our Apollonius is called *Collatinus* in the Edition made by Catta. We muſt rank Ricciolus, among thoſe who ſuppoſed Collatius to be an antient Chriſtian Poet; for he has placed him in the eighth Century (20).

(19) Menſ. Dec. 1692, pag. 558, 559.

(20) Ibid.

☞COLLIER (JEREMY) (*a*) ſon of Jeremy Collier, was born at Stow Qui in Cambridgeſhire September the 23d 1650. His father was a Divine, and conſiderable Linguiſt, and ſometime Maſter of the Free-ſchool at Ipſwich in the County of Suffolk. His grandfather likewiſe was a Clergyman, ſettled at Bradford in Yorkſhire, where he lived in eſteem for his function. He was born at Yeadon near Bradford, and deſcended from a Gentleman's family of that name ſeated at Thruſk in the ſame county in the reign of Henry the Eighth. His mother was Elizabeth Smith of Qui in Cambridgeſhire, where her family were poſſeſſed of a conſiderable intereſt, and related to the Sterne's of that town, being by her mother deſcended from the Keys or Cays of Yorkſhire and Lincolnſhire. He was educated under his father at Ipſwich, from whence he was ſent to Cambridge, and admitted a poor ſcholar of Caius College under the tuition of Mr. John Ellys. His admiſſion bears date April the 10th 1669 in the 18th year of his age. He took the degree of Bachelor of Arts in the year 167$\frac{2}{3}$, and that of Maſter of Arts in 1676, being ordained Deacon on September the 24th of the ſame year by Dr. Peter Gunning Biſhop of Ely, and Prieſt February the 24th 1677, by Dr. Henry Compton Biſhop of London. Having entred into Prieſt's Orders he officiated for ſome time at the Counteſs Dowager of Dorſet's at Knowle in Kent, from whence he removed to a ſmall Rectory at Ampton near St. Edmond's Bury in Suffolk, to which he was preſented by James Calthorpe Eſq; and inſtituted by Dr. Anthony Sparrow Biſhop of Norwich, September the 25th 1679. After he had held this benefice ſix years, he reſigned it, and came to reſide in London in 1685, and was ſome little time after made Lecturer at Gray's-Inn. But the Revolution coming on, the public exerciſe of his function became impracticable,

(*a*) This Article was communicated to us by a very ingenious and learned Gentleman.

ticable †, for he could not be perſuaded either by the arguments of ſome of his brethren or the example of others, to take the new oaths. On the contrary he not only refuſed to comply with the government, but wrote [*A*] ſeveral times in defence of his ſentiments, though

† Thus far is Mr. Collier's own drawing up excepting ſome few dates.

[*A*] *Wrote.*] The Catalogue of his works is as follows: 1. *The Deſertion diſcuſſed in a Letter to a Country Gentleman.* 1688, 4to. This is written againſt Dr. Burnet's *Enquiry into the preſent ſtate of affairs*, and is ſaid to be the firſt pamphlet publiſhed on that ſide the queſtion after the Prince of Orange's arrival. It gave ſuch offence, that Mr. Collier was committed to Newgate for it in the March following the Revolution, but after ſome months confinement he was diſcharged without any tryal. 2. *A Tranſlation of the* 9, 10, 11 *and* 12 *Books of Sleidan's Commentaries*, 1689. 3. *Vindiciæ juris Regii: or Remarks upon a Paper, entitled, An enquiry into the meaſures of Submiſſion to the ſupream Authority.* Lond. 1689, 4to. The Author of this *Enquiry* was alſo Dr. Burnet, afterwards Biſhop of Saliſbury. 4. *Animadverſions upon the modern explanation of* 11. *Hen.* 7. *cap.* 1. *or a King de facto.* 1689, 4to. 5. *A caution againſt inconſiſtency; or the connexion between praying and ſwearing, in relation to the civil powers*, 1690, 4to. This diſcourſe is a diſſuaſive from joining in the publick aſſemblies. 6. *A Dialogue concerning the times between Philobelgus and Sempronius.* 1690, 4to. There was another Dialogue with much the ſame title printed in 1692, and called a *ſecond part*, but it is not Mr. Collier's, being a narrative of the Revolution, whereas Mr. Collier's relates chiefly to the authority of the Convention. 7. *To the Right Honourable the Lords, and to the Gentlemen convened at Weſtminſter October* 1690, half ſheet. It is a petition for an Enquiry into the Birth of the Prince of Wales. 8. *Dr. Sherlock's caſe of Allegiance conſidered, with ſome remarks upon his Vindication.* Lond. 1691, 4to. 9. *A brief Eſſay concerning the Independency of Church Power*, 1692, 4to. The deſign of this Eſſay is to prove the publick Aſſemblies guilty of ſchiſm, upon account of their being held under ſuch Biſhops as had aſſumed, or owned ſuch as had aſſumed the Sees of thoſe, that were deprived for not complying with the Government &c. 10. *The caſe of giving Bail to a pretended authority examined, dated from the King's Bench Nov.* 23, 1692; with a Preface dated Dec. 1692, and a Letter to Sir John Holt dat. Nov. 30, 1692, and alſo a *Reply to ſome Remarks upon the Caſe of giving Bail &c.* Dat. April 1693. In relation to this diſcourſe, we are to take notice, that Mr. Collier and one Mr. Newton another Nonjuring Clergyman were in the year 1692 ſeized at Romney Marſh in Kent, and brought up to London upon ſuſpicion of ſome deſign againſt the Government, where after examination they were by my Lord Nottingham impriſoned in the Gatehouſe. But no evidence appearing againſt them, they were admitted to Bail. However it was not long before Mr. Collier threw up his Bail, upon which he was committed to the King's Bench, where he lay, till by the application of ſome of his friends, he was diſcharged by warrant from the Lord Chief Juſtice Holt. That which moved him to throw up his Bail was a ſcruple he had entertained concerning the lawfulneſs of applying under the ſtated forms of Law to a power he did not acknowledge; and this ſcruple ſat ſo [cloſe upon him, that he thought it neceſſary even while he was in priſon, to commit the reaſons upon which he grounded his opinion to writing, and after he was ſet at liberty, ſent the famous Letter abovementioned to Sir John Holt, the Chief Juſtice at that time, to clear himſelf from having any hand in the application made for his diſcharge. Of this piece there were but five copies printed. 11. *A perſuaſive to conſideration tendered to the Royaliſts, particularly thoſe of the Church of England.* Lond. 1693, 4to. It was afterwards reprinted in 8vo, together with his Vindication of it againſt a piece entitled, *The loyal Layman's Apology &c.* written in confutation of that part of the *Perſuaſive*, which relates to the controverſy about the frequenting the public aſſemblies. 12. *Remarks upon the London Gazette, relating to the Streights fleet and the battle of Landen in Flanders* 1693, 4to. 13. *A Defence of the Abſolution given to Sir William Parkins at the place of execution, April* 3*d*; *with a farther Vindication thereof, occaſioned by a paper, entitled, a Declaration of the Senſe of the Archbiſhops and Biſhops &c.* The firſt dated April 9, 1696; the other April 21, 1696. To which is added *a Poſtſcript in relation to a paper called An Anſwer to his Defence &c.* dated April 25. Alſo a *Reply to the Abſolution of a penitent according to the directions of the Church of England &c.* dated May 20, 1696: and *An Anſwer to the Animadverſions on two Pamphlets lately publiſhed by Mr. Collier &c.* dated July 1, 1696, 4to. The Declaration mentioned above was directed againſt Mr. Collier, Mr. Cooke and Mr. Snatt, of which the firſt pronounced the abſolution over Sir William Parkins, the ſecond over Sir John Friend, and all three joined in a ſolemn impoſition of hands upon them both. It was ſigned by the two Archbiſhops and twelve of their ſuffragans; but Dr. Grove Biſhop of Chicheſter, one of thoſe that ſubſcribed the Declaration, confeſſed, as it was ſaid, that he had not read it, when he ſet his hand to it, but ſigned it implicitly. Be that as it will, they were not only cenſured by the eccleſiaſtical power for what they had done upon that occaſion, but proſecuted alſo in the ſecular Courts as enemies to the Government &c. and Mr. Cooke and Mr. Snatt were committed to Newgate, but diſcharged afterwards without any penalty. But Mr. Collier, in purſuance of his ſentiment againſt giving Bail &c. refuſing to appear upon Summons, was outlawed, and ſo continued to his death. 14. *Eſſays upon ſeveral moral Subjects*, in four parts and three volumes. The firſt Volume printed 1697, the ſecond 1705, and the laſt in 1709, 8vo. The firſt five Eſſays came out in the year 1691, with the title of *Miſcellanies in five Eſſays*, and the ſeventeen following in 1695 under the title of *Miſcellanies upon Moral Subjects, the ſecond part.* The laſt Eſſay alſo, which is upon the *reſurrection*, had been publiſhed before in a Sermon, tho' now altered and moulded into a different form. For I have ſeen an edition of it in 1686, with the following title: *The Difference between the preſent and future ſtate of our Bodies conſidered in a Sermon*, 4°. Beſides this the *Eſſays* on the *Office of a Chaplain*, and that concerning *Pride*, had both of them appeared ſeparately ſome years before the Collection paſſed the preſs, the firſt being printed at Cambridge 1688 with this title, *The Office of a Chaplain enquired into, and vindicated from ſervility and contempt*, 4to, and the other at London 1689 by the title of *A Moral Eſſay concerning the nature and unreaſonableneſs of pride; in which the moſt plauſible pretences of this vice are examined, in a conference between Philotimus and Philalethes*, 8vo. Theſe Eſſays have had ſeveral editions, being much eſteemed by the polite and underſtanding part of mankind; and Father Courbeville a judicious French Writer places them in the ſame claſs with the works of Montagne, la Hoguette, St. Evremont, the Author of the *Moral Reflections*, the Chevalier de Mero, and la Bruyere See the Preface to *Le Heros duit de l'Eſpagnol de Baltazar Gracien &c.* a Paris 1725. 15. *A ſhort view of the immorality and profaneneſs of the Engliſh Stage &c.* London, 1698, 8vo, frequently reprinted. 16. *A defence of the Short View &c. being a reply to Mr. Congreve's Amendments &c. and to the Vindication of the Author of the Relapſe.* Lond. 1699, 8vo. 17. *A ſecond Defence of the Short View &c. Being a reply to a Book, entitled, The ancient and modern Stages ſurveyed &c.* London, 1700, 8vo. The Book here replied to was written by Dr. Drake. 18. *Mr. Collier's Diſſuaſive from the Play-Houſe; in a Letter to a perſon of quality, occaſioned by the late calamity of the Tempeſt.* London, 1703, 8vo. 19. *A farther Vindication of the Short View &c. in which the objections of a late Book, entitled,* A Defence of Plays, *are conſidered.* London, 1708, 8vo. *The Defence of Plays* has Dr. Filmer for its Author. In this controverſy with the Stage Mr. Collier exerted himſelf to the utmoſt advantage. He baffled his adverſaries at their own weapons, and ſhewed that it was poſſible for a Clergyman to have more wit as well as more learning and religion than the Poets; and though they treated him with much rudeneſs, and endeavoured to aſperſe his character with ill-natured and groundleſs inſinuations, yet he had the pleaſure to ſee his labours were not ſo wholly void of ſucceſs,

though upon ſome occaſions it expoſed him to the cenſure and reſentment of thoſe in power. In the reign of Queen Anne ſome overtures were made to engage him to a compliance, and he was promiſed conſiderable preferment, if he would acknowledge and ſubmit to the government. But as he became a Nonjuror upon no other motive but to ſatisfy his conſcience, no offers of advantage could make the leaſt impreſſion upon him. We are well informed that he was conſecrated a Biſhop by Doctor Hickes [*B*] and ſome others on Aſcenſion-day 1713. After ſuch a numerous catalogue of his works, the evidence (as we have ſeen in the note [*A*]) of a long and conſtant application, it will not be ſurprizing to hear that he was afflicted with the ſtone, which at length carried him off. He died on the 26th of April 1726, and was buried on the 29th of the ſame month in the Churchyard of St. Pancras London, being then in the ſeventy ſixth year of his age. He was a perſon of great integrity and a moſt exemplary life, chearful and inoffenſive in converſation, and with all the reſerve of a Chriſtian had the affableneſs and complaiſance of a Gentleman. He was well acquainted with the learned Languages, underſtood both ſacred and profane antiquity, and was no ſtranger to the Common Law. In a word he was a great maſter of Style and Language, had a genius for polite Letters as well as the abſtruſer Studies, and was a thorough Philoſopher, Orator and Divine.

COLLINS

ſucceſs, but that they thought it neceſſary to excuſe themſelves for writing ſome of the Plays he finds fault with, and owned that they might have been guilty of fooliſh miſtakes (as Mr. Vanbrug in his *Short Vindication*) and that they had received advantages from his Book (as Mr. Congreve in his *Amendments*.) Nay the celebrated Mr. Dryden (and to his honour be it ſpoken) ingenuouſly acknowledged that Mr. Collier had in many things taxed him juſtly, publickly retracted all thoughts and expreſſions of his, that could be truly argued of obſcenity, profaneneſs or immorality, and declared it did not become him to draw his pen in the defence of a bad cauſe, when he had ſo often drawn it for a good one. *Preface to Fables ancient and modern.* The *View* was tranſlated into French by Pere Courbeville abovementioned, who elſewhere calls him *an illuſtrious* and *celebrated Author*, and *one of the greateſt genius's in England* (Pref. to *Maximes de Baltazar Gracien &c.* a Paris 1730.) 20. *The Great Hiſtorical, Geographical, Genealogical, and Poetical Dictionary &c.* Four Vol. fol. The two firſt volumes were printed in 1701, the third of which is called a Supplement in 1705, and again in 1727, the laſt, which is an appendix to the other three, in 1721. This Dictionary is chiefly taken from Moreri, but very much improved by Mr. Collier. The two firſt volumes he found tranſlated to his hand, but with the diſadvantage of many miſtakes, and a great diverſity of ſtile (which muſt always be the caſe where many different hands are employed in the ſame work), ſo that he was oblig'd to correct the whole; and the rather becauſe there had been two purged and enlarged Editions of the French ſince the publiſhing of that Engliſh Tranſlation. After theſe two Volumes came out, there were ſome objections ſtarted againſt his management, which he clears up in his Preface to the Supplement; and tho' it is poſſible that in ſo great a variety of matter ſeveral errors may ſtill be diſcovered, (as many of the two firſt volumes are corrected in the Appendix) yet with regard to the choice of proper ſubjects, and the manner of handling them, to the uſefulneſs of the work and the uniformity of the ſtyle, it will juſtify the good opinion the publick have had of it, and be always the model or the reproach of thoſe that write Dictionaries after him. 21. *The Emperor Marcus Antoninus his converſation with himſelf. Together with the preliminary Diſcourſe of the learned Gataker &c. to which is added the mythological Picture of Cebes the Theban &c.* Tranſlated into Engliſh from the reſpective originals. London, 1701, 8vo. 22. *An Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Great Britain, chiefly of England, from the firſt planting of Chriſtianity to the end of the reign of King Charles the ſecond. With a brief account of the affairs of Religion in Ireland. Collected from the beſt ancient Hiſtorians, Councils and Records*, 2 vol. folio. The firſt 1708, the ſecond 1714. This Hiſtory, which is written with great judgment, and contains beſides a relation of facts, many curious diſcourſes upon eccleſiaſtical and religious ſubjects, was taken to taſk by Biſhop Burnet, Biſhop Nicholſon, and Dr. Kennet afterwards Biſhop of Peterborough, each of whom publiſhed a few Animadverſions upon ſome paſſages in it; but was defended by Mr. Collier in two pieces, the firſt entitled, 23. *An Anſwer to ſome exceptions in Biſhop Burnet's third part of the Hiſtory of the Reformation &c. againſt Mr. Collier's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; together with a Reply to ſome Remarks in Biſhop Nicholſon's* Engliſh Hiſtorical Library &c. *upon the ſame ſubject*, fol. London 1715. The other, 24. *Some Remarks on Dr. Kennet's* Second and third Letters; *wherein his miſrepreſentations of Mr. Collier's* Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory *are laid open, and his calumnies diſproved.* Lond. 1717, fol. and 8vo. But in the 8vo it is called, *Some Conſiderations &c.* 25. *An Eſſay upon Gaming in a Dialogue between Callimachus and Dolomades.* Lond. 1713, 8vo. afterwards annexed to the *Tranſlation of St. Gregory Nazianzen's Panegyrick upon the Maccabees &c.* 26. *A Panegyrick upon the Maccabees by St. Gregory Nazianzen. Of unreaſonable Diverſions, by Salvian; a Deſcription of the Manners of the Pagan World; a conſolatory Diſcourſe to the Chriſtians of Carthage viſited by mortality; of the Advantage of Patience: theſe three by St. Cyprian. Done into Engliſh. Together with two Eſſays, viz. of Diſcontent and of Gaming.* London, 1716, 8vo. 27. *Several Diſcourſes upon practical Subjects*, London, 1725, 8vo. The laſt Diſcourſe of this Collection had been printed ſeparately in 1723, with the following title: *The compariſon between Giving and Receiving, with the reaſons for preference ſtated: in a Sermon preached at Whitehall April* 19th, 1687, 4to. 28. *God not the Origin of Evil; being an additional Sermon to a Collection of Mr. Collier's Diſcourſes &c.* Lond. 1726, 8vo. He publiſhed alſo an Advertiſement againſt Biſhop Burnet's *Hiſtory of his own Time*, which was printed on a ſlip of paper and diſperſed in the London Coffee-houſes in 1724, and is to be ſeen in the *Evening-Poſt* Numb. 2254. Beſides this he wrote ſeveral Prefaces &c. as 1ſt, *An Advertiſement concerning the Author and the Tranſlation of Maxims and Reflections upon Plays (in anſwer to a Diſcourſe of the Lawfulneſs and Unlawfulneſs of Plays, printed before a late Play entitled,* Beauty in Diſtreſs) *written in French by the Biſhop of Meaux*, Lond. 1699. 2d, *A Recommendatory Preface to Tully's five Books* de Finibus &c. *Done into Engliſh by S. P.* (Sam. Parker) *Gent. Together with an Apology for the philoſophical writings of Cicero in a Letter to the Tranſlator by Mr. Henry Dodwell.* Lond. 1702. 3d, *A Recommendatory Preface to human Souls naturally immortal. Tranſlated from a Latin Manuſcript by S. E.* Lond. 1707. Of this Preface Mr. Norris makes honourable mention in his Letter to Mr. Dodwell concerning the Immortality of the Soul of Man, and ſays that Mr. Collier's ſingle remark againſt Mr. Locke is in his opinion worth all the Book beſides, p. 107. I have been informed moreover, that he was concerned among others in collecting the paſſages referred to by Dr. Henry Sacheverell in his *Anſwer to the Articles of his Impeachment*, printed at London 1710.

[*B*] *Was conſecrated a Biſhop by Dr. Hickes, &c.*] We have been informed that Dr. George Hickes was conſecrated Suffragan of Thetford on St. Matthias's Eve, Feb. 23d, 1693-4. by the deprived Biſhops, Dr. William Lloyd Biſhop of Norwich, Dr. Francis Turner Biſhop of Ely, and Dr. Thomas White Biſhop of Peterborough. P.

COLLINS (ANTHONY), an eminent Writer of the eighteenth Century, was born at Heſton near Hounſlow in the County of Middleſex June the 21ſt 1676, and was ſon of Henry Collins Eſq; a Gentleman, whoſe eſtate was computed at eighteen hundred pounds *per annum*. Our Author received his firſt education at Eaton-College, from whence he was removed to King's-College in the Univerſity of Cambridge, where he had for his Tutor Mr. Francis Hare, the preſent Biſhop of Chicheſter. He afterwards came up to London, and was admitted a Student of the Temple, but not reliſhing the ſtudy of the Law, ſoon abandoned it. July 22d 1698 he married Martha, the daughter of Sir Francis Child, who was the year following Lord Mayor of the City of London; and by her had two ſons and two daughters, Elizabeth and Martha. Henry, the elder of the ſons, died in his infancy. Anthony, the younger, was born in October 1701, and was a Gentleman of good Learning, of great ſweetneſs of temper, and of a fine underſtanding: he was educated at Bennet College in Cambridge, and died univerſally lamented by all that knew him, December the 20th 1723. In 1700 our Author publiſhed a Tract intitled, *Several of the London Caſes conſidered* (a). In the years 1703 and 1704 he held a correſpondence by letters with Mr. Locke, who had a prodigious eſteem for him, as appears from the letters of that great man to him, publiſhed by Mr. Des Maizeaux in his *Collection of ſeveral pieces of Mr. John Locke, never before printed or not extant in his Works. Publiſhed by the Author of the Life of the ever-memorable Mr. John Hales* (b) [A]. In 1707 he publiſhed without his name (as he did all his other writings) an *Eſſay concerning the Uſe of Reaſon in propoſitions, the evidence whereof depends upon human teſtimony* (c) [B]. Dr. Francis Gaſtrell, afterwards Biſhop of

(a) This appears from the Catalogue of his Library written all with his own hand.

(b) London 1720, in 8vo.

(c) London, Printed in the year 1707, pagg. 56. in 8vo. It was publiſhed in Feb. 1707, as appears from the *Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned*, for Feb. 1707, vol. 9. pag. 127.

[A] *Mr.* Locke *had a prodigious eſteem for him, as appears from the letters of that great man to him, publiſhed by Mr.* Des Maizeaux *in his* Collection of ſeveral Pieces of Mr. John Locke &c.] In his Letter dated from Oates in Eſſex 29 October 1703 he writes as follows (1). *You complain of a great many defects; and that very complaint is the higheſt recommendation I could deſire to make me love and eſteem you, and deſire your friendſhip. And if I were now ſetting out in the world, I ſhould think it my great happineſs to have ſuch a companion as you, who had a true reliſh of truth, would in earneſt ſeek it with me, from whom I might receive it undiſguiſed, and to whom I might communicate what I thought true, freely. Believe it, my good friend, to love truth for truth's ſake, is the principal part of human perfection in this world, and the ſeed-plot of all other virtues; and if I miſtake not, you have as much of it, as ever I met with in any body. What then is there wanting to make you equal to the beſt, a friend for any one to be proud of? . . . . Now methinks, (and theſe are often old men's dreams) I ſee openings to truth, and direct paths leading to it; wherein a little induſtry and application would ſettle one's mind with ſatisfaction even in thoſe matters which you mention, and leave no darkneſs or doubt even with the moſt ſcrupulous. But this is at the end of my day, when my ſun is ſetting. And tho' the proſpect it has given me be what I would not for any thing be without, there is ſo much irreſiſtable truth, beauty, and conſiſtency in it; yet it is for one of your age, I think I ought to ſay for you yourſelf, to ſet about it, as a work you would put into order, and oblige the world with.* In another letter, dated from Oates 11 September 1704 he writes thus: "Dear Sir, "He that has any thing to do with you, muſt own "that friendſhip is the natural product of your con"ſtitution; and your ſoul, a noble ſoil, is enriched "with the two moſt valuable qualities of human na"ture, truth and friendſhip. What a treaſure have I "then in ſuch a friend, with whom I can converſe, "and be enlightened about the higheſt ſpeculations?" In his letter dated, 1 October 1704 he writes thus: *My infirmities prevail ſo faſt on me, that unleſs you make haſte hither, I may loſe the ſatisfaction of ever ſeeing again a man, that I value in the firſt rank of thoſe, that I leave behind me* (2). We have another remarkable letter of Mr. Locke's to him (3), which is as follows.

(1) *Collection of ſeveral Pieces of Mr. John Locke, never before printed, or not extant in his Works. Publiſhed by the Author of the Life of the ever-memorable Mr. John Hales*, pag. 271, & *ſeqq.* edit. London 1720.

(2) Mr. Locke died on the 28th of October 1704, that is, 27 days after the writing of this Letter.

(3) *Collection of ſeveral pieces*, pag. 328, 329.

"For Anthony Collins Eſq;
"To be delivered after my deceaſe.
Oates 23 Auguſt 1704.

"Dear Sir,

"By my will, you will ſee that I had ſome kind"neſs for ***. And I knew no better way to take "care of him, than to put him, and what I deſigned "for him, into your hands and management. The "knowledge I have of your virtue of all kinds ſe"cures the truſt, which by your permiſſion, I have "placed in you; and the peculiar eſteem and love I "have obſerved in the young man for you, will diſpoſe him to be ruled and influenced by you, ſo that "of that I need ſay nothing. But there is one thing "which it is neceſſary for me to recommend to your "eſpecial care and memory *******. May you "live long and happy, in the enjoyment of health, "freedom, content, and all thoſe bleſſings, which "Providence has beſtowed on you, and your virtue "intitles you to. I know you loved me living, and "will preſerve my memory, now I am dead. All "the uſe to be made of it is, that this life is a ſcene "of vanity, that ſoon paſſes away, and affords no "ſolid ſatisfaction, but in the conſciouſneſs of doing "well, and in the hopes of another life. This is, "what I can ſay, upon experience, and what you will "find to be true, when you come to make up the "account. Adieu. I leave my beſt wiſhes with you.
"John Locke."

The latter part of this letter, beginning at [*May you live long and happy, &c.*] was printed by Mr. Whiſton in the *Poſtſcript* to his *Reflections on an anonymous Pamphlet, entitled*, A diſcourſe of *Free-Thinking*, London 1713 in 8vo; and at the end of his *Liſt of Suppoſitions or Aſſertions in the late* Diſcourſe of the grounds and reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion, *which are not therein ſupported by any real or authentick evidence: for which ſome ſuch evidence is expected to be produced.* London 1724 in 8vo.

[B] *His* Eſſay concerning the Uſe of Reaſon in Propoſitions, the evidence whereof depends upon Human Teſtimony.] There was a 2d edition of it printed at London in 1709 in 8°. He defines *Reaſon* to be *that faculty of the mind, whereby it perceives the truth, falſhood, probability, or improbability of propoſitions* (4). He then conſiders the nature of a propoſition, and the various exerciſe of the mind with relation to all kinds of propoſitions (5), and endeavours to ſhew (6), that *Reaſon does its part in all kind of propoſitions, and that the aſſent is proportioned according to the degree of evidence, that each propoſition has.* He obſerves (7), that "Teſti"mony of itſelf is not ſufficient to procure faith or "aſſent, unleſs accompanied with theſe two circum"ſtances, credibility of perſons, and credibility of "the things related." By *credibility of perſons*, he underſtands (8) "men's having the means of infor"mation, capacity to underſtand, honeſty and diſin"tereſtedneſs." By *credibility of things related* he underſtands, 1. *That the words made uſe of in the relation ſtand for known ideas, or ideas, that we are capable of forming; for if they ſtand for ideas that we know not, or want faculties to perceive, there are then no objects for the mind to exert itſelf upon. Nothing remains but mere ſounds, which without ſignifications are no more to it than the ſounds of a trumpet or an hautboy.* 2. "That words muſt ſtand for thoſe ideas, "which the uſe of language has appropriated them "to, or for what the author or relator ſays he under"ſtands by them, or for what the viſible deſign of "the

(4) Sect. 1, pag. 3.

(5) Pag. 3, 4, 5, 6.

(6) Pag. 7.

(7) Pag. 8.

(8) Ibid.

of Cheſter, being animadverted upon in this *Eſſay*, with relation to ſome paſſages in his *Some Conſiderations concerning the Trinity and the way of managing that Controverſy*, printed at London 1702, he ſubjoined to the third edition of it in 1707 a *Vindication* of it in anſwer to Mr. Collins's *Eſſay*. The ſame year our Author entered into the Controverſy between Mr. Dodwell and Mr. Samuel Clarke concerning the Natural Immortality of the Soul, upon which ſubject he publiſhed ſeveral pieces [C]. In December 1709 (d) his Pamphlet, intitled, *Prieſtcraft in perfection, or a Detection of the Fraud of inſerting and continuing this Clauſe* [The Church hath power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and Authority in Controverſies

(d) See *Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned*, for Dec. 1709, vol. 11. pag. 753.

" the author or relator determines them to ſignify. " Theſe are all the ways of knowing the meaning " of words; and if we cannot find the meaning " of a man's words by comparing him with himſelf, " by the uſe of the language, in which he writes, or " by his particular definitions, it is all one to the rea- " der or hearer, as if the words ſtood for ideas he " knew nothing of (9). 3. *I muſt not only have ideas to the words, but the ideas muſt not be repugnant to one another, when put into propoſitions, nor to what we know to be true by the uſe of our faculties.* By knowing a thing to be true, *I underſtand* knowing *ſtrictly ſo called*; *for let a propoſition be ever ſo improbable, if it amounts not to a repugnancy to another propoſition in the hiſtorical relation, or to one which is ſelf-evident, or whoſe ideas I perceive neceſſarily to agree by the intervention of an intermediate idea, it may be received as a truth from a credible Author* (10). Theſe three qualifications are neceſſary to make a matter of fact credible upon any teſtimony whatever (11); " but there is ſtill a " further uſe of reaſon in things, which merely by the " teſtimony of men are ſuppoſed to come from God, " as diſtinguiſhed from other facts; and that is, to en- " deavour to find out ſuch a ſenſe of a ſuppoſed re- " velation as is agreeable to the diſcoveries of our " reaſon, if the words under any kind of conſtruction " will bear it, tho' at firſt view they may ſeem repug- " nant to reaſon, and to one another. This is cer- " tainly a great piece of juſtice, and what is due to " words, which upon the leaſt evidence can be ſup- " poſed to come from God, eſpecially ſince expreſſions, " which do not literally quadrate with the maxims of " Reaſon and Philoſophy, are neceſſary to make a " Revelation have any effect upon common people's " minds. For was not God to be repreſented by ex- " preſſions, which literally underſtood attribute to him " human paſſions and actions, they who by their oc- " cupations in the world are incapable of thoſe more " juſt ideas which men of thought know to belong " to that *Being*, would perhaps think him incapable " of taking cognizance of their actions; and there- " fore to make a Revelation uſeful and credible in it- " ſelf, it muſt conſiſt of words, whoſe literal meaning " is falſe, but whoſe real meaning is conſiſtent with " the juſteſt notions of Reaſon and Philoſophy. And " therefore we ought to examine whether the words " under any conſtruction will bear a reaſonable ſenſe (12)." Mr. Collins then applies this obſervation to the Revelation which we acknowledge, and conſiders thoſe paſſages of Scripture, where God is ſaid to *reſt* (13), *repent* (14), *be angry* (15), *ignorant of the State of Adam* (16), *cheered with wine* (17), &c. and obſerves (18), that beſides endeavouring to put a true ſenſe on words, which literally underſtood imply what is falſe, " there is ſtill this further reſpect due to writ- " ings, which upon human teſtimony are ſuppoſed " to come from God, not to reject the whole for the " ſake of ſome paſſages, which cannot be ſuppoſed " to proceed from God, but rather to preſume they " have been added to the texts out of ſome particular " views and deſigns. Whereas merely human writ- " ings may be fairly rejected or denied to proceed " from the Author, whoſe name they bear if there " are ſeveral paſſages contained in them inconſiſtent " with the character of the Authors or the times " wherein they lived; becauſe there is not that reaſon " for either zealous or deſigning men to make addi- " tions to Books, that are not ſuppoſed neceſſary for " the direction of our theory and practice, as to thoſe " that have or are likely to have any influence on " our lives and opinions. And this reſpect due to " writings, which upon human teſtimony are ſup- " poſed to come from God, is acknowledged neceſſary " by ſeveral (if not all) interpreters of the Scriptures, " to prevent the imputation of falſhood, which other- " wiſe would neceſſarily be fixed on them by the beſt " diſpoſed minds (19)." Mr. Collins afterwards conſiders the principal objections that may be urged againſt what he had delivered; *and I cannot*, ſays he (20), *do that more effectually* than by examining the ſeveral ſenſes put on the famous diſtinction *of things above, and things contrary to reaſon*; for it is chiefly by virtue of that diſtinction the Divines militate in behalf of myſteries and contradictions againſt thoſe, who ſay they can *only believe that, which they can underſtand*. *But before I proceed, I ſhall briefly lay down the diſtinction of propoſitions one from another, as they are the objects of our aſſent or diſſent. Propoſitions however offered to us conſiſting of terms, which ſtand for ideas and their relations, we aſſent when the relations between the ideas joined are agreeable to reaſon, and diſſent when they are contrary to reaſon. As for inſtance, I am aſſured by proper evidence of Jeſus Chriſt's reſurrection. His reſurrection containing no repugnancy to any truth that I know of, becomes by the evidence of teſtimony agreeable to my reaſon, as much as any propoſition in Mathematicks does by the mere uſe of my own faculties, or the aſſiſtance of others. But the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation containing a manifeſt repugnancy to ſeveral propoſitions, which I know to be true, is contrary to reaſon, as any propoſition is in any ſcience whatever, that conſiſts of repugnant ideas. Theſe two propoſitions do indeed become objects of aſſent or diſſent by means of teſtimony; but the different manner of their becoming objects of my underſtanding from other propoſitions, diſtinguiſhes them not from any other propoſitions, conſidered as objects of aſſent or diſſent. In all caſes the aſſent ſhould follow the perception of the agreement of ideas, as the diſſent ſhould the repugnancy of ideas.* He remarks likewiſe (21), that " ſuppoſing man is really reduced to this ſtate, as to " perceive demonſtration on the one ſide for the truth " of a propoſition, and at the ſame time perceive ab- " ſurdities and paradoxes flow from the thing demonſtra- " ted; he ought not to aſſent or diſſent, becauſe there is " a ballance of evidence; for any propoſition involv- " ing an abſurdity or contradiction is as much a de- " monſtration of the falſhood of that propoſition, as " any grounds *a priori* can be of its truth, becauſe " the perception of the diſagreement of our ideas is " as plain as is the perception of the agreement." He denies alſo (22), that if we examine carefully any contradiction or abſurdity follows from a demonſtrated propoſition, and affirms, " that wherever we have capa- " city enough to perceive the truth of a propoſition, we " have capacity enough to perceive that there is no repug- " nancy between that and another true propoſition." He then examines (23) *the ſeeming inconſiſtence between the divine preſcience with the liberty of man; and our notion or idea of eternity*; " both which, ſays he " (24), I doubt not to clear up from all abſurdities, " which in our way of conceiving are thought to fol- " low from them." Dr. Clarke (25) has quoted a paſſage from this *Eſſay* (26), which he calls upon Mr. Collins to reconcile with another paſſage in his *Anſwer to Mr. Clarke's Third Defence* (27), ſince he had affirmed in that *Anſwer* (28), that *all the difficulties, that may be urged againſt the immenſity and eternity of God, &c. which Mr.* Clarke *ſays cannot be clearly anſwered, are to be clearly anſwered.*

[C] *Entered into the controverſy between Mr.* Dodwell *and Mr.* Samuel Clarke *concerning the Natural Immortality of the Soul.*] Mr. Collins's pieces upon this ſubject are as follow; I. *A Letter to Mr.* Dodwell, *containing ſome remarks on a (pretended) demonſtration of the Immateriality and Natural Immortality of the Soul, in Mr.* Clarke's Anſwer *to his late* Epiſtolary Diſcourſe &c. London 1707 in 8vo. There was a 2d Edition in 1709 in 8vo. II. *A Defence of the Argument made uſe of in a* Letter *to Mr.* Dodwell. London 1707 in 8vo. III. *A Reply to Mr.* Clarke's Defence

(9) Pag. 8, 9.

(10) Pag. 11.

(11) Pag. 16.

(12) Pag. 17, 18.

(13) Gen. ii. 3.

(14) Gen. vi. 6. Exod. xxxii. 14.

(15) Ex. xxxii. 10.

(16) Gen. xviii. 21, 26, 28, 30.

(17) Judg. ix. 13.

(18) Pag. 20.

(19) Pag. 20, 21.

(20) Pag. 23.

(21) Pag. 42.

(22) Pag. 43, 44.

(23) Pag. 45, & ſeqq.

(24) Pag. 45.

(25) *Fourth Defence of an Argument made uſe of in a* Letter to Mr. Dodwell *to prove the Immateriality and Natural Immortality of the Soul, &c.* pag. 17, 18, 19. edit. London 1708, in 8vo.

(26) Pag. 53, 54.

(27) Pag. 33, 34.

(28) Pag. 14.

troverſies of Faith] *in the twentieth Article of the Articles of the Church of England* (e) [*D*], was publiſhed, as his *Reflections on a late Pamphlet, entitled*, Prieſtcraft in Perfection, were in February the year following (*). The ſame year (1710) he publiſhed his *Vindication of the divine Attributes: in ſome Remarks on the Archbiſhop of Dublin's Sermon, intitled*, Divine Predeſtination and Foreknowledge conſiſting with the Freedom of Man's Will (f) [*E*]. In March 1711 he went into Holland, and became acquainted with Mr. Le Clerc, and other learned men there, and returned to London in November following, to take care of his private affairs, with a promiſe to his friends in Holland, that he would pay them a ſecond viſit in a ſhort time. In 1713 he publiſhed his *Diſcourſe of Free-Thinking, occaſion'd by the Riſe and Growth of a Sect called Free-Thinkers* (g) [*F*]. It

(e) London printed for B. Bragg in Pater-Noſter Row, 1710, in 8vo.

(*) See *Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned*, for Feb. 1710, vol. 12. pag. 126.

(f) London 1710 in 8vo.

(g) London, printed in the year 1713, in 8vo, pagg. 178.

fence *of his* Letter to Mr. Dodwell: *With a Poſtſcript to Mr.* Milles's Anſwer to Mr. Dodwell's Epiſtolary Diſcourſe. London 1707 in 8vo. There was a ſecond edition of this piece corrected, printed at London 1709 in 8vo. IV. *Reflections on* Mr. Clark's ſecond Defence *of his* Letter to Mr. Dodwell. London 1707 in 8vo. There was a ſecond Edition in 1711 in 8vo. V. *An Anſwer to Mr.* Clark's third Defence *of his* Letter to Mr. Dodwell. London 1708 in 8vo. There was a ſecond Edition corrected, London 1711 in 8vo.

[*D*] *His Pamphlet, intitled*, Prieſtcraft in perfection &c.] The Preface to it is dated at London January 1, 1709. The *ſecond and third Editions corrected* were printed at London 1710 in 8vo; and at the end of the *third Edition* is ſubjoined the following advertiſement: *Whereas in the two former impreſſions of* Prieſtcraft, &c. *a Letter from* Oxford *is cited, giving an account of an Engliſh Edition of the Articles being cut out from a volume of Miſcellanies in the* Bodleian *Library; I have omitted that paſſage in this Edition, upon the ſight of a Letter from* Oxford, *which aſſures the Gentleman to whom it was wrote, that my friend was miſtaken. I do not know at preſent in what part of England he is; and therefore I cannot as yet give the reader and myſelf that ſatisfaction in the matter, which I hope to do when I hear of his return to Oxford.* The authority of the clauſe in the XXth article of the Church of England had been called in queſtion in 1709 in a Book intitled, (29) *The peril of being zealouſly affected, but not well: or Reflections on Dr. Sacheverel's Sermon preached at St. Paul's* Nov. 5, 1709. But ſoon afterwards in the ſame year its authority was *ex profeſſo* attacked in Mr. Collins's Pamphlet abovementioned; which occaſioned great and diligent inquiries into the ſubject, and was anſwered or reflected on in divers Pamphlets, Sermons, and Books. Among which there are two chief works, "which ſeem, ſays "our Author (30), to be written by choſen Champions, "who have been ſupplied with materials from all "quarters, and have taken great pains themſelves to "put their materials in the moſt artful light." The firſt was publiſhed in 1710, and is intitled, *A Vindication of the Church of England from the aſperſions of a late libel, entitled*, Prieſtcraft in Perfection, *&c. Wherein the controverted clauſe of the Church's power in the twentieth Article is ſhewn to be of equal authority with all the reſt of the articles, and the fraud and forgery charged upon the Clergy upon the account of that clauſe, are retorted upon their accuſers. With a Preface containing ſome Remarks upon the* Reflections *on that Pamphlet. By a Prieſt of the Church of England* (31). Mr. Collier (32) ſtiles the Author *a learned and judicious Writer*: and has given us an Abridgment of this Book in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* *. The ſecond Book againſt Mr. Collins's Pamphlet was publiſhed at London 1715; "and ſeems, ſays our Author †, delayed "ſo long on purpoſe to have the benefit of the utmoſt "inquiries which could be made." It is a Book of near 500 pages in 8vo, and is entitled, *An Eſſay on the Thirty Nine Articles of Religion, agreed on in* 1562, *and reviſed in* 1571 *&c. By* Thomas Bennet, *D. D.* ‡. In anſwer to theſe two Books Mr. Collins publiſhed in 1724 his *Hiſtorical and Critical Eſſay on the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England*, which we ſhall mention below in the Note [*K*].

[*E*] *His* Vindication of the Divine Attributes; in ſome remarks on the Archbiſhop of Dublin's Sermon intitled, *Divine Predeſtination and Foreknowledge conſiſting with the Freedom of Man's Will.*] Mr. Thomas Emlyn is ſaid to have written and inſerted ſeveral pages in this Pamphlet relating to the Doctrine of the Trinity, while the manuſcript of Mr. Collins lay at Mr. John Darby's the Printer.

[*F*] *His* Diſcourſe of Free-Thinking, occaſioned by the riſe and growth of a Sect called Free-Thinkers.] It was immediately attacked by ſeveral Writers, and particularly by Mr. Whiſton in his *Reflections on an Anonymous Pamphlet, entitled*, A Diſcourſe of Free-Thinking. *By* William Whiſton, *M. A.* London, 1713, in 8vo, pagg. 55. It is dated January 29th 1712. There have been three editions of it. He obſerves (33), that *tho' this pamphlet be commonly ſo worded as to ſeem rather meant againſt the Heathen Idolatry, Popiſh ſuperſtition, real prieſtcraft, and tyranny over conſcience, than againſt Chriſtianity itſelf with its ſacred Books; yet do I perceive*, ſays he, *there are every where ſuch ill characters given of the Clergy or Chriſtian Prieſthood in general, and ſuch oblique reproaches caſt upon Revealed Religion; ſuch a viſible ſlight put upon the whole Jewiſh Nation and the Moſaick Law; ſuch a plain diſregard of the great foundation of Religion, the Immortality of the Soul; and ſuch inſinuations viſibly tending to render the ſacred Books both Jewiſh and Chriſtian contemptible and uncertain, that it is very fit and reaſonable to make ſome reply to it.* He then remarks (34), that tho' this pamphlet is capable of doing miſchief with the *unthinking and prejudiced part of mankind, yet*, ſays he, *I am in no concern for the truly ſober, the learned and judicious, who, I am ſure, will make deeper enquiries and ſolider reflections, e'er they make ſuch concluſions about matters of ſuch mighty conſequence.* There was publiſhed likewiſe an anonymous Pamphlet, intitled, *Free Thoughts upon the* Diſcourſe of Free-Thinking. London 1713 in 8vo, pagg. 68. Mr. Benjamin Hoadly, now Lord Biſhop of Wincheſter, wrote alſo *Queries recommended to the Authors of the late* Diſcourſe of Free-Thinking. *By a Chriſtian.* London 1713 in 8vo, pagg. 31. This piece is highly commended by the Writer of the *Free Thoughts* (35) abovementioned, and by Dr. Hare in his *Clergyman's Thanks to Phileleutherus*, who tells us (36), that "not a few "have wrote againſt *Free-Thinking* with very good "ſucceſs, particularly the ingenious *Chriſtian Queriſt*, "who, for his honour, was the firſt that appeared in "ſo good a cauſe." This pamphlet of Mr. Hoadly was reprinted by him in his Collection of *Several Tracts* (37). He aſks, *Whether that can be juſtly called* Free-Thinking, *which is manifeſtly* Thinking *with the utmoſt ſlavery and the ſtrongeſt prejudices againſt every branch, and the very foundation of all religion* (38). "Whether the falſe money, that is put upon men "ſometimes, hinders them from believing, that there "is any good coin, or from accepting it, when it is "good. Whether therefore the feigned miracles and "falſe pretences of many to inſpiration and divine "commiſſion, be an argument againſt the truth of any "ſuch thing (39)." *Whether the follies, and inconſiſtencies, and ridiculous opinions of many Chriſtians or Divines, picked up in the courſe of* 1600 *years, can in juſtice be produced, as arguments againſt all religion, any more than the differences among Philoſophers can be an argument againſt reaſon itſelf and every thing in Philoſophy, or than the differences amongſt Atheiſts, and particularly the abſurdities in Epicurus's Syſtem, will be allowed by theſe authors to conclude againſt Atheiſm itſelf. Whether ſuch repreſentations of Chriſtianity and ſuch poſitive aſſertions, as run through this treatiſe, to the prejudice and condemnation of all religion, and particularly of the belief of a future ſtate, do not too evidently ſhew, that the deſign of it was not to incite men to an impartial examination, but to influence men to the utter condemnation of all religion* (40). "Whether it be a ſign "of

(29) Pag. 20, 21.

(30) *Hiſtorical and Critical Eſſay on the thirty nine Articles of the Church of England*, Introduct. pag. 46. edit. London 1724 in 8vo.

(31) London 1710 in 8vo, pagg. 218. beſides the Preface.

(32) *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Great Britain*, Part 2. B. 6. pag. 487.

* Pag. 487, & ſeqq.

† *Hiſt. and Critical Eſſay &c.* Introduct. pag. 46.

‡ See the Article of BENNET (Thomas) vol. 3. pag. 208, 209.

(33) Pag. 3, 4.

(34) Pag. 4.

(35) Pag. 65.

(36) Pag. 15.

(37) Printed at London 1715, in 8vo.

(38) Pag. 3. edit. London 1713.

(39) Ibid. pag. 3, 4.

(40) Ibid. pag. 4, 5.

It was reprinted at the Hague with ſome Additions and Corrections in 1713 in 12mo,

" of that integrity, which infidelity produceth, to " repreſent that fear of God, which hath nothing " ſervile nor terrifying in it, which is nothing but " ſuch a reverence as directs and ſecures men's obedi- " ence to his Laws, upon the ſame foot with that " fear of the Gods amongſt the Heathen, which was " indeed *Superſtition*, and which taught men to have " no other notion of their ſuperior Beings, but that " of tyrannical, cruel, barbarous Lords, delighted " with the blood, miſery, and torments of their Vo- (41) Ibid. pag. 6. " taries (41). . . . . Whether it be not ridiculous, as " well as abſurd to paſs by the noble beneficence " and univerſal love and friendſhip, recommended " and required by the Chriſtian Religion, and practiſ- " ed by the firſt Chriſtians; and to extol *Epicurus* as " carrying Morality to an higher pitch in the caſe of " friendſhip, under pretence that the word *Friendſhip* " in a particular reſtrained ſenſe, is not in the New " Teſtament; in order to magnify this abſurd Philo- " ſopher, to paſs by the Life and Death of Jeſus " Chriſt, the greateſt inſtance of friendſhip (were he " conſider'd only as a Philoſopher,) and not to ſay " a word here in favour of his doctrine, though it " was chiefly deſigned to introduce an univerſal friend- " ſhip and beneficence, and in general every thing *of* " *good repute*, or every thing juſtly eſteemed amongſt (42) Ibid. pag. 11, 12. " men (42). . . Whether, upon the whole, conſidering " the unfair treatment Religion hath met with from " theſe Authors; the falſe repreſentations made uſe of " to its diſadvantage; the little idle ſtories pick'd up " and vented; the great ſcandal ſuch Treatiſes muſt " give to all ſerious perſons; the great handle they " afford to all the enemies of true liberty of conſci- " ence for their unchriſtian treatment of thoſe, who " differ from them: conſidering (I ſay) all this, whe- " ther there may not be ſome ground for ſuſpicion, " that there are amongſt theſe Authors ſome of the " enemies to true liberty and impartial examination; " than whom no perſons are more rejoiced at ſuch (43) Ibid. pag. 23, 24. " performances as this (43). Suppoſing *Atheiſm* to " be better than that *Superſtition*, which tortures a " man's own breaſt, and ſets the world about him in " flames; whether, nevertheleſs, a thorough belief of " an over-ruling Providence, and a State to come, and " of the Truth of Chriſtianity, and a Conqueſt of our " Paſſions founded upon this Belief, and a Practice " of all the lovely virtues of the Goſpel, be not vaſtly " preferable to both; full of the ſupports, which *A-* " *theiſm* explodes, and void of the torments, which " *ſuperſtition* feels. Laſt of all, whether there can be " any thing in *Atheiſm*, (as there certainly is in true " Religion,) to hinder any man from acting the part " of the moſt ſuperſtitious and fiery zealot upon earth (44) Ibid. pag. 24, 25. " (44)." In the *Poſtſcript* (45) Mr. Hoadly confeſſes, that ſome of the particulars mentioned in his *Queries*, (45) Pag. 28. " as deſigned plainly againſt the Belief of Chriſtianity, " are produced in the *Treatiſe of Free-Thinking* under " the ſpecious pretence of their being good reaſons " and occaſions for a free and *impartial Examination*, " and not expreſly declared to be intended againſt the " Goſpel in the ſame paſſages, in which the Au- " thors of that *Treatiſe* produce them." But Mr. Hoadly *verily believes, that theſe Authors themſelves would inwardly laugh at any, who ſhould ſuppoſe them to have had any other view in that performance*; and having placed ſeveral particulars from the *Diſcourſe of Free-Thinking* in one view, he concludes with theſe words (46): " After this let any one doubt, if he can, (46) Pag. 31. " what ſort of Free-Thinking all that is produced in " the *firſt part* of this *Treatiſe* is deſigned to promote; " or ſuppoſe it poſſible, that the chief view of theſe " Authors could be any other, than the promoting " that Free-Thinking, which they themſelves con- " tend to be *Atheiſm* and *Infidelity*." Dr. Richard Bentley ſoon after publiſhed *Remarks upon a late* Diſcourſe of Free-Thinking: *in a Letter to* F. H. *D. D. By Philelcutherus Lipſienſis*. London 1713 in 8vo. This Letter, which is addreſſed to Dr. Francis Hare, now Lord Biſhop of Chicheſter, is dated January 26, *New Stile*. The *ſecond part*, dated Sept. 18, 1713, *ſtilo novo*, was printed the ſame year, in 8vo; and ſoon after a ſheet or two of the *third* part were printed at Cambridge (where indeed the two firſt parts were really printed, tho' the titles ſay at London;) but the learned Author never proceeded further. The *Firſt Part* of theſe Remarks occaſioned a Pamphlet, intitled, *The Clergyman's Thanks to Philelcutherus, for his* Remarks *on the late* Diſcourſe of Free-Thinking. *In a Letter to Dr. Bentley.* London 1713 in 8vo, pagg. 48. It is dated from London March 28th 1713, and is ſaid to be written by Dr. Hare. He obſerves, that had the aſſerting a *juſt Liberty of Thinking* been the real aim of the Authors of the *Diſcourſe*, " there could " not have been a more uſeleſs deſign, nor could it " have been *worſe* executed. For what they affirm, " no body among us, that I know of, now at leaſt " denies, viz. That all men have a *Right* to think " freely upon ſubjects they are qualified to think about, " and that it is the *duty* of all men to think freely " (that is fairly and impartially) of the things they " are required to believe. Theſe are principles evi- " dently founded in reaſon and nature; *Chriſtianity* is " built on them, which is an appeal to the reaſon and " conſciences of men; and the *Reformation* is con- " feſſedly founded on no other bottom (47). . . 'Tis (47) Pag. 18. " not *Liberty* of Thought they contend for, but *Licen-* " *tiouſneſs*, an unbounded liberty to propagate their " crude abſurd notions, which don't deſerve the name " of Thoughts. . . But if a juſt liberty were wanted, " which I have ſhewn, with us it is not, theſe Gen- " tlemen of all men living have the leaſt right to it; " not only becauſe they would make the worſt uſe of it, " but becauſe they give up the principle, on which the " Liberty of Thinking for ourſelves in matters of Re- " ligion is ſolely founded, that is *conſcience*. 'Tis *con-* " *ſcience* ties the hands of the Magiſtrate from forcing " a particular Religion on the ſubject. But if all Re- " ligion be falſe, all pleas of conſcience are at an end, " and the Magiſtrate is at liberty without any other " view or regard to eſtabliſh that Religion, that he " thinks will conduce moſt to the happineſs and quiet " of his Government. The truth or falſhood of their " doctrine will not, on this ſuppoſition, be a point in " queſtion, but its influence on the State; and of that " the Magiſtrate will be the judge; and no body, " who is an unbeliever, has a right to plead for an ex- " emption in matters relating to Religion, any more " than in any other whatſoever (48)." He afterwards (48) Pag. 22, 23. tells us (49), that *the reputed Author* of Free-Thinking *is, for all I ever heard, a* ſober man, *thanks to his na-* (49) Pag. 28. *tural averſion to intemperance, and that is more than can be ſaid of ſome others of the Club; but as for any other virtue, he has told us* (50), *'tis ſuch as he intends* (50) See the *Diſcourſe of Free-Thinking*, pag. 178. edit. 1713, in 8vo. and Dr. Bentley's *Remarks*, Part 1. pag. 10. and *Clergyman's Thanks*, pag. 18. ſhall never hurt him. *And it can't be thought uncharitable, if I ſay it riſes from no higher origin than fear; for he has himſelf diſclaimed all nobler principles.* He concludes with remarking (51), that if we have gained by Dr. Bentley's *Remarks* in one reſpect, we are on the other hand " in danger of loſing no leſs than an E- (51) Pag. 47, 48. " dition of all Tully, and, what is of more conſequence, " a *new Goſpel*; with both which, for the advance- " ment of Learning and Religion, *their* Learning and " *their* Religion, the *Free-Thinking* Club were prepar- " ing to oblige the World. And the laſt of theſe " was, I have been told, quite finiſhed, and juſt ready " to be publiſhed, when your *Remarks* unluckily came " out to ſhew, that they are neither *Chriſtians* nor " *Scholars*. And this has ſuppreſſed at leaſt for ſome " time, if not totally ſunk, both theſe undertakings." The Author of the *Guardian* treated Mr. Collins with the utmoſt ſeverity on account of this Pamphlet *, * See vol. 1. and particularly in Numb. III for Saturday March 14, num. 3, 9, 27, 1713, where he tells us, that " he that ſhould burn a 55, 62, 70, 77. " houſe, and juſtify the action by aſſerting he is a " *Free-Agent*, would be more excuſable than this Au- " thor in uttering what he has from the right of a " Free-Thinker. But they are a ſett of dry, joyleſs, " dull fellows, who want capacities and talents to " make a figure amongſt mankind upon benevolent " and generous principles, that think to ſurmount " their own natural meanneſs, by laying offences in " the way of ſuch, as make it their beſt endeavour to " excel upon the received maxims and honeſt arts of life. " This Gentleman may be aſſured he has not a taſte " for what he pretends to decry, and the poor man " is certainly more a blockhead than an Atheiſt. . . .

" Theſe

12mo [G], and was tranſlated into French, and printed at the ſame place; and a ſecond edition of the French Tranſlation corrected was afterwards publiſhed. This Pamphlet occaſioning a prodigious noiſe, and our Author being diſcovered by his Printer Mr. John Darby, he went from London to Holland [H] January the 2d 1712, from thence to Flanders, where he received great civilities from the Prieſts, Jeſuits, &c. From thence he wrote to one of his ſervants at London to meet him at Calais in order to attend him to Paris; but in the mean time the death of his near relation Mr. Trolope happened, which obliged him to return to London, where he arrived the 18th of October 1713, full of grief for the loſs of ſo great a friend, and the diſappointment of not ſeeing France, Italy, &c. In 1715 he retired into the County of Eſſex, and acted as a Juſtice of the Peace and Deputy-Lieutenant for the ſame County, as he had done before in the County of Middleſex and Liberty of Weſtminſter. The ſame year he publiſhed at London in 8vo *A Philoſophical Enquiry concerning human Liberty*, which was reprinted with Corrections in 1717 in 8vo [I](*). It was afterwards tranſlated into French by the Reverend Mr. D****, and printed in the firſt volume of *Recueil de diverſes Pieces ſur la Philoſophie, la Religion*

(*) Pagg. 115, beſides the Preface.

" Theſe *Free-Thinkers*, who lead the lives of recluſe Stu-
" dents for no other purpoſe but to diſturb the ſentiments
" of other men, put me in mind of the monſtrous recre-
" ation of thoſe late wild youths, who, without provo-
" cation, had a wantonneſs in ſtabbing and defacing
" thoſe they met with. When ſuch Writers as this, who
" have no ſpirit but that of malice, pretend to inform
" the Age, mohocks and cut-throats may well ſet up
" for wits and men of pleaſure. . . . If ever any man
" deſerved to be denied the common benefits of air
" and water, it is the Author of a *Diſcourſe of*
" *Free-Thinking*."

[G] *Reprinted at the Hague by Tho. Johnſon, with ſome Additions and Corrections, in* 1713, *in* 12*mo*.] In the title-page it is ſaid to be printed at London. Beſides ſeveral conſiderable Additions, the Tranſlations in ſeveral places are corrected from Dr. Bentley's *Remarks*; and ſome references are made to thoſe *Remarks* and to Dr. Hare's *Clergyman's Thanks*. And whereas in the former edition the diſcourſe concluded with theſe words: *For I think it virtue enough to endeavour to do good, only within the bounds of doing yourſelf no harm*; in the Hague Edition it is expreſſed thus: *For I think it virtue enough*, in a Country ſo ignorant, ſtupid, ſuperſtitious, and deſtitute of all private and publick virtue, as ours, *to endeavour to do good, only within the bounds of doing yourſelf no harm*.

[H] *He went from London to Holland.*] This is taken notice of by Dr. Hare (52), who having obſerved, that the *leaſt appearance of danger* is able to damp in a moment all the *zeal* of the Free-Thinkers, tells us, that " a bare inquiry after the Printer of their
" wicked Book has frightened them, and obliged the
" reputed Author to take a *ſecond* trip into Holland;
" ſo great is his courage to defend upon the firſt ap-
" pearance of an oppoſition. And are not theſe rare
" Champions for *Free-Thinking?* Is not their book a
" demonſtration, that we are in poſſeſſion of the liber-
" ty they pretend to plead for, which otherwiſe they
" durſt ne'er have writ? And that they would have
" been as mute as fiſhes, had they not thought they
" could have opened with impunity?"

(52) *Clergyman's Thanks*, pag. 18.

[I] *His* Philoſophical Inquiry concerning human Liberty.] In the *Preface* he tells us, I. That tho' he denies the *Liberty* in a certain meaning of that word, yet he contends for *Liberty*, as it ſignifies *a power in man to do as he wills, or pleaſes*, which he obſerves to be the notion of *Liberty* maintained by Ariſtotle, Cicero, Mr. Locke, and ſeveral other Philoſophers antient and modern. II. That when he affirms *Neceſſity*, he contends only for what is called *Moral Neceſſity*, meaning thereby, that *man, who is an intelligent and ſenſible being, is determined by his reaſon and his ſenſes*; and he denies man to be ſubject to ſuch a Neceſſity, as is in clocks, watches, and ſuch other beings, which, for want of *ſenſation* and *intelligence*, are ſubject to an *abſolute, phyſical*, or *mechanical Neceſſity*. And here he remarks, that he has the concurrence of almoſt all the greateſt aſſertors of *Liberty*, who either expreſly maintain *moral Neceſſity*, or the thing ſignified by thoſe words. III. That he has undertaken to ſhew, that the notions he advances are ſo far from being inconſiſtent with, that they are the ſole foundations of, Morality and Laws, and of rewards and puniſhments in Society; and that the notions, which he explodes, are ſubverſive of them. This he judged neceſſary to make out in treating a ſubject, which has relation to Morality, becauſe *nothing can be true, which ſubverts thoſe things*; and all diſcourſe muſt be defective, wherein the reader perceives any diſagreement to *moral Truth*, which is as evident as any *ſpeculative Truth*, and much more neceſſary to be render'd clear to the reader's mind, than truth in all other ſciences. IV. That he has intitled his diſcourſe a *Philoſophical Inquiry &c.* becauſe he propoſes only to prove his point by experience and by reaſon, omitting all conſiderations ſtrictly *Theological*. In the *Inquiry* he ſtates the queſtion whether man be a *neceſſary* or a *free Agent* by obſerving (53) that " man
" is a *neceſſary Agent*, if all his actions are ſo deter-
" mined by the cauſes preceding each action, that not
" one paſt action could poſſibly not have come to
" paſs, or have been otherwiſe than it was; nor
" one future action can poſſibly not come to paſs, or
" be otherwiſe than it ſhall be. Man is a *free Agent*,
" if he is able at any time under the circumſtances
" and cauſes he then is, to do different things: or, in
" other words, if he is not ever unavoidably deter-
" mined in every point of time by the circumſtances
" he is in, and cauſes he is under, to do that one thing
" he does, and not poſſibly to do any other." He proceeds then to ſhew that man is a neceſſary Agent 1, from our *Experience*; 2, the *Impoſſibility of Liberty*; 3, the *Imperfection of Liberty*, and the *Perfection of Neceſſity*; 4, from the conſideration of the *Divine Preſcience*; 5, from the *Nature* and *Uſe of Rewards and Puniſhments*; 6, from the *Nature of Morality*. He afterwards conſiders the following objections to his Scheme, viz. that if men are neceſſary agents, puniſhments are unjuſt and uſeleſs; reaſoning, intreaties, admonitions, blame, and praiſe uſeleſs; that if the period of man's life be fixed, Phyſick, &c. is uſeleſs. In anſwer to the queſtion, *How can a man act againſt his conſcience, and how can his conſcience accuſe him, if he knows he acts neceſſarily, and alſo does what he thinks beſt when he commits any ſin?* he replies (54), " That conſcience being a man's own opinion of
" his actions, with relation to ſome rule, he may
" at the time of doing an action contrary to that
" rule, know that he breaks that rule, and conſequently
" acts with a reluctance, tho' not ſufficient to hinder
" the action. But after the action is over, he may
" not only judge his action to be contrary to that rule,
" but by the abſence of the pleaſure of the ſin, and
" by finding himſelf obnoxious to ſhame, or by be-
" lieving himſelf liable to puniſhment, he may *really*
" *accuſe himſelf*; that is, he may condemn himſelf
" for having done it, be ſorry he has done it, and
" wiſh it undone, becauſe of the conſequences that
" attend it." He then anſwers the objection, that *if all events are neceſſary, it was as impoſſible* (for example) *for Julius Cæſar not to have died in the Senate, as it is impoſſible for two and two to make ſix. But who will ſay the former was as impoſſible as the latter is, when we can conceive it poſſible for Julius Cæſar to have died any where elſe as well as in the Senate, and impoſſible to conceive two and two ever to make ſix?* To this he replies, that he does allow, " that if all events
" are neceſſary, it was as impoſſible for Julius Cæſar
" not to have died in the Senate, as it is impoſſible for
" two and two to make ſix." He then quotes ſome authorities for what he has advanced upon this ſubject; and concludes with declaring, that tho' he has contended that *Liberty from Neceſſity* is contrary to experience, impoſſible, and if poſſible, an imperfection,

(53) Pag. 11. edit. London 1717.

(54) Pag. 103, 104.

Religion Naturelle, l'Hiſtoire, les Mathematiques, &c. par Meſſieurs Leibnitz, Clarke, Newton, & autres Autheurs célebres; publiſhed by Mr. Des Maizeaux at Amſterdam 1720, 2 vol. in 12mo. Dr. Samuel Clarke wrote *Remarks* upon this *Inquiry*, ſubjoined to the *Collection of Papers, which paſſed between the late learned Mr. Leibnitz and Dr. Clarke, relating to the Principles of Natural Philoſophy and Religion*, London 1717 in 8vo. Which *Remarks* were likewiſe printed in French in the *Recueil de diverſes Pieces &c.* abovementioned. Mr. Collins did not publiſh any Reply to Dr. Clarke upon this ſubject; for though he did not think the Doctor had the advantage over him in the diſpute, yet as he had repreſented Mr. Collins's opinion as dangerous in its conſequences, and very improper to be inſiſted upon, the latter, after ſuch an inſinuation, found he could not proceed in the diſpute upon equal terms (*b*). In 1718 he was choſen Treaſurer of the County of Eſſex, to the great joy of ſeveral tradeſmen and others, who had large ſums of money due to them from the ſaid County, but could not get it paid them, it having been ſpent and embezzled by their former Treaſurer. The pooreſt of them he ſupported with his own private caſh; others he promiſed intereſt for their money till it could be raiſed to pay them. In 1722 the debts were all diſcharged, and by his care and management in that affair, the ſeveral ſums which that County was indebted to its workmen, &c. were diſcharged every three months, and with almoſt half the money, which had been raiſed annually for upwards of twenty years before he was choſen. December the 20th 1723 he loſt his ſon; and in 1724 he married Elizabeth the daughter of Sir Walter Wrotteſley Bart; by whom he had no children. In 1724 he publiſhed at London in 8vo his *Hiſtorical and Critical Eſſay on the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England. Wherein it is demonſtrated, that this Clauſe*, The Church has Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and Autority in Controverſies of Faith, *inſerted in the 20th Article, is not a part of the Articles, as they were eſtabliſhed by Act of Parliament in the 13th of Eliz. or agreed on by the Convocations of 1562 and 1571* [K]. This was deſigned as an Anſwer to the *Vindication of the Church of England &c.* and Dr. Bennet's *Eſſay on the Thirty Nine Articles*, which had been publiſhed againſt his *Prieſtcraft in Perfection* (*i*). In the Preface (*k*) he tells us, that he was engaged in writing this work by a *worthy Miniſter of the Goſpel*, who knew, that he had made ſome Enquiries into the *Modern Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of England*, and that he was preparing an *Hiſtory of the Variations of the Church of England and its Clergy from the Reformation down to this time, with an Anſwer to the Cavils of the Papiſts made on occaſion of the ſaid Variations*. At the end of this Book was printed an advertiſement, though without Mr. Collins's knowledge, that ſpeedily would be publiſhed, "Cicero's Treatiſes of "the *Nature* of the Gods and of *Divination*. Tranſlated into Engliſh with Annotations. In "two volumes." But theſe works, though finiſhed by our Author, were never printed. The ſame year he publiſhed his *Diſcourſe of the Grounds and Reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion in two Parts: The firſt containing ſome Conſiderations on the Quotations made from the Old in the New Teſtament, and particularly on the Prophecies cited from the former, and ſaid to be fulfilled in the latter. The ſecond containing an Examination of the* Scheme *advanced by Mr.* Whiſton *in his* Eſſay towards reſtoring the true Text of the Old Teſtament, and for vindicating the citations thence made in the New Teſtament. *To which is prefixed an Apology for free Debate and Liberty of writing* [L]. London 1724 in 8vo. In this Diſcourſe

(*b*) Des Maizeaux's Preface to the *Recueil de diverſes Pieces*, pag. 10.

(*i*) See Note [D].

(*k*) Pag. iv, v.

and ſubverſive of laws and morality; yet he takes "man to have a truly valuable liberty of another kind. "He *has a power to do as he wills or pleaſes*. Thus "if he wills or pleaſes to ſpeak or be ſilent, to ſit or "ſtand, to ride or walk, to go this way or that way, "to move faſt or ſlow, or in fine, if his will changes "like a weather-cock, he is able to do as he wills or "pleaſes, unleſs prevented by ſome reſtraint or compulſion, as by being gagg'd, being under an acute "pain, being forced out of his place, being confined, "having convulſive motions, having loſt the uſe of his "limbs, or ſuch like cauſes. He has alſo the ſame "power in relation to the actions of his mind, as to "thoſe of his body. If he wills or pleaſes, he can "think on this or that ſubject, ſtop ſhort or purſue his "thoughts, deliberate or defer deliberation as he "pleaſes, reſolve or ſuſpend his reſolution as he "pleaſes, and in fine can every moment change his "object when he pleaſes, unleſs prevented by pain, "or a fit of an apoplexy, or ſome ſuch intervening reſtraint and compulſion. And is it not a great perfection in man to be able, in relation both to his "thoughts and actions, to do as he wills or pleaſes "in all thoſe caſes of pleaſure or intereſt? Nay, can "a greater and more beneficial power in man be conceived, than to be able to do as he wills or pleaſes? "And can any other *Liberty* be conceived beneficial "to him? Had he this power or *liberty* in all things, "the would be omnipotent!"

[K] *His* Hiſtorical and Critical Eſſay on the Thirty Nine Articles &c.] Having given an account of the whole controverſy concerning the Authority of the *controverted Clauſe*, he concludes with drawing up in brief that demonſtration, which he promiſes in his title-page, and has given in his Book, and which is as follows (55): "The *Articles* of the Church of England "are ſuppoſed to have their convocational Autority "from the Convocation of 1562, which firſt *agreed* "*on* them; and from the Convocation of 1571, "which after having reviſed, and made alterations in, "and additions to them, *agreed on* them again. The "way of paſſing Acts of Convocation is by the ſubſcription of the majority of the Members of each "Houſe by themſelves. The MS. Articles, which "paſſed the Convocation of 1562, and were ſubſcribed by the majority of both Houſes, are yet extant, "as are the MS. Articles of 1571, with the ſubſcriptions of the Upper Houſe. And both theſe MSS. "are without the clauſe. The Parliament in 1571 "did by a Statute, intitled, *An Act for the Miniſters "of the Church to be of ſound Religion*, confirm Articles of Religion, comprized in an imprinted Engliſh "book, intitled, *Articles, &c. put forth by the Queen's "Autority*. All the Engliſh printed Books of the *Articles* extant before 1571, and while the Parliament "were making this Statute, bore the title recited in "he Statute, and were without the Clauſe. Wherefore "it follows that the Clauſe has neither the Autority of the Convocation nor Parliament."

(55) Pag. 277, 278, 279.

[L] *His* Diſcourſe of the Grounds and Reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion &c. To which is prefixed an Apology *for* free debate and liberty of writing.] This

Diſcourſe he endeavours to ſhew, that Chriſtianity is founded on Judaiſm, or the New Teſtament on the Old; that the Apoſtles ground and prove Chriſtianity from the Old Teſtament, which is the Canon of Chriſtians; that the chief Proofs of Chriſtianity from the Old Teſtament are urged by the Apoſtles in the New Teſtament; that if thoſe proofs are valid, Chriſtianity is invincibly eſtabliſhed on its true foundation; if invalid, then Chriſtianity is falſe; and that thoſe proofs are typical or allegorical proofs. It was immediately attacked by a great number of writings [*M*], and particularly by Mr. Whiſton, who in his *Liſt of Suppoſitions or Aſſertions in the late* Diſcourſe of the Grounds and Reaſons

Apology is likewiſe intitled by him *A Preface to the Reader; containing an Apology for Mr. Whiſton's liberty of writing.* Mr. Thomas Bullock has ſubjoined to the *Preface* to his Book, intitled, *The Reaſoning of Chriſt and his Apoſtles in their Defence of Chriſtianity conſidered: in ſeven Sermons preached at Hackney in Middleſex &c.* the following *Queries* to the *Author of the Apology for free Debate.* "*Qu.* Whether any man "*of underſtanding and honeſty would be glad,* that ſuch "men as HOOKER, HALES, CHILLINGWORTH, &c. "inſtead of endeavouring to eſtabliſh any one impor- "tant truth, and giving their own *moſt intimate "thoughts* thereupon, ſhould have laboured to puzzle "every thing of importance, that came in their way "with the little arts, the quibbles, and ſophiſtry of "a wrangling diſputant? Whether it had been a good "uſe of *their learning and penetration (in which they "had not many ſuperiors)* if inſtead of *ſpeaking their "own minds freely on all important Queſtions in Philo- "ſophy and Theology, like Mr.* Whiſton, they had em- "ployed themſelves in making large collections of all "the weak unguarded expreſſions of Philoſophers "and Divines, publiſhing them to the world in the "moſt ludicrous manner, with deſign only to expoſe "thoſe Writers and their ſubjects, and not to improve "their Readers thereby? Whether ſuch great men "would not *more virtuouſly and religiouſly as well as "more honourably have employed their time,* if they had "*turned themſelves* intirely *to the Heathen Hiſtorians, "Poets, Orators, and Philoſophers, ſpent ten or twelve "years upon* HORACE *or* TERENCE; than in ſtudying "to burleſque the Scriptures, by coining abſurd ridi- "culous interpretations for every paſſage capable of "miſconſtruction, picking out ſcraps of ſentences, "broken unconnected paſſages, half expreſſions, and "putting them together to give the reader a falſe idea "of Religion and the Scriptures whereon it is found- "ed? Or if they had thus *applied their ſagacity and "labour,* whether a juſt apology *for Mr.* Whiſton, "*for free Debate, for free Profeſſion and Communica- "tion of Notions, for teaching others what a man is "perſuaded of himſelf,* could be reckoned an apology "for ſuch men and ſuch Writings?

[*M*] *This was immediately attacked by a great number of Writings.*] Mr. Collins has given a catalogue of them, at the end of the Preface to his *Scheme of Literal Prophecy,* which is as follows. I. A *Letter* in the *Univerſal Journal,* Dec. the 18th 1723. II. *An Examination of a late* Diſcourſe of the grounds and reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion, *with the* Apology for Mr. Whiſton's liberty of Writing, 8vo. 1724. III. *The Chriſtian Religion not founded on Allegory: Or a Vindication of our Faith from the falſhood objected to it in a late* Diſcourſe of the Grounds &c. 8vo. 1724. IV. *A liſt of ſuppoſitions or aſſertions in the late* Diſcourſe of the Grounds &c. *which are not therein ſupported by any real or authentick evidence; for which ſome ſuch evidence is expected to be produced. By* William Whiſton, *M. A.* 8vo. 1724. V. Two *London Journals,* April the 4th and 11th, 1724. VI. *The nature and uſe of a Type; being the ſubſtance of two Sermons &c. By* George Lavington, *L. L. B. with a Preface concerning a late Treatiſe, intitled,* a Diſcourſe of the Grounds, &c. 8vo. 1725. VII. *The ſure word of Prophecy: a Sermon before the Univerſity of Cambridge at St. Mary's Church &c. By* John Newcome, *B. D. Fellow of St. John's College. Publiſhed at the requeſt of the Vice-Chancellor and other Heads of the Houſes.* 8vo. 1724. VIII. *Jeſus Chriſt the Prophet, whom Moſes foretold: a Sermon preached at Norwich, by* Thomas Bullock, *M. A. and Chaplain to the Biſhop of Norwich. To which is added a Poſtſcript explaining a paſſage in St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Galatians.* 8vo. 1724. IX. *Prophetiæ de Meſſiâ, præſertim vero illa de Immanuele, in Jeſu ad literam adimpletæ: Concio habita &c. Oxon. contra anonymum libellum, cui titulus,* A Diſcourſe of the Grounds, &c. *A* Carew Reynel. *S. T. B. & C. C. C. Oxon. Socio.* 4to. 1724. X. *Concio habita in Eccleſia Sanctæ Mariæ Cantabrigiæ pro Gradu Doctoratus, per* Tho. Manningham, *S. T. P. & nuper Coll. Regal. Socium, Rogatu Procancellarii & Capitum Collegiorum, in lucem edita.* 4to. 1724. XI. *The Literal Accompliſhment of Scripture Prophecies, being a full Anſwer to a late* Diſcourſe of the Grounds, &c. *By* William Whiſton, *M. A.* 8vo. 1724. XII. *The Nature of the Prophecies of the old Teſtament relating to the Meſſias: An Anſwer to the firſt part of a late Author's Book, intitled, a* Diſcourſe of the Grounds, &c. *in a Letter to a Perſon of Honour. By a Miniſter of the Church of England.* 8vo. 1724. XIII. *A Letter to the Author of the* Grounds and Reaſons of Chriſtianity. *By a Divine of the Church of England.* 8vo. 1724. XIV. *A Defence of Chriſtianity from the Prophecies of the Old Teſtament, wherein are conſidered all the objections againſt this kind of proof, advanced in a late* Diſcourſe of the Grounds, &c. *By the Right Reverend Father in God* Edward [Chandler] *Lord Biſhop of Coventry and Lichfield.* 8vo, 1725. There have been ſeveral Editions of this Book. XV. *A Diſcourſe of the Connection of the Prophecies in the Old Teſtament and Application of them to Chriſt. By* Samuel Clarke *D. D. Rector of St. James's Weſtminſter.* 8vo. 1725. XVI. *The true Grounds and Reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion, in oppoſition to the falſe ones, ſet forth in a late Book, intitled,* The Grounds &c. 8vo, 1725. XVII. *The Moderator between an Infidel and an Apoſtate: Or the controverſy between the Author of the* Diſcourſe of the Grounds *&c. and his Reverend Eccleſiaſtical Opponents ſet in a clear light. With an Exhortation to a zealous debate about it. By* Thomas Woolſton, *ſome time Fellow of Sidney College Cambridge.* 8vo. 1725. XVIII. *An Anſwer to a Letter concerning the* Grounds and Reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion; *with a Poſtſcript, wherein the* Hiſtorical and Critical Eſſay on the Thirty Nine Articles *is briefly and impartially conſidered. By a Divine of North Britain.* 8vo. 1725. XIX. *A Preſervative againſt a late* Diſcourſe of the Grounds, &c. 8vo, 1725. XX. *The Reaſoning of Chriſt and his Apoſtles in their Defence of Chriſtianity conſidered. In ſeven Sermons preached at Hackney in Middleſex,* 1724. *To which is prefixed a Preface taking notice of the falſe repreſentations of Chriſtianity, and of the Apoſtles reaſoning in defence of it, in a Book, intitled,* The Grounds, *&c. By* Thomas Bullock, *M. A. Publiſhed at the requeſt of the Gentlemen of Hackney.* 8vo. 1725. XXI. *An Eſſay upon the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, wherein its real foundation upon the Old Teſtament is ſhewn. Occaſioned by* the Diſcourſe of the Grounds, *&c. By* Arthur Aſhley Sykes. *M. A. Rector of Rayleigh in Eſſex.* 8vo. 1725. Mr. Collins (56) is of opinion, that in this Eſſay Mr. Sykes alone of all the Writers againſt the *Grounds and Reaſons* "has advanced a conſiſtent "ſcheme of things, which he has propoſed with "great clearneſs, politeneſs, and moderation. XXII. *The uſe and intent of Prophecy in the ſeveral ages of the Church. In ſix Diſcourſes delivered at the Temple Church* 1724. *Publiſhed at the deſire of the Maſters of the Bench of the two Honourable Societies. To which are added Three Diſſertations &c. By* Thomas Sherlock, *D. D. Dean of Chicheſter, and Maſter of the Temple,* 8vo. 1725. XXIII. *A Chronological Treatiſe upon the Seventy Weeks of* Daniel; *wherein is evidently ſhewn the accompliſhment of the predicted events, as eſpecially of the cutting off the* Meſſiah *after the predicted ſeven weeks and ſixty two weeks, according to the expreſs letter of the Prophecy, and in moſt exact agreement with* Ptolemy's *Canon: ſo alſo of the deſtruction of Jeruſalem by*

(56) *Scheme of Literal Prophecy conſidered,* p. 12.

ſons &c. *which are not therein ſupported by any real or authentic Evidence: for which ſome ſuch Evidence is expected to be produced*, ſubjoined to his *Propoſals* for printing by ſubſcription *Authentick Records concerning the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Religion* (*l*), and given away to all the Members of Parliaments, treated our Author, together with Mr. Toland, in very ſevere terms as guilty of *impious Frauds* and *Lay-craft* [*N*]; and application was ſaid to have been made by him to the Lord Chancellor King to remove Mr. Collins from the Commiſſion of Peace, but without ſucceſs. In 1726 he wrote *A Letter to the Author of the* Diſcourſe of the Grounds and Reaſons &c. *In Anſwer to Mr.* Green's Letters, &c. *With a Poſtſcript occaſioned by* Dr. Lobb's Brief Defence &c. [*O*]. London 1726 in 8vo. This piece was not publiſhed, and but very few of the copies were diſperſed. The ſame year appeared his *Scheme of Literal Prophecy conſidered; in a View of the Controverſy occaſioned by a late*

(*l*) Theſe propoſals are dated Jan. 17, 1723-4.

by the Romans in the ſeventieth or ſeparate Week in the literal, obvious and primary ſenſe; however this be groundleſly called in queſtion by a late Writer in a Diſcourſe of the Grounds, *&c. In a particular Diſquiſition upon the three lateſt Hypotheſes of theſe Weeks publiſhed among us, viz. That of the late learned Biſhop* Loyd; *that of the late learned Dr.* Prideaux; *and that of the Reverend Mr.* Lancaſter. *All which Hypotheſes are here fully conſidered, and the late Biſhop* Loyd's *is generally ſuppoſed and eſtabliſhed. With Chronological Tables ſuited to the whole. By* Benjamin Marſhall, M. A. *Rector of* Naunton *in Gloceſterſhire*, 8vo, 1725. XXIV. *A Vindication of the Chriſtian Religion. In two parts. I. A Diſcourſe of the Nature and Uſe of Miracles. II. An Anſwer to a late Book intitled,* A Diſcourſe of the Grounds &c. *By* Samuel Chandler. 8vo, 1725. XXV. *A Diſſertation on the unreaſonableneſs, folly and danger of Infidelity, occaſioned by a late virulent Book intitled,* A Diſcourſe of the Grounds and Reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion. *By* Theotimus Philalethes. 8vo. 1725. XXVI. *A Supplement to the* literal Accompliſhment of Scripture Prophecies; *containing Obſervations on Dr.* Clarke's *and Biſhop* Chandler's *late Diſcourſes of the Prophecies of the Old Teſtament; with four Diſſertations &c. By* William Whiſton M. A. 8vo. 1725. XXVII. *A Supplement to the* Moderator between an Infidel and an Apoſtate; *being a Diſſertation on Daniel's Weeks, from the authority of the Fathers. By* Thomas Woolſton &c. 8vo. 1725. XXVIII. *A ſecond Supplement to the* Moderator between an Infidel and an Apoſtate; *or a Diſſertation on ſome other Prophecies cited by the Biſhop of* Lichfield *againſt the Author of the* Grounds. *By* Thomas Woolſton &c. 8vo. 1725. XXIX. *Letters to the Author of the* Diſcourſe of the Grounds &c. *ſhewing that Chriſtianity is ſupported by facts well atteſted: that the words of Iſaiah, Chap. vii.* 14. Behold a virgin ſhall conceive and bear a ſon, *in their literal and only ſenſe, are a Prophecy of the conception and birth of the Meſſias, fulfilled in Jeſus; and that the Goſpel Application of ſeveral other paſſages in the Old Teſtament is juſt. By* John Greene. 8vo. 1726. XXX. *Remarks on the various Interpretations of the* more ſure word of Prophecy. 2 *Peter i.* 19. *which have lately been publiſhed by the* Dean *of* Chicheſter, *and the Author of* Miſcellanea Sacra. *In vindication of that paſſage from the objections of the* Grounds &c. *With a different account of the place deſigned, in vindication of it againſt the mentioned Author.* 8vo. 1726. XXXI. *A brief Defence of the Chriſtian Religion: or the teſtimony of God to the truth of the Chriſtian Religion. By* Theophilus Lobb M. D. 8vo. 1726. XXXII. *An Eſſay towards a ſummary of Chriſtianity by a Gentleman.* 8vo. 1726. XXXIII. *A Review of the Controverſy between the Author of the* Diſcourſe of the Grounds and Reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion *and his adverſaries, in a Letter to the Author.* 8vo. 1726. This was written by Mr. Thomas Jeffery, a Diſſenting Miniſter. Mr. Collins (57) tells us, that whoever reads this Author, "will be improved "in his Morals by converſing with ſo polite a perſon, "and in his notions of things by attending to the "many judicious obſervations, which occur through-"out his Book." XXXIV. *A Diſcourſe proving the Reſurrection of Chriſt, and ſhewing that it is a ſufficient demonſtration of Chriſtianity. By* John Greene. 8vo. 1726. XXXV. *A Literal Expoſition of two Prophecies by St. Matthew out of the Old Teſtament, and ſaid by him to be* fulfilled *in the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt. The firſt in the VIIth of Iſaiah, verſe* 14. *The ſecond in the XIth of Hoſeah, verſe* 1.

(57) *Letter to the Author of* the Grounds &c. *in anſwer to Mr. Greene's* Letters &c. pag. 80. edit. London 1726, in 8vo.

[*N*] *Treated our Author, together with Mr.* Toland, *in very ſevere Terms, as guilty of* impious Frauds *and* Laycraft.] Mr. Whiſton having obſerved (58), "that "tho' we are perpetually told of the *Pious Fraud* and "*Prieſtcraft* of the Primitive Chriſtians, he can at "preſent call to mind but one ſuch example, that "was ever proved, and that was the forgery or groſs "interpolation of the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* (59), "made by a certain nameleſs Preſbyter at the end of "the firſt, or beginning of the ſecond Century, for "which he was degraded;" tells us, that inſtead of this *one ancient believer*, he ſhall out of a greater number, ſelect two *modern unbelievers, as notoriouſly guilty of the like* Impious Frauds *and* Laycraft. "A firſt "ſhall be Mr. *Toland*. . . . . A ſecond inſtance muſt "be Mr. *Antony Collins*, a Gentleman who has many "years taken ſuperabundant care not to be ſuſpected "of believing ſo much as the Apoſtles Creed, or the "Books of either the Old or New Teſtament, or in-"deed *any Divine Providence at all.* Yet does he "claim a right to be admitted to take an oath upon "the Bible, and to receive the Holy Communion it-"ſelf; and he is at this day admitted to do both, "and in vertue thereof is in Commiſſion of the Peace, "as a good Churchman: i. e. notwithſtanding his open "and profeſſed Infidelity he ventures in the moſt pub-"lick and ſolemn manner to declare his unfeigned "acknowledgment of the Divine Providence, of the "truth of the Chriſtian Religion, and of the Books of "Holy Scripture, that is poſſible to be done among "men. It is with great regret I add this example of "an old friend, and one whom I ſtill love better than "he loves himſelf; but it is too flagrant to be omit-"ted. This I call *groſs Immorality, impious Fraud,* "and *Laycraft.*" Mr. Armand de la Chapelle having tranſlated this paſſage into French in his *Bibliotheque Angloiſe* (60) obſerves, that theſe expreſſions of Mr. Whiſton's are *a little too choleric*, and that his antagoniſt will be highly pleaſed with this inſtance of paſſion, and have ſome ſecret motive to triumph upon that account. The publication of this paſſage in that Journal occaſioned a letter to be ſent to Mr. de la Chapelle, printed in the *firſt Part* of the *XIIth Volume* (61), in which the Writer of it obſerves, that "Mr. Whiſ-"ton having accuſed Mr. Collins of Irreligion, but "being ſenſible, that this accuſation being deſtitute "of proof was ridiculous, he has artfully pretended, "that the latter had been his friend, inſinuating "thereby that Mr. Collins had made him a confident "of his moſt ſecret ſentiments. And yet, *continues "the Writer*, I have been aſſured by perſons, who "are very well informed, that Mr. Collins never had "any intercourſe of friendſhip with him; that he ne-"ver ſpoke to him above eight or ten times, in his "life, in the Coffee-houſe or elſewhere, and always "in other company, and that he has not ſeen him "for above five years. Is this ſufficient for Mr. "Whiſton to claim the character of a friend?"

(58) *Liſts of Suppoſitions and Aſſertions &c.* pag. 15.

(59) Still extant *apud* Grabe Spicileg. Sect. 1. pag. 87-128.

(60) Tom. xi. Part 1. pag. 282, 283, 284. edit. Amſterd. 1724.

(61) Pag. 244, 245, 246.

[*O*] *His* Letter to the Author of the Diſcourſe of the Grounds &c.] This *Letter* is dated April the 23d 1726, and the *Poſtſcript* April the 30th 1726. In the *Preface* (62) he remarks, that Mr. Green in his *Diſcourſe proving the Reſurrection of Chriſt, and ſhewing that it is a ſufficient demonſtration of the Truth of Chriſtianity* (63), after having obſerved, that "the Reader will "find a reflection or two on ſome paſſages in a "*Diſcourſe of the Grounds &c.*" adds, "that his "taking notice of this Book, after having lately "made ſome Remarks upon it in five *Letters* to the "Author, does not proceed from any diſreſpect to "that Gentleman, but a regard to truth. And there-"fore having been told that I (64) inſinuate, continues "Mr.

(62) Pag. 1.

(63) Octavo 1726.

(64) *Letter*, pag. 26.

a late Book, intitled, A Diſcourſe of the Grounds &c. [*P*]. It was printed at the Hague by Tho. Johnſon 1726 in 2 volumes in 12mo, and reprinted at London with Corrections 1727 in 8vo. It is dated at London November the 13th 1725, and addreſſed to *the Right Honourable* *****; and concludes with theſe words. "As to your Lordſhip's "requeſt, that I would ſend you my thoughts on divers other Theological ſubjects, which "you name to me, I ſhall obey you, as ſoon as I can; and I ſhall begin with a *Diſcourſe* "*upon the Miracles recorded in the Old and New Teſtament*; which is almoſt tranſcribed "for your uſe." In this work (*m*) he mentions a manuſcript *Diſſertation* of his, written on the occaſion of and againſt Mr. Whiſton's *Vindication of the Sybilline Oracles*; in which *Diſſertation* Mr. Collins endeavoured to ſhew thoſe Oracles "to be a forgery made in "the times of the Primitive Chriſtians, who, for forging and receiving them, were cal-"led *Sybilliſts* by the Pagans." But this *Diſſertation* never appeared in print. His *Scheme of Literal Prophecy* was replied to by ſeveral Writers [2], and particularly by Dr. John Rogers in his *Neceſſity of Divine Revelation, and the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion*

(*m*) Chap. 2. pag. 61. edit. 1726 in 12mo.

"Mr. Green, that the *ſaid Author* is an *Enemy to* "*Natural Religion*, I freely own, that had I been ſen-"ſible, that my words would have born ſuch a con-"ſtruction, I ſhould have expreſſed myſelf in a dif "ferent manner." Upon this paſſage Mr. Collins makes ſeveral Obſervations, and then conſiders Mr. Green's Reflections *upon the Diſcourſe of the Grounds* in his *Diſcourſe proving the Reſurrection of Chriſt*, and obſerves (65), that his whole Book may be conceived a Reflection on or Argument againſt the *Diſcourſe of the Grounds*, upon which Mr. Collins makes an obſerſervation or two in his *Preface, reſerving the full conſideration of Mr. Green's Book to another occaſion* (66). He tells us (67), that the ſecond part of his Book, wherein Mr. Green attempts to ſhew, that "the Re-"ſurrection of Chriſt [*as before proved by him,*] is a "ſufficient demonſtration of the truth of Chriſtianity, "is weakneſs itſelf. For in the firſt place, he has not "proved to the Deiſts the truth of the *Reſurrection* in "a way proper for them. In the next place, if he "had proved it in a proper way, that is, had made "it out by all the proper topicks to be very probably "true, [for that is all the matter will admit of, and "what is only required to be done in matters of "Faith;] yet that would not be *ſufficient to prove the* "*truth of Chriſtianity*, which is a Religion conſiſting "of many particulars, and all built on the Books of "the Old and New Teſtament. The antiquity, au-"thority, and inſpiration of thoſe Books are there-"fore to be proved; in doing which their morality is "to be cleared; their doctrines ſhewn not to be incon-"ſiſtent with reaſon; the dependency of the New or "the Old Teſtament manifeſted, and in particular the "fundamental Article of Chriſtianity, that *Jeſus of* "*Nazareth is the Meſſias*, [or perſon foretold in the "Old Teſtament] is the perſon there foretold; the "harmony of all their parts with one another de-"fended; and all ſhewn to tend to the Glory of "God, and good of men. For if theſe things can-"not be made out; or if any objections upon theſe "heads cannot be anſwered; here is not only want "of proof for ſome eſſential parts of Chriſtianity, but "objections ſtarted, which not only deſtroy that con-"ſiſtency and reaſonableneſs, which are neceſſary cha-"racters of a Religion, that comes from God, but, "as not being to be anſwered, are demonſtrations "of the falſhood of what can only be grounded on "probability."

(65) Preface, pag. 8, 9.

(66) Ibid. pag. 9.

(67) Ibid.

[*P*] *His* Scheme of Literal Prophecy conſidered; &c.] In his Preface he tells us, that he has advanced ſuch a *Scheme* of things, as will account for all matters in the preſent diſpute. *And tho' that* Scheme, ſays he, *when conſidered together, may perhaps appear to many* new *and* ſurprizing, *yet it ſeems to be the* true old Scheme, *and grounded on the right rules of Criticiſm and Judgment in the caſe; and its parts are proved by the moſt commonly received Theological Topicks and Reaſonings; which, as the Author himſelf deems true and juſt in themſelves, ſo to engage the Reader to the greater attention, and to induce him to give them their due weight, he urges them in the words of the greateſt Divines, without whom he ſcarce preſumes to ſtir a ſtep.* At the end of this Treatiſe (68) he declares, that "the true and only Scheme, by which the world ought "to be regulated and would be regulated, lies in theſe "two particulars. I. That univerſal liberty be eſta-"bliſhed in reſpect to opinion and practices not pre-"judicial to the peace and welfare of Society: by "which eſtabliſhment, *Truth* muſt needs have the "advantage over *Error* and *Falſhood*, the *Law of God*, "over the *Will of Man*, and *true Chriſtianity* tolerated; "*private Judgment* would be really exerciſed; and "men would be allowed to have, and ſuffered to fol-"low their conſciences, over which God only is Su-"preme. . . . II. Secondly, that nothing but the *Law* "*of Nature*, (the obſervance whereof is abſolutely ne-"ceſſary to Society) and what can be built thereon, "ſhould be enforced by the civil ſanctions of the "Magiſtrate, which law will be then beſt underſtood, "beſt eſtabliſhed, and beſt executed, when it is not "propoſed to eſtabliſh any thing elſe to puniſh men "for the breach of any thing elſe, and when men's "fury and zeal are taken off from other matters, "about which their duty is *wholly perſonal*, and con-"ſiſts in *getting the beſt information they can*, and in "*aſſenting only to opinions according to the degree of* "*evidence they have for them*, and in *practiſing ſuch* "(indifferent) *things, which they are convinced to be* "*their duty, leaving other men in like manner to con-*"*duct themſelves*. O what *Piety or true Honour of God*, "(which conſiſts in every man's worſhipping God ac-"cording to the dictates of his own conſcience,) what "*Virtue, order*, and *peace* would prevail in the world, "if men had a direct view only to *piety, virtue,* "*order*, and *peace*, nothing elſe being of any value, "but as it is a means to thoſe ends!" With reſpect to his own religious notions he declares (69), that "he paying no regard to the authority of Jews, "Heathens or Mahometans, or of Papiſts, Lutherans, "Calviniſts, Arminians, Anabaptiſts, or Quakers, "has uſed the means and faculties God has beſtowed "upon him in inquiring after truth, and particularly "in endeavouring to find out God's will, after the beſt "manner he was able, and has a Creed of his own, "which he is ſo far from impoſing on others, that "he is ready to renounce every article of it himſelf "upon better information, to which he hopes to be "always open."

(68) Chap. 13. pag. 413, & *ſeqq.* edit. 1726, in 12mo.

(69) Pag. 418, 419.

[2] *His* Scheme of Literal Prophecy *was replied to by ſeveral Writers.*] We ſhall give the Reader an account of ſome of them. I. *The Neceſſity of Divine Revelation, and the Truth of the Chriſtian Revelation aſſerted, in eight Sermons. To which is prefixed a Preface, with ſome Remarks on a late Book, intitled,* The Scheme of Literal Prophecy conſidered &c. *By John Rogers, D. D.* London 1727 in 8vo. This occaſioned Mr. Collins's *Letter to the Reverend Dr. Rogers, on occaſion of his eight Sermons* &c. mentioned in the text of this article. II. *A Letter to the Author of the* London Journal, *Saturday April* 1, 1727. This *Letter* was written by Dr. Arthur Aſhley Sykes, now Dean of St. Burien. Mr. Collins wrote an *Anſwer* to it, publiſhed at the end of his *Letter to Dr. Rogers*. Upon this Dr. Sykes wrote a ſecond *Letter* in defence of his former, dated June the 24th, 1727, and printed in a Pamphlet, intitled, *The true Grounds of the Expectation of the Meſſiah. In two Letters. The* one *printed in the* London Journal *April the firſt*, 1727. *The* other *in Vindication of it. Being a* Reply *to the* Anſwer *publiſhed at the end of a late* Letter to Dr. Rogers. *By* Philalethes. London 1727 in 8vo, pagg. 68. III. *A Vindication of the Antiquity and Authority of* Daniel's *Prophecies, and their application to Jeſus Chriſt: in anſwer to the Objections of the Author of the*

ligion asserted, in eight Sermons. To which is prefixed a Preface, with some Remarks on a late book, intitled, The Scheme of Literal Prophecy considered. London 1727 in 8vo. In answer to which Mr. Collins wrote, *A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Rogers on occasion of his eight Sermons, concerning the Necessity of Divine Revelation, and the Preface prefixed to them. To which is added,* A Letter *printed in the* London Journal *April* 1, 1727. *With an* Answer *to the same* [*R*]. London 1727 in 8vo, pagg. 143. His health began to decline several years before his death, and he was extremely afflicted with the stone, which at last put an end to his life at his house in Harley-Square December the 13th 1729. He was interred at Oxford Chapel, where a monument was erected to him with an epitaph in Latin [*S*]. It is remarkable, that notwithstanding all the reproaches cast upon him as an enemy to all Religion, just before his last minutes he declared, "That as he had always endeavoured to the best of his abilities to serve "God, his King, and his Country, so he was persuaded he was going to that place, "which God had designed for them that love him;" and presently afterwards, "The "Catholic Religion is to love God, and to love man;" and he advised such as were about him to have a constant regard to those principles. His Library, which was a very large and curious one, was open to all Men of Letters, to whom he readily communicated all the lights and assistance in his power, and even furnished his antagonists with books

the Scheme of Literal Prophecy considered. *By* Samuel Chandler. London 1728 in 8vo. IV. *Christianity the Perfection of all Religion Natural and Revealed. Wherein some of the principal Prophecies relating to the Messiah in the Old Testament are shewn to belong to him in the Literal Sense. In opposition to the attempts of the* Literal Scheme &c. *By* Thomas Jeffery. London 1728 in 8vo. The Dedication to John Lord Viscount Barrington is dated from Little-Baddow May the 10th 1728. V. A *Vindication of the* Defence of Christianity from the Prophecies of the Old Testament, *In Answer to the* Scheme of the Literal Prophecy considered. *By the Right Reverend Father in God,* Edward, *Lord Bishop of* Coventry *and* Litchfield. *In two Volumes. With a* Letter *from the Reverend Mr.* Masson, *concerning the Religion of* Macrobius, *and his testimony touching the slaughter of the Infants at Bethlehem, with a Postscript upon* Virgil's *IVth Eclogue.* London 1728. in 8vo. The Bishop solemnly declares (70), that after going over the *Scheme* with some attention, he sees no cause from any thing the Author hath there said, to change his mind in any point of his *Defence,* "except in relation to the *Writer*'s sincerity, of which, "says he, I once thought perhaps too favourably. "This I have made appear in the course of this "*Vindication,* which might have been reduced into "much narrower bounds, had it not been thought "necessary to shew how little this *Writer* is to be "trusted on his bare word, or even citations throughout his whole Book, who is wont to speak with "most assurance where he is most in the wrong, and "by questions and flirts and cavils, and the authorities of modern Authors, to decline a direct answer "where-ever he is pinched: some of which authorities "are taken from men of his own principles, or from "those, whose judgment as little weighs with others, "as with himself at other times; and are often detached sentences wrested contrary to the intention of "the Authors, which, taken with their context, speak "directly contrary to what he would have them say. "So much I take the liberty to affirm beforehand, having given undeniable instances in the following "pages to prove it; and have more in reserve at the "Author's service, if he force me by a denial to "draw them together into a separate sheet." VI. *The Reasoning of Christ and his Apostles vindicated. In two Parts. I. Being a Defence of the* Argument from Miracles, *proving* the argument from Prophecy *not necessary to a rational Defence of our Religion. II. Being a Defence of* the Argument from Prophecy, *proving the Christian Scheme to have a rational foundation upon the* Prophecies *of the* Old Testament. *In Answer to a Book intitled,* The Scheme of Literal Prophecy considered. *By* Thomas Bullock. *M. A. Rector of North-Creak in Norfolk.* London 1728 in 8vo. pagg. 288. Mr. Bullock observes (71), that the Author of the *Scheme* "pretends to attack Christianity with its own "weapons, and to propagate Infidelity by expressing "himself in the words of Christian Writers; to which "end he has not only raked together the unguarded "expressions of ingenious men, but by altering, adding to, and curtailing passages referred to, and by "other disingenuous methods unbecoming a man of "honour and sincerity, has wrested them to purposes "apparently opposite to their true import."

(70) Introduction, pag. 3, 4.

(71) Introduct. pag. 2.

[*R*] *His* Letter to the Reverend Dr. *Rogers* on occasion of his Eight Sermons &c.] In this *Letter* he observes (72), that Dr. Rogers had invited the Author of the *Scheme* to *Martyrdom* in these words (73): "A "Confessor or two would be a mighty ornament to "his cause. If he expects to convince us that he is "in earnest, and believes himself, he should not decline giving us this proof of his sincerity. What "will not abide this trial, we shall suspect to have "but a poor foundation." These sentiments Mr. Collins tells us (74), are in his opinion, *false, wicked, inhuman, irreligious, and inconsistent with the peace of Society, and personally injurious to the Author of the* Scheme, &c. He remarks (75) that it *is a degree of virtue to speak what a man thinks, tho' he may do it in such a way, as to avoid destruction of life and fortune: and I humbly conceive,* says he, *that it has as great a face of virtue for a man to speak his thoughts on one side of a question in matters of speculation and notion, and that without prospect of reward, and under apprehensions of ill usage; as it is for another to speak what he is hired to speak on the other side of a question, and not content with that, to be urging and soliciting the temporal powers to use force to maintain his interested side of the question, &c.* And he declares (76), that the cause of liberty, which he defends, is "the cause of Virtue, "Learning, Truth, God, Religion, and Christianity; "that it is the political interest of all countries; and "that the degree of it we enjoy in England, is the "strength, ornament, and glory of our country, ... "that if I can contribute, by my poor abilities, to "the defence of so excellent a cause, I shall think I "have acted a good part in life; ... and in fine, "that it is a cause, in which, if your influence and interest were equal to your inclination to procure *Martyrdom* for me, I would rather suffer than in any "cause whatsoever, tho' (77) *sorry* that Christians "should be so weak and inconsistent with themselves, "as to be your instruments to *take my life* from me." He acknowledges (78), *that it may be, and is undoubtedly, the case of many, who* reject the Gospel, *to be influenced therein by their* Vices *and* Immoralities. *It would be very strange, if Christianity, which teaches so much good morality, and so justly condemns divers vices, to which men are prone, was not rejected by some* Libertines *on that account; as the several pretended* Revelations, *which are established throughout the world, are by* Libertines *on that very account also. But this cannot be the case of* all *who* reject the Gospel. *Some of them, who* reject the Gospel, *lead as good lives as those who receive it. And I suppose there is no difference to the advantage of Christians in point of morality, between them and the Jews, Mahometans, Heathens, or others, who reject Christianity.*

(72) Pag. 6.

(73) Dr. Rogers's Preface, pag. 46.

(74) Letter § 11. pag. 6.

(75) Sect. 1. pag. 17, 18.

(76) Sect. 14. pag. 112, 113.

(77) *Chillingworth's Religion of Protestants,* chap. 6. Sect. 56.

(78) Sect. 12. pag. 103, 104.

[*S*] *With an Epitaph in Latin.*] It is as follows.

H. S. E.
ANTONIUS COLLINS, *Armiger:*
Egregiis animi dotibus ornatus,
Præstanti

books to confute himſelf, and directed them how to give their arguments all the force, of which they were capable. He carefully avoided all the indecencies of converſation, and was extremely averſe to the leaſt tendency towards obſcenity of diſcourſe. We are told (*n*) that "the corruption among Chriſtians and the perſecuting ſpirit of the Clergy "had given him a prejudice againſt the Chriſtian Religion, and at laſt induced him to "think, that upon the foot on which it is at preſent, it is pernicious to mankind. As he "had a great fund of humanity, ſweetneſs of temper, and moderation, he ſaw with "grief, that theſe virtues were baniſhed from ſociety, and that Religion was made uſe of, "as a cloke, to authorize all kinds of violence and injuſtice."

(*n*) See the Extract of a Letter from London in the *Bibliotheque Raiſonnée des Ouvrages des Savans de l'Europe*, tom. 4. Part 1. pag. 235. edit. Amſterdam 1730 in 12mo. See likewiſe *Critique deſintereſſée des Journaux Litteraires*, tom. 1. pag. 247. edit. a la Haye 1730 in 12mo.

Præſtanti Ingenio,
Acri Judicio,
Tenaci Memoria.
A Puero uſque mirificâ virtutis indole præditus:
Spectatiſſimum ſemper vitæ morumque exemplar.
Veritatis amicus & indagator ſedulus;
Quam neque ex ſententiis hominum pendere,
Neque Magiſtratus gladio vindicandam eſſe exiſtimavit:
In Libris (quorum opulenta ei copia) evolvendis
Aſſiduus & indefeſſus:
Quantum inde profecerit,
Ex ſcriptis ipſius editis judicet Lector idoneus.
Erga Reges optimos, utrumque Georgium,
Libertatis utpote Civilis & Eccleſiaſticæ
Tutores & Patronos,
Fide (ſi quis alius) conſtans.
Gratam ſui
Erga Conjuges Amoris,
Erga Liberos Charitatis,
Erga Servos Lenitatis,
Erga omnes Benevolentiæ,
Memoriam reliquit.

Calculorum valetudine diu conflictatus,
Demum fractus; obiit XIII Dec. M.DCCXXIX.
Amicorum nuper Deliciæ, nunc eheu! Deſiderium.

Natus eſt XXI Junii MDCLXXVI.
HENRICO *Patre Armigero.*
In matrimonio habuit
MARTHAM, FRANCISCI CHILD *Equitis filiam:*
Atque, eâ defunctâ,
ELIZABETHAM, GUALTERI WROTTESLY *Baronetti:*
Ex alterâ quatuor Liberos ſuſcepit;
Quorum
Duos Filios, HENRICUM *infantem,*
ANTONIUM *vero ad virilem ætatem jam provectum,*
Summâ virtute & humanitate adoleſcentem,
Extulerat:
Duas itidem Filias, ELIZABETH & MARTHAM,
Innuptas reliquit.
Altera chariſſimo Viro,
Quocum conjunctiſſimè vixerat,
Monumentum hoc mœrens poſuit. T.

☞COLLINS (JOHN), a perſon of conſiderable note among the learned in the ſeventeenth Century, and Author of ſeveral Works, was ſon of a Divine, and born March the 5th 1624 at Wood-Eaton near Oxford (*a*). His education was ſuch as diſpoſed his mind to the full purſuit of truth, and formed and directed his thoughts to diſtinguiſh rightly, and to reaſon juſtly. He employed ſome part of his younger years as Clerk under Mr. John Mar (*b*), one of the Clerks of the Kitchin to Prince Charles, afterwards King Charles II. But the civil wars and diſorders coming on, he went to ſea, to which he kept for ſeven years, where he made himſelf ſufficiently acquainted with all the parts of Navigation, as being then his buſineſs; and at his leiſure hours applied himſelf to accounts, and ſome parts of the Mathematics, to which he had a natural genius. Upon his return he took to the profeſſion of an Accomptant, and compoſed ſeveral uſeful Treatiſes upon practical ſubjects, which were publiſhed [*A*], and highly eſteemed. October the 12th 1667 he was elected Fellow of the Royal Society of London. While Anthony Earl

(*a*) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 116. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*b*) This Gentleman was eminent for his skill in the Mathematics, and famous for his excellent Dyals, with which the Gardens of King Charles I were adorned. Idem, ibid.

[*A*] *Compoſed ſeveral Treatiſes upon practical Subjects, which were publiſhed.*] In the year 1652 he publiſhed at London a Treatiſe in fol. intitled, *An Introduction to Merchants Accompts*; which was reprinted in the year 1665 with an additional part, intitled, *Supplements to Accomptantſhip and Arithmetick*; wherein is contained variety of uſeful inſtructions for the ſtating intricate accounts, as, *A Queſtion of Mortgage ſtated according to ſimple intereſt, ſuch as the Courts of Equity do allow*; and ſeveral other familiar inſtances in the way of Merchants and Traders. Here he gives in a ſhort but very plain manner the Rules of Decimal Arithmetic, Simple Intereſt, and Rebate; of Equation of Payment, Compound Intereſt, and Annuities; wherein he ſhews, that a Table made for the forbearance of 1 *l.* at compound intereſt at any rate with the time thereof is a Table of Logarithms, to be continued with eaſe; and that thereby all queſtions concerning Compound Intereſt and Annuities may be reſolved for all rates of Intereſt and for any terms of payment. This part relating to Intereſt was reprinted in 1685, in a ſmall octavo volume. In 1658 he publiſhed at London in 4to a Treatiſe called, *The Sector on a Quadrant*; containing the Deſcription and Uſe of four ſeveral Quadrants, each accommodated for the making of Sun-Dyals, for the reſolving of Proportions, and for the ready finding the Hour of the Day and Sun's Azimuth univerſally; with an *Appendix* concerning Reflected Dyalling, from a Glaſs placed at any Reclination. He has here treated fully of the Affections of Plain and Spherical Triangles, and given all the caſes of thoſe Triangles with their Solutions, and that by various ways. In 1659 he publiſhed in 4to his *Geometrical Dyalling*; wherein he gives ſeveral methods of finding the Requiſites, and drawing the Hour-lines upon all kinds of Plains, by the help only of a line of chords. He ſhews likewiſe the way of drawing a Meridian Line, and of making any Sun-Dyal by the means of three Shadows of a Gnomon. The ſame year appeared his *Mariners Plain Scale new plained*, wherein he gives the beſt manner of keeping of an account of the Ships-way, and of correcting the dead-reckoning, and rectifies many of the errors in the Charts commonly uſed. He reſolves the proportions relating to plain and ſpherical Triangles by means of the Line of Chords only; and all the caſes of Spherical Triangles, by projecting the Sphere either orthographically or ſtereographically, by the help of the ſame Line of Chords. *In the Philoſophical Tranſactions of the Royal Society of London, Numb.* 30, *for Dec.* 1667, he fully explains and demonſtrates the Rule given by the learned Jeſuit *De Billy* for *finding the number of the Julian Period for any year aſſigned, the Cycles of the Sun and Moon with the Roman Indiction for the year being given.* To this he has added ſome very neatly contrived Rules for the ready finding on what day of the week any day of the month falls for ever; and other the moſt uſeful and neceſſary Kalendar Rules. In the ſame *Tranſactions*, Numb. 46 for April 1669, he has a curious Diſſertation *concerning the Reſolution of Equations in Numbers*; wherein there are not a few hints towards ſome of the moſt conſiderable advancements, which

Earl of Shaftſbury was Lord Chancellor, he nominated Mr. Collins in divers References concerning ſuits depending in Chancery about intricate accounts, to aſſiſt in the ſtating thereof; "which was ſome emolument to him, and to the ſhortning of the charge of "the parties concerned; from which time eſpecially his aſſiſtance was often uſed in other "places and by other perſons; whereby he not only obtained ſome wealth, but a great "name, and became accounted in matters of that nature the moſt uſeful and neceſſary "perſon of his time (*c*)." In the latter part of his life he was appointed Accomptant to the Royal Fiſhery Company. In the year 1682, after the Act at Oxford was finiſhed, riding in a hot day from thence to Malmeſbury in Wiltſhire, in order to view the ground to be cut for a river between the *Iſis* and *Avon*, and drinking too large a quantity of Cyder, he fell into a conſumption, of which he died on Saturday November the 10th 1683 at his houſe on Garlick-Hill London, and was interred on the Tueſday following in the Church of St. James Garlick-hithe in the South-Iſle juſt behind the Pulpit (*d*). About five and twenty years after his death, all his papers, and moſt of his books came into the hands of the learned and ingenious *William Jones* Eſq; (*e*), Fellow of the Royal Society; among which were found manuſcripts upon Mathematical Subjects of Mr. *Briggs*, Mr. *Oughtred*, Dr. *Pell*, Dr. *Scarborough*, Dr. *Barrow*, and Mr. *Iſaac Newton*, with a multitude of Letters received from, and copies of Letters ſent to many learned perſons, particularly Dr. *Pell*, Dr. *Wallis*, Dr. *Barrow*, Mr. *Iſaac Newton*, Mr. *James Gregory*, Mr. *Flamſteed*, Mr. *Townley*, Mr. *Baker*, Mr. *Branker*, Dr. *Bernard*, Mr. *Sluſius*, Mr. *Leibnitz*, Mr. *Tſchirnhaus*, Father *Bertet*, and others. From theſe papers it is evident, that Mr. Collins was ſo ſollicitous in his ſearch after uſeful truths, ſo indefatigably induſtrious in proſecuting thoſe enquiries, and of ſo generouſly communicative a diſpoſition, that he held a conſtant correſpondence for many years with all the eminent Mathematicians of his time, and ſpared neither pains nor coſt to procure what was requiſite to promote real ſcience. In ſhort the world is obliged to him for the greateſt part of the late diſcoveries in all uſeful knowledge [*B*]. He was the chief, if not the only promoter of the publication of moſt of the valuable Mathematical Books in his time [*C*]. He was likewiſe the Regiſter of all the new improvements made in that Science; the magazine, to which all the curious had recourſe; and the common Repoſitory, where every

(*c*) Idem, col. 317.

(*d*) Idem, ibid.

(*e*) To this Gentleman we are obliged for ſeveral particulars in this Article.

which have been made ſince in the refined parts of the Mathematics, particularly with reſpect to the *Doctrine of Differences*. Here Mr. Oldenburg, then Secretary of the Royal Society, takes notice, that "the Author "(Mr. *Collins*) having explained *Mercator's Logarithmotechnia* in Engliſh, and illuſtrated the elegant "doctrine thereof with examples, hath handled this "work of Interpolation, and makes the Logarithms to "25 and 30 places of figures by mere diviſion, having herein advanced that Author's doctrine thereof "by diviſion; which (as it is there illuſtrated) did not "ſeem to extend far enough. This hath already been "communicated ſome months ſince to ſome of the "Members of the Royal Society, and may be expect-"ed hereafter." In the *Philoſophical Tranſactions*, Numb. 69 for March 1671, Mr. Collins has given a moſt elegant conſtruction of that chronographical problem; *The diſtances of three objects in the ſame plane, and the angles made at a fourth place in that plane, by obſerving each object, being given; to find the diſtances of thoſe objects from the place of obſervation.* In 1680 he publiſhed at London a ſmall Treatiſe in 4to, intitled, *A Plea for the bringing in of Iriſh cattel, and keeping out the fiſh caught by foreigners; together with an Addreſs to the Members of Parliament of the counties of Cornwal and Devon, about the Advancement of Tin, Fiſhery, and divers Manufactures.* In 1682 he publiſhed at London in 4to his *Diſcourſe of Salt and Fiſhery*, upon theſe heads: I. The ſeveral ways of making Salts in England and foreign parts. II. The characters and qualities of good and bad of theſe ſeveral ſorts of Salts; Engliſh refined aſſerted to be much better than any foreign. III. The catching and curing or ſalting of the moſt eminent or ſtaple ſorts of Fiſh for long or ſhort keeping. IV. The ſalting of Fleſh. V. The cookery of Fiſh and Fleſh. VI. Extraordinary Experiments in preſerving Butter, Fleſh, Fiſh, Fowl, Fruits and Roots, freſh and ſweet for long keeping. VII. The Caſe and Sufferings of the Salt-workers. VIII. Propoſals for their Relief and for the Advancement of the Fiſhery, Woolen, Tin, and divers other manufactures. In the *Philoſophical Tranſactions*, Numb. 159 for May 1684, there is publiſhed a Letter from our Author to the learned Dr. John Wallis, *giving his thoughts about ſome defects in Algebra*; wherein he propoſes the genuine method of deſcribing the *Loci* of Equations, and of determining the Limits and Number of their Roots, with variety of other matters not leſs curious.

[*B*] *The World is obliged to him for the greateſt part of the late diſcoveries in all uſeful knowledge.*] In the year 1666 he had under conſideration the manner of dividing the Meridian Line on the true Nautical Chart, a problem of the utmoſt conſequence in Navigation; and ſome time after he engaged Mr. Nicholas Mercator, Mr. Gregory, Dr. Barrow, Mr. Iſaac Newton, and Dr. Wallis, ſeverally, to explain and find an eaſy practical method of doing it, which excited Mr. Leibnitz, Dr. Halley, Mr. Bernoulli, and all who had capacity to think upon ſuch a ſubject, to give their ſolutions of it. And by this means the practice of that moſt uſeful propoſition is reduced to the greateſt ſimplicity imaginable. The Tables of Logarithms are ſo very uſeful in moſt computations, that nothing that way can well be done without them; but the making of theſe Logarithms was look'd upon as inſuperably difficult and tedious, and the Tables already made not always to be depended upon. Our Author being ſufficiently aware of this, laboured much to find expedients for the ſhortening and facilitating the work; in which he engaged Mr. Mercator, Mr. Gregory, and Mr. Newton, ſeverally to try to render the operation eaſy and expeditious in the practice; which each of them performed, and ſome time after the whole of that affair was compleated by Dr. Halley's finiſhing hand. It was Mr. Collins, who engaged all that were able to make any advances in the ſciences, in a ſtrict enquiry into the ſeveral parts of learning, which each had a peculiar talent for. He made uſe of all the inſtruments, which he found proper for thoſe ends, and which would perhaps have been uſeleſs, or employed to ſome very trifling purpoſes, if his good judgment and ſkill had not diſcovered the ſeveral uſes of them. He ſet them all to work, by ſhewing where the defect was in any uſeful branch of knowledge, by pointing out the difficulties attending ſuch an enquiry; by ſetting forth the benefit of compleating that ſubject; and by keeping up a ſpirit, and a warm deſire of making further diſcoveries and improvements.

[*C*] *The chief, if not only promoter, of the publication of moſt of the valuable mathematical Books in his time.*] It is to him the World is indebted for the publication of Dr. Barrow's *Optical and Geometrical Lectures*, his *Abridgment of Archimedes's Works, and of Apollonius's Conics*; Mr. Branker's Tranſlation of *Rhonius's Algebra, with Dr. Pell's Additions*; *Mr. Kerſey's Algebra*; *Dr. Wallis's Hiſtory of Algebra*; *Mr. Strode of Combinations*; and many other excellent works, which were procured by his unwearied ſollicitations. T

every part of useful knowledge was found. It was upon this account that the Learned stiled him the *English Mersennus* (*f*). If all his correspondents had been so generous in their communications, as not to have obliged him to keep some things too private, there would have been no manner of pretence to dispute the priority of the invention of a method of Analysis, the most admirable that was ever thought of, the honour of which appears evidently to belong to Sir Isaac Newton from Mr. Collins's papers printed in the *Commercium Epistolicum D. Joannis Collins & aliorum de Analysi promota: jussu Societatis Regiæ in lucem editum.* London 1712 in 4to.

(*f*) *See* Mr. Des Maizeaux's Preface, pag. xl. to *Recueil de diverses Pieces, sur la Philosophie, la Religion Naturelle, l'Histoire, les Mathematiques &c. Par Messieurs* Leibnitz, Clarke, Newton, *& autres Autheurs célebres.* In 2 vol. Amsterdam 1720, in 12mo.

COLOGNE (PETER of) in Dutch *Van Ceulen* [*A*], Pastor of Mets in the sixteenth Century, had a great share in Calvin's friendship, and that of Theodore Beza. He was a native of Ghent. I shall observe elsewhere (*a*) that Robert Stephens, with whom he was familiarly acquainted at Paris, was the occasion of his going to Geneva, where Calvin having compleated his instruction, persuaded him to devote himself to the Ministry. He first performed the functions of it in Mets, anno 1558, whither Clervant had brought him from Geneva for this purpose (*b*). That Church was dispersed under Francis II. Clervant, who was a Gentleman of great merit, and very zealous for the cause, withdrew to Strasburg with his family. Peter de Cologne retired to Heidelberg (*c*), where he was recalled to Mets by the Protestants, in the beginning of Charles IXth's reign (*d*). He preached privately from house to house, till the 4th of May 1561, when he was seized as he was preaching. He was obliged to leave the City a little after, but he returned to it in a few days; for May the 25th of that same year, the Protestants began to preach publickly, by permission from the Court. Senneterre, indeed, who commanded in the City being resolved not to let this Minister return to it, he was forced to be conducted back by a strong guard to the village of Grixi, after his Sermon was over. It lasted no longer than till the return of Vieilleville Governor of Mets (*e*); for he brought Cologne thither again. The King having received in Mets, anno 1569, news of the battle of Jarnac, in which the Prince of Conde was killed, suffered the Protestant Church to be pulled down, and it was with the utmost difficulties and dangers that the Ministers had an opportunity of getting out of the City (*f*). Peter de Cologne withdrew to the Palatinate, and was Pastor in Heidelberg. He died in the flower of his age. He had wrote some books [*B*] during his stay in Mets. DANIEL COLONIUS, his son, was Principal of the Walloon College in Leyden (*g*). He published verses on the Institutions of Calvin, anno 1628. Heinsius dedicated the *Aristarchus sacer* to him.

(*a*) In the remark [*A*] of the Article DIEU (Lewis de).

(*b*) Beze, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. 16. pag. 444.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 446.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 449.

(*e*) Ibid. pag. 432.

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 464.

(*g*) *Orat. funebris Ludov. de Dieu.*

[*A*] *In Dutch* van Ceulen.] He was the first person of his family who latinized this name by that of Colonius (1). His Schoolmaster made him alter it in this manner, but in France he was called de Cologne.

(1) *Vide Orationem funebrem Ludovici de Dieu.*

[*B*] *He had writ some Books.*] La Croix du Maine durst not venture to give the titles of them. *He writ, says he, several treatises printed at Lyons in* 1564 *for John d'Ogerolles, the titles of which I will not specify for certain reasons.* Du Verdier Vau-Privas, who was not as la Croix du Maine a Protestant had more resolution; for not being suspected, he did not think himself obliged to be so cautious. He therefore says, that *Peter de Cologne, translated out of the German into French, Conformité & accord tant de l'Escripture Saincte, que des anciens & purs Docteurs de l'Eglise, & de la confession d'Ausbourg bien entendue touchant la doctrine de la S. Cene de nostre Seigneur, par les Theologiens de l'Université de Heidelberg*; i. e. "The conformity and "harmony between the Holy Scripture, as well as the "ancient and uncorrupt Fathers of the Church; and "of the confession of Ausburg righly understood, con- "cerning the last Supper of our Lord, by the Divines "of the University of Heidelberg," printed at Geneva 1566, 8vo. He also translated *from the German of Thomas Erastus*; *Vraie & droicte intelligence de ces paroles de la saincte Cene de Jesus-Christ, cecy est mon corps.* i. e. "The true and natural meaning of the "following words of Christ's last supper, *this is my* "*body*," printed at Lyons 1564, 8vo (2). As these books are not now to be found, I do not believe that tho' I had access to very great Libraries, it would be possible for me to tell which of these two are hinted at by Mr. Ancillon in the life of Farel. *Peter de Cologne*, says he, *translated a treatise on the Lord's Supper, and dedicated it to Monsieur de Clervant.* None of these three Authors speak of the answer, made by Peter de Cologne to Francis de Beaucaire de Peguillon, Bishop of Mets, printed at Geneva anno 1566 (3).

(2) Du Verdier, *Biblioth. Franc.* pag. 1001.

(3) See the Remark [*A*] of the Article DIEU (Lewis de).

COLOMIES (PAUL) in Latin *Colomesius*, cultivated the Study of Polite Learning with great application, and has communicated to the public several curious enquiries [*A*]. He

† His *Italia & Hispania Orientalis* were published by *J. Christ. Wolfius*, at Hamburgh, *in the year* 1730.

(2) 1. *A Collection of Observations, in Latin.*
2. *A Collection of curious Particulars, in French.*
3. *Clavis Epistolarum Scaligeri, Casauboni, Salmasii, & aliorum.*
4. *A Key to the French Letters written to Scaliger.*
5. *Notæ ad Quinctilianum.*

(3) Or rather at Roan, tho' London be put in the Title-page.

[*A*] *He has communicated to the Public several curious enquiries.*] It would be to flatter Mr. Colomiés, to say he made discoveries by the penetration of his genius. Certainly this was not his talent; but he knew how to make good use of what he read, and to pick up many singular things of which most readers take no notice, tho' they are extremely well pleased to find them when any one has made little collections of them. He made such collections his principal study: and in this respect he was a very ferret. The first Book which he presented the public with is intitled *Gallia Orientalis*: he therein treats of the French who have understood the Hebrew tongue (1). This work is much quoted, and sold well: it is not easy to be met with; and was printed at the Hague, in the year 1665, in 4to. The Author had prepared a second Edition, enlarged and corrected; and had compiled a like Work concerning the Italians and Spaniards who were acquainted with Hebrew; he had even delivered his Manuscript to a Bookseller of Rochelle who was settled at Amsterdam, and had promised to print it: but three things have hitherto hindred the impression of those Manuscripts. 1. The death of the Bookseller. 2. The death of the Author. 3. The depraved taste of the Public, who buy scarce any other Books than Libels, or Romances. I hope, notwithstanding, that something of these Works of Colomiés will be printed †. The second Book he published is intitled KEIMHAIA LITERARIA, and contains several small pieces (2). It was printed at Paris in the year 1668, and at Utrecht in 1669, in 12mo. His other works are, *Epigrams and Madrigals*, in French, at Rochelle, in 12mo. *Remarks on the second Scaligerana*, at Groningen, 1669, in 12mo. *The Life of Father James Sirmond*, at Rochelle, 1671, in 12mo. *Tertullian's Exhortation to the Martyrs, translated into Freneh*, at Rochelle, 1673, in 12mo. *Rome Protestante*, at London (3), 1675, in 12mo. *Mélanges Historiques*, at Orange, 1675, in 24mo.

(1) He has been reproached for having omitted some of them, and Casaubon in particular. *See* Ancillon, *Mêlange de Litterat.* tom 2. pag. 95.

(a) Named *John Colomiés*: he had a fine Library.

He was of Rochelle, and the ſon of a good Phyſician (*a*). Among the learned men whom he frequented, there was none with whom he had a greater intimacy than Iſaac Voſſius; and I believe that if he retired betimes to England, and before the Proteſtants of France felt the moſt furious ſhocks of the ſtorm which ſwallowed up the Edict of Nantes, it was becauſe Iſaac Voſſius was become a Canon of Windſor. The praiſes he has beſtowed on that learned man expoſed him to an inſult which he bore with the utmoſt good temper [*B*]. He was not long in England before he ſhewed his diſlike of the Preſbyterian party, and his inclination to the Epiſcopal Communion. The ſmall Collection of certain ſelect paſſages, which he intitled *Theologorum Preſbyterianorum Icon*, procured him a great many enemies. He was doubtleſs to blame for publiſhing that little Book; and there was even a great deal of imprudence in writing againſt people, a part of whoſe character he made ſo impatient, ſo ſuſpicious, and ſo obſtinate a humour. Should not this have obliged him not to ſay any thing which might expoſe him to their anger? The beſt way to refute him was to ſay nothing; for ſo extraordinary a patience would have convinced the whole world that they were not at all like the picture which he had drawn of them. And indeed it muſt be acknowledged, to the glory of thoſe Gentlemen, that they deſpiſed the inſult; but as it is hard, among ſuch a body of men, that not one ſhould get looſe, there happened to be a Preſbyterian Miniſter in Holland who wrote ſo violent an Invective againſt poor Mr. Colomiés (*b*), that if we were to judge of a whole party by the imperfections of a particular perſon, no more would be wanting to make us conclude that the *Icon Theologorum Preſbyterianorum* was drawn from the life. The Author of the *Icon* ſwallowed the affront without ſaying a word: not but that he might very eaſily have repelled the outrages of his Adverſary [*C*]; but probably he was afraid of making his condition

(*b*) See *l'Eſprit de Monſ. Arnaud*, tom. 2. pag. 297, &c.

24mo. *Obſervationes ſacræ*, with a *Letter* which the Author wrote *to Monſr. Claude concerning the French Verſion of the Geneva Bibles*; at Amſterdam, 1679, in 12mo (4). *Theologorum Preſbyterianorum Icon, ex Proteſtantium ſcriptis ad vivum expreſſa*, and *A Parallel between the practice of the ancient Church and that of the Proteſtants of France in the exerciſe of their Religion*, 1682, in 12mo. *Bibliotheque Choiſie*, at Rochelle, 1682, in 8vo. It was reprinted at Amſterdam 1669 with additions. *Ad Gulielmi Cave Canonici Windeſorienſis Chartophylacem Eccleſiaſticum Paralipomena*, Londini, 1686, in 8vo. A *Letter to Mr. Juſtel*, concerning Father Simon's Critical Hiſtory. This Letter was printed at London, in the year 1686, in 4to, with a Book of Iſaac Voſſius's (5). As Mr. Colomiés took extraordinary pains to collect the Letters of illuſtrious men, he publiſhed ſeveral of them at London, in the year 1687, in 8vo, which he joined to the two Epiſtles of St. Clement, &c. The title of the volume at length is *S. Clementis Epiſtolæ duæ ad Corinthios, Interpretibus* Patricio Junio, Gottifredo Vendelino, & Joh. Bapt. Cotelerio. *Recenſuit & Notarum Spicilegium adjecit* Paulus Colomeſius *Bibliothecæ Lambethanæ Curator. Accedit* Thomæ Brunonis *Canonici Windeſorienſis Diſſertatio de Therapeutis Philonis. His ſubnexæ ſunt Epiſtolæ aliquot ſingulares vel nunc primum editæ, vel non ita facile obviæ.* The ſame year he publiſhed ſome Letters of the Queen of Sweden (6), and in 1690 a Collection of Voſſius's Letters, *in folio*. He conſtantly regulated himſelf by this maxim of Callimachus, *That a great volume is always a great evil:* all the Books he has compoſed are of a very ſmall ſize, whereupon Mr. Baillet has made the following reflection (7): *The Author of* l'Eſprit de M. A. ſays he, *thought he could not put a greater affront on Monſr. Colomiés his brother Proteſtant, than by pretending to deſpiſe him, and rallying him very coldly about his little books of a few ſheets. He calls him* the great Author of little Books, *adding that a volume of a ſingle ſheet was enough to make him rank himſelf among Authors of the firſt and ſecond ſize.*

(4) See in the 13th volume of the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*, pag. 337, an Extract of this Book under the Title of *Pauli Colomeſii Obſervationes ſacræ, Editio ſecunda auctior & emendatior. Accedunt ejuſdem Paralipomena de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis, & Paſſio S. Victoris Maſſilienſis ab eodem emendata, Editio IV & ultima, prioribus longe auctior & emendatior.* Londini, 1689, in 12mo, pag. 34.

(5) It is the *Appendix Obſervationum ad Pomponium Melam. Accedit ad tertias P. Simonii Objectiones Reſponſio.*

(6) The *Bibliotheque Univerſelle* informs me of this, tom. 13. pag. 356.

(7) *Jugem. des Savans*, tom. 1. pag. 448.

[*B*] *The praiſes he has beſtowed on Voſſius expoſed him to an inſult which he bore with the utmoſt good temper.*] "I ſhall not however be determined by "the judgment of Mr. Colomiés, who may be ſaid "to be an Author of juſt price, and retained by Mr. "Voſſius to write little books, in which he ſpeaks "ſcarce of any thing elſe but the *great Voſſius* (8)." Mr. Colomiés, after he had read this, was not the leſs diſpoſed to commend Father Simon in a Letter which he wrote to Mr. Juſtel. Let us hear what a Journaliſt ſays on this occaſion (9). *The Letter of Mr. Colomiés . . . . contains very curious Remarks on ſome paſſages of Father Simon's* Critical Hiſtory, *and has nothing in it but what beſpeaks a man of great moderation; tho' Mr. Colomiés was not ignorant that Father Simon is the Author of the Preface and Notes which have appeared in the new Edition of his* Critical Hiſtory.

(8) Preface to the new Edition of the *Critical Hiſtory of the Old Teſtament.*

(9) *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for the month of May 1686, pag. 595 of the 2d edition.

[*C*] *A Preſbyterian Miniſter wrote a violent invective againſt him. . . . He might very eaſily have repelled the outrages of his adverſary.*] I have already blamed Mr. Colomiés for having publiſhed this *Icon*. He would have done better to have let the paſſages he has collected remain ſcattered up and down; and beſides he choſe a very ill time to do it in. *The weak places of the land* ought not to have been expoſed on ſuch an occaſion: ſo that if the Author of *l'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud* had contented himſelf with reproaching him on that head, and refuting him as to the main point, without going into perſonal reflections, he would have deſerved commendation; but having given a looſe to his paſſion, like one in a violent fit of madneſs, he has made himſelf inexcuſable, and hurt his cauſe. His diſputation diverts the readers with a kind of theatrical entertainment; but whereas, when we go to the play, we firſt hear the high-raiſed paſſions of the tragic part, and afterwards the drollery of the comic; here, on the contrary, we find the airs of a buffoon, before we meet with tranſports of anger, and ſerious invective. The paſſages wherein the Author has endeavoured to rally are ſo ridiculous, that he might have been irretrievably mortified on that head, had Mr. Colomiés attacked him with the leaſt vigour. I do not deſire my word ſhould be taken, and therefore produce the proofs to juſtify what I ſay.

I. Mr. Colomiés prefixed his name to his Work, PER PAULUM COLOMESIUM *Rupellenſem.* Upon this the Author of *l'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud* makes a jeſt as cold as ice. *It is eaſily ſeen by the grandeur of the name of this great man, that heaven deſtined him to be an Author. For among all the Ancients and Moderns no name can be found ſo fit to make a figure at the head of a work, or in the title-page of a book* (10). . . . *It muſt be allowed that this fills the mouth and the eyes; and tho' a man had nothing elſe to ſhew the public, he would deſerve however to appear in print* (11). This ſeems to come from a man who, for fear he ſhould be too brief, cannot prevail on himſelf to diſmiſs any thought which offers. Perhaps it would be better to ſay that this ſhews a great want of diſcernment, and a quite dull taſte with regard to raillery. However it be, a man cannot ſhew his ill taſte better, than by pretending to find one grain of wit in this paſſage; and were I to anſwer ſo ſorry a piece of banter, I ſhould take no other method than very gravely to open the firſt Books which came to hand in a Library; and I ſhould have very ill luck if I did not ſoon find names full as proper *to fill the mouth and the eyes*, as that of *Paulus Colomeſius Rupellenſis*. I ſhould find ſuch yet more eaſily among thoſe perſons who have no learning at all; after which, preſerving a very ſerious air, I would thus addreſs my Adverſary: *You ſay that among all the ancients and moderns*

(10) The Author inſerts here in three lines, and in large characters, *per Paulum Colomeſium Rupellenſem.* This laſt word is in ſmall Characters in the Title page of the *Icon.*

(11) *Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud*, tom. 2. pag. 298, 299.

condition worſe by a Reply [*D*]. He acted as the other perſons did who had been abuſed in the ſame Book; he held his peace and imitated their patience, which was moſt certainly a miſtaken and an ill-timed virtue [*E*]. I have heard ſay, I. That when the French Church, of which Mr. Allix was Miniſter, was firſt eſtabliſhed at London, Mr. Colomiés

moderns no name can be found ſo fit to make a fine figure at the head of a Work . . . ; and tho' a man had nothing elſe to ſhew the public he would deſerve however to appear in print. You would not talk in this manner, if you were acquainted with many Authors, and it very plainly appears that neither the ancients nor the moderns have been much the objects of your ſight or meditation. Go and lament the fate of an infinite number of peaſants, who ſet not their names at the head of any Work, tho' they deſerve to appear in print; tho' they deſerve it, I ſay, becauſe they are compoſed of ſeveral letters. This is your principle. Thoſe who rally well never found their raillery on a fact which is evidently falſe; they never turn an Author to ridicule on account of things which are common to him with illuſtrious men, and have nothing peculiar with regard to him. Now, pray, do *David Blondellus Catalaunenſis, Dionyſius Petavius Aurelianenſis, Dionyſius Lambinus Monſtrolienſis*, and a hundred other names I could produce, give leſs handle for banter than *Paulus Colomeſius Rupellenſis?*

II. The railleries which the Author founds on Mr. Colomiés having taken the ſurname of *Rupellenſis* are not a whit better. To make a jeſt a good one, he who is jeſted on muſt deſerve it: but this is what cannot be ſaid of a man who only follows the cuſtom. When we rally a man on account of his dreſs, we make our ſelves very ridiculous, unleſs there be ſomething in that dreſs which tranſgreſſes the common rules and the faſhion. Therefore to make the banter thrown at the word *Rupellenſis* good, it muſt not have been the ordinary practice of Authors, who write in Latin, to add the name of the town they were born in to that of their family; but it is certain that this is their practice, and conſequently Mr. Colomiés has only followed an eſtabliſhed cuſtom (12). Let us conclude that the whole raillery falls back on its Author, and renders him ſuſpected of being a ſtranger in the Republic of Letters.

III. We are now coming to the dulleſt of all his jeſts. After having ſet down the names and ſurnames of his adverſary in capitals, he compares them with others. AURELIUS AUGUSTINUS HIPPONENSIS, ſays he (13), & SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS CLAROMONTANUS (14), *come not near them. I hope poſterity, who will not know Mr. Colomiés ſo well as we do, will be perſuaded that* RUPELLENSIS *ſignifies the Biſhop of Rochelle, as the* HIPPONENSIS *of St. Auguſtin ſignifies the Biſhop of Hippo.* A piece of raillery muſt needs be a very wretched one, when it is ſupported by an abſurd foundation, and when it is more injurious to thoſe who are not intended to be rallied, than to thoſe who are. Such is the character of this. Nothing is more repugnant to probability, than to ſay that the epithet RUPELLENSIS may one day ſignify *the Biſhop of Rochelle*, and it is doing a very great wrong to our poſterity to believe them capable of ſo groſs a blunder. Readers in future ages muſt be a hundred times more barbarous than they were three or four Centuries ago, if they could imagine what the Author of *l'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud* hopes they will imagine. It will be told me, that he does not hope it, but makes uſe of an irony. I know it well enough; but ſtill he ought to have made his pretended and ironical hopes refer to a probable event. Otherwiſe it would be a witty piece of raillery on a Cit who ſets up for a Gentleman, to tell him, *You have had your picture drawn with a ſword by your ſide; I hope our deſcendants will take you for a Duke and Peer.* But it may be farther anſwered me in behalf of our ſorry jeſter, that ſince the *Hipponenſis* of St. Auguſtin ſignifies the Biſhop of Hippo, the *Rupellenſis* may very well ſignify the Biſhop of Rochelle. The conſequence I agree may be granted: but the principle from which it is drawn is falſe and abſurd; for the term *Epiſcopi* is perpetually joined with that of *Hipponenſis* in the title-page of S. Auguſtin, and that Father is taken for the Biſhop of Hippo not by virtue of the word *Hipponenſis*, but ſolely by virtue of the other word (15). The multiplication of Biſhops would be terribly to be feared in future ages, if our cenſurer's raillery may paſs for good; for, as I have ſaid before, it is a very common practice with Authors who write in Latin to add the name of their country in the titles of their Books. The Reformers have not neglected this cuſtom (16). A Profeſſor of Leyden very well known to our banterer, has conformed thereto (17), and the title of his Works is proper enough to fill the mouth and the eyes.

Was I not in the right to ſay that Mr. Colomiés might eaſily have confounded his adverſary as to matter of raillery? Might he not have ridiculed him as a man who affected to to be ſurprized and amazed at very common things (18), which is ſcarce to be pardoned in half ſcholars?

It would have been full as eaſy for him to confound his Antagoniſt as to another point more conſiderable than raillery is. He was accuſed of being the penſioner of Iſaac Voſſius, and his paraſite. *This note was due to the great Iſaac to pay him for the board and lodging which he provides for Mr.* Paulus Colomeſius Rupellenſis; *for it is with him that our Author lives. We need not wonder that Mr. Colomiés is a little attached to the party of the Canons, who live quietly and at eaſe on the fat of God's houſe, ſince he gathers up the crums which fall from their table, and is an inhabitant of the land which flows with milk and honey* . . (19). *It is a baſe piece of complaiſance to ſacrifice his brethren to the paſſion of thoſe who afford him a meal's meat* . . . . . (20). *What religion this man is of I know not, only thus much I ſee for certain, that he is of the Paraſites religion, always for him who gives moſt* (21). This Satire, ſo diſobliging to the Epiſcopal Clergy on the one hand, and ſo mortifying to Colomiés on the other, might eaſily have been refuted. Mr. Juſtel, about that time, wrote a Letter which I have read, wherein he ſaid it was very wrong to call Mr. Colomiés a Paraſite, whoſe behaviour and manner of ſubſiſting in England fully confuted this whole Accuſation of *l'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud.*

[*D*] . . . . *But probably he was afraid of making his condition worſe by a Reply.*] I never heard there were any ill reports abroad againſt the honour of Paul Colomiés, or againſt that of his parents; but after all, where are the people, whoſe youth and family are free from all blemiſh, little or great, or who may not fear the injurious Memoirs of an enemy? I imagine Colomiés conſidered that if he irritated the Author of *l'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud* any farther, he might oblige him to write for Memoirs to Rochelle, from whence he might be furniſhed with ſome for the ſake of defaming a man who had endeavoured to render the Preſbyterian Religion odious to all Europe. He held his peace therefore, that he might not expoſe himſelf afreſh to the teeth of ſo dangerous an enemy. See what has been ſaid above (22).

[*E*] *He held his peace . . . which was a miſtaken and an ill-timed virtue.*] Clemency, that ſo amiable, ſo uſeful, ſo neceſſary, and ſo divine a virtue, becomes pernicious on certain occaſions. There are evils which require the rigour of an exemplary chaſtiſement: to uſe gentleneſs then becomes unſeaſonable, and opens the door to new miſchiefs. If this be true in political States, it is ſo likewiſe in the Republic of Letters. Authors who dare to publiſh ſuch Books as *l'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud* deſerve no mercy: they cannot be left unpuniſhed without expoſing peoples reputation to plunder. It is againſt ſuch Authors that Boccalini ought to have feigned that Apollo, holding his grand Seſſions, and ſitting on his bed of Juſtice, ſummons the Ban and Arriere-ban, or whole forces, of Parnaſſus. He ſhould at leaſt have feigned that Apollo ſends out againſt them the Prætorian Guards, or rather the Band of German Poets, with orders to apprehend and commit them to priſon (23). This is neceſſary for the ſecurity of the highways in the Republic of Letters. And yet among ſo many people who have been abuſed in *l'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud*, there has not been one who has

(12) I produce no proofs of this, becauſe the thing is too evident.

(13) *L'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud*, tom. 2. pag. 299.

(14) *It is unfair dealing to give the names of this Biſhop of Auvergne in this manner. It is curtailing of them, that they may not ſurpaſs thoſe of Colomiés. They ought to have been written thus:* CAIUS SOLLIUS APOLLINARIS SIDONIUS ARVERNORUM EPISCOPUS. *Very few Authors ſay* CLAROMONTANUS EPISCOPUS.

(15) The Author of *la Cabale Chimerique* repreſented this to the Author of *l'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud*, in the year 1691, in pag. 186, and 187. of the Preface to *la Chimére démontrée.*

(16) *Theodori Bezæ Vezelii Volumen primum Tractationum Theologicarum.* This is the Title prefixed to the Works of *Theodore Beza.*

(17) ANDREÆ RIVETI PICTAVI SAMMAXENTINI SS. THEOLOGIÆ DOCTORIS, & SACRARUM LITERARUM . . . PROFESSORIS Opera.

(18) The ſame Author has been often reproached with this fault in the Writings concerning the *Chimerical Cabal of Rotterdam.*

(19) *Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud*, tom. 2. pag. 302.

(20) Ibid. pag. 303.

(21) Ibid. pag. 304.

(22) Remark [*G*] of the Article ARNAULD, Doctor of the Sorbonne.

(23) *See* Mr. Baillet, *Jugem. ſur les Poetes*, tom. 4. pag. 9, citing the 28th *Advice* of the 1ſt Century of *Boccalini.*

Colomiés was made Reader there (c). This was a Church which conformed to the Epiſcopal Ritual. II. That having loſt the place he enjoyed in the family of the Archbiſhop of Canterbury (d), when that Archbiſhop, who obſtinately refuſed to take the oaths to King William and Queen Mary, was deprived of his temporalities in the year 1691, he grew melancholy and fell into a diſtemper of which he died ſoon after: unworthily deſerving to increaſe the *Appendix* of Pierius Valerianus *de Infelicitate Literatorum*. A Liſt of his Works may be ſeen in the firſt Remark. If any think I have ſpoken too well of him, I refer them to Writers more difficult than my ſelf, who have given him much greater commendations [F].

(c) He is called a Prieſt of the Church of England in the 13th Volume of the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*, pag. 338.

(d) It was that of Librarian: *Bibliothecæ Lambethanæ Curator.*

Finding himſelf ill at Lambeth, he came to London, where he died the 13th of January 1692 [G]. It was diſcovered, before he was interred, that he had contracted a marriage of conſcience with a girl of mean condition. He left her a Legacy of thirty pounds ſterling, which recovered her from the affliction ſhe had expreſſed with extraordinary lamentations the day of his funeral. A great many people ſuſpected he died a Socinian.

(e) See the *Mercure Galant* of July 1702, pag. 17.

He has been called a great man by a Writer who obſerves that *it has been ſaid, with as much truth as wit, that he was the great Author of little Books* (e). This is doing him honour by an expreſſion which was intended only to ridicule him (f).

(f) See above, Citation (7).

has opened his mouth; for a Letter which appears ten years after, or a few words inſerted in another Work, ought to go for nothing. That was the time to have cried out: thoſe who had received wounds ſhould have done it; and thoſe who had received none, ſhould have ſerved them as ſeconds in favour of the general intereſt; even the aſſiſtance of the Laws ought to have been implored: ſuch was the practice of Antiquity (24). Impunity has ſerved only to increaſe this Writer's boldneſs; and without doubt, if the Spons, the Allix's, and the Merlats, to ſay nothing of ſo many others who have imitated their patience, had vigorouſly repelled the inſults of this man, he would never have puſhed his Satires ſo far as to attempt the life of his Collegues, by accuſing them of having entred into a Cabal, of which he makes whomever he pleaſes a member. If thoſe who have had ſo much patience dreaded him as an Author, they have been greatly deceived; for nothing has been more eaſy than to reduce him to ſilence. The very firſt time they wrote againſt him on the ſubject of the Cabal, they humbled him to that degree that he ſaw himſelf conſtrained to petition the Magiſtrates that he might be permitted to write, and his Adverſary be forbidden to reply (25). But of this I ſhall ſpeak more amply in ſome other Article (26).

(24) *Doluere cruento Dente laceſſiti, fuit intactis quoque cura Conditione ſuper communi: quin etiam lex Pœnaque lata malo quæ nollet carmine quenquam Deſcribi.* Horat. Epiſt. 1. lib. 2. ver. 154.

(25) See the Preface to the *Chimere démontrée*, pag. 65.

(26) In the Remark [E] on the Article TAVERNIER.

[F] *Writers more difficult than my ſelf . . . have given him much greater commendations.*] It would be wrong in me to compare my ſelf to Mr. Baillet: I willingly, and with very good reaſon, yield the right of Cenſure to him. If he judges more freely than I, and if I ſhew more indulgence than he, it is becauſe I do not know ſo certainly as he does what is good, or what is beſt, the great defects, or the ſmall faults. He ſhall be my Witneſs in this Remark; he, I ſay, who has highly praiſed Colomiés, as will be ſeen by what follows. *It is doing juſtice to this Author to allow him to be one of the moſt intelligent perſons at this day in the knowledge of Books. It even appears that his principal talent lies in diſcerning of good Books from bad ones, and whatever is rare and curious in polite Literature; and as moſt of his Books are only critical Pieces, I am obliged in gratitude to acknowledge that ſeveral of his Works have been of very great ſervice to me* (27). Speaking, in another place (28) of his *Gallia Orientalis*, he ſays, *Theſe are excellent materials collected with abundance of care, which may be of very great uſe to thoſe who ſhall undertake to compile an Univerſal Library of the Writers of France* (28).

(27) *Jugem. des Savans*, tom. 2, num. 66. pag. 32.

(28) Ibid. num. 137. pag. 170.

(29) Add hereto the Elogies which are given him in the *Journal des Savans*.

[G] *He died at London, the 13th of January 1692.*] That is, New Style: for the Regiſter of St. Martin's Church, in the Churchyard of which he was buried, makes the funeral to have been on the 5th of January 1691. It is well known that in England the year begins, with reſpect to the dates of all public Records, on the 25th of March. So that the 5th of Jan. 1691, according to the Regiſter of St. Martin's Pariſh, is the 15th of Jan. 1692, according to the ſtyle of Holland. But as the dead are uſually buried at London two days after their deceaſe, I have conſequently made uſe of the date ſpecified above. I ſhould not have known this ſo preciſely, if Mr. de la Roque, a French Miniſter at London (30), had not taken the trouble to inform me of it.

(30) His capacity appears from the *Sermon on the Peace*, which he preached at London the 23d of September 1697, and was printed in the ſame City ſoon after.

COLONNA (POMPEY) Cardinal, Archbiſhop of Montreal in Sicily, and Biſhop of a very great number of places [A], made a conſpicuous figure in the world, with a great mixture of good and evil. He was equally qualified to wear the Cardinal's Hat and the Helmet; and he experienced more than once the reverſes of ill, and the return of good fortune. Julius II removed him from all his dignities; but Leo X reſtored him to them, created him Cardinal, and ſent him on ſeveral embaſſies. Clement VII diveſted him of the Purple, and afterwards reſtored him to it. It is pretended that he was obliged to him for his exaltation to the Papal Throne, and that he would not acknowledge this favour, by granting him all he aſked. The anſwer which it is ſuppoſed that Pope made him, deſerves to be cited [B]. Pompey Colonna died Viceroy of Naples anno 1532, and was buried without pomp, or even ſo much as an epitaph, in the Convent of the Monks of Mount Olivet. He wrote ſome Poems, in which he deſcribes the charms and beauty of Iſabella Filamarini, conſort to the Prince of Salerno. He declared himſelf to be her humble ſervant, but proteſted that he never had formed any looſe wiſhes with regard to that virtuous Princeſs. Poſſibly this is one of thoſe poetical proteſtations, to which no more regard ought to be had than to the falſe oaths of lovers. He compoſed another

[A] *Biſhop of a very great number of places.*] Here follow his titles from Oldoini and from Mandoſi: *Archiepiſcopus Montis Regalis in Sicilia, & Roſſanenſis, Epiſcopus Reatinus, Sarſinenſis, Interamnenſis, Acerrenſis, Aquilanus, Polentinus, Averſanus, Montis Marrani, & Catanenſis.* i. e. "Archbiſhop of Mount Royal "in Sicily and of Roſſa; Biſhop of Piete, Sarſina, Te"ronium, Accerra, Aquila, Polentia (Palanza) Aver"Mount Marno and Catana."

[B] *The anſwer . . . that Pope made him, deſerves to be cited.*] "Cardinal Pompey Colonna, (ſays my "Author) having raiſed Clement VII to the Holy See, "in oppoſition to Cardinal Franciotto Orſini, obtained "ſeveral favours from that Pope; but imagining that "he would be indulged in all he aſked for, he one "day requeſted ſomething which his Holineſs thought "unjuſt, and therefore could not in honour grant. "So that Colonna provoked at the denial reproached

another work of a more ſerious kind, and more honourable to the fair-ſex, *de Laudibus Mulierum* [C]; and he devoted it chiefly to the glory of Victoria Colonna his relation. This article might have been made longer, but I was not willing to repeat what any one may find in Moreri.

" the Pope, ſaying, that it was by his intereſt he had " attained the Papal throne. His Holineſs owned " this to be true; but at the ſame time he deſired Co- " louna to let him be Pope, and not endeavour to be " ſo himſelf; ſince by acting as he did, he endeavoured " to diſpoſſeſs him of that to which he had been " raiſed by his means (1).

[C] *He compoſed another work . . . more honourable to the fair ſex* de Laudibus Mulierum.] The manuſcript is in the French King's Library, if Father Oldoini may be credited (2). See Profper Mandoſius's *Bibliotheca Romana*.

(1) *Meynier, Reponſes libres aux Demandes curieuſes*, pag. 279, 280.

(2) *In Athenæo Romano.*

COLONNA (VICTORIA) a learned and illuſtrious Lady. See VICTORIA COLONNA.

COLUMNA or COLONNA (JOHN) a native of Rome and a Dominican, was raiſed to the Archiepiſcopal See of Meſſina (*a*), and appointed Legate and Governor of Taurominium by Alexander IV, anno 1255 (*b*). It is therefore an error to place him after 1325 (*c*), or under the year 1313 (*d*). He wrote a Chronicle which he entitled *Mare Hiſtoriarum*, i. e. *The Sea of Hiſtories* [A], and which extended from Adam to 1250 (*e*). Antonini, Archbiſhop of Florence, has quoted it ſometimes. Poſſevinus ſpeaks of one JAMES COLUMNA, a Dominican and an Hiſtorian; and pretends that the Archbiſhop of Florence in queſtion, has copied him in ſeveral places, which Voſſius does not believe [B]. We

(*a*) Leand. Albert. lib. 3. *de Viris illuſt. Ord. Prædic. apud* Voſſium, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 480.

(*b*) Thomas Fazellus, lib. 8. *Decadis Poſter.* Rerum Sicular. *apud eund. ibid.*

(*c*) As John Rioche does, *apud* Voſſium, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 480.

(*d*) As Philip. Bergamenſ. does, lib. 13. *Supplem. Chronic. apud eund. ibid.*

(*e*) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1255, num. 10.

[A] *He wrote a Chronicle which is entitled,* Mare Hiſtoriarum.] There is an error in the following words of Gaultier the Jeſuit. *Johannes de Columna; author Matris Hiſtoriarum* (1). He expreſſes himſelf thus in his table of the XIVth Century, which ſhews that he did not very well know the age when our Columna lived. His French Tranſlator did not ſuſpect that *Matris* was printed inſtead of *Maris*, and therefore he rendered it thus; *Author of the Mother of Hiſtories.* Father Gualtier has copied both theſe miſtakes from Genebrard. *Joannes de Columna auctor Libri, cujus titulus eſt Mater Hiſtoriarum* (2), i. e. " John of " Columna Author of a Book entitled the Mother of " Hiſtories." This Work was tranſlated into French, in the Reign of Charles VIII. The Tranſlator tells us, that he has added to it whatever relates to the Kings of France; and that he formed this deſign, becauſe he had carried on his verſion to the foundation of the French Monarchy, when Charles VIII aſcended the Throne. He ſtiles himſelf a *Frenchman, a native of Beauvoiſin.* He adds, that he was confirmed in his reſolution, *by the virtuous exhortations and eminent reaſons of the noble Andrew de la Haye, Lord of Chaumont, Receiver of the Court of Aids, and payments for the Forces, and of the towns and election of Sans.* I here tranſcribe from the *Lyons* Edition, *printed for John du Pré*, anno 1496 in 2 Volumes, folio, which extends to the death of Lewis XI in 1483. I have ſeen a copy of it that had belonged to a Canon of Antwerp (3). Some perſon had writ the following words in it; *Borchardus auctor hujus operis, ut patet ex* 120 *capite hujus voluminis, folio* 702. i. e. " Bor- " chard is Author of this Work, as appears from the " 120th chapter of this volume, pag. 702." And indeed we find the following words in the page, in queſtion: *And in as much as I Borchard Doctor and Profeſſor of Holy Divinity, being deſirous to gratify the deſire of thoſe who croſs the ſeas out of pure zeal and devotion, to viſit the Holy Land; which I myſelf have gone thro' ſeveral times on foot; and deſcribed it according to the beſt of my abilities, without omitting or adding one ſingle particular, except what I myſelf ſaw on the ſpot, or on the mountains, whence I could view and contemplate thoſe Holy Places.* But this proves only that either the Tranſlator, or ſome Continuator has inſerted in this ſea of Hiſtories, the deſcription which Bonaventure Brocard made of the Holy Land, whither he travelled about the year 1280 (4). Several other particulars have been introduced into it (5), and the order and diſpoſition of the Hiſtory has been changed. John Columna divided this Work into ten Books (6); but in the French tranſlation, it is divided into ſix ages, each of which includes ſeveral Chapters. Andrew du Cheſne, who does not take notice of the Edition I here make uſe of, mentions three others. *The great Sea and Flower of Hiſtories*, ſays he (7), *printed in the beginning of the reign of Charles the VIIIth, King of France, in two Volumes in Folio; and afterwards carried on to the year* 1543. *Printed at Paris, for Am- broſe Girault. And laſtly, augmented with a third Book, down to MDLI, by John le Gendre Aurelianois, Folio.*

(1) Gualter, *Tabul. Chron.* pag. m. 799.

(2) Genebrard, *Chronogr.* lib. 4. *circa ann.* 1327.

(3) Called *William Van Hamme.*

(4) And not in 1533, as *La Croix du Maine* aſſerts, pag. 36.

(5) Sammarthani, *ſub* 75. *Epiſc. Conſtant. Normann. allegant Vitam Caroli VII Reg. Franc. per Joannem Quadrigarium Monachum S. Dionyſii lib.* 4. *Matis Hiſt. & in Patriarchio Bituricenſi, cap.* 16. *allegatur Joannis du Cortils, Mare Hiſtoriarum, capitulum* 24. § 3. *libri primi de origine Francorum.* Sandius, *Animadv. in Voſſium de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 170, 171.

(6) Trithem. *de Scriptor. Eccleſ.* pag. 226. Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 480.

(7) Du Cheſne, *Biblioth. des Hiſt. de France*, pag. m. 57.

This Sea of Hiſtories has been cited by a numberleſs multitude of Authors, and particularly by John Couſin (8), who eſteemed it very much.

(8) In his *Hiſtoire de Tournai.*

Voſſius obſerves, that an anonymous Author, who writ in Italy, in 1381, a Treatiſe *de Hierarchia ſubcœleſti*, has ranked John Columna among thoſe who have writ the Hiſtory of the Popes (9). This however does not neceſſarily imply, that he compoſed a Book profeſſedly on the ſubject in queſtion; it might only ſignify what he has introduced, concerning the Popes, in his *Mare Hiſtoriarum.* He had publiſhed a volume of Letters (10), it is alſo ſaid that he compoſed a Treatiſe *de Viris Illuſtribus & Chriſtianis* (11). Had he written a particular hiſtory of the Popes, I am perſuaded Volaterranus would not have omitted him in his Catalogue (12), in which he gives a place to LANDULFUS COLUMNA, who dedicated his Work to Pope John the XXIId.

(9) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Latin.* pag. 481.

(10) Trithem. *de Script. Eccleſ.* pag. 226. See the *Bibliotheque de Geſner*, folio 408 *verſo.*

(11) Sandius, *Animadv. in Voſſium de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 172.

(12) Volater. lib. 22. *initio.*

[B] *Poſſevinus ſpeaks of one James Columna . . . . and pretends that the Archbiſhop of Florence in queſtion has copied him . . . . which Voſſius does not believe.*] Here follows Voſſius's words, *Poſſevinus diverſa facit,* Joannem & Jacobum, Columnas, *utrumque Ord. Præd. utrumque Hiſtoricum*: atque addit, B. Antoninum *plura ex Jacobo derivaſſe in Hiſtoriam ſuam. Puto falli ſane Antoninus Joannem Columnam teſtem advocat, cum alibi, tum* Tit. XIX, *Cap.* I, *ubi Sermo, ei de Innocentio III, qui prius Lotharius vocabatur. At Jacobum Columnam Hiſtoricum, quantum meminiſſe poſſum plane neſcit; nec fuiſſe ejus nominis Hiſtoricum cenſeo* (13). i. e. " Poſſevinus makes two Columna's, John and " James, both Dominicans and both his hiſtorical " Writers: and adds, that Antoninus tranſcribed into " his Hiſtory many particulars from James. But I " believe he is miſtaken, for Antoninus cites the teſti- " mony of John Columna on ſeveral occaſions, and " particularly in Title XIX, Chap. I, where he treats " of Innocent III, who before was called Lotharius. " But he knew no ſuch Hiſtorian, if my memory " deceives me not, as James Columna; nor do I be- " lieve there was any Hiſtorical Writer of that name." Sandius objects to him, that Nauclerus has related ſome particulars on the teſtimony of James de Columna (14). He might have added, to confirm his criticiſm, that the incident for which Nauclerus cites James Columna, is not found in the *Mare Hiſtoriarum* (15); and it is to be obſerved, that ſeveral Authors have ſpoken of this James. JACOBUS COLUMNA. *Ordinis Sancti Dominici Hiſtoricus eruditus, quem pluries citat Sanctus Antoninus in ſuis Hiſtoriis. Scriptis mandavit* Chronicon à creatione Mundi, uſque ad ſua tempora 1340. *Eſt Jacobi mentio apud Luſitanum, Plodium, Fernandez, Fontanam de Romana Provincia, & Ambroſium de Altamura in Bibliotheca Ordinis Prædicatorum* (16). i. e. " James Columna, a Dominican Friar and learned Hi- " ſtorian, whom St. Antoninus cites often in his Hiſ- " tory

(13) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 480.

(14) Sandius, *Animadv. in Voſſium de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 172.

(15) The thing is this, viz. that Nicholas Biſhop of Myrra gave Arius a box of the ear in the Council of Nice. *See* Nauclerus vol. 2. Generat. 11. pag. m. 469.

(16) Proſper Mandoſius, *Biblioth. Romanæ* Cent. 1. num. 2. pag. 14, 15.

We ſhall take notice of a ſmall miſtake of Andrew Rivetus (*f*).

(*f*) At the cloſe of the Rem. [*B*].

" tory, He wrote a *Chronicle, from the creation of* " *the world to his own time*, viz. the year 1340. This " James is mentioned by Luſitanus, Plodius, Fernan- " dez, Fontana concerning the Roman Provinces, and " Ambroſius Altamara, in his *Bibliotheca Ordinis Præ-* " *dicatorum*." Theſe are the words of Proſper Mandoſius, who omitted our John Columna in his firſt five Centuries *Bibliothecæ Romanæ*.

Here follows a ſmall ſpecimen of the diſpute concerning Pope Joan. Du Pleſſis having cited Antoninus, who relates the ſtory of this female Pope, Coeffeteau charged him with diſguiſing the paſſage, and ſuppreſſing the following reſtriction, *If what is aſſerted, and which Martinus relates be true. It is alſo added that a marble ſtatue hat been erected, to perpetuate this incident; but Vincent de Beauvais, and John Columna do not mention it* (17). Rivet in his anſwer to Coeffeteau, employed the following words: *With regard to the ſetting up of the Marble Satue, and* Antonius *oppoſes to the generality of thoſe who take notice of it, Vincent de Beauvais and John Coſumna who do not ſpeak of it. But this circumſtance ſhews, that they mention the other particulars* (18). Rivet is in an error, for neither of thoſe Authors make the leaſt mention of this female Pope; and conſequently Antoninus did not mean, that they had only omitted thoſe particulars which relate to the ſtatue. He ſhould have conſulted them before he gave his opinion concerning the meaning of Antoninus's ambiguous expreſſions.

(17) Coeffet. *Reponſe au Myſtere de Iniquité*, pag. 508.

(18) Rivet, *Remarq. ſur la Rep. au Myſt. d'Iniquit.* Part 1. pag. 594.

COMANA. There were chiefly two Cities ſo called, the one in Cappadocia (*a*), and the other in the Kingdom of Pontus (*b*). Both were dedicated to Bellona, and obſerved very near the ſame ceremonies in the worſhip of that Goddeſs. The one had been copied from the other, viz. that of Pontus from the other of Cappadocia (*c*); and it was in the latter that Oreſtes eſtabliſhed this worſhip (*d*) [*A*]. In each of theſe Cities, the temple of the Goddeſs, endowed with a great many lands, was ſerved by a great number of Prieſts and others, under the authority of a High Prieſt, who was in very great credit, and had in ſuch veneration, that he was next in dignity to the King [*B*]. His office was for life (*e*). Several Dictionaries and other books aſcribe to Strabo the following aſſertion, viz. that, in his time, there were upwards of ſix thouſand perſons devoted to the ſervice of Bellona at Comana in Cappadocia; and that theſe perſons uſed to fight and wound one another

(*a*) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 359; and lib. 12. pag. 369.

(*b*) Idem, lib. 12. pag. 383.

(*c*) Idem, ibid.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 369.

(*e*) Ibid. pag. 370.

[*A*] *It was in the latter that Oreſtes eſtabliſhed this worſhip.*] Τὰ δ' ἱερὰ ταῦτα δοκεῖ Ὀρέστης μετὰ τῆς ἀδελφῆς Ἰφιγενείας κομίσαι δεῦρο ἀπὸ τῆς Ταυρικῆς Σκυθίας τὰ τῆς Ταυροπόλου Ἀρτέμιδος. These words of Strabo (1) ſignify that, *it is thought Oreſtes and his ſiſter Iphigenia, brought thither this Religion from Scythia Taurica; and that this was the worſhip which was paid to Diana Tauropolos.* He adds, that Oreſtes who had let his hair grow in token of mourning, left them on this very ſpot of Cappadocia, which for that reaſon was called Comana. Now as he ſays in another place (2), where he ſpeaks of Comana, a city of Pontus, that it was dedicated to the ſame Goddeſs as Comana in Cappadocia, and drew its original from it (3); he hints plainly enough, that he either did not know the competition which was between theſe two cities, or elſe that he rejected it, and looked upon the pretenſions of the people of Pontus as null. It is nevertheleſs certain, that they did not yield to the others, the quality of chief or head; and that they boaſted their being poſſeſſed of the true ſtatue of Diana, wherein they were rivalled, not only by the Cappadocians, but alſo by the Lydians; which ſhews that men began to quarrel about the poſſeſſion of a relick, before the eſtabliſhment of the Chriſtian Religion; for when the poſſeſſion of our Saviour's true ſhroud, or of St. John Baptiſt's head was challenged by the inhabitants of different places, many Heathen Cities had long before this conteſted the poſſeſſion of the ſtatue of Diana Taurica. The Lacedæmonians pretended it was among them; the Athenians affirmed, that Iphigenia had left it in their country (4). The people of Pontus, of Cappadocia, and Lydia diſputed with each other the poſſeſſion of this relick. Διαμεμίμηκεν ἔτι καὶ νῦν τηλικοῦτο ὄνομα τῇ Ταυρικῇ Θεῷ ὥστε ἀμφισβητοῦσι μὲν Καππάδοκες καὶ οἱ τὸν Εὔξεινον οἰκοῦντες τὸ ἄγαλμα εἶναι παρὰ σφίσιν. ἀμφισβητοῦσι δὲ καὶ Λυδῶν οἷς ἔστιν Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν Ἀναΐτιδος (5). i. e. " The name of Diana of Tauris is ſo renowned " at this time, that the people of Cappadocia and " Pontus conteſted with one another which of them " has the poſſeſſion of her ſtatue; and the Lydians " alſo, in whoſe country the Temple of Diana Anaitis " ſtands, have the ſame diſpute." Dion aſcribes to Comana of Cappadocia, all the honour of the Statue of Diana; he takes no notice of the competition of the Lydians, nor that of the inhabitants of Pontus. He relates only, that there were two cities in Cappadocia which had the ſame name, and that they were not very far diſtant one from the other. Each of them boaſted the ſame things, told the like idle ſtories, and ſhewed the ſame nicknacks; each pretended to have Iphigenia's true knife or poniard. Μυθολογοῦσι καὶ δεικνύουσι τά τε ἄλλα πάντα ἐκ τοῦ ὁμοίου, καὶ τὸ ξίφος ὡς αὐτὸ ἐκεῖνο τὸ τῆς Ἰφιγενείας, ὃν ἀμφότεραι ἔχουσι (6). He doubtleſs means, that both theſe cities of Cappadocia were called Comana. Now as neither the Hiſtorians nor the Geographers take the leaſt notice of two Comana's ſtanding near one another in Cappadocia, Dion may probably have committed a miſtake in not placing (with Strabo) one of theſe two Comana's in Cappadocia, and the other in the Kingdom of Pontus. Ortelius is in an error when he aſſerts, that Dion ſpeaks of Comana Pontica, and Comana of Cappadocia (7). Dion has perhaps confounded together Comana and Caſtabala; for there really was a city in Cappadocia, called Caſtabala, which it is pretended, was the ſcene of the incidents related concerning Oreſtes and Diana Tauropolos. The Diana who had a Temple in this city was ſurnamed Perafia, which ſerved as a proof. By the way, the Prieſteſſes of Diana there boaſted, that they could walk unhurt over burning coals. Ἐν τοῖς Κασταβάλοις ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς Περασίας Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν ὅπου φασὶ τὰς ἱερείας γυμνοὺς τοὺς ποσὶ δι' ἀνθρακιᾶς βαδίζειν ἀπαθεῖς, καὶ ταῦθα δέ τινες τὴν αὐτὴν θρυλλεῖσθαι ἱστορίαν τὴν περὶ τῆς Ὀρέστου καὶ τῆς Ταυροπόλου. Περασίαν κικλῆσθαι φάσκοντες διὰ τὸ πέραθεν κομισθῆναι (8). i. e. " In Caſtabala ſtands " the Temple of Diana Perafia, where we are told, " that Prieſteſſes of that Goddeſs walk on burning " coals without hurting their feet: and this country is " thought to be the ſame of the tranſactions which " are told of Oreſtes and Diana of Tauris, and who " was called Perafia, becauſe ſhe had croſſed the ſea " hither."

(1) Lib. 12. pag. 369.

(2) Pag. 383, *ſub fin.*

(3) Ἀφιδρυθέντα ἐκεῖθεν. *Atque adeo inde imitata.* This is the printed Tranſlation, which does not ſeem to convey all the force of the original.

(4) Pauſanias, lib. 3. pag. 98.

(5) Idem, ibid.

(6) Dio, lib. 35.

(7) Abrah. Ortelius, *in Theſaur. Geograp.*

(8) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 370.

SEVERAL Heathen Cities boaſted their being poſſeſſed of the ſame RELICKS.

[*B*] *The Temple of the Goddeſs . . . was ſerved . . . under the authority of a High Prieſt . . . ., he was next in dignity to the King.*] The inhabitants of Comana were reputed as ſubjects to the King, but then they were obliged to obey the High Prieſt. Ἄλλως μὲν ὑπὸ τῷ βασιλεῖ τεταγμένοι, τῷ δ' ἱερεῖ ὑπακούοντες. This is what Strabo tells us, in page 639. He adds, that the High Prieſt was Lord of the greateſt part of the Temple and the Prieſts and over others belonging to it; that he received all the produce of the lands belonging to the Temple; in a word, that after the King no man in all Cappadocia, was had in ſuch honour as the High Prieſt, for which reaſon he was generally choſen out of the Royal Family. Ἐσὶν ὅτε διάδημα κατὰ τιμὴν τῇ Καππαδοκίᾳ μετὰ τὸν βασιλέα, ὡς δ' ἐπιτεθολὸ τῷ αὐτῷ γένους ἦσαν οἱ ἱερεῖς τοῖς βασιλεῦσι. Strabo ſays almoſt the ſame of the High Prieſt of Comana in Pontus. This High Prieſt was the next in dignity to the King, and uſed to wear the diadem twice a year, when the people ſolemnized the iſſuing out of the Goddeſs. Ἠίκα δὲς τοῦ ἔτους κατὰ τὰς ἐξόδους λεγομένας τῆς Θεοῦ διάδημα ἀτύγχανε φορῶν ὁ ἱερεὺς, καὶ ἦν διάδημα κατὰ τιμὴν μετὰ τὸν βασιλέα (9). I make theſe obſervations for two reaſons. (9) Ibid, pag. 384.

other every year, on certain feſtivals of the Goddeſs. In my opinion, Strabo ſays only this (*f*), that when he took a journey to that City, the Miniſters of Bellona conſiſted of upwards of ſix thouſand perſons both men and women. What is related concerning their fighting has another foundation [*C*]. This Author, ſpeaking of Comana Pontica ſays, that it was a very populous and trading City; that prodigious multitudes of people flocked thither, on the anniverſary of the iſſuing out of Bellona; and that, at all ſeaſons, great numbers of foreigners were ſeen there, who came either to fulfill their vows, or offer up ſacrifices; that great numbers of lewd women were alſo found in it, and that moſt of them were devoted to the Goddeſs of the Place (*g*). There is no doubt, but that this is one circumſtance which invited foreigners thither. After the war of Mithridates, the Romans ſecular̃iz'd, in ſome manner, this Pontificate [*D*], and made it a kind of Sovereignty, without diveſting it of the ſuperintendence over things relating to Religion. Pompey beſtowed it on Archelaus; Cæſar on Nicomedes; and Auguſtus on Dyteutus who had performed a very generous action (*b*) [*E*]. Appian has

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 370.

(*g*) Strabo, lib. 11. pag. 385.

(*b*) Ibid. pag. 384, 385.

I. To ſhew that the ſame ſpirit, which procured the Clergy ſo much honour and wealth under the Chriſtian diſpenſation, had already diſplayed itſelf under the Heathen Syſtem; ſo that how often ſoever the Precepts of Religion may change, ſtill nature recovers its rights; whatever is founded on the mechanical paſſions, is an inalienable and impreſcriptible domain, nature may be deprived of it for a time, when extraordinary changes happen in Religion; but one time or other ſhe again gets into poſſeſſion. This is my firſt reaſon. With regard to the 2d, I am of opinion that Father Noris is in an error, when he aſſerts in general and unlimited terms, that the ſame man was both King and High Prieſt of Comana (10). I believe indeed, that Pompey raiſed Archelaus to both theſe dignities, but *non ſic erat ab initio*, it was not ſo from the beginning. I ſhall cite two paſſages in the Remark [*D*], which will confirm all I have ſaid concerning the great power of theſe High Prieſts.

(10) *Hunc Archelaum Pompeius Sacerdotem Bellonæ ac Comanorum principem* (UTRAQUE *enim dignitas* UNI EIDEMQUE *conferebatur*) *conſtituerat.* Noris, Cenotaph. Piſan. pag. 255. i. e. "Pompey appointed this Archelaus a Prieſt of Bellona, and King of Comana, for both dignities were beſtowed on one and the ſame perſon." See the Remark [*C*] of the Article ARCHELAUS King of Cappadocia.

[*C*] *What is related concerning their fighting has another foundation.*] The Prieſts of Bellona and thoſe of Cybele, had this in common, viz. that at certain times, they uſed to act as ſo many frantic Enthuſiaſts; and ſhew by their ſtrange geſtures and diſtortions a great diſtraction of mind. They did not ſpare their own bodies, but uſed to make the blood flow from them, and this was part of their Divine Service. Lactantius has reproached the Heathens with this cuſtom. *Ab iſto genere ſacrorum non minoris inſaniæ judicanda ſunt publica illa ſacra; quorum alia ſunt matris Deûm; in quibus homines ſuis ipſi virilibus litant; amputati enim ſexu nec viros ſe, nec fœminas faciunt: alia Virtutis, quam eandem Bellonam vocant, in quibus ipſi ſacerdotes non alieno, ſed ſuo cruore ſacrificant. Sectis namque humeris, & utraque manu diſtrictos gladios exerentes, currunt, efferuntur, inſaniunt* (11). i. e. "From theſe "rites we may judge that the other public ones are no "leſs frantic; as thoſe of Cybele, in which men ſacri"fice their virility to that Goddeſs, and by their ampu"tation become neither men nor women; and thoſe of "*Fortitude*, whom they likewiſe call Bellona, in which "the Prieſts ſacrifice only their own blood. For with "their ſhoulders gaſhed, and flouriſhing a ſword in "each hand, they fly up and down like ſo many "mad-men." The abovementioned ceremony was very probably obſerved in Comana, where Bellona was had in ſuch great veneration. However, Strabo takes no notice of this circumſtance; he ſays indeed, that at Comana in Cappadocia there were ſeveral Enthuſiaſtic People who believed themſelves inſpired; he does not add, that the Prieſts of Bellona were emaſculated (12), nor that they uſed to wound themſelves. Some Authors pretend, that Valerius Flaccus has taken notice of both theſe particulars; for they read *Comanos* inſtead of *Comatos*, in the VIIth Book, towards the end of it.

(11) Lactant. *Inſtitut. Divinat.* lib. 1. cap. 21.

(12) On the contrary, he ſpeaks of their wives. ἀνδρες ὁμοῦ γυναιξί. Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 369.

Qualis ubi attonitos mœſta Phrygas annuæ matris
Ira, vel exactos laterat Bellona Comanos.

That is,

"Like as when Cybele's fierce anger ſtrikes
"Th' aſtoniſhed Phrygians, or Bellona wounds
"Th' unman'd Comaans———

[*D*] *The Romans ſecularized in ſome manner this Pontificate.*] We have already proved that the High Prieſt of Comana did not enjoy the ſovereignty; that the King was ſuperior to him, and that the people of Comana were properly the King's ſubjects. But after that Pompey had ended the war againſt Mithridates, he beſtowed this Pontificate on Archelaus; without ſubjecting him to any other dependence, but that which the Romans reſerved to themſelves, when they made a preſent of the country (13). He only forbid him to ſell the inhabitants, and in all other reſpects, he ordered them to obey Archelaus. Προσέταξε τοῖς ἐνοικοῦσι πειθήρχειν αὐτῷ. τοῦτον μὲν οὖν ἐγκρατῆ τῶν τῆς πόλεως ἱερέων ἐποίησεν ἐκτὸς τῆς πράσεως (14). i. e. "He commanded the inhabitants of Comana to obey "Archelaus. He therefore was King over them, "and Lord of all the Prieſts living in the "city, except that he had not power to ſell them." He enlarged the lands which lay round the Temple by 60 ſtadia or furlongs (15). The following words of Strabo *they were at leaſt ſix thouſand perſons* (16) ſhew, that he ſpeaks of Comana Pontica, and not of the Cappadocian Comana; for ſome pages before (17), he had obſerved of the latter, that he himſelf had ſeen upwards of 6000 perſons in it. What he ſays afterwards confirms this circumſtance, viz. that he means that Pompey beſtowed on Archelaus the Pontificate of Comana in the Kingdom of Pontus. But Strabo does not agree in this particular with Hirtius, who relates, that the Pontificate which Pompey beſtowed was in Cappadocia. He indeed does not mention Pompey: but it is ſufficient that he informs us, that Cæſar beſtowed on Nicomedes the Pontificate of Comana; now we find by Appian (18), that Cæſar diveſted Archelaus of the Pontificate which he beſtow'd on Nicomedes. I ſhall cite Hirtius's words becauſe they confirm what I related above concerning the authority of Comana. *Magnis itineribus per Cappadociam confectis, biduum Mazacæ commoratus* (Cæſar) *venit Comana vetuſtiſſimum in Cappadocia Bellonæ templum, quod tanta religione colitur, ut Sacerdos ejus Deæ majeſtate, imperio & potentia ſecundus à Rege conſenſu gentis illius habeatur. Id homini nobiliſſimo* (19). i. e. "Cæſar going thro' Cappadocia, by long marches, "and after halting two days at Mazaca, came to Co"mana the moſt ancient Temple of Bellona, in all "Cappadocia. Such great veneration is paid to it, "that the Prieſt of that Goddeſs, is by the conſent "of that people, conſidered as next to the King in "majeſty, dignity and power &c." The Reader will find the ſequel of this in the Remark [*D*], Citation (3), of the Article ARCHELAUS King of Cappadocia.

(13) Appian in his Enumeration of the Kings and Princes who were raiſed to thrones by Pompey, in ſeveral parts of Aſia, does not omit Archelaus: *Ejus etiam Deæ quæ à Comanis colitur, Archelaum fecit Flaminem, cuivis Dynaſtæ parem opibus.* Appian. *in Mithridat.* pag. m. 168. i. e. "He appointed "Archelaus chief "Prieſt to the "Goddeſs wor"ſhipped by the "Comanians, "whoſe wealth "is equal to that "of any Prince."

(14) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 384.

(15) Ibid.

(16) Ἦσαν δὲ οὐκ ἐλάττους οὐδ' ἐνταῦθα τῶν ἑξακισχιλίων. Caſaubon ſays hereafter οὐδ' ἐνταῦθα, *quia ſupra dixit in Cappadocis Comanis fuiſſe illorum Veneri devotorum ſex millia & amplius.* But Caſaubon is miſtaken, they not being conſecrated to Venus.

(17) Pag. 369.

(18) In Mithridat. *ſub fin.*

(19) Hirtius, *de Bello Alexandr.*

Not long before this Cicero had prevented a dangerous Civil War from breaking out in that country. He had obliged the High-Prieſt who was exceedingly powerful in all reſpects, and able to make a ſtrong oppoſition to King Ariobarzanes, to leave Cappadocia. *Quumque magnum bellum in Cappadocia concitaretur, ſi Sacerdos armis ſe, quod facturus putabatur, defenderet, adoleſcens & equitatu & peditatu & pecunia paratus, & toto, iis qui novari aliquid volebant: perfeci ut è regno ille diſcederet, rexque ſine tumultu, ac ſine armis, omni auctoritate aulæ communita, regnum cum dignitate obtineret* (20). i. e. "At the time that a furious war "was going to break out in Cappadocia, if the High"Prieſt, a young man who was provided with men, "money &c. ſhould take up arms, as it was ſuppoſed "he would; I prevailed ſo far as to make him leave "the Kingdom and reſtored the King, without injur"ing his honour, without bloodſhed or tumult to "his authority and dominions."

(20) Cicero, *Epiſt.* 4. *libri* 15 *ad Familiar.* pag. 389, 399. edit. Græv.

[*E*] . . . *And Auguſtus on Dyteutus who had performed*

has committed an error on this occaſion [*F*].

ed a very generous action.] Dyteutus was the eldeſt ſon of Adiatorix Tetrarch of Galatia. This Adiatorix having obtained from Mark Anthony, that part of the city and territory of Heraclea, granted by the inhabitants to the Colony which the Romans ſent thither, was ſo baſe and cowardly as to fall upon the Romans in the night and cut them to pieces. He afterwards declared that Mark Anthony had permitted him to act in that barbarous manner. This happened a little before the battle of Actium. After the defeat of Mark Anthony, Adiatorix was taken by Auguſtus, and ſentenced to die with his eldeſt ſon (21). Himſelf, his wife and children were carried in triumph; and as he was carrying to the place of execution, his younger ſon told the ſoldiers that he was the eldeſt; Dyteutus aſſerted the contrary, when a very ſurprizing conteſt enſued between the two brothers. Their father and mother put an end to it by perſuading Dyteutus to yield, ſince he, as he was older, would conſequently be more capable of protecting his mother and his other brother. So that Adiatorix was put to death with his younger ſon. Auguſtus, having been told theſe particulars, regretted their loſs; and in order to make ſome compenſation to thoſe who ſurvived, he raiſed Dyteutus to the Pontificate of Comana (22).

(21) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 374.

[*F*] *Appian has committed an error on this occaſion.*] He tells us that Cæſar confirmed the diſtributions which had been made by Pompey of ſeveral countries, the Pontificate of Comana excepted, of which he diveſted Archelaus; but that ſoon after the conqueſt of Egypt, all theſe States, and whatever Cæſar and Mark Anthony had beſtowed, were added to the Roman Provinces: the Romans, continues he, ſeizing eagerly every opportunity to aggrandize themſelves (23). But I had rather believe Strabo, who aſſerts, that in his time Dyteutus enjoyed the Pontificate of Comana (24).

(22) Idem, ibid. pag. 384, 385.

(23) Appian. *in Mithrid. ſub fin.*

(24) Νῦν ἔχει Δύτευτος υἱὸς Ἀδιατόριγος. Strabo lib. 12. pag. 384.

COMBABUS, a young Nobleman at the King of Syria's Court, was appointed by that Monarch to attend the Queen in a pretty long journey ſhe was to undertake. This Queen's name was Stratonice, and her deſign was to build a temple in honour of Juno, purſuant to the orders ſhe had received in a dream for that purpoſe. Combabus was a youth of exquiſite beauty, and being firmly perſuaded that the King would be jealous of him, he earneſtly beſought the Monarch not to give him that employment, but his intreaties not prevailing, he looked upon himſelf as a dead man, in caſe he did not behave in ſuch a manner as might not give the leaſt occaſion to detraction. He obtained only ſeven days to get ready for his journey, and his preparations were as follow. The inſtant he was got home, he bewailed the wretchedneſs of his condition, by which he was expoſed, either to loſe his life or his manhood, and after venting the deepeſt ſighs, he lopped off certain affairs which ſhall be nameleſs (*a*), and then embalming them, laid them in a box which he ſealed up. The time for his ſetting out being come, he gave the box to the King before a great number of people, and begged him to keep it for him till his return. He declared to his Majeſty, that he had treaſured up ſome things in it which he valued more than gold and ſilver, and that were as dear to him as his life. The King taking the box, put his ſeal upon it, and ordered the Maſters of his wardrobe to keep it. The Queen was three years in her journey, and the very circumſtance happened which Combabus had foreſeen. She fell diſtractedly in love with this young man, and did all that lay in her power to obſerve the decorum that became her quality; however her ſilence ſerved to no other purpoſe but to wrankle the wound, ſo that ſhe was forced to reveal her paſſion, firſt by ſigns, and afterwards by words. It is true indeed, that as ſhe would not make uſe of a confident, and was not bold enough to ſue for the remedy to her evil; ſhe had recourſes to the bottle, which inſpired her with a boldneſs ſhe before wanted [*A*]. Having therefore intoxicated herſelf with liquor, ſhe went to Combabus's apartment, where revealing her paſſion to the lovely youth, ſhe beſought him to pity her fond paſſion. He deſired the Queen to leave him, ſaying that ſhe was diſguiſed in liquor; but finding her obſtinate, and threatning to lay violent hands on her ſelf, he declared that it was abſolutely not in his power to ſatisfy her; and, leſt ſhe ſhould ſuppoſe this a meer evaſion, he made her an eye-witneſs of his impotency. Stratonice, after this ſight, was not ſo diſtractedly fond of Combabus; nevertheleſs, ſhe ſtill loved him [*B*], and would always be in his company: ſhe endeavoured, by ſeeing and converſing

(*a*) He is very juſtly compared to the Beaver. *Imitatus Caſtora, qui ſe Eunuchum ipſe facit, cupiens evadere damno Teſticulorum.* Juvenal. Sat. 12. ver. 34. Thus tranſlated, "Who, when "he's cloſe purſued, by furious hunters, "Bites off his "ſtones, and "ſaves his life by "flight."

[*A*] *Stratonice fell diſtractedly in love with this young man . . . had recourſe to the Bottle, which inſpired her with a boldneſs ſhe before wanted.*] Lucian ſuppoſes, that three reaſons prompted her to intoxicate herſelf (1). 1ſt, She hoped that it would inſpire her with ſo much boldneſs, as might enable her to diſcloſe her paſſion. 2ly, A denial would not then put her ſo much to the bluſh. 3dly, A woman ſoon forgets what ſhe does in that condition. He might have added a fourth, viz. that a man has not ſo great a contempt for a woman, who is prompted to ſuch an exceſs of immodeſty, by over-drinking, as for another, who in her ſober moments, ſhould make him the like declaration.

(1) Lucian, *de Syria Dea*, pag. 892, 893. vol. 2.

[*B*] *He made her an eye-witneſs of his impotency . . . nevertheleſs ſhe ſtill loved him.*] Let me obſerve, to the honour and glory of this Queen; that Lucian, who was a very bold Writer, declares, ſhe did but barely converſe with her Gallant; that theſe converſations were indeed frequent, but that they never exceeded the bounds of modeſty; Ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἡ Στρατονίκη τὸ ὕποπτον ἔλαβεν, μανίης μὲν ὅτο ἐκείνης ἔχετο, ἵμερος δὲ ἀδαμᾶ ἐληλύθεε, ἀλλὰ πάντα οἱ συνῆσαν ταύτην παραμυθίην ἐπρίατο ἵμερος ἀπρήκτοιο (2). i. e. "Stratonice having a "ſight of what ſhe never expected to ſee, her love "did not rage with ſo much violence as before, but "ſtill ſhe could not eraze the dear man from her mind, "and ſoothed her unaccompliſhed paſſion, by being "for ever in his company." And let it not be objected, that in the condition to which Combabus had reduced himſelf, he could oblige her with nothing but words: for the hiſtories of the Levant inform us of the contrary. The jealouſy of men, how extravagant ſoever it be, is yet not ſo inventive as the love of women. They thought, that by putting their wives under the guard of Eunuchs, I mean of certain men whoſe *pudenda* had been cut off, they might ſafely indulge themſelves in peaceable ſlumbers, and not be under the leaſt apprehenſion: however, they found they had been miſtaken. Theſe Eunuchs were not only fit for ſomething; but were even preferred to others on many accounts (3). Huſbands were therefore obliged to have recourſe to other expedients, and to quite lop the Eunuchs. They could not be truſted in Turkey, were the leaſt portion of the affair in queſtion left them (4). But this precaution is ſtill not ſecure enough; for *notwithſtanding*

(2) Lucian, *de Syria Dea*, vol. 2. pag. 893.

(3) *Sunt quas Eunuchi imbelles ac mollia ſemper, Oſcula delectent & deſperatio barbæ, Et quod & abortivo non eſt opus.* Juven. Sat. 6. ver. 364.

(4) Busbec, Letter 3. cited by La Mothe le Vayer, Letter 112. tom. 11. pag. 527.

verſing with him, to conſole herſelf for her unhappineſs, in not being able to indulge her fondeſt wiſhes. In the mean time the King being informed of what was doing, recalled Combabus, who was not terrified in any manner at this order, well knowing that his Majeſty had, in his own hand, wherewith to juſtify, in the ſtrongeſt manner, his (Combabus's) conduct; and for this reaſon, he returned to Court without the leaſt apprehenſions. He was thrown into priſon immediately upon his arrival; ſome time after which, the King had him brought into his apartment, where he accuſed him of adultery, treachery and impiety [C], in preſence of thoſe perſons who had ſeen him deliver up the box. There were ſome witneſſes who depoſed, that they had ſeen him lie with the Queen [D]. However, Combabus made no anſwer till he was carrying to execution, when he cried, that he ſhould be put to death, not for having defiled the King's bed, but becauſe his Majeſty would not return him the box which he had put into his hands at his leaving the Kingdom. His Majeſty hearing this, ordered the box to be brought, and the ſeal being broke up, the innocence of Combabus appeared, and he himſelf told the reaſons which had prompted him to emaſculate himſelf. But now the King embraced him, and ſeemed grieved at his misfortune, whereupon he puniſhed his accuſers, beſtowed mighty poſſeſſions on him, and granted him the privilege of coming and ſpeaking to him at all hours, not excepting thoſe when his Majeſty ſhould be claſped in amorous embraces, and that without

† Or cropp'd.

withſtanding that they are † ſcraped cloſe to the belly (to uſe the expreſſion of the Embaſſador de Breves,) nevertheleſs, there are ſome who marry ſeveral wives, to foment their abominable luſt (5). St. Baſil knew, that the moſt complete mutilations are not to be truſted; they do not, ſays he, turn a man into a woman, he is ſtill a man; in like manner as a bull is ſtill a bull, tho' his horns are cut off, and he is not metamorphoſed into a horſe. He carries on this compariſon much farther; he ſays, that a bull whoſe horns are cut off, performs nevertheleſs the ſame motions as before, when his anger is rouzed; and even butts with that very part of the head on which his horns ſtood before. The reader will find the other part of this compariſon in the Latin paſſage following. *Maſculina corpora, licet illa Eunuchorum ſint, cautè vitanda ſunt virgini. Sit enim ille licet Eunuchus, vir tamen per naturam eſt. Sicut enim cornutus bos, etſi illi præcidantur cornua, non tamen ſublatis cornibus equus efficitur; ſed abſint licet cornua, bos tamen eſt: ita & maſculus, abſciſſis genitalibus omnibus, ea tamen mutilatione ſua, mulier effectus non eſt, ſed maſculus (ut eſt natura conditus) permanet: ac ſicuti bos reciſis cornibus, ſic quoque, furore cornu petit, (cervicem quippe incurvans, & caput ad feriendi impetum formans, gaudet intentare minas;) ac ſæpius ea parte capitis ferit qua cornibus antea fuerat armatus; ſatisfacitque furori per actus imaginem; (ita enim afficitur, correptus iræ impetu, non ut caſſo feriens vulnere, ſed ut prius ictu cornuum ſcindens, ac dividens:) ita & maſculus quamvis abſciſſus genitalia, vitioſa tamen concupiſcentia maſculus eſt. Quocirca & ipſe ſe ad actum fœditatis ſimiliter formans, amorem ſpirat, incredibilemque veſaniam; imo & ad coïtum fervens, etiamſi ea parte non violet fœminæ turbulentus incumbens; ipſe tamen ac ſi corruperit ſatisfeceritque cupidini, ita ſceleris imagine affectus eſt. Eam verò ad peccatum vehementius irritans, totum quidem corrumpit animum, corpuſque ad corruptionis actum inclementer inſtigat* (6). St. Baſil is not the only Father of the Church, who has admoniſhed women to be ſtrongly aware of Eunuchs; and to be perſuaded, that they are ſtill able to commit a thouſand impurities with them. I ſpeak of thoſe Eunuchs who had been cut cloſe. See the above cited work of Theophilus Raynaud. The inſtances and paſſages of the Fathers cited by this Jeſuit, make him laugh at the apology of Peter Abelard. I have already taken notice of this (7), and ſhall perhaps ſay ſomething more of it in the article HELOISE. But let us return to Stratonice and Combabus, to obſerve, that ſhe muſt have behaved in a very laudable manner (as ſhe had the criminal weakneſs to love another man, and not her huſband) if ſhe could reſtrain herſelf merely to converſation with her gallant. Dido would not have been ſo prudent, ſince, even in the abſence of her lover, ſhe wanted more real and ſolid amuſements than mere words; and this was, to take Æneas's ſon in her lap (8).

(5) La Mothe le Vayer, ibid.

(6) S. Baſilius, *Libro de Sancta Virginitate, ad finem, apud* Theophilum Raynaudum, *in Tractatu de Eunuchis*, cap. 5. Art. 2. num. 17. pag. m. 147.

(7) In the Remark [T] of the Article ABELARD.

(8) *Illum abſens abſentem auditque videtque,*
Aut gremio Aſcanium genitoris imagine capta
Detinet, infandum ſi fallere poſſit amorem.
Virg. Æn. lib. 4. ver. 83.
That is,
" Abſent, her
" abſent hero
" ſees and hears,
" Or, in her boſom, young
" Aſcanius bears,
" And ſeeks the
" father's image
" in the child,
" If love, by
" likeneſs, might
" be ſo beguil'd."
DRYDEN.

[C] *The King accuſed him of adultery, treachery and impiety.*] The firſt and ſecond crimes are eaſily known, when we call to mind, that the King had appointed Combabus to watch over the conduct of the Queen. The third crime may be ſoon gueſt, when we conſider, that the King had appointed Combabus to build a Temple in honour of Juno. This journey to the holy City (9), in order to build a Temple there, was a pious work, and a kind of pilgrimage. It was therefore profaning a holy thing, to make love at that time. Λέγων τριστὸν Κομβάβου ἀδίκημα μοιχᾶν τὰ ἱερὰ, καὶ εἰς θεὸν ἀσέβημα, καὶ εἰς θεὰν ἀσωτέρημα τῆς ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ τοιαύτῃ ὑπηρέτης (10). i. e. " Saying that Combabus had " committed a threefold crime, viz. was guilty of adul- " tery, of breach of faith, and impiety with regard " to the Goddeſs, while he was employed in her ſer- " vice having perpetrated ſuch impious crimes."

(9) So Lucian calls the City, in which Stratonice was going to build a Temple.

(10) Lucianus, *de Syria Dea*, tom. 2. pag. 894.

[D] *There were ſome witneſſes who depoſed, that they had ſeen him lie with the Queen.*] I have followed Benoit's (Benedict's) tranſlation, both here, and where he ſpeaks of the converſations of Stratonice and Combabus. Lucian employs the ſame verb in both places (11), παῦλα δὲ συνεῆσα, i. e. " perpetual converſations with her (12)." Ἤλεγχον ὅτι ἀναφανδὸν σφίας ἀλλήλοισι συνίοντας εἶδον. i. e. " They declared, that they had ſeen them, very " plainly, joined in the amorous congreſs." But this verb has not the ſame meaning in both thoſe paſſages; it ſignifies, in the firſt, to be together, and in the ſecond, to lie together. If we were to judge of things from outward appearance, the accuſers might be in the right; nevertheleſs, we muſt not pretend to affirm this, ſince Lucian does not aſſert it (13). A probable circumſtance is, that ſince the Queen did not ceaſe to love Combabus, but, on the contrary, uſed to ſee and ſpeak to him very often, in order to conſole herſelf, in ſome little meaſure, for being diſappointed in her wiſhes; ſhe therefore was not ſatisfied with mere words. And as Combabus was perfectly ſenſible, that he had a ready and ſure juſtification in the Prince's hands (be the malice of his accuſers ever ſo great) it is very probable, that he granted the Queen every thing that was in his little power to beſtow. The box ſecured them both from the ill offices of the accuſers; a circumſtance which doubtleſs made them not obſerve ſo ſtrictly, whether they were watched. So that the accuſers perhaps ſaw as much as was ſufficient to prove them guilty of the crime with which they charged Combabus. It may not be improper to call to mind the paſſage of St. Baſil, to which I ſhall add the following. *Eunuchos quibus exſcinditur tota virilitas, negat S. Baſilius* (14) *impudicitiæ flamma liberari, ſed quamvis corpore nihil poſſint, tamen ait animo deſiderioque jugiter in cæno porcorum more, convolvi, & poſt abſciſſionem eſſe impudiciores ſervos voluptatis, qui liberi metu ne deprehendantur petulantiam licenter fœdis attactibus & amplexibus exſatiant, ut poſſunt, non ut volunt, laſcivientes.* i. e. " Ac- " cording to St. Baſil, Eunuchs who are totally emaſ- " culated, are not able to do any thing, (corporally,) " yet, ſays he, in mind and deſires, they are conti- " nually wallowing in the mire, like ſo many ſwine; " and, after being caſtrated, abandon themſelves ſtill " more to luſt, and for this reaſon, becauſe as they are " now delivered from the fears of a diſcovery, they " ſatiate their looſe deſires by impure touches and em- " braces, not in the manner they would do, but to " the utmoſt of their abilities." And who can ſay, whether Stratonice never addreſſed him like the woman mentioned by Petronius? *Languori tuo gratias ago, in umbra voluptatis diutius luſimus.* i. e. " Thanks to " your impotence, but we really have ſported long " enough in the ſhadow of pleaſure."

(11) Pag. 893.

(12) Pag. 895.

(13) Theophile Raynaud, *in Tractatu de Eunuchis*, pag. 148, is in an error to ſay, *Hoc Stratonicæ à Combabo exacto accidiſſe narrat Lucianus.*

(14) *Libr. de vera Virgin. ſub finem, apud* Theoph. Raynaudum, *de Eunuchis*, num. 12. pag. 143.

without being ſent for [*E*]. Now, as Combabus was ordered, by his firſt commiſſion, to ſuperintend the building of the temple which Stratonice was ordered to raiſe in honour of Juno, he deſired leave to return back to complete the edifice. Leave was accordingly granted him, and he did not return any more to Court (*b*). A ſtatue of braſs, repreſenting Combabus, was placed in the temple, and that by the King's order, purely to do him honour. A female air was given to this ſtatue, but it had a male habit; and nevertheleſs, we are told that Combabus laid aſide the dreſs of his ſex, merely out of compaſſion to the women (*c*) [*F*]. The reader will find, in the remarks, the variations relating to this ſtory [*G*], and the error which thoſe have committed, who aſſert, that the Courtiers emaſculated themſelves, in order to ingratiate themſelves with Stratonice [*H*].

(*b*) That is, he continued the reſt of his life in the holy city where the temple was built. Lucian, *de Syria Dea*, pag. 896.

(*c*) Extracted from Lucian in the Treatiſe *de Syria Dea*, pag. 876, *& ſeq.* I am to obſerve, that this Tract which is aſcribed to Lucian, is not wrote in the Attic Dialect, as the reſt of that Author's pieces are, but in the Ionic Dialect.

COMENIUS

[*E*] *The King granted him the privilege of coming and ſpeaking to him at all hours, not excepting thoſe when his Majeſty ſhould be claſped in amorous embraces, and that without being ſent for.*] Thoſe who are acquainted with the ceremony obſerved with regard to the Eaſtern Princes both ancient or modern, know, that it is a very ſignal favour, to enjoy the privilege of entering the King's apartment at all times. Combabus's privilege extended ſtill farther, for all the King's Officers were ſtrictly forbid to ſend him away, tho' he ſhould interrupt the King and Queen in their dalliances. Ἀπίξιμι δὲ παρ' ἡμῖν ἄνευ ἐπαγγελίης· οὐδὲ τις ἀπόρξει ἐπ' ἡμεῖς τέρης ὄψιος· οὐδ' ἢν γυναικὶ ἅμα συνάζωμαι (15). Thoſe who aboliſhed the tyranny of the Magi, after the death of Cambyſes the ſon of Cyrus, were ſatisfied with a leſs privilege. It was agreed, that they ſhould be allowed to enter into the King's apartment without aſking leave, except when he ſhould be in bed with the Queen. Παριέναι ἐς τὰ βασιλήια πάντα τὸν βουλόμενον τῶν ἐπτὰ ἄνευ ἐπαγγελίης· ἢν μὴ τυγχάνῃ εὕδων μετὰ γυναικὸς βασιλεύς (16).

(15) Lucian, *de Syria Dea*, tom. 2. pag. 896.

(16) Herodot. lib. 3. cap. 84.

[*F*] *We are told, that Combabus laid aſide the dreſs of his ſex, merely out of compaſſion to the women.*] During the celebration of the great Feſtival, Combabus appeared ſo exquiſitely beautiful in the eyes of a certain foreign Lady, that ſhe fell diſtractedly in love with him; but hearing afterwards that he was an Eunuch, ſhe was ſo deeply afflicted at this diſappointment, that ſhe killed herſelf. Combabus reflecting on his unhappy impotency, no longer wore a male habit, to prevent any other woman from committing ſuch diſagreeable and fatal miſtakes for the future. This puts me in mind of a ſmart repartee mentioned in the *Menagiana*. "Madam Cornuel knew that Mr. de L.... was impotent, and had never ſeen him: He was a very handſome man. Happening to meet him at M. de Rambouillet's, ſhe aſked who he was; and being told that it was the Marquis de L..... Ah! ſays ſhe, who would not have been deceived (17)?"

(17) Menagiana, pag. m. 167.

[G] *The reader will find.... the variations relating to this ſtory.*] Some Authors ſaid, that it was Stratonice herſelf, who accuſed Combabus, and wrote to her royal Conſort, viz. that Combabus had urged her to violate her conjugal fidelity. But Lucian rejects this as fabulous (18), and does not even credit what is related of Stenobœa and Phedra. Ἐγὼ μὲν οὐδὲ Σθενεβοίην πείθομαι, οὐδὲ Φαίδρην τοιαῦτα ἐπιτελέσαι, εἰ τὸν Ἱππόλυτον ἀρρενίως ἐπόθεε Φαίδρη (19). i. e. "I do not believe that either Sthenobœa or Phædra (if the latter really wanted to enjoy Hippolytus) did ſuch things." It is related that theſe, in order to revenge themſelves for the ill ſucceſs they had met with in their firſt advances, complained to their huſbands, declaring that their virtue had been attacked, the former by Bellerophon, and the latter by Hippolytus. I do not ſee why Lucian ſhould doubt the truth of theſe incidents; for it is not only very poſſible that the love of theſe women, how violent ſoever, might have turned into hatred, upon their being refuſed their wiſhes, but is even very probable. Such a refuſal is the higheſt affront; it is a capital offence, to reject the firſt advances made by the fair ſex, who are uſed to be addreſſed, and not reduced to the neceſſity of courting the men. Such is the corrupt ſtate of our nature, that immediately upon their receiving ſuch an affront, they breathe nothing but revenge. The Scriptures inform us, that Potiphar's wife changed in like manner, her love into a very ſtrong and revengeful hatred againſt the Patriarch Joſeph (20). One of the Emperor Conſtantine's wives, conceived the like averſion to Criſpus, her huſband's ſon. It is therefore my opinion, that Lucian does not ſhew a good taſte in the affair in queſtion. But he ſeems more judicious with regard to the other: and is in the right in not believing, that Stratonice accuſed Combabus; ſhe having no reaſon, as Phædra had, to think herſelf deſpiſed. She might flatter herſelf with the thoughts of having appeared the moſt beautiful woman in the world in the eyes of her lover. What reaſon therefore ſhould ſhe have to be exaſperated againſt him? he could not have been kinder to the fineſt woman upon earth. But Stenobœa, Phædra, Potiphar's wife, and Fauſta could not ſay the ſame of the object of their loves, whoſe frozen indifference for them was not owing to an inſurmountable imperfection.

(18) Lucian, *de Syria Dea*, tom. 2. pag. 894.

(19) Idem, ibid.

(20) Gen. chap. xxxix.

[*H*] .... *And the error which thoſe have committed who aſſert, that the Courtiers emaſculated themſelves, in order to ingratiate themſelves with Stratonice.*] The "love of ſeveral women for Eunuchs is ſo common, "that all hiſtories give inſtances of it. This paſſion "of Stratonice for Combabus, when an Eunuch, was "ſo much the more remarkable, in as much as all the "Courtiers of that Queen caſtrated themſelves alſo, "out of mere complaiſance, in order to ingratiate "themſelves with both." La Mothe le Vayer ſays this (21). But he here commits three miſtakes. Iſt, He ſuppoſes, that Stratonice's paſſion began after that ſhe knew Combabus was emaſculated; but this is a great miſtake. Had Stratonice known the execution which he had performed upon himſelf, ſhe would have made choice of ſome other object; and it is certain that the diſcovery of a certain imperfection is able to prevent the riſe of a paſſion, but not to extinguiſh it, when it is got to a great height. IIdly, He ſhould not have aſſerted, that all the Courtiers emaſculated themſelves; for Lucian ſays this only of Combabus's moſt intimate friends. IIIdly, Much leſs ſhould he have ſaid, that all the Courtiers emaſculated themſelves, in order to gain the favour of Stratonice; for Lucian does not ſay any thing like this; he only obſerves, that thoſe who had the greateſt affection for Combabus, caſtrated themſelves merely to conſole him for his misfortune. Λέγεται δὲ τῶν φίλων τοὺς μάλιστα οἱ ἐυνοίσαι ἐς παραμυθίην τῷ πάθει· κοινωνὸν ἑλέσθαι τῆς συμφορῆς ἑωυτοῖς ἐπὶ ἑωυτούς (22). It is a conſolation to the wretched to have companions in their miſery. We muſt take notice of two things; firſt, that Combabus, after his box had been opened, gained the King's favour in the higheſt degree; and ſecondly, that he deſired leave to return to the holy City, where he ſpent the remainder of his days. Add to this, that three years were to be employed in building the temple (23). It is probable, that Stratonice (after the expiration of this term) returned to her Conſort. She conſequently was ſeparated from Combabus; the perſons therefore who caſtrated themſelves out of complaiſance for Combabus, could not do this to pleaſe Stratonice. I confeſs that Lucian does not tell us, whether the friends of Combabus mutilated themſelves at the King's Court, or in the holy City; however, he hints plainly, that it was in the latter place; for he ſays, that their example gave riſe to a cuſtom which was obſerved annually, viz. the caſtrating of ſeveral perſons in the Temple built by Stratonice and Combabus (24). The Author of a French Dictionary (25), by copying the error of la Mothe le Vayer, had made it worſe. Here follow his words. "We find in hiſtories, that ſeveral women "have been diſtractedly in love with Eunuchs. Stra"tonice could not live a moment from Combabus who "was emaſculated; ſo that the Courtiers of this Queen "caſtrated themſelves, in order that they alſo might "ſhare in her favour. Cæſar Scaliger Exercitat. 277." This is encreaſing upon the error of la Mothe le Vayer; for he has not omitted Combabus, nor mentioned

(21) Lettre 192. tom. 11. pag. 525, 526.

(22) Lucian, *de Syria Dea*, tom. 2. pag. 897.

(23) Idem, ibid. pag. 892.

(24) Ibid. pag. 897.

(25) Ceſar de Rochefort: his Dictionary was printed at Lyons anno 1685, in folio. The paſſage I now cite, is from pag. 168.

COMENIUS (JOHN AMOS) a Grammarian and Proteſtant Divine in the ſeventeenth Century, was born in Moravia the 28th of March 1592. Having ſtudied in ſeveral places, and particularly in Herborn, he returned to his own country in 1614, and was made Rector of a College there (*a*). He was ordained Miniſter in 1616 (*b*), and was Paſtor of the Church of Fulnec in 1618 (*c*). At the ſame time he was appointed Maſter of the School which was lately ſet up in that little City. One of his greateſt deſigns at this time was, to introduce a new method for teaching the Languages. He publiſhed ſome Eſſays for this purpoſe in 1616, and he had prepared other pieces on that ſubject, which were deſtroyed in 1621, when the Spaniards plundered his Library, after having taken the City. The outlawry of all the Miniſters of Bohemia and Moravia, by an edict in 1624, interrupted his project, that he did not reſume it, but only at the requeſt of a Clergyman his friend, whom a Proteſtant Baron (*d*) had appointed Tutor to his three ſons in 1627. Some Miniſters, among whom was Comenius, were at that time concealed in the houſe of this Baron, in the mountains of Bohemia. However, the perſecution grew ſo hot the year following, that they were forced to leave the retreat abovementioned. Comenius fled to Leſna, a City of Poland, and taught Latin there. The book he publiſhed in 1631, under the title of *Janua Linguarum reſerata*, i. e. "the gate "of Languages unlocked," gained him prodigious reputation [*A*], inſomuch that thoſe who governed Sweden, wrote to him in 1638, and offered him a Commiſſion for new regulating all the Schools in that Kingdom. However, he did not think proper to accept of this offer, but only promiſed to aſſiſt, with his advice, thoſe who ſhould be appointed to execute that Commiſſion; and he then tranſlated into Latin the piece he had written in his native tongue, concerning the new method of inſtructing youth (*e*). A ſpecimen of this appeared under the title of *Panſophiæ Prodromus* (*f*), which made him be conſidered as one very capable of reforming the method of teaching. The Parliament of England deſired his aſſiſtance to reform the Schools of that Kingdom. Comenius arrived at London in September 1641, and would have been received by a Committee, in order for him to propoſe his plan, had not the Parliament been too much taken up with other matters. The civil wars which broke out in England, and the diſſentions which reigned in Ireland, ſhewed Comenius that this was not a juncture favourable to his deſigns. He therefore went to Sweden, whither he was invited by a perſon of merit (*g*), who had the public welfare very much at heart. He arrived there in Auguſt 1642. He diſcourſed

(*a*) *Scholæ Præroviensi Præfectus. Præfat. Operum Didacticorum Comenii.*

(*b*) *Epiſt. Dedicat. Oper. Didact. Comenii.*

(*c*) *Præfat. Oper. Didact.*

(*d*) George Sadowski de Slaupna.

(*e*) Ex Præfatione *Operum Didacticorum.*

(*f*) i. e. the forerunner of univerſal Learning.

(*g*) Lewis de Geer.

tioned Stratonice as the only motive of the Courtiers emaſculating themſelves; and farther, he does not cite Scaliger, who makes no mention of theſe particulars. In all other reſpects the tranſcriber is guilty of the ſame errors as la Mothe le Vayer. The example which he gives of Stratonice is not well choſen, becauſe ſhe did not fall in love with Combabus, after ſhe knew that he was an Eunuch. Since Lucian does not ſay, whether Combabus was imitated in his ſelf-caſtration, at the King's or Queen's Court; it is an inexcuſable raſhneſs in a modern Author, to preſume to determine, that it was in Stratonice's Court. We are to obſerve, particularly, that Combabus was the Minion in both theſe Courts; but that he was not at the King's and at the Queen's Court at the ſame time, ſince Stratonice's paſſion for him; for after this, he was either with the King in the Queen's abſence, or elſe with the Queen when the King was abſent. I ſhall add, that Lucian does not give the title of Courtiers to thoſe who conformed themſelves to Combabus: but ſays, on the contrary, that theſe were the trueſt and moſt intimate friends of Combabus; and that they followed his example, merely to conſole him. By what authority therefore ſhall a Writer, 1500 years after the incident happened, aſſert, that not only thoſe who emaſculated themſelves were Stratonice's Courtiers; but likewiſe, that the only motive of their doing this, was to inſpire this Queen with a paſſion for them. I own that my criticiſm on this head is a little too captious; and I do not offer it to the reader as a thing conſiderable in itſelf. The motive of my inſiſting upon it was, to cure if poſſible a diſtemper which reigns but too much among Authors. They cite, with a thouſand alterations and additions, whatever is related by the ancients. I am certain that, in our modern Writers there are an hundred paradoxes, accompanied with their citations in the margin, that have no better foundation than the abovementioned incident which la Mothe le Vayer relates, and makes others relate, with regard to the pretended method, which the Courtiers of Stratonice employed, in order to get into her good graces.

I ſhall conclude this article with the following note; it is related that Juno, out of friendſhip for Combabus, excited a great many perſons to caſtrate themſelves, in order that he might not be the only one who ſhould bewail the loſs of the affair in queſtion. Λέγουσις ὡς ἡ Ἥρη φιλέυσα Κομβάβον πολλοῖσι τὴν τομὴν ἐπὶ νόον ἔβαλλε ὅπως μὴ μοῦνος ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναιδείῃ λυπτέοιτο (26).

(26) Lucianus, *de Syria Dea*, tom. 2. pag. 897.

[*A*] *The Book he publiſhed under the title of* Janua Linguarum reſerata *gained him prodigious reputation.*] Had Comenius publiſhed only this Book, he would have immortalized himſelf. It has been printed a multitude of times; tranſlated into a great number of languages; and there are ſeveral polyglot Editions of it. I do not doubt but that Comenius is ſincere, when he owns, that the ſucceſs of this work exceeded infinitely his expectations; for who will not be ſurprized to hear, that ſuch a Book was tranſlated, not only into twelve European Languages, but alſo into Arabick, Turkiſh, Perſian, and Mogol. The moſt conceited Author would never have flattered him with the hopes of ſuch ſucceſs. *Factum eſt, quod futurum imaginari non poteram, ut puerile iſtud opuſculum univerſali quodam eruditi Orbis applauſu fuerit exceptum. Teſtati ſunt id permulti variarum Gentium Viri, tum literis ad me datis, quibus inventioni novæ impenſe gratulabantur, tum tranſlationibus in Linguas vulgares quaſi certatim ſuſceptis. Non ſolum enim in omnes Europeæ linguas* (1) *(XII numero, quarum editiones publicas vidimus, nempe Latinam, Græcam, Bohemicam, Polonicam, Germanicam, Suedicam, Belgicam, Anglicam, Gallicam, Hiſpanicam, Italicam, Hungaricam,) ſed in Aſiaticas, Arabicam, Turcicam, Perſicam, adeoque Mogolicam, toti Orientali Indiæ familiarem (ut ex literis ad* Jacobum Golium, *Orientalium LL. Lugduni veſtræ Profeſſorem, à* Petro Golio *fratre, Alepo Syriæ Anno* 1641 *datis, patet) tranſlatus eſſet idem Libellus noſter* (2). i. e. "A circumſtance has happened which I could never "have expected, viz. that this little Book, calculated "only for children, ſhould have met with uni-"verſal applauſe from the learned. This has been "teſtified by the Letters I received from a great number "of learned men of various Nations, in which they "congratulate me on the invention; as alſo by the "verſions which have been emulouſly made of it, in-"to ſeveral of the modern Tongues. For it has not "only been tranſlated and publiſhed in twelve Euro-"pean languages, viz. Latin, Greek, Bohemian, Poliſh, "German,

(1) Here follow the names of ſome Tranſlators of the Book in queſtion, *ex Diario Biographico Henn. Witte.* The German Tranſlation is by *Johannes Mochingerus*; the Poliſh by *Andreas Wegierſcius*; the Bohemian *by Comenius*; the Greek tranſlation by *Theodorus Simonius*; the Engliſh one, by *John Ancoranus*; the French by *Samuel Hartlib*; the Italian and Spaniſh, by *Nathaniel Duez*; the Flemiſh, by *Seidelius.*

(2) Comenius, *Epiſt. Dedicator. Operum Didactic. ad Conſules* Amſterdam. pag. 1.

diſcourſed with Oxenſtiern about his method; and the reſult of the affair was this, that he ſhould go and ſettle at Elbing in Pruſſia, and there compoſe his method. But I omit the beſt circumſtance of all. The Patron in queſtion was very generous; he ſettled a conſiderable ſtipend on him, by which means Comenius, now delivered from the fatigues of teaching [B], employed himſelf wholly in diſcovering ways and general methods, for thoſe who inſtructed youth. He applied himſelf in this ſtudy at Elbing, during four years; after which he returned to Sweden, to ſhew his compoſition. It was examined by three Commiſſioners, who declared it worthy of being made public, after that the Author ſhould have quite finiſhed it. To this Comenius employed himſelf, during the two following years, in the abovementioned City of Elbing; after which he was obliged to return to Leſna (*b*). We are now come to 1648. I find that, two years after, he took a journey to the Court of Sigiſmund Ragotſki, Prince of Tranſilvania, where a conference was deſired with him, in order for reforming the method of teaching in ſchools. He gave this Prince ſome pieces, containing inſtructions for regulating the College of Patak (*i*), purſuant to the maxims laid down in his *Panſophia*; and, during four years, he was allowed to propoſe whatever he pleaſed, with regard to the government of that College (*k*). After this he returned to Leſna, and did not leave it till April 1656, when it was burnt by the Poles [C]. He there loſt all his manuſcripts, except what he had written on *Panſophia*, and on the Revelations (*l*). He fled into Sileſia, thence to Brandenburg, afterwards to Hamburg, and laſtly to Amſterdam (*m*), where he met with extremely charitable people. The golden ſhower which came pouring upon him in this city, prevailed with him to reſide in it during the remainder of his days [D]. He there printed in 1657, at the expence of his chief Mecænas (*n*), the different parts of his new method of Teaching. This work, in folio, is divided into four parts; the whole coſt the Author prodigious pains; other people a great deal of money, and the Learned have not received any benefit by it; and, in my opinion, there is nothing practicably uſeful in the hints of that Author (*o*). However, he was not only bigotted with reſpect to the reformation of Schools; but he alſo filled his brain with Prophecies, Revolutions, the ruining of Antichriſt, the *Millenium*, and ſuch like ideas of a dangerous enthuſiaſm; I ſay dangerous, not only with regard to the Orthodox Faith, but alſo to Kings and Governments. He collected with prodigious care the chimeras of one Kotterus, thoſe of Chriſtina Poniatovia, and of Drabicius, and publiſhed them in Amſterdam. Theſe chimeras promiſed miracles to thoſe who ſhould attempt to extirpate the Houſe of Auſtria and the Pope. Guſtavus Adolphus, and Charles Guſtavus Kings of Sweden, Cromwell and Ragotſki, had been promiſed, as thoſe who ſhould put theſe ſplendid Prophecies in execution, to which however the event did not correſpond. We are told, that Comenius not knowing which way to turn himſelf, at laſt took it into his head to addreſs Lewis XIV of France [E]. He

(*b*) *Ex Præfatione Partis II.* Operum Didacticorum.

(*i*) Suſanna Lorantſi mother to Sigiſmund Ragotski, took this ſchool more immediately under her protection. *See* Comenius, Part 3. *Operum Didactic.* pag. 70.

(*k*) See Part 3. of his *Opera Didactica.*

(*l*) *Hiſtoria Revelationum*, pag. 181.

(*m*) Ibid. pag. 182.

(*n*) Laurence de Geer, ſon of Lewis.

(*o*) Sorbiere has drawn admirably well the character of this man, and of his *Panſophia*. See the *Sorberiana*, pag. 51.

" German, Swediſh, Dutch, Engliſh, French, Spaniſh, " Italian, Hungarian; but likewiſe into the Aſiatick " Languages, as Arabic, Turkiſh, Perſian, and even " the Mogul, which is ſpoke all over the Eaſt-Indies, " as appears from the Letter written from Aleppo, in " 1641, by Peter Golius, to his brother John Golius, " Profeſſor of the Oriental Languages at Leyden."

[B] *Comenius was delivered from the fatigues of teaching.*] Hitherto, his labours had been confined merely to the care of a ſingle School, but they now extended to all the Colleges. This is the ſame as if a Country Prieſt ſhould be made a Cardinal. *Factis mihi*, ſays he (3), *a Mecænate meo beato otiis, conſtitutaque honeſta (ut particulari ſcholæ miniſtrandi functione exemptus, communioribus poſſem vacare ſtudiis) ſuſtentatione, elaboravi ſexennio.* i. e. " Having, by the generoſity of " my kind Mecænas, got leiſure, and obtained a de- " cent competency (in order that being freed from the " care of teaching a private ſchool, I might devote myſelf " to a more general ſtudy) I have ſpent ſix years &c."

(3) Comen. *Epiſt. Dedicator. Conſulibus Amſterdam.*

[C] *He returned to Leſna, and did not leave it .... till it was burnt by the Poles.*] We ſhall ſee below (4), that Comenius has been reproached with having been the cauſe of this diſaſter (5); and that could he have followed his inclination, he would not have ſtaid in that City, tho' he adviſed others not to be afraid; and aſſured them that their deliverance was at hand.

(4) In the Remark [K].

(5) *Poſt Leſnæ incendium quod ſua πολυπραγμοσύνη illi miſeræ urbi conciviſſet, ut etiam illi publicè exprobratum eſt.* Mareſius, *in Antirrhetico*, pag. 8. i. e. " After the " burning of " Leſna, which " calamity (as " he was pub- " lickly re- " proached for " it) was brought " upon that un- " happy city by " his haughti- " neſs and pride."

[D] *The golden ſhower which came pouring upon him in this city, prevailed with him to reſide in it during the remainder of his days.*] Some perſons were offended at this, ſince his office of Superintendant of the Poliſh and Bohemian Churches required his preſence in thoſe Countries. There is ſome probability to think, that he would have continued his rambling way of life longer, had he not met with ſo plentiful a ſubſiſtence at Amſterdam. He there found charitable perſons, and rich merchants who were perſuaded that he would teach their children Latin after a ſhort and eaſy method; and therefore thought themſelves obliged to pay generouſly a perſon who ſaved youth their time, and ſmooth'd their progreſs in ſtudy. He doubtleſs ſaid to himſelf, It is good to live here, let us therefore pitch our tents in this place. *Mercatoribus quibuſdam Amſterdamenſibus gratus vivit, qui delicatulis ſuis filiis, ejus opera habitum latinitatis nullo labore, & majore æris quam temporis diſpendio, infundi poſſe ſperant Et ſic ille auream apud eos meſſem metit; at vero ubi manet cura Eccleſiarum Polonicarum & Bohemicarum; quarum ſenior & ſuperintendens eſt, & quas in tam miſero ſtatu reliquit ſibi conſulens* (6)? i. e. " He is generouſly befriended " by ſome Merchants of Amſterdam, who fancy that " by his aſſiſtance, their darling ſons may learn to " ſpeak Latin, without pains, and with a leſs expence " of time than money. In this manner Comenius " reaps a golden harveſt among them. But then, " where is his regard and care of the Churches of Po- " land and Bohemia, whoſe Elder and Superintendant " he is; and which he (when he was ſo careful of his " own ſafety) left in ſo calamitous a ſtate?" Arnoldus here gives, in few words, a lively deſcription of the paternal tenderneſs which the Dutch have for their children.

(6) *See* Nicholas Arnoldus, *in Diſcurſu Theologico contra Comenium*, in the laſt page.

[E] *Not knowing which way to turn himſelf, he at laſt took it into his head, to addreſs Lewis XIVth of France.*] I have heard ſeveral perſons affirm it, and this is all I can ſay of the matter. But with regard to the promiſe itſelf, I ſhall cite an Author, who is very converſant in Dabricius, and therefore to be credited with reſpect to the particulars which he declares were read by him in Dabricius. Here follow his words. *The Spaniards may boaſt, if they pleaſe, the ſignal advantages, which the Houſe of Auſtria obtains over its enemies; with regard to us* (he ſpeaks in the name of the Proteſtants) *if we have not quite reaſon enough to be ſatisfied with the preſent ſtate of affairs, we yet may very juſtly conceive great hopes of the future. There is a prediction which promiſes the Empire to the King. It is by Dabricius, a Bohemian, who propheſied about twenty*

He ſent him a copy of Drabicius's Prophecies; and inſinuated, that it was to this Monarch God promiſed the Empire of the world, by the downfal of thoſe who perſecuted Chriſt. He wrote ſome books in Amſterdam under an inauſpicious planet, which may be ſaid chiefly with regard to that which he publiſhed againſt Mr. Des Marets, concerning the *Millenium*. He drew a moſt furious anſwer on himſelf, in which the Author pretends that he has pulled off his maſk (*p*). He is there repreſented as a bite and a true ſharper [*F*], who reaped admirable advantage, by his character of a perſon who was a refugee for Religion; and by the pompous ideas of his method of teaching; who made, I ſay, a wonderful uſe of theſe ſprings, to empty the purſes of tender hearted perſons. He alſo was exhibited in other diſadvantageous lights [*G*]. Comenius was at laſt ſenſible of

(*p*) *Ita Deo diſpenſante evenit, ut tua importunitate coactus, larvam tibi detraxerim, & quam hactenus egeris perſonam in hac ſcena mundi toti mundo oſtenderim.* Mareſius, *in Antirrhetico*, pag. 11. i. e. "Thus, "by the Providence of God, "and compelled "to it by your "importunity, I "have pulled off "your mask; "and ſhewed to "the whole "world, the part "you have hi-"therto acted in "it."

years ago, that the King ſhould be made Emperor, and the Houſe of Auſtria be deſtroyed; that Vienna ſhould be taken by the Turks, that theſe would make themſelves maſters of Carinthia and Styria; and would march, and deſtroy the Republic of Venice and the City of Rome; and that the King, being elected Emperor, will reſtore peace and the free exerciſe of Religion to all Europe. We find that for theſe fifteen or ſixteen years, heaven is preparing to perform its promiſes, and we'll certainly do whatever lies in our power to fulfil theſe prophecies. The Houſe of Auſtria is already humbled and almoſt deſtroyed. The King is poſſeſſed of the great City of Straſburgh, of all Alſatia, and of Friburg; and has under his command all the countries watered by the Rhine, and five Electors, three of whom are Eccleſiaſticks; and the other two, the Palatine of the Rhine, and the Elector of Brandenburgh; the war with the Grand Signior is not yet ended, and who knows what will be the reſult of all this (7). This Author has changed his ſyſtem very much ſince that time (8).

(7) *Eſprit de Mr. Arnauld*, tom. 2. pag. 290, 291. This Book was printed, ſoon after the raiſing the ſiege of Vienna.

(8) See *La Cabale Chimerique*, pag. 133, 134. of the 2d edition; where the Reader will find, among other particulars the following. "Oh how ſoon "his Syſtem "faced about; "and how much "ought he to be "aſhamed to "have rendered "us, as much as "lay in his pow-"er, the deteſta-"tion of the Chri-"ſtian name, and "of our faithful "Allies, in de-"claring, that "we would en-"deavour with "all our might, "to engage the "Turks to de-"ſtroy the Houſe "of Auſtria, the "Republic of "Venice, and "the City of "Rome; and to "raiſe Lewis the "XIVth to the "Imperial "Throne? *Quantum mutatus ab illo!*"

[*F*] *He is there repreſented as a bite and a true ſharper.*] Here follow the words of his antagoniſt. *Agnoſco hominem eſſe ingenii eximii & admodum inventivi, ac, plane ei convenientis qui diceret*, con l'arte l'inganno io vivi mezzo l'anno: con l'inganno e l'arte, io vivo l'altra parte. *Nam ut nullum hoc ſæculum tulit myſticum æruſcatorem illo ſubtiliorem, ita nullum protulit ſcriptorem in trichotomiis excogitandis feliciorem* (9). i. e. "I acknowledge Comenius to be poſſeſſed of a fine, "and very inventive genius, and ſuch a one as would "well ſuit a man who ſhould ſay, *I ſubſiſt half the "year by tricking and artifice, and by artifice and tricking I ſubſiſt the other half*: for as this Age has not "produced a more arch ſharper than Comenius, neither has it given birth to a Writer who has a happier knack at ſtarting of nice and uſeful diſtinctions." See what he relates concerning the craft, which Comenius employed with regard to Lewis de Geer, in order that he might be the only object of his liberality, and to make it laſt the longer. The Panſophia he promiſed, and which never appear'd in print, was always kept back, as he uſed to ſay, by ſome extraordinary occurrences; ſo that, by ſuch delays, Comenius made it quite uſeleſs according to his own principles; for he pretended that the reign of the millenium was to begin in 1672 (10). Now there would have been no occaſion, for Comenius's new method of teaching at that period. Mr. Des Marets obſerves (11), that Comenius put his Patron to four times more expence, every year, than his ſalary amounted to, *Auſim dicere Comenium triplo vel quadruplo quotannis amplius conſtitiſſe uni familiæ Degerianæ, dum eam fraudulenter lactat ſpe Panſophica, & paſcit ſive faſcinat potius fumo Chiliaſtico, & revelationum Drabicianarum, quam ſoleo conſequi in meum ſtipendium annuum ex ærario publico.* i. e. "I dare be ſo bold as to aſſert, that "Comenius coſt the ſingle family of de Geer, three "or four times as much annually, as I am paid yearly "out of the public treaſury, whilſt he fraudulently "cajoles them with his chiliaſtic ſmoke or dreams "of the Millenium, and with the revelations of Drabicius."

(9) Mareſius, *in Antirrhetico*, pag. 5.

(10) Idem, ibid. pag. 8.

(11) Ibid. pag. 55.

[*G*] *He alſo was exhibited in other diſadvantageous lights.*] In the firſt place, he is accuſed of being exceſſively proud; and it is obſerved, that this is the uſual defect of thoſe who pretend to be inſpired by heaven. And indeed this is ſo great a privilege, that we muſt not be ſurprized, when thoſe who imagine themſelves honoured from God with ſo extraordinary a mark of diſtinction, behave with the utmoſt contempt towards other Divines who are not intoxicated with ſuch chimæras. But this denotes at the ſame time, that they are in the wrong to boaſt their being inſpired; for were God to favour them in this ſignal manner, he would not refuſe them the ſpirit of Chriſtian Humility; they would not be ſo highly incenſed againſt all thoſe who will not give credit to their idle notions, *Ut eſt ſui plenus* (In this manner Des-Marets (12) ſpeaks of Comenius) *& grandia ſentit de ſeipſo, prout ſolent omnes iſti Viſionarii qui ſpeciale cum numine commercium ſibi intercedere gloriantur eſſe ſuperbiſſimi, non poteſt æquo ferre animo ſuas non dicam ſolum nænias. & quiſquilias, ſed fanaticas, & enthuſiaſticas cogitationes improbari* .i. e. "As he is very full "of himſelf and entertains the higheſt idea of his own "merit, as do all ſuch Enthuſiaſts who boaſt their "having an immediate correſpondence with the Di-"vine Being; he cannot bear to have his nonſenſe "and riffraff, or rather his fanatic and enthuſiaſtic "chimæras diſapproved." IIdly, Comenius is accuſed of having been angry, particularly becauſe it was proved that he had contradicted himſelf. He had writ againſt one Felgenhaverus who gave out Prophecies very like thoſe of Dabricius (13), Comenius oppoſed to him almoſt the ſame reaſons which refuted the chimæras of Dabricius, and conſequently he had refuted himſelf beforehand; and no other expedient was neceſſary, in order to make him the object of ridicule, but to oppoſe his own arguments one againſt the other. This exaſperated him to the higheſt degree. And ſuch is the fate of obſtinacy and ſelf conceit; and of thoſe who become fanaticks, by imbibing too eager a fondneſs for certain opinions. Their firſt works deſtroy their laſt; and if any man preſumes to reproach them with their contradictions, they immediately fly into a great paſſion. We have ſeen ſo extraordinary an inſtance of this ſince the death of Comenius, that it is not neceſſary to particularize it here. IIIdly, He is accuſed of want of judgment: but as for genius and memory, it is not denied but that he poſſeſſed both in an eminent degree; and to prove his want of judgment, it was objected to him that he undertook too many things; was reſtleſs and turbulent, that he could not come to any certainty with regard to his notions on Grammar. *Non mirum eſt quod in Comenio ſumma ἀκρισία ſummæ ingenii dexteritati conjungatur. Illam comprobant ἀκρισίαν conſtans ejus πολυπραγμοσύνη genus vitæ deſultorium, & ἀκαταστασία perpetua, quæ maximè in ſuis Grammaticationibus fingendis & refingendis per totos 30 annos eluxit* (14). IVthly, Comenius is accuſed of inconſtancy in matters of Religion. It was objected to him that he had long meditated a project concerning the pacification of the Church, in concert with the Socinians (15). Zwickerus who was of that Sect, reproached him with this publickly. It is added, that Comenius had a wonderful flexibility of temper whereby he could conform himſelf to the maxims of any Sect among whom he happened to live; but that if common fame ſaid true, he did not communicate with any party. He is reproached for his lukewarmneſs in not attempting to refute the Papiſts, he having never writ any thing againſt them, except a little Book in oppoſition to Valerian Magni a Capuchin, to which he even did not put his name till he had diſguiſed it according to the myſterious rules of the Cabala (16). He juſtified himſelf however in the ſecond Edition of this treatiſe, by ſaying that he had never loved diſputes. He intended to annex to this ſecond Edition, a plan for uniting the Proteſtants and Papiſts; but his friends obliged him to ſuppreſs it (17). His antagoniſts forgot to cite as a proof of his inconſtancy, the works he publiſhed againſt the *Irenicon Irenicorum* of Zwickerus the Socinian (18). But on the other ſide it was reproached to him, that whilſt his

(12) Ibid. pag. 5.

(13) Idem, ibid.

(14) Idem, ibid.

(15) Idem, ibid. pag. 6.

(16) *Ita tepidus eſt in propugnanda Proteſtantium cauſa contra Pontificios, ut non niſi ſemel tale quid fecerit adverſus Valerianum Magnum Capucinum ſuo ordinario nomine diſſimulato, & aſſumpto Cabaliſtico Huldrici Newfeldii quod præfixit illi paucularum plagarum opuſculo.* Mareſius, *in Antirrhetico.*

(17) This Book is intitled, *Abſurditatum Echo.* The 2d edition is of 1658.

(18) See the Remark [*M*].

of the vanity of his labours [*H*], and of the great trouble he had given himſelf, ever ſince the time that Providence had forced him to leave his native country. And indeed, it would have been more laudable in him, had he turned his eyes inward, and applied his whole thoughts to his ſalvation, during his exile, rather than to buſy himſelf ſo much about the tranſactions of Europe, in order to diſcover, in the intereſts of Princes, in their wars, alliances, &c. wherewithal to ſooth the hopes he entertained of being reſtored to his country, as well as revenged of his enemies: it was this threw him into enthuſiaſm. He died in Amſterdam the 15th of November 1671 (*q*). Had he lived but a very little longer, he himſelf would have been a witneſs of the falſity of his promiſes with regard to the Millenium [*I*]. He was in his eightieth year when he died. Some perſons were ſurpriſed how it was poſſible for him to live ſo long [*K*]; and that the grief, to find himſelf ſo unſucceſsful in his Prophecies, did not ſhorten his days. Meſſieurs Bourignon and Comenius

(*q*) *Epiſt. Danielis Comenii* Joh. Amaſii Filii, apud *Spizelium in Infel. Literat.* pag. 1028. Konig is miſtaken, in fixing Comenius's death to 1670.

his two Mecænas's were living he had always made honourable mention of Des Cartes; whereas after their death he publiſhed a libel againſt that famous Philoſopher. V. The chief defect reproached to Comenius is Enthuſiaſm. *Sed præſertim eſt Comenius Fanaticus, Viſionarius, & Enthuſiaſta in folio* (19). i. e. "But "eſpecially Comenius is a Fanatic, a Viſionary Crea- "ture and an Enthuſiaſt of the firſt claſs." He pretended that Dabricius's Propheſies would cut out work enough for all the Princes of Europe; for this reaſon he wrote letters to the Pope, to the Emperor, to Kings, and to Cardinals, in order to recommend this work to them, as the rule and ſtandard by which they were to conduct themſelves. *Datis ad Papam, ad Imperatorem, ad Reges, ad Cardinales literis, has nænias illis de meliori nota commendare atque exinde quid facere, quid cavere, quid metuere debeant illis præſcribere* (20). Comenius was always attentive to the events which happened in Europe, in order to reconcile them with the ſyſtem of his Chimeras! It is the cuſtom of ſuch perſons (as has been ſeen by late inſtances,) to ſquare and adjuſt ſome part of their predictions, to the articles of the News-Papers. Comenius being in doubt whether the Plenipotentiaries of England and Holland, who were to treat about a peace at Breda, in 1667, could conclude it; diſpatched one of his angels to tell them, that they muſt put an end to the war; and by this means facilitate the coming of the reign of Chriſt Jeſus, that reign of a thouſand years which would reſtore the golden age, and the ſtate of innocence (21). VIthly. It is reproached to him, that himſelf and ſuch other millenary Fanaticks have no other view but to ſpirit up people to rebellion; and that he omitted no endeavours to perſuade Cromwell to raiſe diſturbances in Bohemia. *Ne objiciam Comenio quæ ipſe quondam per tertium molitus eſt apud Cromwellium ad reſturbandas in Bohemia* (22). VIIthly and laſtly, Comenius is reproached with having choſe to expoſe the authority of the Scriptures, rather than own that he was in an error. He had long before concluded (23), that ſince the event did not anſwer the Prophecies of Felgenhaverus, they did not come from God; but with regard to thoſe of his three Seers (24), he protected them againſt all oppoſers, altho' their Prophecies had been contradicted by the event, and he even compared their idle predictions with thoſe of the Old Teſtament. *Nunc verò ſuas propugnat etſi ab eventu fuerint deſtitutæ, imo eas impiè, profanè, & ſacrilegè cum prophetiis V. T. audet conferre* (25).

(19) Mareſius, *in Antirrhetico*, pag. 9.

(20) Idem, pag. 10.

(21) He publiſhed a Book intitled, *Angelus pacis ad Legatos pacis Anglos & Belgas Bredam miſſus, indeque ad omnes Chriſtianos per Europam, & mox ad omnes Populos per Orbem totum mittendus, ut ſe ſiſtant, belligerare deſiſtant, paciſque Principi Chriſto pacem gentibus jam loquuturo locum faciant.* He promiſed to publiſh two other Books, which were to be intitled, *The double Aurora of the mighty Day that was going to riſe.* Mareſ. *in Antirrhetico*, pag. 10.

(22) Ibid. pag. 58.

(23) *In Epiſtola ad Stolcium, anno* 1640.

24 Cotterus, Poniatovia, Drabicius.

(25) Mareſ. *in Antirrhet.* pag. 66.

(26) *In Infelice Literato*, pag. 1024, & *ſeq.*

(27) Mareſ. *in Antirrhet.* pag. 8.

[*H*] *Comenius was at laſt ſenſible of the vanity of his labours.*] See the Book he publiſhed at Amſterdam, entitled by him *Unius neceſſarii* anno 1668, and the applauſes which are beſtowed upon him by Spizelius (26) for this confeſſion; and the deſign he entertained of employing all his future thoughts wholly on his ſalvation.

[*I*] *Had he lived but a very little longer, he himſelf would have been a witneſs to the falſity of his promiſes with regard to the Millenium.*] He affirmed that it would begin in 1672 or 1673 (27). There is ſcarce any perſon but what thinks, that Comenius died in very a propos time, ſince he thereby avoided the ſhame and confuſion of being himſelf an eye-witneſs to the vanity of his predictions. But I am of opinion, that his death was not of much advantage to him; for he met ſo often with this kind of misfortunes, and was ſo much hardened againſt whatever people ſhould ſay, that he would have been quite inſenſible to this laſt diſgrace. Theſe Gentlemen are of an excellent temper; nothing can ruffle them, or put them out of countenance; they appear as boldly in company after the expiration of the period as before; they do not fear either the jokes or the ſerious reproaches to which they muſt be expoſed. They are ever ready to begin again; in a word, they are proof againſt the moſt juſtly grounded mortifications. We muſt not aſcribe this wholly to the odd caſt of their minds and affections; the public is more to be blamed than they, becauſe of their too extreme indulgence towards ſuch people. It is ſaid commonly, that God pardons all things, and men nothing; but this maxim is falſe when applied to the Commentators on the Revelations; it is very plain that God has not the ſame indulgence as the public, for the bold interpretations which thoſe pretended Prophets give to the Oracles of the Holy Scriptures at the ſame time that they expoſe them to the contempt of unbelievers. A learned Divine obſerves, that Comenius did not loſe his credit in any manner, tho' he had impoſed upon the people an hundred times, by his idle dreams; and was ſtill conſidered as a great Prophet; ſo true it is, that people love to be impoſed upon in certain things (28). I obſerved before, that Comenius ſtill continued to publiſh the predictions of Dabricius as coming from God, even after they had been contradicted by the event. Here follows an inſtance of this. He was Dabricius's Coadjutor, and was to be one of thoſe, who in preſence of this Prophet, ſhould ſet the Crown of Hungary on the head of Prince Ragotſki at Preſburg (29); after that Dabricius ſhould have gone into Tranſilvania, in order to proclaim this Prince King of Hungary; and to anoint him in preſence of all the people at the end of the Sermon, which he was to have preached on the following text. I HAVE ANOINTED HIM MY KING, UPON MY HOLY HILL. *Suſcipe iter ad principem .... ut eum coram toto exercitu quem ad ipſum collegi ungas & proclames Regem terræ hujus. Sed præmittas concionem ſuper verba Pſalmi ſecundi,* Ego unxi Regem meum, &c. *quam concionem ſtatim meditare, peractaque illa effundas oleum unctionis olei Balſami* (quod reperies in aula principis) *in conſpectu totius populi ſuper caput principis* (30). i. e. "Set out to the Prince, in order to "anoint and proclaim him King of this land, in pre- "ſence of the whole army which I aſſembled for "him. But firſt preach a Sermon on the following "words of Pſalm II, *I have anointed my King* &c. "which Sermon compoſe immediately, and after hav- "ing preached it, pour the anointed oil of balſam "(this you will find in that Prince's Court) on the head "of the Prince, in preſence of all the people." He lived long enough to be aſſured, that this could never come to paſs.

(28) *Interea toties ineptiis ejus decepti eum pro magno Propheta habere pergunt, nec quicquam inde detrimenti authoritas ejus ſentit. Sic mundus vult decipi.* Arnoldus, in the *Appendix* of the *Diſcurſus Theologicus*, pag. ult.

(29) *Scribe Adjuncto* (Comenio) *illum fore unum de illis qui regio capiti coronam imponent te quoque præſente.* Revel. 155. ver. 3, 4. *apud* Arnoldum, *Diſcurſ. Theol. contra Comenium*, pag. 37.

(30) Revel. xxx. 4. *apud* Arnold. ibid.

[*K*] *Some perſons were ſurprized how it was poſſible for him to live ſo long.*] It is difficult to conceive how a man of honour can long ſurvive the ſhame of having been the promoter of Prophecies, which the event had confuted in ſuch a manner as ſeemed purpoſely to contradict them. Comenius was alſo expoſed to ſeveral other kinds of mortification which muſt neceſſarily have been as grievous to him as thoſe in queſtion.

In theſe he was reproached with having done great prejudice to his baniſhed brethren (31). Moſt of them had fled from their country with conſiderable ſums of money; but inſtead of being œconomiſts, they ſquandered it away in a ſhort time, becauſe Comenius aſſured that they ſhould return immediately to their native country; that on theſe promiſes they imagined there was no occaſion for them to be ſaving; but that it was better to rid themſelves of whatever might incumber them in their journey. By this means they were

(31) *See* Arnoldus, *Diſcurſ. Theolog. contra Comenium.*

Comenius had a cordial and ſpiritual eſteem for one another [*L*]. I muſt not omit, that he publiſhed a piece againſt the Socinians [*M*]. The Author of a book intitled JANUA COELORUM RESERATA, i. e. *The Gate of Heaven unlock'd*, choſe, as we are told, this title, becauſe there is no one to which the ear is more accuſtomed than to that of *Janua Linguarum reſerata* of Comenius [*N*]. There will be many particulars in the Articles DRABICIUS

were ſoon reduced to beggary, in ſpite of all the fine promiſes with which they had fed themſelves. Comenius was alſo accuſed (32), of having been the cauſe of the plundering and burning of Leſna (33) in Poland, where his brethren had been indulged an aſylum and as it were their Pella; to have been I ſay the cauſe of it, by the Panegyric he made ſo unſeaſonably on Charles Guſtavus King of Sweden, when he invaded Poland. Comenius proclaimed him in a prophetic manner, to be the immediate deſtroyer of Popery; whereby the Proteſtants of Poland became extremely odious to the Roman Catholicks of that Kingdom; and he did not ſeem to be undeceived when the King of Sweden turned his arms ſoon after againſt Denmark. Comenius made him a ſecond Panegyrick (34), wherein he congratulated him no leſs on this new invaſion, than he had done upon the former. It was a great error to imagine, that the abovementioned Prince intended to deſtroy Popery. The Elector of Brandenburg acquainted Richard Cromwell in a letter that the Swedes had made a dreadful havock of the Proteſtants in Poland (35); and no Princes contributed ſo much as thoſe of the Proteſtant Religion, to diſpoſſeſs Charles Guſtavus of his conqueſts. The faith of Comenius was ſhaken at certain times; for tho' it is related (36), that upon his bare word, the Proteſtants of Leſna thought their great deliverance near at hand, and therefore did not take care to retire with their effects to ſome ſecure aſylum; he himſelf tells us (37), that he propoſed to ſecure himſelf from the impending ſtorm; but that not being able to get diſmiſſed from his Church, and being unwilling to bring a reflection upon it, by quitting it without leave, (which he was told would be ſetting an ill example) he and the reſt were ſurprized by the Poliſh Army; on which occaſion he loſt his houſe, his furniture, his Library; and ſeveral works in the compoſing of which he had ſpent above forty years. Only part of the Apocalyptick Treatiſes, and ſome other Pieces (28), eſcaped the flames; he had juſt time to throw them into a hole and cover them with earth, and they were taken from it ten days after the fire (39).

(32) Ibid. and pag. 83.

(33) This City was burnt about the latter end of April 1657.

(34) Arnoldus, *Diſcurſ. Theolog.* pag. 69.

(35) This Letter contains ſeveral curious particulars. It is dated Dec. 28, 1658; and is inſerted in the *Præſtantium & eruditorum Virorum Epiſtolæ*, pag. 897. edit. 1684.

(36) Arnoldus, pag. 87.

(37) *Equidem ſubducere me mature volui metu ſive talis alicujus tragici exitus, ſive diuturnioris belli ... ſed impetrare à meis demiſſionem non potui; cum ſcandalo autem deſerere gregem (malo prorſus exemplo, ut dictitabant) nolui.* Hiſt. Revel. pag. 181.

(38) Thoſe which related to the *Panſophia*.

(39) *Hiſtoria Revelationum*, pag. 281.

[*L*] *Madam Bourignon and Comenius had a cordial and ſpiritual eſteem for one another.*] "Comenius fell out "with Serrarius, becauſe the latter behaved with ſo "much paſſion and injuſtice towards her. He pre"ſerved an entire friendſhip for her all the remainder "of his life; and being upon his death bed, he de"ſired her to pay him a laſt viſit, ſaying to thoſe "who ſpoke of her: *O where is this holy maid! let "me have the ſatisfaction of ſeeing her once more be"fore I die. All the learning and knowledge which I "have acquired, are only the productions of the under"ſtanding and reaſon of man, and the effects of hu"man ſtudy; but ſhe is poſſeſſed of a wiſdom and light "that proceed immediately from God only, thro' the "Holy Ghoſt.* After ſhe had viſited him at his requeſt "and was withdrawn; he ſaid frequently, in the "higheſt tranſports of joy, to thoſe who came to ſee "him: *I have ſeen an Angel of God; God ſent me "his Angel to day.* He died ſome time after in the "grace of God, as Mrs. Bourignon did not doubt; "ſhe often uſing to ſay, that ſhe had never known "a man of learning, who had a more upright heart, "and was poſſeſſed of a greater ſpirit of humility "than Comenius (40).

(40) *Vie continuée de Mad. Bourignon*, pag. 292.

[*M*] *He publiſhed a piece againſt the Socinians.*] A Socinian writ a Book entitled, *Irenicum Irenicorum, ſeu reconciliatoris Chriſtianorum hodiernorum norma triplex, ſana omnium hominum ratio, ſcriptura ſacra, & traditiones*, and dedicated it to the Pope. Neither the name of the Author, nor the date or place where it was printed are ſet down; but it is known that it was written by a Phyſician born in Dantzick, called Daniel Zwickerus, and that he got it printed at Amſterdam in 1658 (41). Comenius refuted this work by another entitled, *De Irenico Irenicorum, hoc eſt conditionibus pacis à Socini ſecta reliquo Chriſtiano orbi oblatis, ad omnes Chriſtianos facta admonitio*, printed at Amſterdam, in 1660, and which was alſo refuted ſoon after; for Zwickerus publiſhed in the ſame city, anno 1661, his *Irenicomaſtix perpetuo convictus & conſtrictus, ſeu nova confirmatio infallibilitatis Irenici Irenicorum per oſtenſam utilitatem criminoſæ* COMENIANAE *Refutationis*. Soon after Comenius printed an Anſwer, which was followed in a little time by a Work of Zwickerus entitled, *Irenicomaſtix poſterior iterato victus & conſtrictus, imo obmuteſcens, ſeu novum & memorabile exemplum infeliciſſimæ pugnæ Dn. Joh. Amos Comenii, contra Irenici Irenicorum Autorem.* Comenius took the field once more, and his antagoniſt did the ſame, he publiſhing, *Irenicomaſtigis pars ſpecialis, ſeu finalis Confutatio Comenii, Hoornbeekii, & aliorum* (42). We are to obſerve, by the way, that Dr. Bull has refuted ſeveral paſſages of the *Irenicum Irenicorum*, and that he is accuſed for not having read the other works of the ſame Author, for want of which he cenſured Daniel Zwickerus for ſome points which he would not have objected to him, had he peruſed his *Irenicomaſtix perpetuus convictus, &c.* This is objected to him in a Pſeudonymous Piece, printed at London anno 1697, and entitled, *Fides primorum Chriſtianorum ex Barnaba, Herma, & Clemente Romano, monſtrata, Defenſioni Fidei Nicenæ D. Georgii Bulli oppoſita* (43).

(41) See the *Bibliotheque of the Antitrinitarians*, pag. 152.

(42) Extracted from the *Bibliotheques of the Antitrinitarians*, pag. 152.

(43) The Author aſſumes the name of *Lucas Mellierus, V. D. M.* Obſerve that *Lucas Mellierus* is the anagram of *Samuel Crellius*, the real name of the Author, grandſon of the famous John Crellius.

[*N*] *The Author of a Book entitled*, JANUA COELORUM RESERATA *choſe, as we are told, this title, becauſe there is none to which the ear is more accuſtomed than to that of* Janua Linguarum Reſerata *of Comenius.*] As this Book is not very much known, it may not be improper to take ſome notice of it here, in order that my Readers may have a general idea of it, without having recourſe to other Books, or even moving from their ſeats.

I ſay therefore that the real or pretended name of the Author of this Book (44), is *Carus Larebonius*. He attacks in the ſtyle and manner of a Peripatetick Philoſopher, Mr. Jurieu's Syſtem of the Church; and quite overthrows it, ſince he ſhews plainly, that according to the hypotheſis of this Miniſter, perſons of all Religions may be ſaved. This is very grievous to Mr. Jurieu, as it is depriving him of the moſt valuable part of his poſſeſſions, and deſtroying the work which did him moſt honour. For Mr. Nicolle among ſo many works of Mr. Jurieu, thought this only deſerved to be anſwered. He had formed two claſſes of the remainder, and placed in the firſt, thoſe Books wherein he pretended that Mr. Jurieu had not advanced any thing new; and in the ſecond, thoſe where he ſays that Mr. Jurieu has publiſhed ſuch particulars as were new (45); according to him thoſe of the firſt claſs are only *various rhapſodies and collections* of what had been already related by the Proteſtant Writers; and thoſe of the ſecond contain nothing but loads of *ſlander, vented againſt all ſort of perſons; or elſe wild chimæras and opinions, or paſſionate declamations.* Now he was of opinion, that *the Authors of Collections*, do not merit an anſwer, but ought to be *left to the judgment of the public, who ſoon bring them to their right wits, by the diſtaſte which they take for Works of this ſort*; and that *ſilence and contempt are puniſhments beſt proportioned to the vanity and paſſion* of thoſe, who write Books of the ſecond claſs. It was his opinion particularly with regard to the accompliſhing of Mr. Jurieu's Propheſies, that *it would be as idle for any man to attempt the refutation of them, as of the centuries of Noſtradamus* (46): but with reſpect to the ſyſtem of the Church, which *the public*, ſays he (47), *did not look upon as a contemptible work*, he was of opinion, after weighing the affair maturely that it would be proper for him to refute it. I only relate theſe things hiſtorically.

(44) Printed at Amſterdam, 1692, in 4to.

(45) Nicolle, *Preface de l'Unité de l'Egliſe*, pag. 2.

(46) Idem, ibid. pag. 27.

(47) Idem, pag. 1.

We muſt not be ſurprized that Mr. Jurieu, by employing the expreſſions of a man who is highly exaſperated (48), ſhould have ſhewn, that he was ſtrongly affected at the deſtroying of that work, which muſt neceſſarily

(48) See his 2d Apologie.

DRABICIUS and KOTTERUS, which may ſerve as a ſupplement to that we have here given.

necessarily have been his favourite; and those only who are strangers to this kind of paternal tenderneſs can be diſpleaſed at his conſoling himſelf in ſome meaſure, by giving a very diſadvantageous character both of the Book which was writ againſt him (49), and of the perſon to whom he aſcribes it.

Solatia luctus
Exigua ingentis, miſero ſed debita patri (50).
That is,
" A ſlender comfort for ſo deep a grief,
" But, to an unhappy father, due.

(49) He even cenſures the Latin of it; and hints, that ſuch a neglect of ſtyle, is a miracle of God's juſtice (ſo fond he is of miracles;) and does not obſerve that Larebonius ſays, at the beginning and end of his book, that he purpoſely choſe the ſcholaſtic ſtyle. *Iniquum eſt*, ſays Mr. Amyraut, on the like occaſion, *id in aliquo reprehendere, in quo data opera neglexit diligenter elaborare.* i. e. " It is unjuſt to cenſure a Writer for not being accurate, when he purpoſely neglected being ſo." Mr. Jurieu was ſo prudent, as to judge of the Latin only by proxy; for he was not ignorant, that his inability on that head was known, even before he wrote againſt Scultetus. See Mr. Simon *Rep. à ld Def. des Sent.* pag. 191. This proxy is in all probability ſome very poor ſcholar, ſince he looks upon, as dark and perplexing, the arguments of Larebonius, whoſe book is as clear as the Sun.

See a little Book printed at Amſterdam, in 1692, and entitled, *New Advices to the little Author of little Books*; you will there find (51), a letter full of reflections that are curious enough wherein an apology is made for Mr. Jurieu's anger, and which will prevent our wondering that neither this Miniſter nor his friends have been able to make the leaſt anſwer to the *Jaina Coelorum Reſerata*. It is being ridiculouſly ſcrupulous to cenſure Larebonius, on pretence that ſeveral of his terms and phraſes are not borrowed from the Claſſicks. His work is of the nature of thoſe whoſe imperfections conſiſt only in bad arguments or falſities; and he cannot be refuſed the privilege which all the Authors of common places of Divinity and public Theſes enjoy, viz. the not regarding whether their Latin is flat or not.

(51) In pag. 58, & ſeq.

(50) Virg. Æneid. lib. 11. ver. 62.

COMMANDINUS FREDERICK) born at Urbino in Italy, and deſcended from a very noble family, was a learned man of the ſixteenth Century. To a vaſt knowledge in the Mathematicks he had added a great ſkill in the Greek tongue, by which he was very well qualified to tranſlate the Greek Mathematicians into Latin. And indeed, he publiſhed and tranſlated ſeveral, to which no Writer, till then, had done that good office. Francis Maria Duke of Urbino, who was very converſant in thoſe Sciences, was a very affectionate Patron to him on that account. Commandinus died in 1575, aged ſixty ſix years. He was buried in the monument of his anceſtors; and Antonio Toroneo delivered his funeral Oration (*a*). I ſhall give a catalogue of the works which Commandinus has tranſlated and illuſtrated with Notes [*A*]. He is greatly applauded by Blancanus (*b*) and other Writers, and deſerves their encomiums very juſtly. It is not the leaſt of his commendations to obſerve, that among the reſt of his diſciples were Bernardinus Baldus and Guy Ubaldus, both excellent Writers, who doubtleſs were indebted to his care for the great progreſs they made. I have one obſervation to make on his Tranſlation of Euclid [*B*].

(*a*) *Ex* Thuano, lib. 61. pag. 139.

(*b*) *Chronolog. Mathem.* pag 61.

[*A*] *I ſhall give a catalogue of the Works which Commandinus has tranſlated and illuſtrated with Notes.*] *Archimedes circuli dimenſio, de lineis ſpiralibus, quadratura paraboles de conoidibus & ſphæroidibus, de arenæ numero*; Venice, printed by Paulus Manutius, 1558, *folio*. *Ejuſdem Archimedis de iis quæ vehuntur in aqua*, Bologna, 1565 4*to*. *Apollonii Pergæi Conicorum libri quatuor una cum Pappi Alexandrini lemmatibus, & commentariis Eutocii Aſcalonitæ, &c.* Bologna, 1566, *folio* (1). *Ptolomæi planiſphærium*, Venice, 1558 4*to*. *Ejuſdem de Analemmate Liber*, Romæ 1562, 4*to*. *Elementa Euclidis*, Peſaro, 1572, *folio*. *Ariſtarchus de magnitudinibus ac diſtantiis Solis & Lunæ*, Peſaro, 1575, 4*to* (2). *Hero de ſpiritalibus* (3), Urbino. 1575, 4*to*. *Machometes Bagdedinus de ſuperficierum diviſionibus*, Peſaro, 1570, *folio*. *Pappi Alexandrini Collectiones Mathematicæ*, Peſaro, 1588, *folio*, *&c.* The publication of this laſt Work, would have been ſtill longer after the death of its Author, had not the Duke of Urbino exerted himſelf vigorouſly about it; otherwiſe the law ſuit, which Commandinus's two daughters commenced againſt each other, would have occaſioned a very long delay, as Valerius Spaciolus his ſon-in-law (4) owns. He alſo writ ſome Books of his own compoſing; with a treatiſe *De Centro gravitatis ſolidorum*, printed in Bologna, 1565, *folio*; *Horologiorum deſcriptio*, Rome, 1562 (5), &c.

(1) Ex Ant. Verderio, *Supplement. Epitom. Geſner.*

(2) See the *Bodleian Catalogue.*

(3) *See* Voſſius, *de Mathem.* pag. 290.

(4) Voſſius, ibid. pag. 59.

(5) *The Bodleian Catalogue.*

[*B*] *I have one obſervation to make on his Tranſlation of Euclid.*] Teiſſier tells us, that Commandinus tranſlated Euclid's Works into Italian, and quotes Voſſius de *Mathem. pag.* 68 (6): but is certain, that Voſſius does not affirm this to have been an Italian tranſlation; nor do I find any Author who declares it to be ſo. Doubtleſs Mr. Teiſſier's Printer is the cauſe that inſtead of *Heronis Alexandrini Spiritalium Liber*; we read in page 470 cited by me, *Hieronis Alexandrini Spiritualium Liber*. In Blancanus (7) we find *Neronis* inſtead of *Heronis*. Thus do Printers multiply Authors. Some Compilers, to ſhew that they have improved on their predeceſſors, will perhaps tells us as a rare diſcovery, that there was antiently an able Mathematician called Nero, ſome of whoſe Works are ſtill extant.

(6) *Eleg. tirée de Mr. de Thou*, tom. 1. pag. 470.

(7) *Chronol. Mathemat.* pag. 61.

CONCINI (CONCINO) known by the name of MARSHAL D'ANCRE, abuſed in ſo extraordinary a manner the favour of the Queen-mother, Mary of Medicis, that, to check his ambition, it was thought convenient to diſpatch him, without bringing him to a tryal [*A*]. There would have been too much danger, in doing this in a legal way, which circumſtance alone proves him to have been a wicked man [*B*]. He was born in Florence, where his father, from the profeſſion of a Scrivener, had roſe to be Secretary of State. He came into France with Mary of Medicis wife of Henry IV, and was at firſt but Gentleman in ordinary to that Princeſs; but he afterwards was appointed her Maſter

[*A*] *It was thought convenient to diſpatch him, without bringing him to a trial.*] I am not ignorant that le Grain and ſome other Hiſtorians, relate that the King commanded Mr. de Vitri *to ſeize the Marſhal, with the intent to have him tried in his Parliament of Paris* (1), but I give more credit to the particular relation of the death of Marſhal d'Ancre (2). It declares, that the King finding that the proſecuting him according to the uſual forms of law would be too dangerous, employed another expedient, viz. the ordering Vitri to get the Marſhal killed.

(1) Le Grain, *Decade de Louis XIII*, Book x. pag. m. 387.

(2) It is inſerted in, *Hiſtoire des Favoris*, compiled by Pierre du Puis.

[*B*] *Which circumſtance alone proves him to have been a wicked man.*] For a ſubject cannot without guilt, form a deſign to make himſelf formidable to his Sovereign; and if he ſucceeds in ſuch an attempt, he muſt have employed a thouſand unjuſt methods; removed thoſe perſons from their employments who were obnoxious to him, and advanced others on whom he could depend; that is he muſt have turned out all men of worth, in order to make room for thoſe who ſacrifice all things to their advancement. What ſums muſt he have extorted, in order to amaſs as much money as was neceſſary for maintaining ſpies and creatures in all places! Our Marſhal *never went without a train of two hundred Gentlemen, beſides his domeſticks whom he uſed to call* his ſtipendiary Poltroons (3). We ſhall take notice below (4), of the ſubjection in which he kept the King.

(3) Le Grain, *Decade de Louis XIII*, Book x. pag. 307.

(4) In the Remark [*D*].

Maſter of the Horſe, and raiſed himſelf to a prodigious height of power, by the aſcendant which a woman whom he married had over the Queen (a). He purchaſed the Marquiſate of Ancre (b), a little after the death of Henry IV. He was Governor of Amiens, of Peronne, of Roie and Mondidier. He was made firſt Gentleman of the Chamber, and afterwards Marſhal of France (c). He endeavoured to obtain the Government of Picardy; but the Duke of Longueville having this Government and that of Normandy at his option, choſe Picardy, by which means Marſhal d'Ancre was excluded from his pretenſions, and even obliged to reſign the Government of Amiens to that Duke; for this ceſſion was ſtipulated by the Treaty of Loudun, in caſe the Duke de Longueville ſhould make choice of the Government of Picardy. However, Marſhal d'Ancre had wherewithal to conſole himſelf, ſince he, at the ſame time, was appointed Governor of Normandy. He there fortified Quillebeuf, in ſpite of the prohibition of the Parliament; obtained the particular Government of Pont de l'Arche, and tried to get that of Havre de Grace (d). At laſt, it was no longer doubted but that he was endeavouring to bring all things to his devotion, for he removed ſuch Noblemen as were poſſeſſed of the greateſt abilities from his Majeſty's Council, and filled the vacancies with his own creatures. He diſpoſed of the Treaſury, beſtowed all poſts and employments as he pleaſed, made himſelf friends every where, in the armies and in cities; and intimidated, by the example of a ſevere vengeance, thoſe who oppoſed his faction. No other remedy could be thought of to theſe great diſorders, but to get him killed. This Commiſſion being given to Vitri, a Captain of the Life-guard, was executed on the Drawbridge of the Louvre, the 24th of April 1617, by firing ſeveral piſtols at this Marſhal. The next day the populace having dug up his corps in the Church of St. Germain de l'Auxerrois, dragged it through all the ſtreets, and wreaked their vengeance on it in a moſt ſignal manner [C]. The Parliament arraigned the memory of the deceas'd, and declared him guilty of treaſon both divine and human; ſentenced his wife to loſe her head, and declared their ſon *ignoble, and incapable of poſſeſſing* any employment in the Kingdom (e). Strange things appeared in the courſe of their proſecution, with regard to their judaizing and incantations, which I ſhall mention elſewhere (f). The inſolence of this man is a melancholy example of the fatality which attends on the French Monarchy more than on any other in the world; I mean, that Queens there generally continue as much in the intereſt of the country they came from, as before they left it; and are commonly the inſtrument which heaven employs, to humble and chaſtize the Nation. There have already been two Queens, ſprung from the Houſe of Medicis (g), who, in favour of Spain, had brought the Monarchy to the brink of ruin. This circumſtance in Hiſtory is a ſcandal to the French Name. Should the King have been ſuffered to continue ſo many years the ſlave of a Florentine [D]? Was it not infamous to kneel to this idol, at

(a) Leonora GALLIGAI. See her Article.

(b) It is in Picardy.

(c) Baptiſt le Grain, *Decade de Louis le Juſte*, lib. 4. *ad finem*.

(d) Ibid. lib. 9.

(e) Idem, lib. 9.

(f) In the Article GALLIGAI, remarks [D] and [E].

(g) Catherine, mother of Charles IX, and Henry III; and Mary, mother of Lewis XIII.

[C] *The populace . . . . wreaked their vengeance on it in a moſt ſignal manner.*] The footman of a perſon who had been put to death a little before (5) to pleaſe the Marſhal, began the tumult in the Church of St. Germain de l'Auxerrois. The people cried aloud, that the body of *this excommunicated Jew*, ought to be dug up and thrown to the ravens; immediately the populace fell to work with ſo much fury, that had any perſon dared to repreſent to them, that they ought to ſhew a greater regard to the holineſs of the place, they would have buried him in the Marſhal's grave. After that the Coffin had been forced open, the corpſe was dragged to the end of the Pont-neuf, and hanged by the feet on one of thoſe gibbets which the Marſhal had cauſed to be erected for all thoſe who ſhould ſpeak ill of him. They cut off his noſe, his ears, and his pudenda. A little after he was cut down, dragged to the Greve and other publick places, and then his limbs were torn aſunder, and his corpſe cut into a thouſand pieces. Every one would have ſome part of him: the ears were bought at a great price, the bowels were caſt into the river; part of the body was burnt before the ſtatue of Henry the IVth on the Pont-neuf; and ſome perſons roaſted at this fire part of his fleſh, and threw it to their dogs (6). The Author of the relation printed with the *Hiſtory of Favourites*, relates ſome particulars that are ſtill more ſurprizing. The Great Prevoſt* appearing with his Officers, in order to appeaſe, in the beginning, the tumult in the Church of St. Germain de l'Auxerrois, was threatned with being buried alive, if he preſumed to advance a ſtep farther (7). It is added, that a man dreſſed in ſcarlet was ſo exaſperated, that thruſting his hand into the dead body, and drawing it out again all bloody, *he ſucked it, and ſwallowed ſome little pieces of fleſh which he had tore away. That another plucked out the Marſhal's heart; broiled it on coals, and eat it publickly with vinegar* (8). This Author gives a very minute account of the behaviour of the populace in the ſeveral places where the corpſe was hanged, torne to pieces and burnt: he ſays, that the day after the aſhes were ſold for a quarter of a crown (fifteen pence, French) an ounce (9). It is certain that a herd of mad bulls may as ſoon be brought to hear reaſon, and are leſs to be dreaded than an exaſperated mob.

(5) He was a Gentleman of Normandy, called Hurtevan, who was beheaded at Paris the 21ſt of March 1617. Le Grain, *Decade de Louis XIII*, Book 9. toward the end.

(6) Idem, lib. 10. pag. 399, 400.

* A kind of High-Sheriff.

(7) *Relation*, pag. 53.

(8) Idem, pag. 56.

(9) Idem, pag. 57.

[D] *Should the King have been ſuffered to continue ſo many years the ſlave of a Florentine?*] This is not a calumny contrived, either by the enemies of Marſhal d'Ancre, or by thoſe of Lewis XIII, ſince this Prince himſelf owns the ſlavery to which he was reduced, in the Letters he wrote to the Governors of the Provinces, the day that the Marſhal was killed. "I don't doubt, "*ſays he* (10), but that in the courſe of affairs which "have been tranſacted, ſince the demiſe of the late "King, my Lord and Father (whom God abſolve) "you have plainly diſcovered, in what manner Marſhal "d'Ancre and his wife, taking advantage of my youth, "and of the influence which they had obtained for "many years over the Queen my Mother; have pro-"jected to uſurp the whole ſupreme authority, as alſo "to diſpoſe, in an abſolute manner, of the affairs of "my Kingdom, and deprive me of the means of "becoming acquainted with them. Which deſign "they have carried ſo far, that hitherto I had only "the bare title of King left me; and it would have "been a capital offence in my officers or ſubjects, to "ſee me in private, or diſcourſe with me on a ſeri-"ous ſubject. Which deſign God, of his great good-"neſs, having made me perceive; and diſcover ma-"niſeſtly the imminent danger, to which my perſon "and kingdom would have been expoſed, by ſuch an "unbounded ambition, had I given the leaſt marks "of my reſentment, and of the great deſire I had to "apply a proper remedy to it; I was forced to diſ-"ſemble; and to conceal, by all my outward actions, "my good intentions, till it ſhould pleaſe God to "give me the means and opportunity of redreſſing

(10) Le Grain, *Decade de Louis XIII*, pag. 392.

at the very time that thoſe who thus proſtrated themſelves deteſted him in their hearts [*E*]? None of Malherbe's Verſes are finer than thoſe he wrote on the downfall of this Idol. According to the Poet, this downfall juſtified Providence, which was, in ſome meaſure, impeached as criminal, during the Marſhal's proſperity [*F*]. In this manner Poets preſume to introduce the greateſt myſteries in a metaphorical way, and under too bold images. It is ſurprizing, that Marſhal d'Etré ſhould have extenuated ſo much the crimes of Marſhal d'Ancre [*G*]. An Italian Author who publiſhed at Lyons a Hiſtory of Lewis the Juſt anno 1691, was not ſo partial in his favour [*H*]. Mr. de Beauvais-Nangis (*b*), who

(*b*) See his *Hiſtoire des Favoris François*, pag. 100, & ſeq.

" theſe irregularities." The Author of this Relation ſays, that when the King was informed of the Marſhal's death, he cried aloud from the windows of his palace, *Thank you, thank you* (11); *I now am King*. He afterwards went to other windows, and cried *To arms, to arms, my companions*; and afterwards, *God be praiſed, I now am King* (12). The Lieutenants, Enſigns, and Exempt of the Life-Guards, whom he ſent into the ſtreets of Paris, in order to prevent any tumult, cried aloud in every part of the city, *Long live his Majeſty, the King is King* (13). The Biſhop of Lucon, who was afterwards Cardinal de Richelieu, had been one of the Marſhal's favourites; and exerciſed at that time the employment of chief Secretary of State. He entered the King's apartment, ſoon after the Marſhal's execution; *Sir*, ſaid the Monarch to him, *we now, God be praiſed, are delivered from your tyranny* (14). He did not then know that his deliverance would be ſhort; and that he was ſpeaking to a man who would leave him only the bare title of King. Be this as it will, it is certain, that the Marſhal had uſurped a great aſcendant even over the King's perſon. He deprived him of *the liberty of viſiting the fine houſes which are in the neighbourhood of Paris, and permitted the King only to walk in the Tuilleries, but would not allow him to go a hunting, tho' he loved that diverſion* (15). The protection of a Queen-Regent inſpires a proud ambitious man with too much boldneſs.

(11) He ſpoke thus to thoſe who were with Vitry.

(12) *Relation*, pag. 28.

(13) Idem, pag. 29.

(14) Le Grain, pag. 391.

(15) *Relation*, pag. 4, 5.

[*E*] *Was it not infamous to kneel to this Idol, at the very time that thoſe who thus proſtrated themſelves deteſted him in their hearts?*] The Marſhal ſaid one day, " that the French are not the people they ſeem to be; " for tho', *continued he*, they charge me with the greateſt crimes, I yet am no ſooner arrived in any part of " the Provinces, but the Officers come and make " ſpeeches to me as to the King (16)." So baſe an adulation deſerved not only to be related, but ought to have been told with more indignation than is ſeen in the following paſſage; " I muſt not diſſemble (for Hiſtorians ought to ſpeak truth) that ſeveral Princes " and Lords of the Court, ſeveral Deputies of the " States-General, and many of the chief Magiſtrates " of France, great numbers of retainers or hangers-on " to the Noblemen, and a multitude of Officers and " Citizens, not only tolerated, but were not aſhamed " to advance, to the utmoſt of their power, the grandeur of this Tyrant; in order to ingratiate themſelves in his favour, during which they ſuffered the " love and fidelity which God commands us to bear to " our King and Country to grow cool; and the ancient generoſity, then baniſhed from the French, " was wholly employed to ſupport a foreign Uſurper (17)."

(16) Ibid. pag. 43.

(17) Le Grain, pag. 385.

[*F*] *According to this Poet, the downfal juſtified Providence, which was in ſome meaſure impeached as criminal during the Marſhal's proſperity.*] Malherbe introduces the God of the Seine curſing the Marſhal, and foretelling his approaching ruin.

Tes jours ſont à la fin, ta chute ſe prépare,
Regarde moi pour la derniere fois.
C'eſt aſſez que cinq ans ton audace effrontée,
Sur des ailes de cire aux étoiles montée,
Princes & Rois ait oſé défier;
La fortune t'apelle au rang de ſes victimes,
Et le ciel accuſé de ſuporter tes crimes,
Et reſolu de ſe juſtifier.

Thus Engliſh'd,

" Thy life is near its end; prepare, prepare,
" For mighty ruin, lo! thy fall's at hand;
" Once more behold me: — once — then leave the
" world.—
" Enough, that five long years, thy frantic pride
" On waxen wings convey'd beyond the Stars,
" Dar'd to contend for ſway with potent Kings,
" Fortune now calls thee to her ſplendid victims;
" And Heaven accus'd of winking at thy crimes,
" Reſolves to clear up its myſterious conduct.

Balzac has made ſome reflections on the Poem in queſtion of Malherbe (18). I perhaps ſhall touch upon this ſubject in the article RUFFINUS (19), on occaſion of the words of Claudian, who ſays, that the good fortune of this man was a trial between God and man, which God gained only by the fall of Ruffinus.

(18) In the *Socrate Chretien*, pag. m. 239.

(19) Remark [*C*].

[*G*] *It is ſurprizing that Marſhal d'Etrée ſhould have extenuated ſo much the crimes of Marſhal d'Ancre.*] If the reader peruſes the Memoirs of the regency of Mary de Medicis, printed in 1666, he will not find (according to the author of them) that Marſhal d'Ancre was guilty of any heinous crime; and at the end of this piece is a character of the Marſhal, that ſeems a Panegyrick rather than an Apology. I ſhall not here, as is my uſual cuſtom, refer the reader to Moreri, but will give the very words cited by him. " When I re- " flect, (*'tis the Author of the Memoirs who ſpeaks*) (20) " on the circumſtances of Marſhal d'Ancre's death, I " can aſcribe it to nothing but to his evil deſtiny; he " having been adviſed by a perſon who was of a very " ſweet temper; and as the Marſhal himſelf was naturally generous, and had diſobliged very few, it " muſt have been his evil ſtar, or the ſtate of affairs, " which cauſed ſo many people to riſe up againſt him; " he was a handſome man, ſkilful in riding, and in " all bodily exerciſes that ſuit a Gentleman; he was " fond of diverſions, and eſpecially gaming; his converſation was eaſy and unaffected; his thoughts were " lofty and ambitious, but he uſed to conceal them " carefully; he never having entered, or offered to " enter the Council; and the King has often been heard " to ſay, that he did not know that the Marſhal was " to be killed." I believe it would be imprudent in me, ſhould I prefer the teſtimony of this Author, to that of ſo many Writers who have ſtigmatized Concius Concini. Not but I think it is very poſſible, that a very indiſcreet man, whoſe vices and errors are far from being of a capital nature, may yet, if he has a great number of enemies, become odious to the people, and be conſidered as a monſtrous villain. A malicious and powerful enemy is able to make the common people believe many falſities. I am even of opinion, that a great many particulars, which are related of this ill fated Florentine, are very much exaggerated; and that, to diſcover very exactly and juſtly the truth of theſe matters, a man muſt ſurmount as many obſtacles, as to find out the cauſe of the properties of the load-ſtone; and I ſhall obſerve, by the way, that, on ſeveral occaſions, hiſtorical truths are as difficult to find out as thoſe in Phyſics.

(20) Pag. 244, 245.

[*H*] *An Italian Author . . . was not ſo partial in his favour.*] I mean Count Alexander Roncoveri (21). He tells us that Concini, in the beginning of his exaltation, was poſſeſſed of very good qualities, but theſe, adds the Author in queſtion, were afterwards deſtroyed by the bad ones, and never appeared more, nor could do the leaſt ſervice. *Aſſeriſcono le memorie di quel tempo, che ne' principii della ſua potenza era huomo di buona legge, di grata compagnia, di confacevole humore, diſintereſſato, mà profondamente ambitioſo, e violente; diffetti, che nel progreſſo confondendoſi con le prime buone qualità in ultimo le ſoffocarono di tal maniere, che quelle non poterono apparire e meno giovargli* (22). Had this Author only given the particulars of this Marſhal's eſtate, this would have proved ſufficiently that he was a bad man, and at the ſame time have been a ſatyr upon him. Juvenal ſhall be my witneſs on this occaſion.

(21) He is of Placentia.

(22) Aleſſ. Roncoveri, *Iſtoria del Regno di Luigi XIII*, lib. 5. pag. 205.

Patricios omnes opibus cum provocet unus,
Quo tondente gravis juveni mihi barba ſonabat,
Cum pars Niliacæ plebis, cum Verna Canopi,

who was very well acquainted with the Court of Lewis XIII, does not apologize in any manner for our Concini, but rather confirms the public rumours.

Criſpinus Tyrias humero revocante lacernas
Ventilet æſtivum digitis ſudantibus aurum,
Nec ſufferre queat majoris pondera gemmæ:
Difficile eſt ſatyram non ſcribere . . . . . .
. . . . Sacro nec cedat honori,
Nuper in hanc urbem pedibus qui venerat albis (23).

(23) Juven. Sat. 1. ver. 24 and 110.

That is,

" When all our Lords are by his wealth outvy'd,
" Whoſe razor on my callow beard was try'd;
" When I beheld the ſpawn of conquer'd Nile,
" Criſpinus, both in birth and manners vile,
" Pacing in pomp with cloak of Tyrian dye,
" Chang'd oft a day for needleſs luxury;
" And finding oft occaſion to be fann'd,
" Ambitious to produce his Lady-hand
" Charg'd with light ſummer rings, his fingers ſweat,
" Unable to ſupport a gem of weight.
" Such fulſome objects meeting every where,
" 'Tis hard to write, but harder to forbear.
" The man who, ſhoeleſs, lately trod the ſtreets,
" To ſacred honours, now, refuſes homage."

Oltre un miglione de lire, che valevano i ſuoi ſtabili in Francia, ne havera un' altro di contanti in caſſa, ſecento mila ſcudi ſopra Faideau, quattrocento mila fra Roma, e Fiorenza, e non oſtante il ſacheggio della ſua caſa, mobili, gioie, argenti, e cariche per due miglioni ſenza quella di luogotenente del Re nella Normandia, di primo Gentilhuomo della Camera del Re, e d'Intendente della caſa della Regina (24). i. e. " Beſides a million " of livres, which his eſtates in France amounted to, " he had as much in ſpecie, ſix hundred thouſand " crowns upon Faideau, four hundred thouſand at Rome " and Florence; and, beſides the plunder of his pa- " lace, there were in jewels, money, and employ- " ments to the value of two millions, excluſive of thoſe " of the King's Lieutenant in Normandy, firſt Gen- " tleman of the Bedchamber to his Majeſty, and Stew- " ard of the Queen's Houſhold."

(24) Aleſſ. Rinocoveri, *Iſtor. de Luigi-XIII*, pag. 199, 200.

CONDREN (CHARLES of) Superior-General of the Fathers of the Oratory in the ſeventeenth Century. See Moreri. I ſhall add but one particular, viz. that all ſuch of his writings as could be found were collected together, and that this collection contains two parts, the laſt of which was reprinted at Bruſſels for Francis Foppens, anno 1659, in 12mo. They conſiſt of Letters of Piety, the peruſal whereof may give great ſatisfaction to contemplative perſons.

CONECTE (THOMAS) a Carmelite, and a native of Brittany, was burnt at Rome as an Heretic in 1434 (*a*), after having been followed, by the common people, as the greateſt Preacher of the age. Having excited the admiration of his countrymen, he left the Convent of Rennes, and went into Flanders. He there gained ſuch great reputation for his preaching, that words could never expreſs the honours which were paid him in all places through which he paſſed [*A*], nor the multitudes who flocked to hear his Sermons [*B*]. He inveighed with great vehemence againſt the vices of the Clergy and the luxury of the women. His ſatyr was levelled chiefly againſt their head-dreſſes, which roſe to ſo enormous a height [*C*], that the moſt exalted head-dreſſers of this age are but dwarfs to them. Conecte got the better of the mode, and obliged the Ladies to dreſs themſelves in a modeſt manner; but he did not prevail ſo much by the ſtrength of the arguments wherewith he repreſented the duties of the Goſpel, as by the inſults which he

(*a*) Argentré, *Hiſt. de Bretagne*, lib. 10. cap. 42. Other Writers, as Spondanus, fix his death at the year 1431.

[*A*] *Words could never expreſs the honours which were paid him in all places thro' which he paſſed.*] When it was known in any place, that he was *coming to it, the Nobility and people of all ranks went to meet him, and accompanied him bare-headed, holding the bridle of his mule, till he was come to the houſe where he was to lodge, and happy was he who could prevail with him to lodge in his houſe* (1).] Paradin gives us a more particular account of this. " Fryar Thomas Conette was " ſo famed for ſanctity, that he was followed by every " body; and ſuch multitudes crouded about him, that " very few could get a ſight of him. He uſed always " to travel on a very ſmall mule; and was followed " by ſeveral Fryars of his Order, and who walked af- " ter him, as tho' they had been his diſciples, as did " many ſecular Prieſts. The Clergy, the Nobility, " and Burghers, uſed to come out of their cities and " towns to meet him; paying him as much reve- " rence and honour, as they would have done to one " of Chriſt's Apoſtles: ſo that in whatever place he " arrived, he was always attended by multitudes of " people, who uſed to go a great way to meet him, as " tho' he had deſcended from heaven. When he was " come into any city, generally the nobleſt and moſt " eminent perſon in it, being on foot, uſed to hold " the bridle of his mule, and conduct him (followed " by numberleſs crowds) to his lodging, which was " commonly prepared for him in the handſomeſt " houſe of the city. And his diſciples uſed alſo to be " lodged one after another in the beſt houſes (in the " ſame manner as the attendants of Princes;) and the " maſters of thoſe houſes thought themſelves very hap- " py, when it was their good fortune to have him, or " one of his diſciples for their gueſt (2).

(1) Argentré, *Hiſt. de Bretagne*, Book 10. chap. 42.

(2) Paradin, *Annales de Bourgogne*, Book 3. under the year 1428, pag. m. 700.

[*B*] *Nor the multitudes who flock'd to hear his ſermons.*] There were generally fifteen or ſixteen thouſand perſons on theſe occaſions (3); the women ſtanding on one ſide and the men on the other, with a rope laid between them (4). He never preached in churches but in the greateſt ſquares or market-places, where a large ſcaffold covered with the richeſt tapeſtry that could be got, was erected. On the ſcaffold an altar was ſet, which was adorned in the moſt ſumptuous manner poſſible: Here Fryar Thomas uſed to ſay Maſs, before he preached his ſermon (5). All the balconies round the ſquare were ſpread with beautiful carpets. See Bertrand d'Argentré (6).

(3) Paradin ſays, that there were often about twenty thouſand perſons.

(4) Argentré, *Hiſt. de Bretagne*, Book 10. chap. 42.

(5) Paradin, *Annales de Bourgogne*, Book 10. chap. 42. ſays, that a Sermon uſed to be preached before maſs was celebrated.

(6) Argentré, Idem.

[*C*] *His ſatyr was levelled chiefly againſt their head-dreſſes, which roſe to ſo enormous a height.*] " The " Ladies of the Netherlands uſed to wear, at that time, " a head-dreſs called *Hennin*, which was of a great " height and very rich . . . . and indeed Meſſire John " Juvenal des Urſins (who lived at that time) declares, " that notwithſtanding the diſcords and tumults in " France (he ſpeaks of Charles VIth's reign) the " maidens and married ladies roſe to prodigious ex- " ceſſes in their attire, and wore horns of a ſurprizing " height and breadth, having on each ſide two ears " of ſo unaccountable a ſize, that it was impoſſible for " them to paſs thro' a door; which I take to have " been the Hennins of Flanders; for ſuch a ſuperfluity in pomp ſpreads among the women every where " in an inſtant (7)." See the following remark, and obſerve, by the way, how often faſhions change (8). The Hennins are again revived under another name, viz. that of *top-knots*. I have not yet ſeen the Treatiſe, publiſhed at Paris in 1694 on the *extravagance of head-dreſſes*; however, I don't doubt but the ſame reflection is there made.

(7) Argentré, *Hiſt. de Bretagne*, Book 10. chap. 42.

(8) See the remark [*G*] of the article ANDROMACHE.

he exhorted children to employ againſt ſuch women as would not reform in this particular [*D*]. Hence it was, that as ſoon as he had left the country, the head-dreſſes ſhot to a greater height [*E*] than before, as though they had intended to make amends for the time that had been loſt (*b*). With regard to Conecte, he uſed to burn the ſuperfluities in dreſs, aprons, cards, dice, &c (*c*); and would never be ſeen but in the pulpit. In this he acted prudently; for he very probably would have been leſs ſevere, in common converſation, than ſuited his character, which would have leſſened the high opinion the public entertained of him. After ſtaying a conſiderable time in Flanders, he went into Italy, and made certain new regulations in the Order of the Carmelites of Mantua (*d*), but not without meeting with ſome oppoſition [*F*]. From the laſt mention'd City he travell'd to

(*b*) See the Remark [*E*], in the margin, Citation (11).

(*c*) See the cloſe of the Remark [*E*].

(*d*) Anno 1432.

[*D*] *Conecte got the better of the Mode ... by the inſults which he exhorted children to employ againſt ſuch women as would not reform in this particular.*] I will explain this from the old French of Paradin. *But a remarkable circumſtance in his Sermons*, ſays he (9), *was, his manner of exploding the head-dreſſes of the maidens, and married ladies of that age, for perſons of all ranks at that time were very extravagant in their attire. But the head-dreſſes of the women were particularly remarkable; for theſe were about an ell in height, and as ſhart-pointed as a ſteeple; with long pieces of crape, adorned with rich fringes hanging down behind, and waving in the wind like ſo many ſtandards. This Preacher abhorred theſe kind of head-dreſſes ſo much, that moſt of his Sermons were levelled againſt them; on which occaſion he always employed the moſt bitter expreſſions he could think of; and let fly all manner of opprobrious terms againſt the Ladies who wore thoſe head-dreſſes, which he called Hennins. And in order to make them ſtill more odious to the populace, he uſed to excite little children, to whom he gave ſome trifling preſents, in the places where he preached, to hoot and hollow after theſe Hennins. Theſe children were ſo well taught by him, that when they ſaw any Lady coming to Fryar Thomas's Sermon with ſuch a head-dreſs on, they uſed to hollow after her, tho' the congregation was ever ſo numerous, and cry a Hennin, a Hennin, without ceaſing, till ſuch ladies had left the congregation, or taken off their Hennins. And thoſe little children were ſo exaſperated againſt the Hennins, that when Ladies of diſtinction were going to leave the congregation out of ſhame and confuſion, the children would run hooting and hollowing after them. They even carried their reſentments ſo far, that ſome of them flung ſtones at theſe head-dreſſes; whence great miſchief enſued, upon their inſulting ſome Ladies of high quality, who were ſcarce able to get into houſes for ſhelter, becauſe of the annoyance of this rabble of children, thus animated by the Preacher, who indulged them a numberleſs multitude of pardons, (by the power with which he ſaid he was inveſted) for their bellowing after and inſulting the women; and this they continued with ſo much virulence, that the Ladies did not dare to appear any more in public in ſplendid habits, but came to Fryar Thomas's Sermon in diſguiſe, and with head-dreſſes made of linnen, like thoſe of women of mean condition.*

(9) Paradin, *Annales de Bourgogne*, pag. 700.

[*E*] *... As ſoon as he had left the country, the head-dreſſes ſhot to a greater height.*] It is on this occaſion we may ſay very juſtly that they only bowed their heads like bulruſhes, which is the emblem of ſuch a repentance as laſts no longer than the day which had been deſigned for an extraordinary faſt. But Paradin employs another image which I think ſtill better adapted. Here follow his words (10). "Wherever Fryar Thomas "went, the Hennins did not dare ſo much as to peep "out by reaſon of the ſtrong hatred he bore them. "This ſuppreſſed the head-dreſſes in queſtion for ſome "time, and till our Preacher had left the abovementioned countries. But after he was gone, the Ladies "again lifted up their horns, and imitated ſnails, "which when they hear a noiſe gently draw in their "horns; but the noiſe once over, they immediately "ſhoot them out to a greater length than before (11). "Thus did the Ladies, for they never had wore larger, "more pompous, or more magnificent Hennins, than "they did after Fryar Thomas was gone from among "them. This it is, to oppoſe with obſtinacy, ſome "ſtubborn and obſtinate people." Could the reader imagine, that this Author, would ſay but three or four lines after, that the exclamations of Fryar Thomas *againſt ſmall ornaments were ſo efficacious, that the Ladies themſelves uſed to bring them to him in a full congregation, and throw them publickly on his ſcaffold, into a great fire which he kindled near his pulpit?* Does he not here plainly contradict himſelf? However he might have avoided this contradiction by only ſaying, that all the Ladies did not leave their ornaments for fear of being hooted at, and knock'd on the head; but that ſome of them had a true compunction of heart.

(10) Paradin, *Annales de Bourgogne*, pag. 701; and obſerve that Monſtrelet, in the 2d volume of his *Chroniques*, folio m. 38 *verſo*, & *ſeq.* relates almoſt the ſame particulars as Paradin.

(11) The women, after Conecte was gone, did not keep long within the bounds he had preſcribed them, but again liſted up their horns to a greater height than before, in order to compenſate for the time paſt. Argentré, *Hiſtoire de Bretagne*, Book 10. chap. 42.

At the time that this article is printing (12), the News-Papers inform us, that at the Court of France, a ſingle word tranſiently ſpoke by the King, had a ſtronger effect on the enormous altitude of women's head-dreſſes, than all the eloquence of the Preachers. Theſe have exclaimed for twelve or fifteen years againſt this ſuperfluity in the dreſs of women; they have attacked this Coloſſus with all the figures of Rhetorick, inforced by the moſt ſolid arguments of Religion; but inſtead of demoliſhing it, or even beating down ſome portion of it, they have ſeen it riſe higher every month. They ſaw around their pulpits a new kind of amphitheatre, which would have been a regular one, had all the women of the like rank and condition ſat in the ſame row; and had not been at ſuch a diſtance from the Preacher, in proportion as the top-knots exceeded one another in height; but as places are not divided according to this proportion, there was no ſymmetry in the amphitheatre in queſtion. We may therefore more juſtly compare it to a foreſt of lofty trees, wherein ſuch of them as ſhoot up to the greateſt height, are intermixed with others not ſo tall. But however this be, the Preachers did not exclaim againſt an abſent enemy, they ſeeing it near at hand; it advanced within reach of their cannon, faced its thunder, and yet *increaſed and multiplied*. The double edged ſword of the Preachers made furious havock, and this had no other effect, than what reſults from the labour of a Gardiner who, by lopping a tree, makes it riſe higher, and diffuſe a more extenſive ſhade than before (13); but the bare hint of his Gallic Majeſty wrought ſo ſpeedy and effectual a change, that in a day's time it almoſt levelled theſe proud mountains even with the ground. People had no ſooner heard, (I won't ſay a prohibition or ſome menace) but only that his Majeſty had barely inſinuated his diſlike of this mode, but the whole night was ſpent in this new regulation; and the Ladies appeared the very next day before the Monarch in another dreſs. This regulation makes a ſurprizing progreſs. It flies from the Court to the City in the twinkling of an eye; and as we are told, it would denote a plebeian turn of mind, in any woman who ſhould not follow the new faſhion, we may naturally believe, that there will be but a very few traces left in a few months of the mode which had reigned ſo long. This ſhews, that if Sovereigns knew how great their power is in this reſpect, or would make uſe of it, they could effect more by a ſingle word, than all the Preachers and Confeſſors, with their great profuſion of words (14). Will not a medal be ſtruck on this occaſion? A ſong will certainly be made upon it, and I do not doubt but that ſome Poets will allude one way or other to thoſe Kings of Judah, who did not take away the high places (15); and who by this means did not compleat the reſtoration of Religion to its former purity. On this occaſion will they ſay, the reformation begins by the taking away of the high places. The ingenious Writer, who publiſhes monthly reflections on the News-Papers (16), will doubtleſs give us a very entertaining account of this incident. The exceſs or irregularity was ſo great, that another Thomas Conecte was wanted to reform it.

(12) In the beginning of October 1699.

[*F*] *He made certain new regulations in the Order of Carmelites ... but not without meeting with ſome oppoſition.*] Nicholas Kenton an Engliſhman, and Provincial of the Carmelites, wrote a piece againſt this regulation, and dedicated it to John Facius General of the Order (17).

(13) *Durit ut ilex tonſa bipennibus*
Nigræ feraci frondis in Algido,
Per damna, per cædes, ab ipſo
Ducit opes animumque ferro.
Horat. Od. 4. lib. 4. ver. 57, & *ſeq.*

(14) Compare this with the remark [*M*] of the article LEWIS XII.

(15) *Veruntamen excelſa non abſtulit, adhuc enim populus immolabat & adolebat in excelſis incenſum,* Book 4. *Kings*, cap. 12. ver. 3. & *alibi paſſim.*

(16) Since June 1699. His book is intitled, *L'Eſprit des Cours de l'Europe.*

(17) Argentré, *Hiſt. de Bretagne*, Book 10. chap. 42.

to Venice, where he acquired eſteem; for the Embaſſadors of the Republic (in the Court of Eugenius IV) whom he followed to Rome, recommended him, in the ſtrongeſt terms, to this Pope, as a very zealous and holy man; however, they verified the maxim *Peſſimum inimicorum genus laudantes*, although they acted very innocently on that occaſion. The Pope, hearing that this Preacher of Reformation was in Rome, gave orders for his being ſeized and brought to a trial. Conecte was convicted of the moſt dangerous hereſies that could have been taught at that time, for he cenſured the diſſoluteneſs of the Clergy, and that of the Court of Rome. He had declared, that there were many abominations in this Court; that the Church ſtood in need of reformation; that thoſe who perform the ſervice of God have no reaſon to dread the Papal excommunications; that Monks may eat fleſh; and that ſuch of the Clergy as have not the gift of continence ought to be allowed to marry. He ſubmitted to the flames with great patience and reſolution, and did not recant. Several conſiderable perſons among the Roman Catholicks have declared with freedom enough, that he was put to death unjuſtly. Baptiſt Mantuan (*e*), who was General of the Carmelites, ſpeaks of him as a true martyr (*f*). The Proteſtants never omit ſpeaking of Conecte, when they give the liſt of thoſe, in different ages, who have wiſhed for a reformation in the Church.

But it muſt be obſerved at the ſame time, that ſome Proteſtants conſider him as an arch-hypocrite [*G*].

(*e*) His words, extracted from the Treatiſe *de Vita beata*, have been cited by Bertrand d'Argentré, *Hiſtoire de Bretagne*, lib. 10. cap. 42.

(*f*) Extracted from the *Hiſtoire de Bretagne de Bertrand d'Argentré*, lib. 10. cap. 42.

[*G*] *Some Proteſtants conſider him as an arch Hypocrite.*] John Chaſſanion, a zealous Huguenot, having obſerved, that *hypocriſy intrudes and blends itſelf with the* pure and lawful ſervice of God, as *it alſo does in ſuperſtitious and idolatrous worſhip, even with parade and oſtentation*, cites, as an inſtance of this, *Fryar Thomas, who, by his boaſtings, impoſed ſo ſtrangely on the World upon pretence of introducing a reformation of manners, that he was conſidered in all places as a holy man* (18). He relates, on the credit of Enguerrand de Monſtrelet, the travels of this Preacher &c. "To "give him the better opportunity, *ſays he* (19), of "acting his farces, ſcaffolds were built for his uſe in "the moſt ſpacious, and moſt commodious ſquares, "which were hung with rich carpets, and otherwiſe "adorned; where, after having firſt ſaid Maſs, he "preached a Sermon, in which he uſed to cenſure the "vices of every one, and eſpecially thoſe of the Cler-"gy, for their keeping Concubines and whores (20). "In all which he acted right. But when he uſed to "ſpirit up little children to halloo after the women, "becauſe of their head-dreſſes, promiſing them cer-"tain days of pardon as tho' he had been a God; "all this reſulted from a mixture of monkery, mad-"neſs, and ſacrilegious impudence." Laſtly he tells us, that Conecte was tried, convicted of hereſy, and burnt; after which he adds; "By this means "God, who employs inſtruments of all kinds, and is "able to ſet every engine at work, was pleaſed thus to "puniſh the hypocriſy of this Friar, who putting on "a ſpecious maſk of piety, was in reality a madman, "a giddy-headed, and ambitious wretch (21)."

(18) Chaſſanion, *Hiſtoires mémorables des grans & merveilleux Jugemens de Dieu*, chap. 12. pag. m. 119.

(19) Idem, pag. 121.

(20) Paradin, *Annales de Bourgog.* pag. 700. relates the ſame thing of Conecte: he uſed, *ſays he*, to make very long Sermons, in which he introduced tedious digreſſions againſt the vices of perſons of all ranks, eſpecially againſt the fornication and impurities of the Clergy, becauſe of their keeping concubines and whores at bed and board, contrary to the vow they made of preſerving their chaſtity.

(21) Chaſſanion, *Hiſt. Memorables &c.* pag. 124.

☞CONGREVE (WILLIAM), an eminent Engliſh Poet, was the ſon of Mr. Will. Congreve, a younger brother of an antient and good family in Staffordſhire, who was employed in the Stewardſhip of part of the great eſtate of the Earl of Burlington in Ireland, where he reſided many years. His only ſon the Poet was born in that Kingdom in 1672, and educated at the Free-ſchool at Kilkenny, from whence he was ſent to Trinity-College in Dublin, where he had the advantage of being under the tuition of a Gentleman well ſkilled in polite Learning, Dr. St. George Aſh, afterwards Provoſt of that College, and ſucceſſively Biſhop of Clogher and Derry, who had likewiſe the honour of having Dr. Jonathan Swift, Dean of St. Patrick's, another of his pupils, though not at the ſame time with Mr. Congreve (*a*). Upon Mr. Congreve's coming to England, he was entered in the Middle-Temple, where he began the ſtudy of the Law, but was diverted from a vigorous proſecution of it by his inclination to polite Literature and Poetry. His firſt performance was a Novel intitled, *Incognita, or Love and Duty reconciled* [*A*]; and he ſoon after began his Comedy of the *Old Batchelor*. But having little acquaintance with the traders in that way, he was recommended by his couſins to Mr. Thomas Southerne, who was very uſeful to him in the whole courſe of the Play, and engaged Mr. Dryden in its favour. That great man upon reading it declared, "that he never ſaw ſuch a firſt "Play in his life; but that the Author not being acquainted with the ſtage or the town, "it would be a pity to have it miſcarry for want of a little aſſiſtance. The ſtuff was "rich indeed; it wanted only the faſhionable cut of the town." Mr. Dryden, Mr. Arthur Mainwaring, and Mr. Thomas Southerne read it with great care; and Mr. Dryden put it in the order in which it was played; and Mr. Southerne obtained of Mr. Thomas Davenant, who then governed the Theatre Royal in Drury-Lane, that Mr. Congreve ſhould have the privilege of the houſe half a year before his Comedy was acted; a favour never granted before. It was at laſt acted in 1693 with univerſal applauſe, and uſhered into the world with a commendatory by Mr. Southerne, Mr. Marſh, and Mr. Bevil Higgons, tho' when he wrote it he was but nineteen years of age, and but one and twenty, when it was brought upon the ſtage [*B*]. The reputation of it gained him a great many conſiderable

(*a*) For theſe and other particulars of this [Article] we are obliged to the very ingenious *Thomas Southerne* Eſq; Author of *Oroonoko*, and the *Fatal Marriage, or the Innocent Adultery*, and ſeveral] other excellent Plays.

[*A*] *His firſt performance was a Novel, intitled,* Incognita: or Love and Duty reconcil'd.] It was publiſhed without his name, and addreſſed to Mrs. Katherine Leveſon, by a Dedication ſigned by the name of *Cleophil*. He tells us, that it *was begun and finiſhed in the idle hours of a fortnight's time; for I can,* ſays he, *only eſteem it a laborious idleneſs, which is parent to ſo inconſiderable a birth.*

[*B*] *When he wrote his* Old Batchelor, *he was but nineteen years of age, and but one and twenty, when it was brought upon the Stage.*] He tells us himſelf (1), that he was *very much a boy, when that Comedy was written*; "which, ſeveral, *ſays he*, know was ſome "years before it was acted. When I wrote it, I had "little thoughts of the Stage; but did it to amuſe "my ſelf in a ſlow recovery from a fit of ſickneſs. "Afterwards

(1) *Amendments of Mr.* Collier's *falſe and imperfect Citations.* pag. 39, 40.

conſiderable friends, and particularly Mr. Montague, afterwards Lord Halliſax, who procured him to be appointed one of the Commiſſioners of the Hackney-Coaches, and then gave him a place in the Pipe-Office, and afterwards a Patent-place in the Cuſtoms of ſix hundred pounds *per annum*, and the Poſt of Secretary to Jamaica, which paid him ſeven hundred and nine pounds a year on the Exchange at London. In 1694 his *Double Dealer* [*C*] was acted at the Theatre in Drury-Lane, and, together with his former Comedy, was honoured with the preſence of Queen Mary, upon whoſe death December the 28th 1694, our Author wrote a beautiful Paſtoral intitled, *The Mourning Muſe of Alexis*; *a Paſtoral lamenting the Death of Queen Mary*. The year following the State-factions grew ſo high, that the company divided, and Mr. Betterton being the moſt injured perſon, Mr. Congreve gave him the Comedy of *Love for Love* to open the New Theatre, which Mr. Betterton had made out of the Tennis-Court in Portugal-Row in Lincoln's-Inn-Fields. His next performance was the *Mourning Bride*, a Tragedy [*D*], which was likewiſe acted in Lincoln's-Inn-Fields in 1697, and dedicated to the Princeſs Anne of Denmark, afterwards Queen. In 1698 his four Plays were attacked from the Preſs by Mr. Collier in his *View of the Immorality and Profaneneſs of the Engliſh Stage*; in an anſwer to which Mr. Congreve wrote *Amendments of Mr. Collier's falſe and imperfect Citations &c. from the* Old Batchelor, Double Dealer, Love for Love, Mourning Bride. *By the Author of thoſe Plays.* London 1698 in 8vo. Mr. Collier replied to this piece in his *Defence of the* Short View of the Profaneneſs and Immorality

" Afterwards through my indiſcretion it was ſeen, " and in ſome little time more it was acted. And I " through the remainder of my indiſcretion ſuffered " myſelf to be drawn into the proſecution of a diffi- " cult and thankleſs ſtudy, and to be involved in a " perpetual war with knaves and fools." The Lord Falkland likewiſe in his *Prologue* intended for this Comedy has the following lines:

As for our youngſter, I am apt to doubt him,
With all the vigour of his youth about him:
But he, more ſanguine, truſts in one and twenty,
And impudently hopes he ſhall content you.

(2) Num. 9. The Author of the *Tatler* tells us (2), that *in the character, which gives name to this Play, there is excellently repreſented the Reluctance of a battered Debauchee to come into the Trammels of Order and Decency. He neither languiſhes, nor burns, but frets for love. The Gentlemen of more regular behaviour are drawn with much ſpirit and wit; and the Drama introduced by the dialogue of the firſt ſcene with uncommon, yet natural converſation. The part of* Fondlewife *is a lively image of the unſeaſonable fondneſs of age and impotence.* The ſame Writer likewiſe tells us in another place (3), that in this " Comedy there is a neceſſary circumſtance ob- " ſerved by the Author, which moſt other Poets either " overlook or do not underſtand, that is to ſay, the " diſtinction of characters. It is very ordinary with " Writers to indulge a certain modeſty of believing " all men as witty as themſelves, and making all the " perſons of the Play ſpeak the ſentiments of the Au- " thor, without any manner of reſpect to the age, " fortune, or quality of him, that is on the Stage, " Ladies talk like rakes, and footmen make ſimiles. " But this Writer knows men; which makes his " Plays reaſonable entertainments, while the ſcenes of " moſt others are like the tunes between the Acts. " They are perhaps agreeable ſounds, but they have " no ideas affixed to them."

(3) Num. 195.

[*C*] *His* Double Dealer.] It is dedicated to the Right Honourable *Charles Montague*, one of the Lords of the Treaſury; and in the Dedication he obſerves, that he deſigned to have written *a true and regular Comedy*, but found it an undertaking, which put him in mind of, *Sudet multum, fruſtraque laboret auſus idem.* " And now, *ſays he*, to make amends for the vanity " of ſuch a deſign, I do confeſs both the attempt and " the imperfect performance. Yet I muſt take the " boldneſs to ſay, I have not miſcarried in the whole; " for the mechanical part of it is regular. That I " may ſay with as little vanity, as a Builder may ſay " he has built a houſe according to the model laid " down before him; or a Gardiner, that he has ſet " his flowers in a knot of ſuch or ſuch a figure. I de- " ſigned the moral firſt, and to that moral I invented " the fable, and do not know that I have borrowed one " hint of it any where. I made the Plot as ſtrong as " I could, becauſe it was ſingle; and I made it ſingle, " becauſe I would avoid confuſion, and was reſolved " to preſerve the three unities of the Drama." Mr. Dryden wrote a copy of verſes to his *dear Friend Mr. Congreve* on this Comedy; in which he has the following lines:

In eaſy Dialogue is Fletcher's *praiſe;*
He mov'd the mind, but had not power to raiſe.
Great Johnſon *did by ſtrength of judgment pleaſe,*
Yet doubling Fletcher's *force, he wants his eaſe.*
In diff'ring talents both adorn'd their age;
One for the ſtudy, t'other for the ſtage.
But both to Congreve *juſtly ſhall ſubmit,*
One match'd in judgment, both o'ermatch'd in wit.
In him all beauties of this age we ſee,
Etherege *his courtſhip*; Southerne's *purity*;
The ſatire, wit, and ſtrength of manly Wicherly
All this in blooming youth you have atchiev'd;
Nor are your foil'd contemporaries griev'd;
So much the ſweetneſs of your manners move,
We cannot envy you, becauſe we love *.

* Mr. *Congreve's Candour* is likewiſe celebrated by Mr. Charles Hopkins in his Poem to him in *Dryden's Miſcellanies*, Part 5. pag. 50. edit. London 1716.

And a little lower Mr. Dryden writes thus:

Thy firſt attempt (4) *an early promiſe made;*
That early promiſe has been more than paid:
So bold, yet ſo judiciouſly you dare,
That your leaſt praiſe, is to be regular.
Time, place, and action, may with pains be wrought,
But genius muſt be born, and never can be taught:
This is your portion, this your native ſtore;
Heav'n, that but once was prodigal before,
To Shakeſpear *gave as much; ſhe could not give him more.*

(4) *The Old Batchelor.*

[*D*] *His next performance was the* Mourning Bride, *a Tragedy.*] Sir Richard Blackmore has the following paſſage concerning it (5). " This Poem has received, " and in my opinion very juſtly, univerſal applauſe, " being look'd on as the moſt perfect Tragedy, that " has been wrote in this Age. The Fable, as far as " I can judge at firſt ſight, is a very artful and ma- " ſterly contrivance; the characters are well choſen " and well delineated; that of *Zara* is admirable. " The paſſions are well touched, and ſkilfully wrought " up. The diction proper, clear, beautiful, noble, " and diverſified agreeably to the variety of the ſubject. " Vice, as it ought to be, is puniſhed; and oppreſſed " innocence at laſt rewarded. Nature appears very " happily imitated (excepting one or two doubtful in- " ſtances) thro' the whole piece; in which there are " no immodeſt images or expreſſions, no wild unna- " tural rants; but (ſome exceptions being allowed) all " things are chaſte, juſt, and decent. This Tragedy, " as I ſaid before, has mightily obtained, and that " without the unnatural and fooliſh mixture of farce and " buffoonery; without ſo much as a Song or a Dance " to make it more agreeable. By this it appears, " that as a ſufficient genius can recommend itſelf, and " furniſh out abundant matter of pleaſure and admi- " ration without the paltry helps above named; ſo " likewiſe, that the taſte of the Nation is not ſo far " depraved, but that a regular and chaſte Play will " not only be forgiven but highly applauded."

(5) Preface to *Prince Arthur.* edit. London, fol. 1697.

Immorality of the Engliſh Stage &c. *Being a Reply to Mr.* Congreve's Amendments, &c. *and to the* Vindication *of the* Author *of the* Relapſe. London 1699 in 8vo. The laſt of his Plays was the *Way of the World* [*E*], acted by Mr. Betterton's Company in Lincoln's-Inn-Fields, and dedicated to the Earl of Montague. This excellent Comedy met with very indifferent ſucceſs the firſt night of its being exhibited, but afterwards was received in a manner ſuitable to its merit. He reviſed Mr. Dryden's Tranſlation of Virgil's Æneis [*F*]. He wrote likewiſe a *Maſque* intitled, *The Judgment of Paris*; and an Opera, intitled *Semele* [*G*], which was never performed, but excellently ſet to Muſic by his friend Mr. John Eccles. In 1710 he publiſhed an edition of his Poetical Works, in three volumes in 8vo, containing, beſides his performances already mentioned, *A Collection of Poems upon ſeveral Occaſions*; and all his Poetical Works have been reprinted at London in 1730 in three volumes in 12mo. He wrote alſo ſome *Letters*, particularly one *upon Humour in Comedy*, publiſhed by Mr. John Dennis in a Collection of Letters written by Mr. Dryden, Congreve, Moyle, &c. and a Dedication of Mr. Dryden's Plays to the Duke of Newcaſtle. In the latter part of his life his health began extremely to decline, and his ſight to fail. He died about five of the clock on Sunday morning, January the 19th $172\frac{8}{9}$, at his houſe in Surrey-ſtreet in the Strand, in the fifty ſeventh year of his age, and on the Sunday following, January the 26th, his corps lay in ſtate in the Jeruſalem-Chamber; from whence the ſame evening it was carried with great decency and ſolemnity into King Henry VIIth's chapel in Weſtminſter-Abbey, and interred near the late Earl of Godolphin, and a monument was erected to him there by Henrietta, late Ducheſs of Marlborough [*H*]. We ſhall give the character of him and his Writings in the Note [*I*].

CONON

[*E*] *The laſt of his Plays was* The Way of the World.] In the *Dedication* of it to Ralph E. of Montague he obſerves, that the ſucceſs of it on the Stage was almoſt beyond his expectation; *for but little of it was prepared for that general taſte, which ſeems now to be predominant in the palates of our Audience. Thoſe characters, which are meant to be ridiculed in moſt of our Comedies, are of fools ſo groſs, that in my humble opinion they ſhould rather diſturb than divert the well-natured and reflecting part of the Audience. They are rather objects of charity than contempt; and inſtead of moving our mirth, they ought very often to excite our compaſſion. This reflection moved me to deſign ſome characters, which ſhould appear ridiculous, not ſo much thro' a natural folly, (which is incorrigible, and therefore not proper for the Stage) as thro' an affected wit; a wit, which at the ſame time that it is affected, is alſo falſe. As there is ſome difficulty in the formation of a character of this nature, ſo there is ſome hazard, which attends the progreſs of its ſucceſs upon the Stage. For many come to a Play ſo over-charged with criticiſm, that they very often let fly their cenſure, when thro' their raſhneſs they have miſtaken their aim. This I had occaſion lately to obſerve; for this Play had been acted two or three days, before ſome of theſe haſty Judges could find the leiſure to diſtinguiſh betwixt the character of a* Witwoud *and a* Truewit. Sir Richard Steele wrote an *Epiſtle* to him upon the occaſion of this Comedy (6).

(6) It is printed by Mr. Charles Gildon in a *New Miſcellany of Original Poems on ſeveral Occaſions. Written by the* E. *of* D. *Sir* Charles Sidley, *&c. and ſeveral other eminent Hands. Never before printed.* London 1701 in 8vo.

[*F*] *He reviſed Mr. Dryden's Tranſlation of Virgil's Æneis.*] Mr. Dryden mentions this in the following paſſage of his dedication of that Tranſlation to John Lord Marquis of Normanby (7): *Mr. Congreve has done me the favour to review the* Æneis, *and compare my verſion with the original. I ſhall never be aſhamed to own, that this excellent young man has ſhewed me many faults, which I have endeavoured to correct.*

(7) *The Works of Virgil. Tranſlated into Engliſh Verſe by Mr. Dryden*, vol. 2. pag. 435. edit. London 1730, in 12mo.

[*G*] *In* 1710 *he publiſhed* Semele, *an Opera.*] In the *Argument* introductory to it he obſerves, that it was not thought requiſite to have any regard either to rhyme or equality of meaſure in the lines of that part of the dialogue, which was deſigned for the *Recitative-Style* in Muſic. "For as that Style in Muſic is not "confined to the ſtrict obſervation of *Time* and *Meaſure*, which is required in the compoſition of *Airs* "and *Sonata's*, ſo neither is it neceſſary that the ſame "exactneſs in numbers, rhymes, or meaſure, ſhould "be obſerved in words deſigned to be ſet in that manner, which muſt ever be obſerved in the formation "of *Odes* and *Sonnets*. For what they call *Recitative* "in Muſic, is only a more raiſeable ſpeaking; it is a "kind of proſe in Muſic: its beauty conſiſts in coming near nature, and in improving the natural accents of words by more pathetic or emphatical "tunes."

[*H*] *A monument was erected to him there by Henrietta Ducheſs of Marlborough.*] The Epitaph inſcribed upon it is as follows: *Mr.* William Congreve. *Dyed January the* 19*th* 1728, *aged* 56, *and was buried near this place. To whoſe moſt valuable memory this monument is ſett up by* Henrietta *Ducheſs of* Marlborough, *as a mark how dearly ſhe remembers the happineſs and honour ſhe enjoyed in the ſincere friendſhipp of ſo worthy and honeſt a man, whoſe virtue, candour and witt gained him the love and eſteem of the preſent age, and whoſe writings will be the admiration of the future.*

[*I*] *We ſhall give the character of him and his writings in the Note.*] Sir Richard Steele (8) obſerves, that his *great diſcernment in diſtinguiſhing the characters of mankind*, which is manifeſted in his *Comedies*, rendered his *good opinion a juſt foundation for the eſteem of other men:* That he acquired a juſt ſucceſs in the various parts of Poetry; that gentle, free, and eaſy faculty, which alſo in Songs and ſhort Poems, he poſſeſſed above all others, diſtinguiſhed itſelf wherever he appeared. "I cannot but "inſtance, *ſays Sir Richard*, your inimitable *Doris*, "which excels for politeneſs, fine raillery, and courtly "ſatire, any thing we can meet with in any language. "I cannot leave my favourite *Doris*, without taking "notice how much that ſhort performance diſcovers a "true knowledge of life. *Doris* in the character of a Li"bertine-Woman of condition, and the Satire is work'd "up accordingly. For people of quality are ſeldom touch"ed with any repreſentation of their vices, but in a light "which makes them ridiculous." Sir Richard then remarks that as much as our Author is to be eſteemed for his *excellent writings* (by which he is an honour to our Nation) he chooſes rather, as one that has paſſed many happy hours with him, to celebrate that *eaſy condeſcenſion of mind and command of a pleaſant imagination*, which gave him the uncommon praiſe of a man of wit, *always to pleaſe, and never to offend.* No one, after a joyful evening, could reflect upon an expreſſion of Mr. Congreve's, that dwelt upon him with pain. "In a man capable of exerting himſelf any "way, this, whatſoever the vain and ill-natur'd may "think of the matter, is an excellence above the "brighteſt ſallies of imagination." The ſame Writer likewiſe in his Epiſtle Dedicatory of the ſecond Edition of Mr. Addiſon's *Drummer* to Mr. Congreve (9) writes thus: *You will pleaſe to pardon me, that I have thus laid a nice affair before a perſon, who has the acknowledged ſuperiority to all others, not only in the moſt excellent talents, but poſſeſſing them with an equanimity, candour, and benevolence, which render thoſe advantages a pleaſure as great to the reſt of the world, as they can be to the owner of them. And ſince fame conſiſts in the opinion of wiſe and good men, you muſt not blame me for taking the readieſt way to baffle an attempt upon my reputation,*

(8) In his *Dedication* of his *Poetical Miſcellanies* &c. to Mr. Congreve. The 2d edition was printed at London 1727 in 12mo.

(9) Printed at London 1722, in 4to.

CONON, a Mathematician and Aſtronomer, was of Samos (*a*). He flouriſhed about the 130th Olympiad. He died before his friend Archimedes, who had a great value for him, and uſed to communicate his Problems to Conon, and ſend him Problems [*A*]. He engaged in ſome diſputes with Nicoteles the Mathematician, who wrote againſt him, and treated him with a little too much contempt (*b*). Apollonius Pergæus confeſſes this, and he declares, that Conon had not been ſucceſsful in his Demonſtrations (*c*). He invented a kind of *Volute* which differed from that of Dinoſtratus, but as Archimedes exhibited the properties of it more clearly, he, by that means, paſſed for the inventor of it; it having been called the Volute of Archimedes, and not that of Conon (*d*). With regard to the Aſtronomical knowledge of Conon, I refer you to Catullus [*B*], who gives an account of it in the beginning of his Poem on the hair of Berenice, ſiſter and wife of Ptolomy Euergetes. I muſt obſerve, that this Conon was ſo great a flatterer, as to aſſert that this Queen's hair had been transformed to a Conſtellation. We find, in Photius (*e*), the extracts of a work which contained fifty relations concerning the fabulous ages. The Author's name was CONON, and he had dedicated the book in queſtion to King Archelaus Philopator, whence Voſſius (*f*) ſuppoſed, that he might fix his life to the beginning of the eighth Century of Rome; he imagining that Strabo, Dion, and other Hiſtorians furniſh proofs from which it may be inferred, that this King Archelaus was one of the Princes who followed Mark Anthony in oppoſition to Octavius. Were this true, this Conon muſt be diſtinguiſhed from him, who, according to Joſephus, had mentioned the Jews (*g*). And indeed, it would have been very ridiculous in Joſephus, had he gloried in the teſtimony of ſo modern an Hiſtorian. The moſt probable aſſertions that can be made are, I, that the CONON, Author of a book relating to the City of Heraclea, cited by Apollonius the Scholiaſt (*b*), is the ſame with CONON who wrote a work concerning Italy, which Servius has cited (*i*). II, that the Conon of Photius, or the Conon of Joſephus, are the ſame with him in queſtion.

(a) Apollonius Pergæus, *in Epiſtola ad Attalum* præfixa lib. 4. *Conicor.*

(b) Idem, ibid.

(c) Idem, ibid.

(d) *Ex* Voſſio *de Scient. Mathem.* cap. 54. num. 5. pag. 327, 328.

(e) Chap. 186.

(f) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* lib. 1. cap. *ult.* pag. m. 162.

(g) Joſeph. *contra Apionem*, lib. 1. pag. 1051.

(b) Apol. Schol. in lib. 1.

(i) Servius *in Æneid.* lib. 7. ver. 738.

CONON

reputation, by an addreſs to one, whom every wiſe and good man looks upon with the greateſt affection and veneration. Major Richardſon Pack tells us (10), that in all his "Plays there is a great deal of lively and uncommon humour, and ſuch as yet, for the moſt part, is a picture of true life. Beſides, he hath raiſed the vein of ridicule, and made the Stage, which had been too much proſtituted to the mob, edifying to perſons of the firſt condition. And as his Fable is diverting, ſo it is wrought according to the ſtricteſt rules." Mr. Pope (11) ſtiles him [*one of the moſt valuable men, as well as fineſt Writers of his age and country.* Mr. de Voltaire obſerves (12), that he *raiſed the glory of Comedy to a greater height than any Engliſh Writer before or ſince his time. He wrote only a few Plays, but they are excellent in their kind. The Laws of the Drama are ſtrictly obſerved in them. They abound with characters, all which are ſhadowed with the utmoſt delicacy; and we don't meet with ſo much as one low or coarſe jeſt. The language is every where that of men of honour, but their actions are thoſe of knaves; a proof that he was perfectly well acquainted with human nature, and frequented what we call polite company. He was infirm, and come to the verge of life, when I knew him* (13). *Mr. Congreve had one defect, which was his entertaining too mean an idea of his firſt profeſſion, (that of a Writer,) tho' it was to this he owed his fame and fortune. He ſpoke of his works as of trifles, that were beneath him; and hinted to me in our firſt converſation, that I ſhould viſit him upon no other foot than that of a Gentleman, who led a life of plainneſs and ſimplicity. I anſwered, that had he been ſo unfortunate as to be a mere Gentleman, I ſhould never have come to ſee him; and I was very much diſguſted at ſo unſeaſonable a piece of vanity.* H.

(10) *Eſſay on Study* in his *Miſcellanies*, pag. 100.

(11) *Poſtſcript* to his *Tranſlation of the Iliad of Homer*, dated March 25, 1720.

(12) *Letters concerning the Engliſh Nation*, Lett. 30. pag. 188, 189. edit. London 1733, in 8vo.

(13) Mr. Voltaire came to England about the year 1726; for in the Preface to his *Eſſay on the Civil Wars of France &c.* printed at London 1727 in 12°, he tells us, that he had *been but eighteen months in England.*

[*A*] *He died before his friend Archimedes who had a great value for him; and uſed to communicate his Problems to Conon.*] This appears from Archimedes's writings. *Debemus Cononе vivente ipſa emittere in vulgus: hunc enim accepimus talia potiſſimum poſſe deprehendere, & ipſis accommodatam proferre demonſtrationem* (1). i. e. "We ought to publiſh theſe things in the life-time of Conon; for he, I am informed, is beſt capable of comprehending, and of giving a proper demonſtration of them." Theſe words are extracted from a Letter of Archimedes, inſerted at the beginning of one of his Books, and the following are found in another Letter. *Antea quidem mihi mandaſti ſcirem eorum problematum demonſtrationem quæ prius ipſe propoſueram Cononi* (2). i. e. "You ſome time ſince deſired me to write a demonſtration of thoſe Problems, which I firſt propoſed to Conon." He ſays in another place: *Quot in Geometria theoremata viſa primum impoſſibilia, tempore perfectionem capiunt? Conon quidem non ſufficiens tempus ſortitus in eorum diſquiſitione, vitam cum morte commutavit, & ea dubia reliquit; quamquam omnia invenerat, ut & alia multa quibus plurimum Geometriam adauxit. Scimus quippe in illo fuiſſe non vulgarem Mathematicarum artium peritiam, laboriſque ſupra modum tolerantiam* (3). i. e. "What a number of geometrical Theorems, which at firſt were thought impoſſible, have by time been carried to perfection? Conon indeed, not being allowed by the fate years ſufficient for inveſtigating them, was ſnatched from the world, and ſo left them unravelled, although they had been invented by him, and many more by which he has greatly improved Geometry; for we knew him to be exceedingly well ſkilled in the Mathematicks, and prodigiouſly laborious in his ſtudies." Here follows another paſſage. *Cum audiſſem defunctum eſſe Cononem qui nobis reliquus erat in amicitia, tibique admodum fuerat familiaris, puta in Geometria maxime verſatus; virum quidem mortuum amare planxi, ut amiciſſimum & hominem in Mathematicis plane mirabilem. Atque tunc repente ſtatui mittere ad te, ſicuti antea ad Cononem ſolebam, geometricum theorema, quod nemo quidem prius eſt contemplatus &c* (4). i. e. "When I heard of the death of Conon, who was my very good friend, and very intimate with you, and greatly ſkilled in Geometry; I bewailed exceedingly the loſs of ſo kind a friend, and ſo admirable a Mathematician: and immediately reſolved to ſend to you, as I uſed to do to Conon, a geometrical theorem, which till then had not been conſidered by any one."

(1) Archimed. *Epiſt. ad Doſitheum*, præfixa libro 1. *de Sphæra & Cylindro.*

(2) Idem, Archimed. Epiſt. *præfixa* lib. 2.

(3) Idem, Epiſt. *præfixa Libro* de Spiralibus.

(4) Idem in *Libr. de Quadrat. Parabolæ.*

[*B*] *With regard to the aſtronomical knowledge of Conon I refer you to Catulus.*] His Poem begins as follows:

Omnia qui magni diſpexit lumina mundi,
Qui ſtellarum ortus comperit, atque obitus:
Flammeus ut rapidi ſolis nitor obſcuretur,
Ut cedant certis ſidera temporibus,
Ut Triviam furtim ſub Latmia ſaxa relegans
Dulcis amor gyro devocet aërio:
Idem me ille Conon cœleſti lumine vidit
E Bereniceo vertice cæſariem
Fulgentem clarè (5).

"Thus Engliſh'd,
"Conon, whoſe eagle-eye the Stars ſurvey'd,
"Found when they riſe, or when they ſet to mortals.
"Who knew why Sol's effulgence is eclips'd,
"Why Stars at certain periods diſappear,
"How gentle love could draw fair Cynthia down
"To Latmos, there to kiſs her dear Endymion.
"Conon, who ſaw me, ſhining, in the Orb,
"Whence Berenice ſheds æthereal luſtre."

(5) Catullus, Epigr. 67. pag. m. 134.

CONON, General of the Athenians during the war of Peloponneſus, had made himſelf ſo illuſtrious by his brave actions, that they gave him the command over all the Iſlands [*A*]. He commanded the Naval Army the laſt year of the war; but he was not preſent at the battle which proved ſo fatal to the Athenians [*B*]. His abſence contributed very much to the deciſive advantage which thoſe of Lacedæmon obtained (*a*) under the conduct of Lyſander at the Goat's river (*b*). Conon, being informed after that misfortune of the taking of his native City, retired to Pharnabazus Governor of Ionia and Lydia [*C*], and inſinuated himſelf into his favour, that he might be able to hurt the Lacedæmonians. Theſe latter broke with Artaxerxes King of Perſia, and carried the war into his country under the conduct of Ageſilaüs. They made great progreſſes, and would in all likelihood have ſubdued all the provinces on this ſide Taurus, if Conon, by whoſe counſel the Perſian army was conducted (*c*), had not traverſed their deſigns [*D*]. He eaſily perceived that Tiſſaphernes betrayed the King of Perſia: this was too viſible; and yet the King, who had ſome obligation to Tiſſaphernes, was ſo prepoſſeſſed in his favour that he would not believe him guilty. This obliged Conon to take a journey to the Perſian Court; where he made that General's treaſon ſo apparent, that he convinced the King of it. He received a commiſſion to fit out ſhips of war againſt the Lacedæmonians; and by that means he had a fleet under his command, which gained (*d*) a ſignal victory over them (*e*). His principal care was to make the beſt uſe of the opportunity in

(*a*) In the 4th year of the 93d Olympiad.

(*b*) *Apud Ægos flumen.* Corn. Nepos, *in* Conone, cap. 1.

(*c*) *Hunc* (Ageſilaum) *adverſus Pharnabazus habitus eſt imperator; re quidem vera exercitui præfuit Conon, ejuſque omnia arbitrio geſta ſunt.* Corn. Nepos, *in* Conone, cap. 2.

(*d*) The 2d year of the 96th Olympiad, according to Diodorus Siculus.

(*e*) *Hos Conon apud Cnidum adortus magno prælio fugat.* Corn. Nepos, *in* Conone, cap. 4.

[*A*] *They gave him the command over all the Iſlands.*] It is thought Cornelius Nepos has here committed a ſmall Anachroniſm (1); for the other Hiſtorians ſcarce begin to ſpeak of Conon, but by ſaying that he was put in the place of Alcibiades: now from that time to the end of the war, they do not ſay he had the poſt in queſtion, and it was not a poſt which the Athenians were in a condition to create: however, he who might be inveſted with it could not have made conqueſts, as Conon did: *In qua poteſtate Pharas cepit coloniam Lacedæmoniorum* (2). i. e. "Which command "while Conon held, he took Pharæ a Colony of the "Lacedæmonians." It was very much at that time if they could ſtand on the defenſive (3). It is thought therefore that the Hiſtorian anticipates and confounds the times, and that Conon had not this authority over all the Iſles, till he received it from the King of Perſia. If that Author had committed this error, he would have very ill diſcharged the duty of an Hiſtorian. He would be in ſome ſort excuſable, if he had taken one time for another with regard to a dignity which the Commonwealth of Athens had conferred: but ſuppoſing the cenſure juſt, he has done much worſe; he has been miſtaken both as to the time, and as to the perſons who conferred the command; he has attributed that to the Athenians which was done only by Artaxerxes; and he has notwithſtanding ſpoken ſeparately of what Artaxerxes did (4). It will be anſwered, perhaps, that he does not ſpecify from whom Conon received that Commiſſion, and therefore charity obliges us to ſuppoſe that he intends to ſpeak of the command which Artaxerxes beſtowed on Conon: but nothing can be more abſurd, or more repugnant to the Laws of Hiſtory, than to inſert in that paſſage, in the manner it appears there, the employment with which the King of Perſia honoured this illuſtrious Athenian. Let us allow therefore that Cornelius Nepos has confounded himſelf. Xenophon expreſly obſerves that Pharnabazus and Conon ravaged the territory of Pharæ (5). This was ſome time after the defeat of the Lacedæmonians at Cnidus.

(1) *See* Kirchmaier's *Commentary on Cornelius Nepos*, in *Conon.* pag. m. 433, 434.

(2) C. Nepos, *in Conone*, cap. 1.

(3) *See* Juſtin, lib. 5. cap. 6.

(4) *Hinc magnis muneribus donatus* (Conon) *ad mare eſt miſſus, ut Cypriis & Phœnicibus cæteriſque maritimis civitatibus naves longas imperaret.* i. e. "Hence was "Conon ſent, "laden with "rich preſents, "down to the "ſea, to order "the Cyprians, "Phœnicians, "and other maritime Cities, "to furniſh "ſhips of war." C. Nepos, *in* Conone, cap. 4.

(5) Xenoph. lib. 4. *de Rebus geſtis Græcorum*, pag. m. 314.

(6) Xenoph. lib. 2. pag. 268. *See alſo* Plutarch, *in Lyſandro.*

(7) *See* Kirchmaier, *in C. Nep. Conon.* pag. 434.

[*B*] *He was not preſent at the battle which proved ſo fatal to the Athenians.*] Here is a freſh fault of the Hiſtorian. There are no readers but would imagine, from his words, that the Athenian Fleet was attacked while Conon was gone to take a journey, or while he was carried to ſome town for the ſake of his health; but this was by no means the caſe: the abſence of Conon conſiſted in his eſcaping in time with nine veſſels, having well foreſeen that the enemy would gain a complete victory (6). It is true, it was not out of fear, but becauſe he ſaw that by reaſon of the ill diſcipline of the troops, they were in ſuch a condition that they could not poſſibly make reſiſtance. The Commentators who endeavour to juſtify Cornelius Nepos make wretched work of it (7).

[*C*] *He retired to Pharnabazus Governor of Ionia and Lydia.*] We have here another fault of the Hiſtorian: he does all that is neceſſary to perſuade his readers that Conon, ſeeking not a place of ſafety, but a place where he might do ſervice to his country, went directly to the Court of Pharnabazus. *Non quæſivit ubi ipſe tuto viveret, ſed unde præſidio poſſet eſſe civibus ſuis* (8). All this is deceitful: neither the fact nor the reaſon of it is true; for that General eſcaped directly to the Iſle of Cyprus, to King Evagoras a good friend of the Athenians; he eſcaped thither, I ſay, as well for his own ſecurity, as in order to concert meaſures with that Prince for the re-eſtabliſhing the affairs of his country. Ὡς Εὐαγόραν ἦλθε νομίσας κ) τῷ σώματι βεβαιοτάτην εἶναι τὴν παρ' ἐκείνου καταφυγὴν κ) τῇ πόλει τάχιστα ἂν αὐτὸν γενέσθαι βοηθόν: *Ad Evagoram ſe contuliſſe quod putabat ſe apud eum & ſaluti ſuæ rectiſſimè conſulturum, & Reipublicæ erigendæ adjutorem quamprimum habiturum* (9). All the Hiſtorians ſpeak of this retreat of Conon (10); and there are ſome Authors who ſay he was yet in Cyprus when Ageſilaüs ravaged Aſia. Iſocrates aſſures us that Conon for ſome time thought of nothing but his own private affairs in the Iſle of Cyprus. Χρόνον μέν τινα περὶ τὴν τῶν ἰδίων ἐπιμέλειαν διέτριβεν (11). He was yet in Cyprus, according to Juſtin (12), when it was diſcovered that Tiſſaphernes, betraying the King of Perſia, had ſuffered the Lacedæmonians to commit hoſtilities in Aſia. If Cornelius Nepos has been guilty of a fault when he did not ſpeak of this retreat of Conon, he has been guilty of another when he took upon him to ſpeak of it." He ſays in the Life of Chabrias, that it is the ordinary defect of Republics not to bear a diſtinguiſhed merit: *Eſt hoc commune vitium in magnis liberiſque civitatibus, ut invidia gloriæ comes ſit, & libenter de his detrahant quos eminere videant altius.* i. e. "This is the common fault "in great and free Cities, that envy is the concomi-"tant of glory, and men willingly detract from thoſe "whom they perceive to be more highly eminent." It is for this reaſon, ſays he, that ſeveral great men have voluntarily abſented themſelves from Athens, and that Conon lived a long time in the Iſle of Cyprus. This example is good for nothing; for Conon retired into that Iſland after ſo lamentable a defeat, that he was either afraid (13) or aſham'd (14) to return to Athens. Add to this, that that City fell ſoon after under the Lacedæmonian yoke.

(8) C. Nep. cap. 2.

(9) Iſocrat. *in Evagora*, pag. m. 292.

(10) Juſtin. lib. 5. cap. 6. Xenophon, lib. 2. Diodorus, lib. 13. Plutarchus, *in Lyſandro*, pag. 438. *in* Artaxerxe, pag. 1021.

(11) Iſocrat. *Orat. ad Philipp.* pag. m. 137.

(12) Juſtin. lib. 6. cap. 1.

(13) *Crudelitatem civium metuens ad regem Cyprium concedit.* Juſtin. lib. 5. cap. 6.

[*D*] *The Lacedæmonians would have ſubdued the Provinces on this ſide Taurus, if Conon . . . . had not traverſed their deſigns.*] A political fetch, which his Hiſtorian ſays nothing of, proved a hundred times more uſeful to him than all his military ſkill: the fetch was this. He perſuaded the King of Perſia to ſend round ſums of money to the Orators of Greece, to the end they might excite a war againſt the Lacedæmonians. Thoſe Orators, being gained by this means, ſtirred up the people, each of them in his own city, to ſuch a degree that a formidable league was formed againſt the Lacedæmonians (15); and then Ageſilaus was recalled home, and obliged to quit all his projected conqueſts to think only of defending the territories of Lacedæmon. There is nothing of greater uſe to thoſe who would kindle a war, or cauſe one to continue, than to have the Orators tongues at their devotion. For which reaſon it is obſerved they take great care to gain thoſe men's affection.

(14) Ἀτυχήσας ἐν τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ . . . εἰκὸς δὲ μὴ, αἰσχυνθῆναι κατηγορῶν. *Cum navali prælio . . . male pugnatum eſſet redire domum erubuit.* Iſocrat. *Orat. ad Philip.* pag. 138.

(15) Polyænus, lib. 1. *Stratagem. ſub fin.* *See alſo* Plutarch, *in Artaxerxe*, pag. 1021; *and* Xenophon, *Hiſt. Græc.* lib. 3. pag. 294. edit. 1581.

in favour of his native country [E]: he ſailed to Athens with part of the victorious fleet, he diſtributed among the inhabitants the money which he had received from Pharnabazus, and he gave orders for repairing the Piræus and the City walls. Had he done no more than this, he would not have been to blame; but he forgot himſelf ſo far as to contrive the taking of Ionia and Æolis from the Perſians, and the bringing them again under the Athenian power. This plot could not be carried on ſo ſecretly but the Perſians perceived it. Whereupon Teribazus, the Governor of Sardis, ſent Conon word that he had ſome affairs of great importance to communicate to him, on account of which he deſigned to ſend him to the King. Conon repaired to Sardis, and was there made priſoner. Some ſay he was carried to Artaxerxes, and that he ended his life in that country; but others aſſert that he eſcaped out of priſon, and doubt whether Teribazus was not conſenting to it (f). Moreri ought not, therefore, to have affirmed that Teribazus, *being envious of his glory, put him to death*; for Xenophon acknowledges, I, that Teribazus did not arreſt him till after the crimes, of which the Lacedæmonians accuſed him, were fully proved; II, that he afterwards ſent to know of the King his maſter what he ſhould do with him (g). Conon left a ſon named TIMOTHEUS, who was a great Captain, and experienced the uſual ingratitude of his country (b). This Timotheus was the ſcholar of Iſocrates [F]. He brought himſelf genteelly off when he was reproached with the lewd life of his mother [G]. He left a ſon named CONON, who was condemned to rebuild part of the City walls [H]. No great exactneſs is to be found either in Juſtin or in Cornelius Nepos, with regard to our Conon, whether we compare them with one another [I], or whether we

(f) Extracted from Cornelius Nepos, in the *Life of Conon.*

(g) Xenoph. *de Geſtis Græcorum*, lib. 4. pag. m. 315.

(b) See his *Life* in *Cornelius Nepos.*

[E] *His principal care was to make the beſt uſe of the opportunity in favour of his native country.*] Juſtin and Cornelius Nepos have employed too ſtrong expreſſions, when they ſpeak of the condition from which Conon delivered the city of Athens. Juſtin ſuppoſes that when the Lacedæmonians loſt the famous battle of Cnidus, they held the city of Athens under the yoke of ſervitude; that they had a garriſon there; in a word, that it was one of their conquered countries. *Victi Lacedæmonii fugam capeſſunt, præſidia hoſtium Athenis deducuntur, populo reſtituta dignitate conditio ſervilis eripitur* (16). This is not only carrying matters too far, but alſo advancing a great falſhood; for ſix or ſeven years before Conon had defeated the Lacedæmonian fleet at Cnidus, the Athenians had recovered their liberty; the government of the thirty Tyrants had been aboliſhed, a general amneſty had been publiſhed, the popular ſtate had been reſtored, &c (17). It was Thraſybulus who produced theſe great changes the third year of the 94th Olympiad (18): but the battle of Cnidus was fought the ſecond year of the 96th Olympiad. Beſides, is it not certain that the year before this battle of Cnidus, the Lacedæmonians had been beaten near Haliartus by the army of the Allies? Were not the Athenians one of the people who had entered into a confederacy againſt the Lacedæmonians? Could they have done this if they had had a Lacedæmonian garriſon in their city? Cornelius Nepos has not committed the Anachroniſm of Juſtin; he very well knew that the Thebans and Athenians had declared war againſt thoſe of Lacedæmon before the battle of Cnidus. *Poſteaquam domum à ſuis civibus revocatus eſt* (Ageſilaus) *quod Bœotii & Athenienſes Lacedæmoniis bellum indixerant, Conon nihilo ſecius apud præfectos regis verſabatur.* i. e. "After "that *Ageſilaus* was recalled home by his citizens, be"cauſe the Bœotians and Athenians had declared war "againſt the Lacedæmonians, Conon nevertheleſs con"tinued with the King's Governors." The ſame Hiſtorian, after theſe words, relates how Conon took a journey to the Court of Perſia, and obtained a commiſſion to cauſe ſhips of war to be equipped, to put to ſea the year following. It was with this fleet that Conon beat the Lacedæmonians at Cnidus. Juſtin has confounded every thing: he has falſly imagined that the Thebans, the Athenians, and their Allies, did not declare war againſt Lacedæmon till after the battle of Cnidus (19). It is no wonder that the terms of Cornelius Nepos are leſs falſe than thoſe of Juſtin; becauſe the Anachroniſm of the latter is not to be found in the former. We may, notwithſtanding, affirm that Cornelius Nepos has expreſſed himſelf ill (20); for it cannot be ſaid, properly ſpeaking, that a people which makes war on another, and wins battles againſt another, is under the ſervitude of that other. The Athenians were in this ſituation before the battle of Cnidus. In the ſtyle of an Orator one may ſpeak as Cornelius Nepos does; for an Orator would make no difficulty to ſay that Guſtavus gave liberty to all Europe, which was in ſlavery to the Houſe of Auſtria; but this language would be very impertinent in an Hiſtorian.

(16) Juſtin. lib. 6. cap. 3.

(17) Xenophon, lib. 2. *ſub fin.*

(18) According to Calviſius.

(19) Juſtin. lib. 6. cap. 4.

(20) *Hos Conon apud Cnidum adortus magno prælio fugat, multas naves capit, complures deprimit: qua victoria non ſolum Athenæ ſed etiam cuncta Græcia, quæ ſub Lacedæmoniorum fuerat* IMPERIO, *liberata eſt.* i. e. "Theſe Conon "attacked near "Cnidus, and "defeated them "in a great en"gagement, "taking and "ſinking many "ſhips; by "which victory "not Athens "alone, but all "Greece like"wiſe, which "had been ſub"ject to the "power of the "Lacedæmoni"ans, was ſet at "liberty. Corn. Nepos, *in Cononе.*

[F] *TIMOTHEUS, his ſon, was the Scholar of Iſocrates* (21).] Cicero teſtifies that Timotheus equalled his father in military virtues, and ſurpaſſed him in learning. *Quod idem fecit Timotheus Cononis filius, qui cum belli laude non inferior fuiſſet quàm pater, ad eam laudem doctrinæ & ingenii gloriam adjecit* (22).

(21) Plutarch. *in Vita Iſocrat.*

(22) Cicero, *de Offic.* lib. 1. cap. 32.

[G] . . . . *and brought himſelf genteelly off, when he was reproached with the lewd life of his mother.*] This woman was of Thrace, and had followed the trade of a Courtezan; but after ſhe had left it off, no one ſhewed a more prudent and exemplary conduct than ſhe; and this is the property of that ſort of women when they become ſincere converts: it is at leaſt the opinion of the Author whom I copy. Τιμοθεος δ' ὁ στρατηγήσας Ἀθηναίων ἐπιφανῶς, ἑταίρας ἦν υἱὸς, Θρᾴττης τὸ γένος, σώφρονος δ' ἄλλως τοὺς τρόπους, μεταβαλλόντων δὲ αἱ τοιαῦται εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, τῶν ἐπὶ τούτῳ σεμνυνομένων ἐστὶ βελτίων. *Timothei, qui cum magna gloria Athenienſium dux exercituum fuit, mater erat Thracia genere, meretrix, ſed gravibus & laudatis moribus. Nam ejus conditionis fœminæ cùm ad temperantiam & continentiam ſeſe applicuerint, aliis qui ob eas virtutes gloriantur, probiores ſunt* (23). Timotheus being rallied for having ſuch a mother, anſwered that he was greatly obliged to her, ſince ſhe was the cauſe that he was the ſon of an illuſtrious father (24). And indeed, if this woman had not been one of a looſe behaviour, ſhe had never lain with Conon; and conſequently Timotheus had never been. He owed his exiſtence therefore to his mother's lewdneſs; which exiſtence was glorious, conſidering the figure Conon made in the world. This makes me recollect what is told of the mother of three illuſtrious baſtards. She repented not of her faults, ſince they had produced three men of great merit. Conſult the Remark [B] of the article ERASMUS.

(23) Athen. lib. 13. cap. 5. pag. m. 577.

(24) Idem, ibid.

[H] *CONON, his grandſon, was condemned to rebuild part of the city walls.*] Cornelius Nepos moralizes upon this by a very pretty antitheſis: *Hujus* (Timothei) *poſt mortem quum populum judicii ſui pœniteret, mulctæ novem partes detraxit, & decem talenta Cononem filium ejus ad muri quamdam partem reficiendam juſſit dare; in quo fortunæ varietas eſt animadverſa, nam quos avus Conon muros ex hoſtium præda patriæ reſtituerat, eoſdem nepos cum ſumma ignominia familiæ ex ſua re familiari reficere coactus eſt* (25). i. e. "After "the death of Timotheus, when the people re"pented of the ſentence they had paſſed, they remit"ted nine parts of the fine, and ordered Conon his ſon "to pay ten talents to repair a certain part of the "wall; wherein the viciſſitude of fortune is obſerva"ble: for the ſame walls which Conon the grandfa"ther had rebuilt for his country out of the ſpoil of "its enemies, was the grandſon, with the utmoſt igno"miny to the family, compelled to repair out of his "private fortune."

(25) Corn. Nepos, *in Vita Timothei*, cap. 4.

[I] *No great exactneſs is to be found either in Juſtin, or in Cornelius Nepos, ... whether we compare them with one another . . . .*] Here is the narrative of

we compare the Life of Conon with that of Ageſilaüs, both written by Cornelius Nepos.

Juſtin (26). The Lacedæmonians, after they had ſubdued the Commonwealth of Athens, became more ambitious than before (27), and thought of no leſs than the conqueſt of all Aſia. To perform this they muſt neceſſarily vanquiſh the Perſians, as well thoſe who were commanded by Tiſſaphernes, as thoſe who were commanded by Pharnabazus. The enterprize appeared too great to Hercyllides the Lacedæmonian General: for which reaſon he corrupted Tiſſaphernes, and made a private treaty with him, by which he engaged not to attack him, provided that certain ſums were paid him. Pharnabazus complained of this conduct: he repreſented that Tiſſaphernes inſtead of repelling the enemies, bought a Truce of them, which afforded them an opportunity of attacking the other provinces of the Empire more vigorouſly; that the command of the Fleets ought therefore to be taken from him, and conferred on Conon, who lived in exile in the Iſland of Cyprus. The King of Perſia found the Remonſtrances of Pharnabazus juſt, and ordered the Naval Army to be put under the command of Conon. Hereupon, the Lacedæmonians demanded ſuccours of the King of Egypt, and obtained ſeveral ſhips, and reſolved to ſend their King Ageſilaüs into Aſia with a great army. Here therefore are Conon and Ageſilaüs oppoſed to one another in Aſia: the match was well made; they were equal in all things; and it thence came to paſs that neither of them vanquiſhed the other. *Non facile dixerim quod aliud par ducum tam bene comparatum fuerit, quippe ætas, virtus, conſilium, ſapientia utrique prope una, gloria, quoque rerum geſtarum eadem: quibus cum paria omnia fortuna dederit, invictum tamen ab altero utrumque ſervavit* (28). i. e. "It would be hard to "ſay that any other two Generals were ſo well matched; for their age, their valour, their conduct, and "their prudence, were nearly the ſame, the glory of "their paſt actions was alſo equal: whom when fortune had thus alike favoured in all reſpects, ſhe notwithſtanding ſuffered neither of them to be conquered by the other." But as Conon's ſoldiers mutinied for want of pay, and the letters which he wrote to the King on that head produced no effect, he took a journey to the Court of Perſia, and remonſtrated the ill uſe which the Miniſters made of the public revenues ſo ſtrongly, that the King named a perſon whoſe care it ſhould be to furniſh Conon with what money was neceſſary. Immediately Conon was ſent to the Fleet, and without loſing time he went and landed in the enemies country, ravaged it, took ſome Towns, and ſpread ſuch a conſternation there, that thoſe of Lacedæmon reſolved to recall Ageſilaüs. However, they fitted out a great fleet, and thought themſelves in a condition to hazard a battle; but they were defeated by Conon. This victory reſtored the Athenians to liberty, and encouraged the Thebans to declare war againſt the Lacedæmonians: they beat them, and then entred ſword in hand into the territory of Lacedæmon. The Lacedæmonians recalled Ageſilaus to oppoſe this torrent (29). Ageſilaus came back, and obtained a victory. Conon, being informed that Ageſilaus had left Aſia, made a new deſcent on the enemies lands, pillaged them, and afterwards returned to Athens.

(26) Juſtin. lib. 6. cap. 2, *& ſeq.*

(27) *More ingenii humani quo plura habent eo ampliora cupientes.* i. e. "According to "the natural "diſpoſition of "mankind, "whereby the "more they "poſſeſs, the "more they co-"vet." Idem, ibid. cap. 1.

(28) Juſtin. lib. 6. cap. 2. *His* TAMEN *ſeems to me to be the term of a very bad Logician; for it is ſo far from being ſtrange that two Captains equal* IN EVERY THING *did not vanquiſh one the other, that it would have been ſurprizing if it had happened otherwiſe. This is the reaſon why I have not ſaid according to the Text of Juſtin,* Notwithſtanding it came to paſs that neither of them vanquiſhed the other: *but have put* thence *in the room of* notwithſtanding.

(29) See the laſt Remark, towards the end.

See the Narrative of Cornelius Nepos in the Text of this Article, and compare it with that of Juſtin, and you will find that either the one or the other of theſe two Hiſtorians has committed great overſights. I. According to Juſtin, no employment was given to Conon till the King of Perſia was convinced of the treaſon of Tiſſaphernes by the means of Pharnabazus: the firſt employment which was given him was the command of the Fleet; he had continued in the Iſle of Cyprus till Pharnabazus procured it for him (30). But according to Cornelius Nepos, he had not retired into the Iſle of Cyprus, but went directly to Pharnabazus: he had been the ſoul of the army commanded by that General, and had been oppoſed to King Ageſilaüs; he had, by his good counſels, hindred Ageſilaüs from making farther conqueſts; nor had he remained uſeleſs after that Prince's retreat: he had been ſent to the Court by Pharnabazus to accuſe Tiſſaphernes: he had undeceived Artaxerxes with regard to that traitor; and it was ſubſequent to all this that he obtained the command of the fleets. Can two Narratives be more different? II. According to Juſtin, the Lacedæmonians, being informed that Conon was to command the naval forces of Perſia, made great armaments by ſea and land: they gave the command of their Fleet to Piſander, and ſent Ageſilaüs into Aſia with very fine troops to oppoſe Conon; ſo that thoſe two great men were then matched againſt one another. Ageſilaüs and Conon maintained their honour; neither of them vanquiſhed his antagoniſt. But Conon, being ill obeyed by his ſoldiers becauſe they were not paid, was obliged to go to the Court of Perſia to repreſent the neceſſary remedy to the King: he received money, and was ſent back to the Fleet. Cornelius Nepos relates things very differently: he will have it that Conon did not command the naval army till after Ageſilaüs had quitted Aſia to go and ſuccour Lacedæmon; and that Conon went to the Court of Perſia to accuſe Tiſſaphernes, and not becauſe the ſoldiers had mutinied. III. According to Juſtin, the Perſian army was commanded by Conon only; but, according to Cornelius Nepos, it was Pharnabazus who commanded it: it is true, the real command was in Conon, becauſe his counſels were followed. It is impoſſible not to ſee faults in the Relation of Juſtin; for after that Author has told us that Conon was the King of Perſia's Admiral (31), he makes him appear at the head of a Land-army, without acquainting us why or how the Court ordered ſuch a metamorphoſis, and even without taking notice that they diſpoſed of him in a different manner. It will not be denied that Ageſilaüs made war by land (32); it is therefore moſt certain that Conon, who was oppoſed to him, according to Juſtin, muſt have commanded by Land. The Hiſtorian, not content with this fault, has committed a ſecond; he not only ſhews us a chimerical Admiral, who, without having performed the leaſt thing at ſea, appears at the head of an army far within land; but he ſays alſo that this General having gone to complain that his troops were not paid, was ſent back to the Fleet. Who would not believe, when he reads this, that Conon had already appeared on board the King of Perſia's Fleet? Yet it is certain that he appears in Juſtin only among the land-forces. Theſe are inaccuracies which are not to be juſtified by ſaying, that this Author only wrote an Abridgment of a larger Hiſtory; for a good Abridger never ſuppreſſes ſuch circumſtances as are wanting here. So much for the Criticiſms which might be made on Juſtin, conſidering him as the only Writer who has ſpoken of theſe things: but I doubt not but if he were compared with the other Hiſtorians, he might eaſily be convicted of ſome falſhoods. I wiſh they who have commented him would have taken notice of the faults of his narration, and his hiſtorical confuſions. Almoſt all of them have rather choſen Grammatical Remarks.

I would not always prefer Cornelius Nepos to Juſtin; for though, having only written the Life of a ſingle perſon, he ought to have ſpoken more exactly of him than thoſe who met with him in their way, while they were writing a General Hiſtory, it is true nevertheleſs that in certain particulars I ſhould rather truſt to the General Hiſtory left us by Xenophon, than to him. Xenophon is in divers reſpects more and leſs conformable to Cornelius Nepos than to Juſtin. He neither introduces Conon in the wars by land againſt Ageſilaüs, nor makes him concerned in the diſgrace of Tiſſaphernes; which is at once to refute both Cornelius Nepos and Juſtin. He does not make Conon appear on the Stage, till after the puniſhment of Tiſſaphernes, and to command the Van-guard of Artaxerxes's naval army at the battle of Cnidus (33). Here is nothing to countenance Cornelius Nepos; but Juſtin finds ſomething to favour him. Xenophon acknowledges that Conon made two deſcents on the lands of the Lacedæmonians, but both poſterior to the battle of Cnidus, and as Lieutenant or Collegue of Pharnabazus (34). This refutes Juſtin, who does not ſpeak of Pharnabazus even as a cypher, and who ſuppoſes that the firſt deſcent was made before the battle of Cnidus. When the news of that battle was brought

(30) *His vocibus regem à Tiſſapherne alienatum hortatur* (Pharnabazus) *ut in locum ejus navalis belli ducem eligat Conona Athenienſem, qui amiſſa bello patria Cypri exulabat.* Juſt. lib. 6. cap. 1.

(31) *Juſſus eſt* (Pharnabazus) *Conona claſſi præficere.* Idem, ibid.

(32) Xenophon, lib. 3. pag. 294. *obſerves that the Lacedæmonians ſent the commiſſion to command the naval forces into Aſia to Ageſilaus; but that he gave that poſt to his brother-in-law.*

(33) Xenophon, *de Rebus Geſtis Græc.* lib. 4. pag. 303.

(34) Idem, pag. 313, 314.

Nepos [K]. Servius the Grammarian is miſtaken in ſuppoſing that our Conon was meant in thoſe words of Virgil (i), *In medio duo ſigna, Conon.* Beroaldus (k), cenſuring this error, has obſerved that, according to the Grammarian Probus, Virgil intended to ſpeak of Conon of Samos, who is the ſubject of the preceding Article.

(i) Eclog. 3. ver. 40.

(k) Beroald. *Animadv. in Servium.*

brought to Ageſilaüs, he was already in Bœotia, according to Xenophon (35). On this foot, Juſtin is miſtaken, when he ſays that the exploits of Conon obliged the Lacedæmonians to recall Ageſilaüs. He is alſo miſtaken when he relates that Conon, having learned that Ageſilaus was returned from Aſia to Greece, quitted the coaſts of Aſia, and returned thence towards Lacedæmon, to make a ſecond deſcent there (36); for as this ſecond deſcent was made after the battle of Cnidus, and that battle was poſterior to Ageſilaüs's return into Europe, I leave you to judge whether the news of that return of Ageſilaüs was the occaſion of Conon's taking the reſolution to make this ſecond deſcent. People may praiſe the ancient Hiſtorians as much as they pleaſe, but they ſhall never perſuade me that they equal ſome of our moderns with regard to the diſtinct obſervation of the times wherein each thing happened (37).

(35) Idem, pag. 303.

(36) *Conon quoque audito reditu Ageſilai, & ipſe ex Aſia ad depopulandos Lacedæmoniorum agros revertitur.* Juſtin. lib. 6. cap. 5.

(37) *See* Mr. Perrault, *Parallele des Anciens & des Modernes*, tom. 1. pag. 275, of the Dutch Edition.

[K] . . . . *or whether we compare the Life of Conon with that of Ageſilaüs, both written by Cornelius Nepos.*] We ſee Conon in the former ſo highly eſteemed by Pharnabazus, that every thing is done by his advice. It is he who, properly ſpeaking, commands the army (38); and Pharnabazus is Generaliſſimo only in name. It is Conon who ſtops the progreſs of Ageſilaüs: without him all Aſia on this ſide Taurus would have fallen under the Lacedæmonian yoke. Look in the Life of Ageſilaüs whether Conon ſignalized himſelf againſt him, and you will not find Conon's name there ſo much as once. You ſee Ageſilaüs always triumphant; he always over-reaches his enemies; if he does not think fit to fight, it is not poſſible to force him to it; if he does fight, he always conquers, though he be inferior in number (39); if he does not penetrate into the heart of the Empire, Conon is not the cauſe of it, it is becauſe he is recalled home where his preſence is neceſſary. In caſe Cornelius Nepos had a mind to conſult Conon's honour, he has done well not to introduce him in the Life of Ageſilaus, where there is nothing but ſhame to be gotten by all who reſiſted that Prince during his Aſiatic expedition. But in conſulting the honour of another, the Hiſtorian has proſtituted his own: he has not conſidered the character with which he had inveſted Conon in the Life of that General; ſo that one might ſtrangely perplex Cornelius Nepos by the following Dilemma: *What you have ſaid of the exploits of Conon againſt Ageſilaüs is either true or falſe: if it be falſe, you deſerve to be toſſed in a blanket; if it be true, you deſerve it no leſs: for you have not only ſuppreſſed it in the Life of Ageſilaus, but you there ſpeak of Ageſilaus's exploits in ſuch a manner, that all your Readers clearly ſee the Perſians did nothing of conſequence, and got nothing but ſhame.* Here is another attack. In the Life of Conon, the Lacedæmonians break the alliance they had made with the Perſians; they carry the war into Aſia under the conduct of Ageſilaüs, and they are encouraged to this chiefly by Tiſſaphernes, who betrays his maſter, and makes a private Treaty with them. That General's treaſon is a clear and certain fact, though the King is not willing to believe it (40). But in the Life of Ageſilaüs, it is Artaxerxes who begins to make preparations againſt the Greeks; and he is prevented with ſuch diligence, that Ageſilaüs arrives in Aſia with his troops before the Perſian Governors know he is ſet out (41). Tiſſaphernes is ſurprized and diſconcerted no leſs than the others: he demands a truce, and feigns to deſire it only to conclude a peace; but at the bottom he only ſeeks to gain time, in order to levy forces: he obtains a truce for three months, and thinks of nothing but war; and in all that follows he makes not one ſtep which looks like a colluſion. Indeed he is not fortunate enough to penetrate the deſigns of his enemy, or to defend the Provinces which the King of Perſia had intruſted him with; but he does all that he is able, if the Hiſtorian may be believed. I have ſeen no Commentators who reproach him with this groſs contradiction. To conclude, in the Life of Conon, it is Pharnabazus who commands the Perſians againſt Ageſilaüs; but in the Life of the latter, the name of this Pharnabazus is not even once to be ſeen: ſo that the ſame Author in one place attributes the whole care of making reſiſtance to Conon and Pharnabazus, and in another he attributes it wholly to Tiſſaphernes. It may be ſaid, that it would have diminiſhed the glory of Ageſilaüs, if he had owned the treaſon of Tiſſaphernes. But if this reaſon be good, let us deprive him of the title of Hiſtorian; for he deſerves no other than that of a Panegyriſt, who imitates the falſe Rhetoric of a Sophiſt. If theſe two Lives were ſtrictly examined, one would be apt to conclude them to have been the Work of two Writers, who endeavoured to refute each other; and yet they are the production of the ſame pen.

(39) *Pepulit ergo quotieſcumque congreſſus eſt multo majores adverſariorum copias.* Idem, *in* Ageſilao, cap. 3, *fin.*

(40) *Defecerat à Rege Tiſſaphernes, neque id tam Artaxerxi quàm cæteris erat apertum.* Idem, *in* Conone, cap. 3.

(41) *Tanta celeritate uſus eſt, ut prius in Aſiam cum copiis pervenerit quam regii Satrapæ eum ſcirent profectum.* Idem, *in* Ageſilao, cap. 2.

Cornelius Nepos criticized.

The Life of Conon written by Cornelius Nepos differs from the relation of Juſtin in ſeveral particulars; as has been ſhewn above. Give me leave farther to obſerve a variation which is found between Juſtin and the Life of Ageſilaüs written by Cornelius Nepos. According to Juſtin, fortune carried herſelf ſo evenly between Ageſilaüs and Conon, that they were equal in every thing, ſo that the one did not vanquiſh the other (42). Cornelius Nepos tells us quite the contrary, though he affects to ſuppreſs the name of Conon. He is not ſatisfied with relating events which prove in a very ſenſible manner that Ageſilaüs beat the Perſians, without the leaſt appearance of their ever gaining any advantage, he ſays expreſly that all the world would agree that Ageſilaüs was the conqueror (43). He adds that that Prince at the head of a victorious army was in full hopes of ſubduing all Perſia (44). I forgot to take notice that, according to Juſtin, the Lacedæmonians recalled Ageſilaüs when they ſaw themſelves blocked up by the enemy after the battle of Haliartus, where Lyſander was ſlain. They were in pain for their City, ſays he, for which reaſon they recalled Ageſilaüs, who was performing great things in Aſia (45). Had he ſaid no more than this, he could not well have been cenſured; but he had ſaid, ſome pages before, that the recalling of Ageſilaüs was reſolved on before the battle of Cnidus, and that the loſs of that battle gave ſuch encouragement to the Athenians and Thebans, that they declared war againſt the Lacedæmonians, and won a battle in which Lyſander was killed. This is overturning the order of events; for the battle of Haliartus was fought a year before that of Cnidus: ſo that we ſee Juſtin has fallen into the Sophiſm *à non cauſa pro cauſa*, which is yet more frequent among the Hiſtorians than among the Peripatetics, as I have elſewhere (46) obſerved.

(42) I have quoted and criticized Juſtin's words above, Citation (28).

(43) *Sic in Aſia verſatus eſt ut omnium opinione victor duceretur.* Cornelius Nepos, *in* Ageſilao, cap. 3, *fin.*

(44) *Quum victori præeſſet exercitui, maximamque haberet fiduciam regni Perſarum potiundi.* Idem, ibid. cap. 4.

(45) *Quod metuentes Lacedæmonii regem ſuum Ageſilaum ex Aſia, qui ibi magnas res gerebat, ad defenſionem patriæ arceſſunt.* Juſtin, lib. 6. cap. 4.

(46) Above, at the end of the the laſt Remark of the Article CAUSSIN.

CONRAD (HERIMANNUS). There is extant under that name a Latin Oration, in which the United Provinces are very much abuſed [A]: It was printed at Molſheim about the year 1618. The Author aſſerts that he bore arms ſince the battle of Pavia. Berneggerus thinks that piece was written by a Jeſuit (a).

(a) Matth. Berneggerus, *in Tuba Pacis*, pag. 271.

[A] *There is under that name an . . . . . Oration, in which the United Provinces are very much abuſed.*] The Author charges the States with Atheiſm, and aſſerts, that they do not mind Religion, but only ſo far, as they think it may ſerve to enlarge their Dominions. *Ordines Belgii potentiſſimos Atheiſmi præſidenter arceſcit, nec Religionem curæ habere dicit*, niſi quatenus ad ampliendum Imperium utilis eſſe videtur (1).

(1) Bernegg. *in Tuba Pacis*, pag. 271.

CONRARUS (GREGORY) Protonotary to the Pope, was one of the learned men who lived in the fifteenth Century. There is a Letter, which Poggius wrote to him, in which he anſwers the objections which Conrarus had propoſed to him concerning his book *de*

de Nobilitate. Amongſt Candidus Decembrius's manuſcript Letters there is one of our Conrarus to the learned Cecilia de Gonzaga, in which he congratulates her, becauſe ſhe had deſpiſed the pleaſures of this world, in order to devote her herſelf entirely to God: he entreats her not to read any more the Poets, for which Victorinus her Tutor had given her a taſte, and which he had taught her to underſtand; but he adviſes her to read the Treatiſes, which the holy Fathers wrote upon Virginity and Continency. He directs her to ſeveral Works of the Fathers, and particularly to a Treatiſe of St. Baſil, which Ambroſe of Camaldoli had tranſlated into Latin, and to Salvian's Book *de Providentia Dei*, which he (Conrarus) had met with in Germany, and had carried with him into Italy, when he returned from the Council of Baſil (*a*). He mentions Ambroſe of Camaldoli as a very eminent man, who died before he was grown very old (*b*) [*A*].

(*a*) *Cujus libros de providentia Dei è Concilio Baſileenſi rediens, de Germanorum ergaſtulis in Italiam deportavi.*

(*b*) Ex *Muſæo Italico Mabillonii*, tom. 1. pag. 198.

[*A*] *He mentions Ambroſe of Camaldoli as a . . man who died before he was grown very old.*] Here follow his own words. *Multa quidem utilia ex Doctoribus Eccleaſticis egregie tranſtulit, & plura tranſtuliſſet, niſi eum a laboribus humanis* IMMATURA *mors ſuſtuliſſet.* i. e. "He "(*Ambroſe*) has excellently tranſlated a great many things "from the Eccleſiaſtical Writers; and would have "tranſlated more, had not an *untimely* death ſnatched "him from his worldly labours." This may ſerve to confute thoſe who make Ambroſe live till the year 1490. Add this to the arguments with which I confute them in his Article (1).

(1) CAMALDOLI Remark [*E*].

CONSTANCE, a City in Germany ſituated between two Lakes, formed by the Rhine, was for ſome time under a Republican Government; and the Citizens, the better to maintain their liberty, of which the Princes of the Houſe of Auſtria would deprive them, made an alliance with the Cities of Zurick, Lindau and Uberlingen: they renounced Popery in the year 1523; but the City having been proſcribed by the Emperor in the year 1548, it was ſo cloſely preſſed by Charles the Fifth, that the Citizens were obliged to ſubmit to him, upon which moſt of the Proteſtants, and particularly Ambroſe Blaurer their chief Miniſter, retired to other places. Since that time the City of Conſtance belongs to the Houſe of Auſtria (*a*); Moreri, who ſaid in two places that it is an Imperial City, is very much miſtaken. The City of Conſtance entered into the Confederacy of Smalcald in 1531 (*b*); and this was, no doubt, one of the reaſons which determined Charles the Fifth to ſubdue it, after he had vanquiſhed the Confederates. The Swedes under the command of Marſhal Horn beſieged Conſtance in the year 1633, but did not ſucceed in their deſign. The beſieged drew up a Journal, in which they related a great many *miracles, and remarkable ſigns of the divine protection, which appeared in their behalf during the ſiege* (*c*) [*A*]. A Proteſtant Author wrote a ſhort Cenſure upon this [*B*].

(*a*) Taken from Matthew Dreſſerus, *Iſag. Hiſt.* Part 5. pag. 196, & *ſeq.*

(*b*) Munſter, *in Coſmog.* pag. m. 397.

(*c*) Spanheim, *Merc. Suiſſe*, pag. 372.

COORNHERT,

[*A*] *The Swedes . . . beſieged Conſtance in . . 1633. . The beſieged drew up a Journal, in which they related a great many miracles, . . . which appeared in their behalf during the ſiege.*] "The moſt remarkable are, I. "The advantages they gained over the enemy in the "weakeſt part of their city, beyond what they could "expect. II. The incredible courage and ſtoutneſs "both of their Citizens and Soldiers, beſides the good "underſtanding there was between them. III. The "frequent ſupplies of proviſions, which were very ſea"ſonably thrown into the city, and the wonderful "concurrence of favourable winds, to conduct theſe "ſupplies, tho' the air in that climate be generally "ſubject to contrary winds, and their lake to frequent "tempeſts in that month. IV. The little damage "done by the granades and red-hot bullets, notwith"ſtanding the prodigious number of them, which had "been thrown into the city, and which alone were "ſufficient to burn it to aſhes, and reduce all the in"habitants to the utmoſt poverty. V. The height of "the Rhine, which is uſed to fall as ſoon as the hot "days of the ſummer are over, and yet continued to "ſwell to ſuch a degree as to furniſh all the mills in "the city with water ſo abundantly, that there was "enough to ſupply the neceſſities of the inhabitants as "long as the ſiege laſted': this was confirmed by the "teſtimony of their Millers, who declared, that this "great quantity of water run off, as ſoon as the ene"my was retired, and the foreign Troops had been "diſmiſſed. VI. The moſt contemplative added, "that the fourth day of the ſiege they obſerved at "noon-day the bleſſed Virgin flying over the Church "of the Auguſtin Friars with an extraordinary ſplen"dor. The Swediſh Centries are alſo alledged in the "ſame Journal, as witneſſes to ſuch apparitions, and "it is there pretended, that they ſaw a face more "than angelical, ſliding along the wall, near the loop"holes, from the Tower of Rewenegg, to the Gate "of Creutzlingen (1)."

(1) Spanheim, *Mercure Suiſſe*, pag. 372, &c.

[*B*] *A Proteſtant Author wrote a ſhort cenſure upon this.*] Frederic Spanheim, who was a Miniſter at Geneva when he wrote his *Mercure Suiſſe*, from which I have extracted the foregoing remark, adds what follows. "The Swedes did not find any ſuch thing, nei"ther in their own accounts, nor in thoſe of their ſol"diers. They alſo obſerved, that the Author of the "Journal often wanted memory, and did not remem"ber in the cloſe of his account what he had owned "in the beginning, namely, the fear the beſieged "were in, the ruins of the city, the number of the "ſick in their hoſpitals, their bills of mortality; all "which ſufficiently ſhewed, that the granades were "not entirely ineffectual. The Swedes alſo relate a"mongſt the moſt dangerous circumſtances of the "ſiege, that they obſerved a great number of troops "entering the city over the lake, which being very "broad, and they wanting boats, they could not op"poſe the paſſage of thoſe troops but from a great "diſtance. And indeed the beſieged themſelves rec"kon in their Muſter-Rolls 5500 men, who entered "their city during the ſiege, beſides Count Wolffegg's "Regiment, which was there before the arrival of the "Swedes. The city of Uberlingen furniſhed the inhabi"tants of Conſtance with 200 men; Lindaw with 400; "Bregentz with 200; Colonel de Merſy with 1200; "the Regiment of Embs with 500; that of Altringen "with as many; Colonel Comargo with 1000; "Serjeant-Major de Reinach with 100; his Lieutenant "with 500. So that the Swedes were of opinion, "that ſo many and ſuch powerful ſupplies, together "with the neceſſary proviſions, were ſufficient not "only to make the City, which was well fortified, "hold out againſt five or ſix thouſand men, which "were ſo bold as to beſiege them amongſt a great ma"ny inconveniencies, and in a foreign country, but "alſo to make them quit the field, if thoſe auxiliary "troops had been as jealous of their reputation, as "they were careful to preſerve their lives (2)."

(2) Spanheim, *Mercure Suiſſe*, pag. 374, &c.

You ſee, that this Miniſter explodes as ſo many forgeries, part of the miracles, of which the inhabitants of that beſieged city boaſted. The reſt of thoſe miracles are of ſuch a nature, that there is no country in the

COORNHERT, a Dutch Author in the ſixteenth Century. See KOORNHERT.

the world, but where it may be obſerved, that the like circumſtances of winds, rain, the ſwelling of rivers, &c. have either favoured warlike undertakings, or made them miſcarry. Now, as it is not at all probable, that God would alter the general laws of nature, but when the ſalvation of his children requires it, we ought not to take for miracles ſuch events, as happen equally amongſt the unbelievers, and amongſt the faithful: And yet men of all perſuaſions are very much inclined to think themſelves favoured with miraculous bleſſings; and if Frederic Spanheim had given an account of a ſiege happily held out by a Proteſtant City, he would perhaps have made obſervations not much different from thoſe he refuted (3). There are ſome Miniſters, who think all thoſe events miraculous, in which their party is concerned. Monſieur Jurieu, for inſtance, finds miracles every where (4), and of late, in what happened to the inhabitants of the Cevennes (5). But people, who underſtand the art of war, and who are acquainted with the ſituation of the country, and knew how the neighbouring cities were diſpoſed, and all the circumſtances of the inſurrection of the inhabitants of the Cevennes, find nothing in all this, but what is very natural. I will not examine whether a man, who thinks that a certain concurrence of ſecond cauſes had ruined the deſigns of the enemy, ought to make people believe, that there is ſomething miraculous in this, and whether he can juſtify himſelf by ſaying, that this is a proper method to raiſe men's hopes and confidence, and to fill them with a greater gratitude for the divine protection. But I dare to affirm, that if he hopes by this means to perſuade the Rulers of Nations to enter into a war, he is very much miſtaken. Let Monſr. Jurieu repeat as often as he pleaſes, that the preſervation of the Camiſards is a continued ſeries of miracles, the Princes will not be much moved by all this, if other political reaſons, which they know much better, than he does, and with which they do not want to be acquainted by him, do not determine them to relieve the Cevennois. They will underſtand an affair thoroughly, before they undertake it: but future miracles are objects of faith, and conſequently dark.

(3) Compare this with what has been ſaid in the *Continuation des Penſées diverſes*, pag. 312.

(4) See the ſame *Continuation*, pag. 313.

(5) See the Piece he publiſhed in 1705, intitled, *Avis aux Puiſſances de l'Europe, &c.*

CORBINELLI (JAMES), born at Florence of an antient and illuſtrious family [*A*], retired into France under the reign of Catharine de Medicis. This Queen, to whom he had the honour of being related, placed him with her ſon the Duke of Anjou, as a man well ſkilled in polite Literature, and capable of giving good advice (*a*). He read every day to the Duke, Tacitus, Polybius, and often Machiavel's Diſcourſes, and his *Prince*, if we may believe Davila (*b*). Corbinelli did not flatter his maſter like a weak and ſelf-intereſted Courtier, but told him the truth boldly, and made his court without baſeneſs. He was looked upon as a man of the ſame character with the antient Romans [*B*], upright, and uncapable of doing the leaſt unworthy action. Chancellor de l'Hoſpital had a very great eſteem for him [*C*]. He was the friend and open Patron of all men of Letters, ſo far, that though he was not rich, yet he ſpent part of his eſtate in the printing of their works [*D*]. But his talents were not confined to the Muſes only; he was proper both for Study, and for the Council Table; he was even a man of courage and reſolution,

[*A*] *He was of an . . . illuſtrious Family.*] Here follows a paſſage from the Preface, which is prefixed to the Sentences (*Maximes*) of Livy, collected by Mr. Corbinelli. "He is originally deſcended from one of "the moſt ancient and nobleſt families of Florence; "and when the Commonwealth ſubſiſted, his anceſtors "filled the higheſt poſts amongſt the Lords, who go-"verned the State."

See Claude Malingre Sieur de St. Lazare in a Dedication to the *Noble and illuſtrious Meſſire Peter de Corbinelli, Counſellor and Lord Steward to the King* (1). He was one of James Corbinelli's ſons.

(1) That of the Book intitled, *Hiſtoires Tragique de notre tems*, printed at Roan, in 1641.

[*B*] *He was look'd upon as a man of the ſame character with the ancient Romans.*] The following words of Juſtus Lipſius are quoted in the Preface, which I have mentioned. *Gentem veſtram amavi ſemper, & ex ea illos maxime qui vetere illa Italia digni, qualem te eſſe, mi Corbinelli, video* (2). i. e. "I have always "loved your family, and eſpecially thoſe perſons of it, "who deſerve to be ranked amongſt the great men of "ancient Italy, as I find you do, my dear Corbinelli." The paſſage is curtailed, we muſt tranſcribe the whole of it; by which it will appear that Peter Victorius had a great eſteem for our Corbinelli. *Qualem te eſſe, mi Corbinelli, non ſolum ex igniculis literarum tuarum, quos ſparſos colligo, video; ſed etiam ex teſtimonio viri magni Victorii, qui de indole tua ad virtutem magna prædicat, nec vana.* i. e. "As I find you do my dear Corbi-"nelli, not only by your excellent Letters, of which "I make a collection, but alſo by the character, which "that great man Victorius gives you, who loudly "proclaims your virtuous diſpoſition, and not with-"out reaſon. This Letter of Lipſius acquaints us, that Corbinelli had a brother, who came to an unfortunate end. *Fratris tui μεγαλοψυχια hiſtoriam & triſte exitium legi. Quid miremur? hodie illæ viæ, & nil niſi σχολιον videmus à pleriſque his Dynaſtis* (3). i. e. "I have read the ſtory and ſad fate of your magna-"nimous brother. Why ſhould we wonder at it? "This is now-a-days the way, and we ſee, that no-"thing but injuſtice is done by theſe great Lords." It is very probable, that he periſhed at Florence in ſome republican attempt.

(2) Lipſ. *Epiſt.* 5. *Cent.* 2. *Miſcellan.* It is dated from Leyden in 1586.

(3) Idem, ibid.

[*C*] *Chancellor de l'Hopital had a very great eſteem for him.*] "We ſee in the Chancellor's Epiſtle to him in Latin Verſe, not only, that of all his friends, Corbinelli's converſation was moſt agreeable to him, but alſo, that he was almoſt the only Courtier, whom the "Court had not corrupted, and who could prefer po-"lite learning before his own intereſt and advance-"ment." Theſe are the words of the Author of the Preface; and here follow ſome of the Chancellor's Verſes, which offer the ſame ſenſe.

Corbinelle, libens te plus fruar omnibus uno,
Præſentiſque animum ſermone oblectet amici.
Tu ſervare modum noſti prope ſolus in aula,
Et præferre bonas inhoneſtis quæſtibus artes (4).

(4) *Hoſpital. Epiſt.* 6.

[*D*] *He ſpent part of his eſtate in the printing of ſeveral works.*] "Dante's Book concerning the Italian "Tongue was publiſhed by his care (*a*), beſides a great "many other Books, which would for ever have been "buried in oblivion, had he not cauſed them to be "printed (5)."

(5) Preface des *Maximes de Tite Live.*

* (*a*) He not only publiſhed this Book of Dante from the only manuſcript extant, which he had, but alſo adorned it with Italian Annotations, which are printed after the Text, in the Paris Edition of 1577, 8vo. It is ſuppoſed as a matter of fact in one of Marſhal de Baſſompierre's obſervations upon ſome of the Hiſtorian du Pleix's lives, quoted in the Remark [*H*], that Corbinelli had been baniſhed from Florence for high-treaſon, which is inconſiſtent with the words of J. A. de Baïf in his Epiſtle in verſe to King Henry III, where ſpeaking of the ſame Corbinelli, the Poet ſays

Sans aucun ſien m'effait exilé de Florence.

That he was baniſhed from Florence; tho' he was not guilty of any crime. Let us obſerve, that this Epiſtle fills up the fourth leaf of the Book we have mentioned, the whole title of which is, *Dantis Aligerii præcellentiſſ. Poetæ de vulgari Eloquentia Libri duo. Nunc primum ad vetuſti & unici ſcripti Codicis exemplar editi. Ex Libris Corbinelli: Ejuſdemque annotationibus illuſtrati. Ad Henricum Franciæ Poloniæque Regem Chriſtianiſſimum. Paris. Jo. Borbon.* 1577. CRIT. REM.]

resolution, as much as of cunning and intrigue [*E*]. His son Raphael Corbinelli, Secretary to Mary de Medicis, Queen of France, was the father of Monsieur Corbinelli, who is at present one of the greatest and best wits of France (*c*) [*F*]. See his Elogy in a Preface, from which I have extracted not only the materials, but even the very expressions of this article; it is very remarkable, that men did not know *of what Religion James Corbinelli was* [*G*]. This may make us suspect, that he had no other but that of an honest man. Marshal de Bassompiere has very much abused him [*H*].

(*c*) Extracted from an *Advertisement to the Reader*, prefixed to a Book intitled, *Les anciens Historians reduits en Maximes*, printed in 1694. This Preface is ascrib'd to Father Bouhours.

[*E*] *He was a man of courage and resolution, as much as of cunning and intrigue.*] "Peter Matthieu relates "in his *History of Henry IV*, that the King came near "Paris, on account of a design formed by his faithful subjects there, who had given him their word, "that they would open one of the gates of the city "to him. The Historian adds, that Henry was acquainted by them with all that passed; and the "most secret intelligence was conveyed to him by Corbinelli, a stout man, who was extremely zealous for "the King's cause, which he defired should get the "better of the rebels. Corbinelli, *says the same Writer*, wrote down whatever he heard, and carried the "paper openly in his hand, as tho' it had contained "only indifferent things relating to tryals and lawsuits. His bold and stout countenance imposed upon the guards, who watched at the gates, and as "he shewed that he trusted every body, no body mistrusted him (6)." Another Historian speaks after this manner. The King *had a great many faithful servants in the city, who acquainted him very punctually with all that past, and held themselves in readiness, to facilitate his entry into the city. Amongst them was James Corbinelli, who employed the utmost care and artifice. He always carried his advice to the King in his hands, as common papers relating to some law-suit that by this boldness he might give no suspicion. When he pressed his Majesty to execute his designs, he used to write to him only these three words*, come, come, come, *written only upon such a small bit of paper, as was sufficient to contain them, and put it into a quill sealed up, which the messenger carried in his mouth. . . This Corbinelli was an Italian, of a most ancient and noble family of Florence. He had taken sanctuary in France, because he had been concerned in Pandolfo Puccio's conspiracy, as Thuanus observes in his History* (7).

(6) Ibid.

(7) Dupleix, *Hist. de Henri IV*, pag. 22. under the year 1589.

[*F*] *Mr. Corbinelli . . is at present one of the greatest and best Wits of France.*] It is not said in the Preface, that he published in several volumes a Collection of the most beautiful passages, which are to be met with in the wits of this age (8). I observe it therefore in this place: and for the rest, I refer the reader to the Preface, in which Mr. Corbinelli's character is drawn in a very ingenious manner, and which is very much to his honour. The pains he took in digesting the maxims of the ancient Historians into order, will very much raise their reputation, and also serve to instruct the public. The author of the Preface does very well observe, "that the skilful readers will be de"lighted to see, that an infinite number of thoughts "and maxims, with which the moderns adorn their "writings, have been stolen from the ancients, and "that this alone may make us sensible of the merit "of those great men, and will perhaps undeceive those "prepossessed persons, who have not for the ancients "all the respect and admiration they deserve." If the ancients be compared with the moderns with regard to their respective thoughts and maxims considered in themselves, and separated from the body of their works, I don't doubt, but we shall be easily convinced, that the former have the advantage over the latter: for I do not believe, that there is any lofty or ingenious thought expressed in this age, but what may be met with in the Books of the ancients. The most sublime notions either in Metaphysicks or Ethicks, which we admire in the moderns, are to be found in the writings of the ancient Philosophers. So that our Age cannot pretend to any superiority over antiquity, except a whole work be compared with a whole work. For it must be confessed, that a work, which with regard to the beauties of it does not yield to other works considered also with regard to their beauties, is yet inferior to them, if there be in the former more defects and greater faults than in the latter. Can it be questioned, that tho' Des Cartes had borrowed every part of his Philosophical System from the ancients, yet he deserves more to be admired than they, since he knew how to connect together so many loose parts, and to make a regular System of the incoherent subjects?

(8) It is intitled, *Extrait de tous les beaux Endroits des Ouvrages des plus celébres Auteurs de ce tems*, printed at Amsterdam in 1681.

A Reflexion upon the parallel between the Ancients and the Moderns.

Observe that M. Corbinelli had a literary correspondence with Monsr. de Bussi-Rabutin. This is plain from the Volumes of Letters written by the latter, amongst which they have inserted several Fragments of Mr. Corbinelli's Letters to him. His name is there marked only by a *C*.

[*G*] *Men did not know of what Religion James Corbinelli was.*] Thuanus tells us this; let us transcribe the whole passage: *It was not known of what Religion Corbinelli was; it was a political Religion, after the manner of the Florentines, but he was a man of good morals* (9). This assertion is of great weight for two reasons; 1. because Thuanus was a grave and honest man; 2. because he was intimately acquainted with Corbinelli. Let us see what he had already said of him. *I have known Corbinelli particularly; he was a very great Wit. He was also very proper for business, in which he was wonderfully skilled. He married an English woman, by whom he had some daughters, who are still at Court in the service of some Ladies. One of them lives with the Countess of Fiesque. Corbinelli was not rich: but he lived with great oeconomy, and was always extremely neat and genteel in his dress. He was a great friend to the Abbé d'Elbene* (10).

(9) *See* Thuana, pag. m. 35.

(10) Ibid. pag. 30.

[*H*] *Marshal de Bassompiere has very much abused him.*] It was with regard to the passage in Dupleix, which I have quoted above: The Marshal's censure upon it is as follows (11). *There is nothing more silly and impertinent than this whole chapter. Had he no other good Frenchmen to name, that he instances in this man banished from Florence for treason? A wonderful invention it was, to carry his advices in his hands! They must have been very important, since that, which is related by way of eminence, is his* come, come, come. *The King would have been very prudent indeed, had he undertook any thing upon such an exhortation. What occasion was there to fill the History of France with an account of this Corbinelli's pedigree? He must have been a very honest man really, since he was concerned in a conspiracy to kill his Prince, with Pandolfo Puccio the ringleader of it, who was hanged for his crime on a hook, at the very windows of the Palace.* Observe, that this conspiracy, how wicked soever it may have been, does not refute what others relate of Corbinelli's good morals. Conspiracies against the State are the greatest crimes men can commit, and yet some persons suffer themselves to be drawn into conspiracies by such motives as they think are morally good: so true is it, that man's conscience is liable to the most lamentable errors! Brutus, and several of those, whom he prevailed upon to murther Cæsar, were men of the most eminent probity and virtue.

(11) *Remarques sur les Vies de Henry IV & de Louis XIII de Dupleix*, pag. 11.

CORCEONE (ROBERT DE) Cardinal with the title of St. Stephen on Mount Celius, was an Englishman. There is an article of him in Moreri's Dictionary (*a*), but the following particulars are not mentioned there. Having been sent into France by Pope Innocent III for the affairs of the Crusado which was intended both against the Albigenses and the Saracens, he held a Council at Paris in the year 1212, in which he caused very good regulations to be made for the reformation of manners. He forbad the Secular Clergy

(*a*) Under the name of *Curson*.

Clergy to bind themſelves by oath not to lend books, or houſes, or other things, and not to be bail. He alſo forbad the Regular Clergy to bind themſelves by oath, not to lend books, provided however they took the neceſſary precautions to have them returned to them, or to be otherwiſe indemnified. He alſo commanded them not to lie two together [*A*]; he gave the ſame command to the Nuns, in order to prevent, ſaid he, the danger of incontinency. He held other Councils; he eſtabliſhed preachers for the Cruſado, and he perſecuted the Heretics very much. But he ſhewed himſelf ſo paſſionate againſt the Clergy, and was ſo ready to give the croſs to all ſorts of perſons, that heavy complaints were made againſt him at the Court of Rome. He made himſelf ſo odious by invading the rights of the Gallican Church, that they appealed from his proceedings, whilſt the Council, which he had ſummoned at Beziers, was ſitting. The Deputies from the French Clergy carried on the appeal very vigorouſly, and confounded this Cardinal to ſuch a degree, in a general Aſſembly, which was held at Rome, that the Pope deſired them not to inſiſt ſo much upon the grievances of which they complained (*b*). Corceone conducted a great number of Croiſes in 1214, to Simon of Montfort, who was making war againſt the Albigenſes (*c*). He died in Paleſtine, whither he had followed the Cruſado, as may be ſeen in Moreri. Amongſt the books which he wrote, there is one upon this queſtion, *Whether Origen be in Heaven?*

(*b*) Taken from Spondan. *Annal. Eccleſiaſt. ad ann.* 1212, n. 8.

(*c*) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1214, num. 2.

[*A*] *He commanded the Regular Clergy not to lie two together.*] Here follows a paſſage from Peter de St. Romuald's *Abridgment of the Chronological Treaſure* (1). "In the year 1212 there was a Council held at Paris "by Cardinal de Corceone, of which Spondanus has "related the Decrees, amongſt which is the following, "*Interdicimus Regularibus & Monialibus ne bini vel "binæ in lecto jaceant, propter metum incontinentiæ.* "That is, *We forbid the Monks and Nuns to lie two together in a bed, for fear of incontinency.* In 1643 "there was publiſhed a little Book, writen by a devout Prieſt, and approved by four Doctors, which "was intitled, *Avis Chreſtien touchant une matiere de "grande importance* (A Chriſtian Advice concerning a "very important Subject) in which the Author earneſtly wiſhes that this Decree were exactly obſerved, "becauſe of the inconveniencies, which he deſcribes "as modeſtly as he can." Let it be done as modeſtly as you pleaſe; yet this Book is proper only to raiſe our indignation againſt the Law of Celibacy, ſince it is liable to ſuch dreadful conſequences.

(1) Saint Romuald, *Abrégé Chronologique & Hiſtorique*, tom. 3. pag. m. 127, 128.

CORDIER (MATHURIN) in Latin *Corderius*, lived in the ſixteenth Century, and was one of the beſt Teachers that could be wiſhed; for he underſtood the Latin Tongue perfectly well, was a man of virtue, and performed his functions with the utmoſt diligence, being as careful to teach his ſcholars true wiſdom, as to make them learn good Latin. He ſpent his long life in teaching *children at Paris, Nevers, Bordeaux, Geneva, Neufchaſtel, Lauzane, and laſtly again at Geneva* (*a*), where he died September the 8th (*b*), 1564, *at the age of eighty five, having inſtructed the ſcholars of the ſixth form three or four days before his death.* He ſtudied Divinity for ſome time at Paris in the College of Navarre, about the year 1528, after he had taught a form in the ſame College; but he left off that ſtudy, in order to apply himſelf to his former functions of a Grammarian (*c*). He had taught at Nevers in the years 1534, 1535, and 1536 (*d*). Calvin, who had been his ſcholar at Paris in the College de la Marche (*e*), dedicated his Commentary on the 1ſt Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians to him (*f*). It is not exactly known of what Province Mathurin Cordier was; ſome ſay he was born in Normandy; others pretend he was born in the Earldom of Perche (*g*). He publiſhed ſeveral books, which ſerved very much to improve the ſcholars [*A*].

(*a*) Beze, *Vie de Calvin, en Preface du Commentaire de Calvin ſur Joſué*, pag. m. 4.

(*b*) In the Latin editions of Calvin's Life, they have put *VI Nonas Septembris*, but it ſhould be *Idus* inſtead of *Nonas*.

(*c*) Laun. *Hiſt. Colleg. Navarr.* pag. 700.

(*d*) Idem, ibid.

(*e*) Beze, *Vie de Calvin*, pag. 4. In one of the foregoing editions he had ſaid, that it was in the College of St. Barbe.

(*f*) Beze, *Vie de Calvin*, pag. 51.

(*g*) La Croix du Maine, pag. 318.

CORPICIUS

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral Books, which ſerved very much to improve the Scholars.*] Du Verdier Vau-Privas gives the titles only of the following. *Epiſtres Chreſtiennes.* "Chriſtian Epiſtles", printed at Lions, by Loys Tachet, in 1557, 16to. *Sentences extraictes de la Saincte Eſcriture pour l'inſtruction des Enfans.* i. e. "Sentences extracted from the Holy Scripture for the "inſtruction of children;" printed in Latin and French by Thybault Payen, in 1551. *Cantiques ſpirituels en nombre 26:* i. e. "26 Spiritual Songs;" printed in 1560 by John Cariot, at Lions, 16to (1). *Le Miroir de la jeuneſſe, pour la former à bonnes mœurs, & civilité de la vie* (2); i. e. "A Mirrour for the Youth, "to inform them in the practice of virtue and politeneſs;" printed at Paris, by John Bonfons, 16to. *L'Interpretation & conſtruction en François des Diſtiques Latins, qu'on attribue à Caton*; i. e. "A French Tranſlation and Conſtruction of the Latin Diſtichs, which "are aſcribed to Cato;" printed at Lyons in 8vo by Thibault Payen, *above an hundred times, and ſince by others, becauſe it is a Book, which children uſe to read at ſchool* (3). Du Verdier adds, that Mathurin Cordier's *Colloquia* or Dialogues have been tranſlated into French by Gabriel Chapuis. There are but few Books, that have been ſo uſeful as this, to teach children to talk Latin. A correct ſtyle and ſound morality reigns thro' the whole; it has been printed a thouſand times. La Croix du Maine obſerves (4), that this Author *wrote in French Verſe ſeveral Remonſtrances and Exhortations to the King, and to the Eſtates of the Kingdom*, printed in the year 1561 at G. that is to ſay, at Geneva. Geſner, who publiſhed his *Bibliotheca* in 1545, ſays, that Cordier was then teaching in the Latin Schools at Neufchaſtel: he ſets down the titles of ſome Books for the uſe of the Schools publiſhed by this Writer (5): I ſhall mention but one of them, which is, *De corrupti Sermonis apud Gallos emendatione, & Latinè loquendi ratione, ſive de Latini ſermonis varietate & modis loquendi Lib.* 1. *adduntur autem etiam ipſæ phraſes corruptæ, & Gallicæ interpretationes locutionum, ut in poſterum vitentur; earumque loco puræ ac elegantes eloquendi formulæ doceantur: quæ quidem non temere, ſed ſecundum locos communes aliquot digeſtæ ſunt. Plurimum ſane prodeſt hoc opus, ad ſermonem & variandum & locupletandum. In Latinis formulis ſola contentum eſt linguæ proprietate: neque verborum ſucum, neque longas & obſcuras Periphraſes affectat, cum potiſſimum in puerorum gratiam conſcriptum ſit, propter quos etiam paſſim permulta piè & Chriſtianè vivendi hortamenta interjiciuntur* (6). Geſner tells us, that this book was printed at Paris by Robert Stephens in 1536, in 4to, and at Baſil, by Weſthemer in 1537, 4to. Geſner's Epitomizers ought to have known in 1583 the following particulars. Mathurin Cordier corrected and improved this work very much in the fourth Edition, which Robert Stephens printed of it. He had been told, that the examples of bad phraſes, which he had collected only with a deſign, that the children ſhould avoid them, were very prejudicial

(1) Geſner's *Epitomizer* mentions, pag. 596. an edition of 1557, 16to, *apud* Joann. Gerardum.

(2) La Croix du Maine, pag. 318. obſerves, that ſince this book had been printed at Poitiers in 1559, it has been reprinted at Paris by John Ruelle and others in 1560, with this title *Civilité puerile.*

(3) Du Verdier, *Bibl. Françoiſe.* pag. 861.

(4) *Biblioth. Françoiſe*, pag. 318.

(5) *De Quantitate Syllabarum, de Latino declinatu partium Orationis, &c.*

(6) Geſner, *Biblioth.* folio 507 *verſo.*

CORICIUS (JOHN) lived very agreeably at Rome under the Popes Julius II, Leo X, and Clement VII. He gained the love of the men of Letters by the particular kindneſs he had for them, and they extolled him ſo much, that they raiſed him a very great reputation. He made them meet often in his garden (*a*), and he gave all the Poets, whom Leo X's liberality had invited to Rome, a very good opportunity to ſhew their wit (*b*); for he eſtabliſhed poetical games [*A*], which were celebrated every year on St. Ann's day (*c*), the ſubjects of the Poems were the Elogium of that Saint, the Virgin Mary, and of Jeſus Chriſt (*d*). He fell into the hands of the ſoldiers, who took the City of Rome in 1527, and it coſt him a very great ſum of money to get his liberty (*e*). He had hid part of his money under the yard-door of his houſe; no body knew it, but the maſon, who had ſtopt the hole. This maſon begged him to lend him twenty five piſtoles, which he wanted to get out of the ſoldier's hands; but as he could not get them from him, he diſcovered the whole ſecret to a Spaniſh Captain, who thereupon went to Coricius's houſe, ſent him out of the way under divers pretences, and ſeized all the money, that was hid. Coricius complained of it to the General Officers, but to no purpoſe: finding himſelf thus reduced to a very great want, he endeavoured to go out of the City, and did at laſt, though with great difficulty. He was maintained for ſome time at Verona, through the generoſity of Calyſtus Amadeus (*f*), and as he was getting himſelf ready to return to Treves his native country (*g*), he fell ſick, and died overwhelmed with grief and ſorrow (*b*).

(*a*) Taken from Pierius Valerianus, lib. 2. *de Literatorum Infelicit.* pag. m. 87.

(*b*) Paulus Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 103. pag. m. 241.

(*c*) Pier. Valerian. *de Literat. Infelic.* pag. 87.

(*d*) Jovius, Elog. cap. 103.

(*e*) Pier. Valer. *de Literat. Infelic.* pag. 87.

(*f*) *Caliſti Amadei ejus Urbis Propræſulis liberalitate ſuſtinetur*, Idem, ibid. pag. 88.

(*g*) Jovius, *Elogior.* cap. 103.

(*b*) Taken from Pierius Valerianus, *de Literat. Infelicit.* pag. 87.

prejudicial to them; becauſe as our natural inclination prompts us to evil, the children took much more notice of thoſe barbarous phraſes, which gave them an opportunity to laugh and banter, than they did of the exact and good expreſſions. *In libelli noſtri lectione unum eſſe hoc malum permulti affirmabant, quod pueri (ut natura in deteriorem partem fere proni ſumus) ridendi & jocandi ſtudio & libentius & ſæpius in legendo corrupto ſermone & barbaris locutionibus, quam Latinis edi*ſ*cendis, ſeſe oblectarent. Ex quo fieri dicebant, ut nonnulli formandæ juventutis magiſtri diſcipulos omnino prohiberent ab ejus libri lectione: videlicet ne ſermonis vitiis, quæ nondum audierant ſemel in tenera ætate imbuti, ea vix unquam poſtea deponerent* (7). He had then been often adviſed to ſuppreſs that part of his Book, and he yielded at laſt to thoſe exhortations. The title of his Book was altered thus in the fourth edition (8). *Commentarius puerorum de quotidiano Sermone, qui prius Liber de corrupti ſermonis emendatione dicebatur.*

(7) Matur. Corderius, Præf. in *Comment. Puerorum, de quotidiano ſermone.*

(8) I do not know the date of it; the author put none to his Preface. I make uſe of the Paris edition *Ex Officina Roberti Stephani*, 1580, 8vo, which was printed ſixteen years after Cordier's death. Mr. D. Launoi, *Hiſt. Colleg. Navar.* pag. 701, places the 4th edition under the year 1550. *apud Robertum Stephanum.*

[*A*] *The Men of Letters extolled him much.... He eſtabliſhed Poetical Games.*] Let us quote Paulus Jovius: *Franciſcus Arſillus ſcripſit ... lepidum item libellum de Poetis urbanis mihi tanquam veteri ſodali dedicatum* (1), *quum Leone ingeniis liberaliter arridente, multi undique Poetæ illuſtres, nequaquam ad inanes ſpes in urbem confluxiſſent, & pulcherrimo quodam certamine a ſingulis in una tantum ſtatuæ materia ſcriberetur, qua Carminum farragine Coritius homo Trevir, humani juris libellis propoſitus, uti perhumanus poetarum hoſpes, ac admirator inclaruit; ea ſcilicet ſtatua inſigni marmorea, Aureliano in Templo dedicata, invitatiſque vatibus, ut tria numina Chriſti Dei, & Matris, ac Aviæ uno in ſigno celebrarent* (2). Longolius has mentioned theſe Aſſemblies; and ſpoke alſo of the entertainments given on St. Ann's day: he even ſaid, that the Poets once quarrelled there, but he does not enter into particulars, becauſe he wrote to a man, who was well acquainted with the whole affair. *De eodem Corytio illud mihi velim diligenter perſcribas, ecquid ſacrum Annæ diem anniverſario illo ſtudioſorum hominum conventu epuliſque celebrarit: an vero propter anni ſuperioris diſſidium, cœnas facere omnino deſierit; an ſodalitatem potius illam, (ſcis quam dico) non vocarit: reliquis cœnam dederit. Neque vero quam eos lautè ſplendideque acceperit, quæro: novi hominis magnificentiam, ſed quid dictum, quamve frequens convivium ex hominum genere fuerit, qui ſe academicos & eſſe & numerari exiſtimant. Subvereor interdum, ut cum illis in gratiam redierit. Contra cum mihi in mentem venit, iſtis & cœnas & hortos Epicuri mirum in modum probari, hunc autem menſas non ſumptuoſe minus quam libenter inſtruere, jam nihil inimicitiarum reliquum eſſe ſuſpicor. Tu me velim de tota dici illius ratione certiorem facias* (3). i. e. "I wiſh you would "let me know, whether Coricius has celebrated St. "Ann's Day, by the annual aſſembly and entertain"ment of learned men, or whether he left off thoſe "entertainments, on account of the laſt year's diſ"putes; or rather, whether he only paſſed over that "fraternity (you know what I mean) and invited the "reſt. I do not aſk how nobly he entertained them; "I know his magnificence; but what diſcourſes they "held, and how many there were of thoſe men, who "think that they are Academicians, and that they "are reckoned to be ſo. I am a little afraid, he is "not yet reconciled with them. Yet when I conſider, "how much they like Epicurean treats and gardens, "and how generous and magnificent he is in his enter"tainments, I am apt to think, that there remains "not the leaſt enmity between them. I deſire you "would give me an account of all that paſſ that "day."

(1) See the remark [*A*] of the article ACCURSIUS (Mariangelus.)

(2) Jovius, *Elogior.* cap. 103. The ſubſtance of this paſſage has been given in the Text.

(3) Longolius, *Epiſt.* lib. 2. folio m. 183.

CORNELIA Pompey's wife; ſee the laſt remark of the article MUCIA.

CORNELIUS (ANTHONY) a Licentiate of the Law, and Author of a book, which I mention in the article of WECHEL (*a*), was a native of Billi [*A*] upon the borders of Auvergne, and lived under the reign of Francis I. Father Garaſſe has committed a great many blunders concerning that book [*B*], which was printed off

(*a*) In the Remark [*B*].

[*A*] *He was a native of Billi.*] I prove it by the following Epigram, which is at the end of the *Querela Infantium* (1), (the Infants complaint) *Gulielmi Nurii Judicis Billienſis ad Antonium Cornelium Billienſem utriuſque Juris Licentiatum Doctiſſ. Hexaſtichon.*

Olim in te puero quiddam haud vulgare videbar
Perſpicere, Antoni, talia ſigna dabas.
At neque deſtituis ſpem tu jam grandior iſtam,
Imo infinitis vincis ubique modis.
Id tibi teſtantur facile liber ille, puellos
Intinctos ubi litem inſtituiſſe facis.

That is,

"An Epigram of ſix Verſes on Anthony Cornelius of "Billi, Licentiate of the Law both Canon and Ci"vil, written by William Nurius * Judge of Billi.

"I thought, I obſerved formerly ſomething uncom"mon in you, when you was young, Anthony, by the "great tokens of wit you then gave. Nor have you "diſappointed my expectations, now you are grown "up; nay, you are gone much beyond them: as ap"pears evidently by that Book, in which you make "thoſe infants, who died without Baptiſm, plead their "cauſe."

(1) See the Title of our Cornelius's Book more exactly in the Remark [*B*] of the Article WECHEL.

* His French name was perhaps *Nouri* or *Le Nouri.*

[*B*] *He is the Author of a Book.... Father Garaſſe has committed a great many blunders concerning that Book.*] I prove this unqueſtionably in the remark [*B*] of the article WECHEL; but ſince the ſecond Edition of this Dictionary, I have received an account of the *Querela infantium*, at the end of which are the following words. "Let

off in January 1531 (b): The Author was ſtill very young at that time [C].

(b) It is the year 1532, if the year be ſuppoſed to begin with January.

" Let me beg leave to draw ſome inferences from the " foregoing account. I. The Name of Antonius Cor- " nelius is not a fictitious name, as F. Garaſſe aſſerts " in his *Somme Theologique*, p. 19, and 298: this may " be inferred from his Dedication: is it probable that a " man in diſguiſe ſhould have dared to dedicate his " work to Anthony du Bourg (2) *Lieutenant-Civil* in " the diſtrict of the *Prevoſt* of Paris †, and afterwards " Chancellor, and even to call him his Mecænas, and " to relate ſome particular circumſtances, which hap- " pened between that Magiſtrate and him? II. It " ſeems that the epigram, which we have tranſcribed " above (3) ſhould fully perſuade us, that Cornelius " was his true name; would a man, who does not " conceal of what country he is, and to whom the Judge " of his native place directs ſome verſes, diſguiſe him- " ſelf under a fictitious name? The leaſt attention to " all theſe circumſtances will remove all manner of " ſuſpicion. III. By what has been ſaid above ‡ " concerning his Book, it appears that it is not ſuch " an infamous and abominable Book, as Father Ga- " raſſe would make us believe. IV. And conſequently " this Jeſuit is in the wrong to ſay that the printing of " this wicked Book drew God's wrath upon the " Printer (4)."

(2) Obſerve, that Monſ. Du Bourg was of Auvergne, as well as our Cornelius.

† The Provoſt of Paris is the chief Magiſtrate, who has ſeveral Lieutenants under him, both for civil and criminal affairs.

(3) In the remark [A].

‡ See the Article WECHEL Remark [B].

(4) From a Manuſcript communicated by Monſ. Lancelot.

I have obſerved in another place (5) that there are two copies of this work of our Cornelius in the Archbiſhop of Rheims's Library; and that Monſ. Bourdelot (6) did me the favour to ſend me his copy; ſince that time Monſr. Lancelot let me know, that there is alſo a copy of it in the Mazarine Library, and that it has been ſeen, as he has been told, in the King's Library, and in other places. Another perſon wrote to me, that the copy in the Mazarine Library, *Number* 2634, is bound in paſte-boards covered with red paper, with another Book intitled, *Diſcorſo Cattolico & Apologia Hiſtorica cavata dal Vecchio e nuovo Teſtamento, &c. ordinata de diverſe Hiſtorie, compoſta dal eccellente Dottor Camillo Borrello ſopra un Giudicio fatto intorno à quella ſentenza di Pilato che li anni paſſati fu trovarta nel l'Aquila Citta d'Abruzzo. Opera veramente utile, nella quale ſi deſcrivono diverſi concetti notabili ſi di Teologia, come anco d'Hiſtorie e d'Annali, ove con molte Autorità e Sentenze de Scrittori approbati ſi ſcuopre ſe detta Sentenza è vera, o no. Drizzata alla Santità di N. S. Siſto V, Sommo Pontefice, con la Tavola delle materie principali, & coſe piu notabili, ch' in eſſa ſi contengono. In Napoli, appreſſo Horatio Salviati,* 1588. This piece is directed to Paulus Jovius (7): The Author takes a great deal of pains, to prove, that this ſentence of Pilate, which was found at Aquila in the Province of Abruzzo, is ſpurious.

(5) In the Remark [B] of the article WECHEL.

(6) He is firſt Phyſician to the Ducheſs of Burgundy.

(7) It contains 144 pages.

[C] *The Author was ſtill very young at that time.*] We may infer this from the following words in his Advice to the Reader. *Quod ſi quid deprehenderis nota dignum, pro tua facilitate in meliorem interpretare partem,* ÆTATIQUE *meæ adſcribe atque condona.* i. e. " If you find any thing in it that deſerves to be cen- " ſured, be ſo kind as to put the beſt conſtruction up- " on it, and aſcribe it to my *age*, and forgive it me."

CORONEL ALPHONSUS) a great Lord of Spain, who miſtruſting Don Pedro the Cruel King of Caſtile, formed a party in Andaluſia that he might be in a condition to maintain himſelf againſt his King. He raiſed troops, fortified ſome places, and ſent John della Cerda, his ſon-in-law, into Mauritania, to aſk for aſſiſtance. He depended chiefly upon the City of Aguilar, of which he was Governor. Don Pedro having taken ſome other places from him, made preparations to beſiege Aguilar, when more preſſing affairs obliged him to march into Aſturia, where one of his brothers had revolted. But as ſoon as he had reſtored the tranquillity of that Province, and ſuppreſſed the commotions in other places, he returned into Andaluſia, and beſieged Aguilar. Coronel defended himſelf very vigorouſly during four months; but at laſt the city was carried by ſtorm in February 1353. Coronel was hearing maſs, when they came and told him, that the enemies were in the city. Notwithſtanding this he continued to hear maſs till the divine ſervice was quite performed, and then he ſhut himſelf up in a tower. He was taken and treated like a rebel; that is, he was condemned to death for high-treaſon (a). Mary, one of his daughters, was ſo careful to preſerve her chaſtity, that ſhe choſe rather to kill her ſelf, than to expoſe that virtue to the leaſt danger [A]. The Author ſhe employed is

(a) Taken from Mariana, in chapter the 17th of the 16th book of his *Hiſtory of Spain.*

[A] *One of his daughters . . . choſe rather to kill herſelf, than to expoſe her chaſtity to the leaſt danger.*] John de la Cerda her huſband having in vain ſought for aſſiſtance amongſt the Moors of Granada and amongſt thoſe of Africa, returned into Portugal and led a ſad melancholy life in his baniſhment. Mary Coronel his ſpouſe could not bear his abſence, and that ſhe might not yield to the temptations of nature, ſhe killed herſelf. I cannot well expreſs in Engliſh what device ſhe made uſe of; I ſhall therefore tranſcribe Mariana's Latin words. *Ejus Uxor Maria Coronellia, cum Mariti abſentiam non ferret, ne pravis cupiditatibus cederet, vitam poſuit, ardentem forte libidinem igne extinguens, adacto per muliebria titione. Dignam meliore ſæculo fæminam, inſigne ſtudium caſtitatis* (1). This Author does not contradict himſelf, tho' he maintains on the one hand, that this Lady was extremely careful of her chaſtity, and ſuppoſes on the other hand, that ſhe was probably tormented with ſenſual inclinations. For the moſt fervent love of chaſtity does not neceſſarily remove the natural diſpoſitions towards incontinence. This Lady being firmly determined not to do the leaſt thing againſt her duty, and having a very great love for chaſtity, ſtruggled againſt the intices ments of nature, but ſhe could neither prevent them, nor ſuppreſs them for ever. This kind of a military life ſeemed both too troubleſome and too dangerous to her; and this made her deſperate. She went beyond the Counſels of the Goſpel. The Scripture tells us indeed (2); " If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, " and caſt it from thee: for it is profitable for thee " that one of thy members ſhould periſh, and not that " thy whole body ſhould be caſt into hell. And if " thy right hand offend thee, cut it off and caſt it " from thee: for it is profitable for thee, that one of thy " members ſhould periſh, and not that thy whole body " ſhould be caſt into hell." But we do not find there, that it is lawful for a perſon to kill himſelf, in order to prevent a temptation. She might have practiſed literally this evangelical precept or counſel, without killing herſelf. Origen, Ambroſe Morals, and ſome others practiſed it literally, and yet it was not mortal to them (a). You have read in the Dialogues of a Jeſuit (3), *what a woman of Athens did, that ſhe might not be tempted to reveal the ſecret of her friends. After ſhe had been put to the rack, and had ſuffered the moſt cruel pains with an incredible conſtancy, without declaring the leaſt thing, ſhe cut her tongue with her teeth, and ſpit it in the Tyrant's face, who would force from her, what ſhe was reſolved not to declare.* You have alſo read there the following reflection of the Author. *This woman was in the right to fear leſt her tongue ſhould play her ſome bad trick, and therefore ſhe did wiſely to get rid of it* (4). But you would not be reaſonable, if you ſhould apply this reflection to Mary Coronel's action. There would be more regularity in a compariſon between Porcia, Brutus's wife, and John de la Cerda's wife, tho' there would alſo be ſome diſparaty in the parallel. Porcia, Cato of Utica's daughter and Brutus's wife, killed herſelf by ſwallowing glowing coals (5); but it was only out of pride, becauſe ſhe would not ſurvive her huſband, and would ſhew herſelf a true follower of the Stoic Sect, which her father and her huſband had been ſo fond of.

(1) Mariana, *de Rebus Hiſpaniæ*, lib. 16. cap. 17. pag. 80. edit. Mogunt. 4to. The ſenſe is, " That ſhe ex- " tinguiſhed one " fire by an- " other, thruſt- " ing a Brand " into her.

(2) Matt. v. 29, 30.

(3) Entretiens, d'Ariſte & d'Eugene, 3 Entretien, pag. m. 197.

(4) Ibid. pag. 198.

(5) Val. Maximus, lib. 4. cap. 6. num 5.

is ſo ſtrange, that I think my ſelf obliged to relate it. See the Remark [*A*].

* (*a*) One can eaſily conceive, how men can perform that operation upon themſelves, but it is not ſo eaſy to underſtand how women can do it. Monſr. Venette, in the laſt chapter of his book intitled, *Le Tableau de l'amour conjugal &c.* (The Deſcription of conjugal Love &c.) ſays, " It cannot be queſtioned, but a woman may be rendered uncapable to conceive, by cutting off the &c. But it is difficult to know, how the ancients performed that operation: and that I may ſay what my opinion is, I think that it cannot be done without danger." It will perhaps be explained in the following book, which I have not ſeen. *Eunuchi nati, facti, & myſtici, ex ſacra & humana literatura illuſtrati. Zacharias Paſqualigas puerorum emaſculator ob muſicam quo loco habendus. Reſponſa ad quæſitum per epiſtolam J. Heriberti. Divione*, 1655. *in* 4*to.* i. e. " The Eunuchs born, made, and myſtical, illuſtrated by ſacred and prophane Literature. What muſt be thought of Zachariah Paſqualigas, who caſtrates boys to make fine Singers of them? An Anſwer to a queſtion propoſed in a Letter of J. Heribert. At Dijon, 1655, 4to." This Book is aſcribed to Father Theophilus Raynaud. CRIT. REM.]

COSTA (MARGARET) was born at Rome, and lived in the ſeventeenth Century. She *had wit and a genius for Poetry*, and *prepared for the King* of France *an entertainment on horſeback after the manner of a* Carrouſel *and* Balet. *The ſubject of the piece was a conteſt between Apollo and Mars* (*a*). You will find a deſcription of it in a book of F. Menêtrier (*b*). " But as it was thought too difficult to put that deſign in execution, they preferred Orpheus before it, which was acted in the year 1647 [*A*]. However " Signora Coſta's Entertainment was printed with her other Poems, which ſhe dedicated " to Cardinal Mazarin (*c*)".

(*a*) Menêtrier, *Repreſentat. en Muſique*, pag. 232.

(*b*) Ibid. pag. 233, &c.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 235.

[*A*] *She prepared an entertainment on horſe-back. . . . They preferred Orpheus before it.*] " Cardinal Mazarin, who propoſed to introduce into France the " diverſions of Italy, cauſed ſome Players to come " from that country in 1647, who acted at the Royal " Palace Orpheus and Euridice an entertainment in " Muſic and in Italian Verſe; it was acted with " wonderful changes of the Scenes, and with a Ma" chinery, all which had never been ſeen before (1)." You will find a deſcription and an abſtract of that Opera in F. Menêtrier (2). *The ſucceſs of this entertainment, the novelty of which ſurprized all the ſpectators by the wonderful changes of the extraordinary ſcenes, by the beauty of the airs, as well as by the variety of the dreſſes, and the different concerts of Muſic, determined the Court to give another entertainment of the ſame nature at his Majeſty's nuptials: they acted* Ercole amante, *which being written in Italian, was tranſlated into French Verſe for the ſatisfaction of thoſe, who did not underſtand Italian* (3). It will perhaps be ſaid, that all this is nothing to the purpoſe, ſince it does not concern Signora Margarita Coſta. I own it; but as a great number of readers are very glad to find ſomething, that may give them a notion of the firſt eſſays of Opera's, when I have mentioned them occaſionally, I thought, that this remark ought not be ſuppreſſed.

(1) Menêtrier, *Repreſentat. en Muſique*, pag. 395.

(2) Ibid. pag. 205.

(3) Idem, pag. 205.

☞COTES (ROGER), an excellent Mathematician, and *Plumian* Profeſſor of Aſtronomy and Experimental Philoſophy at Cambridge in the 18th Century, was ſon of Roger Cotes, Rector of Burbage in Leiceſterſhire, which Rectory was remarkable for being held many years by Anthony Earl of Kent, grandfather to the preſent Duke of Kent (*a*), to whom by his mother, a daughter of Major Farmer of that county, he was nearly related (*b*). He was born at Burbage July 10, 1682, and received his firſt education at Leiceſter-School, where at the age of eleven or twelve years he diſcovered a ſtrong inclination to Mathematics, in which his uncle, Mr. John Smith (*c*), a Clergyman in Lincolnſhire, very much encouraged him, and was ſo highly pleaſed with his genius, that he prevailed with his father to ſend him to his houſe to aſſiſt him in thoſe ſtudies. From thence he was ſent to St. Paul's School in London, where he was educated under Dr. Thomas Gale, and Mr. John Poſtlethwayte, ſucceſſively maſters of that ſchool, and found ſo much time from School-hours, as to keep up a conſtant correſpondence with his uncle not only in Mathematics, but likewiſe in Metaphyſics, Philoſophy, and Divinity. April the 6th 1699 at ſeventeen years of age he was admitted a Penſioner of Trinity-College in the Univerſity of Cambridge, of which he was choſen Fellow at Michaelmas 1705. He was Tutor likewiſe at the College to Anthony Earl of Harold, and Henry de Grey, ſons to the Duke of Kent. In January 170$\frac{5}{6}$ he was appointed Profeſſor of Aſtronomy and Experimental Philoſophy in the Profeſſorſhip founded by Thomas Plume D. D. Archdeacon of Rocheſter, being choſen the firſt in that chair for his great merit and learning (*d*). In 1706 he took the degree of Maſter of Arts, and entered into holy Orders about the year 1713 (*e*). He was highly eſteemed for his knowledge in the moſt abſtruſe parts of Mathematics by the greateſt men of the age. In the year 1713, at the deſire of Dr. Richard Bentley, he publiſhed at Cambridge in 4to a ſecond edition of Sir Iſaac Newton's *Philoſophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica*, with all the improvements which the Author had made thereto; to which he prefixed an excellent preface, giving an ample account of the Philoſophy introduced by that great man. He had prepared ſeveral uſeful books for the public, one of which, intitled, *Harmonia Menſurarum, ſive Analyſis & Syntheſis per Rationum & Angulorum menſuras promotæ. Accedunt alia opuſcula Mathematica per* Rogerum Cotes [*A*], was publiſhed at Cambridge in 4to, 1722 by his learned ſucceſſor

(*a*) *Life of Dr. John Colet Dean of St. Paul's. By Samuel Knight, D. D.* pag. 429, 430. edit. London 1724, in 8vo.

(*b*) From Memoirs communicated to us by Robert Smith, L. L. D. Plumian Profeſſor of Aſtronomy in the Univerſity of Cambridge.

(*c*) Father of Dr. Robert Smith abovementioned.

(*d*) From Dr. Smith's *Memoirs*, and Dr. Knight, pag. 430.

(*e*) From Dr. Smith's *Memoirs*.

[*A*] *His* Harmonia Menſurarum &c.] The whole title is as follows: *Harmonia Menſurarum, ſive Analyſis & Symtheſis per Rationum & Angulorum Menſuras promotæ. Accedunt alia Opuſcula Mathematica: per* Rogerum Coteſium. *Edidit & auxit* Robertus Smith *Collegii S. Trinitatis apud Cantabrigienſes Socius; Aſtronomiæ & Experimentalis Philoſophiæ poſt* Coteſium *Profeſſor.* The Dedication of this work to Richard Mead M. D. and F. R. S. by Dr. Robert Smith is dated from Trinity College Cambridge April the

ſucceſſor Robert Smith, now LL. D. He wrote likewiſe a *Deſcription of the Great Meteor, which was on the 6th of March* 171⅝, *in a Letter to Robert Dannye, D. D. Rector of Spofforth in Yorkſhire*, publiſhed in the *Philoſophical Tranſactions*. Num. 365. And for the ſake of preſerving as much as poſſible the hiſtory of every part of that learning wherein Mr.

the 16th 1722. The *Harmonia Menſurarum* is divided into three parts. The firſt is called *Logometria*, and was firſt publiſhed by the Author himſelf in the *Philoſophical Tranſactions* of the year 1714, num. 338. In this part (1), the Author's chief deſign is to ſhew how that ſort of Problems, which are uſually reduced to the Quadrature of the *Hyperbola* and *Ellipſis*, may be reduced to the meaſures of Ratio's and Angles; and afterwards to be ſolved more readily by the Canons of Logarithms, and Sines, and Tangents. He defines the meaſures of Ratio's to be quantities of any kind, whoſe magnitudes are analogous to the magnitudes of the Ratio's to be meaſured. In this ſenſe any Canon of Logarithms is a Syſtem of numeral meaſures of the Ratio's of the abſolute numbers to an unit. The parts of the Aſymptote of the Logiſtic Line, intercepted between its Ordinates, are a Syſtem of Lines or Meaſures of the Ratio's of thoſe Ordinates. The Areas of an *Hyperbola*, intercepted between its Ordinates to the Aſymptote, are a Syſtem of Plane Meaſures of the Ratio's of thoſe Ordinates. And ſince there may be infinite Syſtems of Meaſures according as various kinds of Quantities are made uſe of, ſuch as Numbers, Time, Velocity, and the like; or according as the Meaſures of any one Syſtem may be all increaſed or diminiſhed in any given Proportion; in ſuch variety much confuſion may poſſibly ariſe as to the kind and abſolute Magnitudes of particular Meaſures, which happen to fall under conſideration. Our Author very happily removes the difficulty, by ſhewing that the nature of the ſubject points out the Meaſure of a certain immutable Ratio for a *Modulus* in all Syſtems, whereby to determine the Kind and abſolute Magnitudes of all other Meaſures in each Syſtem. The *firſt Propoſition* (2) is to find the Meaſure of any propoſed Ratio. This he conſiders in a way ſo ſimple and general, as naturally leads to the Notion and Definition of a *Modulus*; namely, that it is an invariable Quantity in each Syſtem, which bears the ſame Proportion to the Increment of the Meaſure of any propoſed Ratio, as the increaſing Term of the Ratio bears to its own Increment. He then ſhews, that the Meaſure of any given Ratio is as the *Modulus* of the Syſtem from whence it is taken; and that the *Modulus* in every Syſtem is always equal to the Meaſure of a certain determinate and immutable Ratio, which he therefore calls the *Ratio Modularis*. He ſhews that this Ratio is expreſſed by theſe Numbers 2, 7182818 &c. to 1, or by 1 to 0, 3678794 &c. So that in *Briggs's* Canon of the Logarithm of this Ratio is the *Modulus* of that Syſtem: in the Logiſtic Line the given Subtangent is the *Modulus* of that Syſtem; in the *Hyperbola* the given Parallelogram, contained by an Ordinate to the Aſymptote and the Abſciſs from the Center, is the *Modulus* of that Syſtem: and in other Syſtems the *Modulus* is generally ſome remarkable Quantity. In the *ſecond Propoſition* (3) he gives a conciſe uncommon method for calculating *Briggs's* Canon of Logarithms, together with Rules for finding intermediate Logarithms and Numbers, even beyond the limits of the Canon. In the *third Propoſition* (4) he conſtructs any Syſtem of Meaſures by a Canon of Logarithms, not only when the Meaſure of ſome one Ratio is given, but alſo without that *Datum*, by ſeeking the *Modulus* of the Syſtem by the Rule abovementioned. In the *fourth* (5) *fifth* (6) and *ſixth* (7) *Propoſitions* he ſquares the *Hyperbola*, deſcribes the Logiſtic Line and Æquiangular Spiral by a Canon of Logarithms, and ſhews ſome curious uſes of theſe Propoſitions in their *Scholia*. Take an eaſy Example of the Logometrical Method in the common Problem for finding the Denſity of the Atmoſphere. Suppoſing Gravity uniform, every one knows, that if Altitudes are taken in any Arithmetical Proportion, the Denſities of the Air in thoſe Altitudes will be in a Geometrical Progreſſion; that is, the Altitudes are the Meaſures of the Ratio's of the Denſities below and in thoſe Altitudes, and ſo the difference of any two Altitudes is the Meaſure of the Ratio of the Denſities in thoſe Altitudes. Now to determine the abſolute and real Magnitude of thoſe Meaſures, Mr. Cotes ſhews *a priori*, that the *Modulus* of the Syſtem is the Altitude of the Atmoſphere, when reduced every where to the ſame Denſity as below. The *Modulus* therefore is given (as bearing the ſame Proportion to the Altitude of the Mercury in the Barometer, as the ſpecific Gravity of Mercury does to the ſpecific Gravity of the Air,) and conſequently the whole Syſtem is given. For ſince in all Syſtems the Meaſures of the ſame Ratio's are analogous among themſelves; the Logarithm of the Ratio of the Air's Denſity in any two Altitudes will be to the *Modulus* of the Canon, (that is to the Logarithm of the *Ratio Modularis* defined above,) as the Difference of theſe Altitudes is to the aforeſaid given Altitude of the homogeneous Atmoſphere. He concludes his *Logometria* with a *General Scholium* (8), containing great variety of elegant conſtructions both Logometrical and Trigonometrical; ſuch as give the length of Curves either Geometrical or Mechanical; their Area's and Centers of Gravity; the Solids generated from them, and the Surfaces of theſe Solids; together with ſeveral curious Problems in Natural Philoſophy, concerning the Attraction of Bodies, the Denſity and Reſiſtance of Fluids, and the Trajectories of Planets. Several of theſe Problems have two Caſes; one conſtructed by the meaſure of a Ratio, and the other by the meaſure of an Angle. The great affinity and beautiful *harmony* of the *Meaſures* in thoſe caſes gave occaſion to the title of the Book. The Meaſures of Angles are defined (juſt as the Meaſures of Ratio's) to be Quantities of any kind, whoſe magnitudes are analogous to the magnitude of the Angles. Such may be the Arcs or Sectors of any Circle, or any other Quantities of Time, Velocity, or Reſiſtance, analogous to the Magnitudes of the Angles. Every Syſtem of theſe Meaſures has likewiſe its *Modulus* homogeneous to the Meaſures in that Syſtem, and may be computed by the Trigonometrical Canon of Sines and Tangents, juſt as the Meaſures of Ratio's by the Canon of Logarithms; for the given *Modulus* in each Syſtem bears the ſame proportion to the Meaſure of any given Angle, as the *Radius* of a Circle bears to an Arc, which ſubtends that Angle, or the ſame as this conſtant Number of Degrees 57, 2957795130 bears to the Number of Degrees in the ſaid Angle. Upon the whole Mr. Cotes thus expreſſes himſelf (9): *Geometris integrum erit, ex adductis hactenus exemplis de Methodo noſtra judicare; quam quidem, ſi proba fuerit, ulterius excolere pergent, & excolendo latius promovebunt. Patet utique Campus ampliſſimus, in quo vires ſuas experiri poterunt, præſertim ſi Logometriæ Trigonometriam inſuper adjungant, quibus miram quandam affinitatem in ſe invicem euntem intercedere notabam. Hiſce quidem Principiis haud facile crediderim generaliora dari poſſe; cum tota Matheſis vix quicquam in univerſo ſuo ambitu complectatur, præter angulorum & rationum Theoriam. Neque ſane commodiora ſperabit, qui animadvertit effectionis facilitatem per ampliſſimas illas, omnibuſque ſuis numeris abſolutas, tum Logarithmorum tum Sinuum & Tangentium Tabulas, quas anteceſſorum noſtrorum laudatiſſimæ ſolertiæ debemus acceptas. Ut vero tanti beneficii uberior nobis exſurgat fructus, id nunc exponendum reſtat, quibus artibus ad iſtiuſmodi concluſiones rectiſſima perveniatur. In hunc finem* Theoremata *quædam, tum* Logometrica, *tum* Trigonometrica *adjeciſſem, quæ parata ad uſum aſſervo; ni conſultius viſum eſſet, quum abſque nimiis ambagibus ea tradi non poſſent, intacta potius præterire, atque aliis denuo inveſtiganda relinquere.* Why our Author takes his principles to be ſo general, will farther appear by an inſtance or two. In the Problem already mentioned he meaſures the Ratio of the Air's Denſities in any Altitudes, by the Altitudes themſelves, and makes uſe of the Altitude of an uniform Atmoſphere for the *Modulus*. So likewiſe when he conſiders the Velocities acquired, and the Spaces deſcribed in given times, by a Body projected upwards and downwards in a reſiſting Medium with any given Velocity; he ſhews, that the Times of Deſcent, added to the given time,

(1) See the Account of the *Harmonia Menſurarum &c.* in the *Philoſophical Tranſactions*, num. 372. vol. 32. pag. 139, & *ſeqq.* for the years 1722 and 1723.

(2) Pag. 4-9.

(3) Pag. 10-11.

(4) Pag. 11.

(5) Pag. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.

(6 Pag. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19.

(7 Pag. 19, & *ſeqq.*

(8) Pag. 22, & *ſeqq.*

(9) Pag. 35, 36.

(10) P

Mr. Cotes excelled, we ſhall give extracts of ſome original Letters of his to the learned and ingenious William Jones, Eſq; F. R. S. in the note [*B*]. He lived but a little while to

time, are the Meaſure of Ratio's, to a given *Modulus* of Time, whoſe terms are the Sum and Difference of the ultimate Velocity and the preſent Velocities, that are acquired: that the Times of Aſcent, taken from a given Time, are the Meaſures of Angles, to a given *Modulus* of Time, whoſe Radius is to their Tangents in the Ratio of the ultimate Velocity to the preſent Velocities; and laſtly, that the Spaces deſcribed in Deſcent or Aſcent are the Meaſures of Ratio's to a given *Modulus* of Space, whoſe terms are the abſolute accelerating and retarding Forces ariſing from Gravity and Reſiſtance taken together at the beginning and end of thoſe Spaces. This general account may be ſufficient to illuſtrate what we are going to ſay; that ſince the Magnitudes of Ratio's (as well as Forms) may be expounded by Quantities of any kind, the Mathematician is at liberty upon all occaſions to chooſe thoſe which are fitteſt for his purpoſe; and ſuch are they without doubt, that are put into his hand by the Conditions of the Problem. He may indeed repreſent thoſe Quantities by an *Hyperbola*, or any other Logometrical Syſtem, were not his purpoſe anſwered with greater ſimplicity by the very Syſtem itſelf, which occurs in each particular Problem. And the ſame may be ſaid for the Syſtems of Angular Meaſures, inſtead of recurring upon all occaſions to Elliptical or Circular Area's. As to the convenience of calculating from Mr. Cotes's Conſtructions, he ſhews that the Meaſures of any Ratio's or Angles are always computed in the ſame uniform way; by taking from the Tables the Logarithm of the Ratio, or the Number of Degrees in the Angle, and then by finding a fourth Proportional to three given Quantities; for that will be the Meaſure required. The ſimpleſt Hyperbolic Area may indeed be ſquared by the ſame operation taught in the Author's *fourth Propoſition*; but the ſimpleſt Elliptic Area requires ſomewhat more. Thoſe that are more complex in both kinds (which generally happens) require an additional trouble to reduce them to the ſimpleſt; to ſquare them by infinite Series is ſtill more operoſe, and does not anſwer the end of Geometry. Upon the whole therefore it may deſerve to be conſidered, for what purpoſes ſhould Problems be always conſtructed by Conic Area's, unleſs it be to pleaſe or aſſiſt the imagination? The deſign of Theoretical Geometry differs from Problematical; the former conſiſts in the diſcovery and contemplation of the Properties and Relations of Figures for the ſake of naked truth; but the deſign of the laſt is to do ſomething propoſed, and is beſt executed by the leaſt *Apparatus* of the former. The *ſecond part* of our Author's *Harmonia Menſurarum* contains *Theoremata tum Logometrica, tum Trigonometrica, quæ datarum Fluxionum Fluentes exhibent per Menſuras. Adjiciuntur Theoremata de Continuatione Formarum & Fluentium ad infinitum.* The *third part* contains *Problematum Analyſis & Conſtructio per Formas præcedentes.* Theſe two parts were publiſhed after Mr. Cotes's death by Dr. Smith, who has ſubjoined to them, *Theoremata tum Logometrica tum Trigonometrica datarum Fluxionum Fluentes exhibentia, per methodum menſurarum ulterius extenſam. Operis materiam à Rogero Coteſio accepit, Opus ipſum compoſuit Robertus Smith.* The firſt Treatiſe in the *Miſcellaneous Works* is intitled, *Æſtimatio Errorum in mixtâ Matheſi, per Variationes Partium Trianguli Plani & Sphærici.* It conſiſts of 28 Theorems, to determine the Proportions among the leaſt contemporary Variations of the Sides and Angles of Plane and Spherical Triangles, while any two of them remain invariable. An example will ſhew their great uſe in Aſtronomy. The time of the day or night is frequently to be determined by the Altitude of the Star. Let it then be propoſed to find the error, that may ariſe in the time, from any given error in taking the Altitude. By applying the 22d Theorem (10) to the Triangle formed by the Complements of the Star's Altitude and Declination, and by the Complement of the Poles Elevation, Mr. Cotes ſhews, that the Variation of the Angle at the Pole, and conſequently the Error in Time, will be as the Error in the Altitude directly, as the Sine of the Complement of the Pole's Elevation inverſely, and as the Sine of the Star's Azimuth from the Meridian inverſely. Conſequently, if the Error in the Altitude be given, under a given Elevation of the Pole, the Error in time will be reciprocally as the Sine of the Azimuth contained by the Meridian and the Vertical, which the Star is in. This Error therefore will be the ſame, whatever be the Altitude of the Star in the ſame Vertical; and will be leaſt when the Vertical is at right Angles to the Meridies; but will be abſolutely the leaſt in the ſame circumſtance, if the obſerver be under the Æquator. In which caſe, if the Error in the Altitude be one minute, the error of the Time will be four ſeconds. If the Obſerver recedes from the Æquator towards either Pole, the Error will be encreaſed in the Proportions of the Radius to the Sine Complement of the Latitude. So that in the Latitude of 45 Degrees it will be 5 $\frac{2}{3}$ Seconds, and in the Latitudes of 50 and 55 it will be 6 $\frac{2}{3}$ and 6 $\frac{12}{13}$ Seconds reſpectively. If the Star be in any other vertical Oblique to the Meridian, the Error will ſtill be increaſed in the Proportion of the Radius to the Sine of that oblique Angle. Laſtly, if the Error in the Altitude be either greater or leſs than one Minute, the Error in Time will be greater or leſs in the ſame Proportion. Much after the ſame manner may the Limits of Errors be computed in other caſes, which ariſe from the Inaccuracy of Obſervations, and from hence the moſt convenient opportunities for obſerving are alſo determined. The *ſecond* Treatiſe is *De Methodo Differentiali Newtoniana.* The Author having written it, before he had ſeen Sir Iſaac Newton's Treatiſe upon that ſubject, has treated of it after a manner ſomewhat different. The *third* Treatiſe is intitled, *Canonotechnia, ſive Conſtructio Tabularum per Differentias.* It conſiſts of ten Propoſitions, moſt admirably contrived for the expeditious Computation of intermediate Terms in any given Species. The laſt Propoſition, which contains a general ſolution of the whole deſign, is this (11): *Datis Seriei cujuſcunque Terminis aliquot æquidiſtantibus, quorum intervalla ſecanda ſunt in æquales quotlibetcunque partes, propoſitum ſit invenire terminos interſerendos.* The Book concludes with three ſmall Tracts, *De Deſcenſu Gravium*; *De Motu Pendulorum in Cycloide*; *De Motu Projectilium*; compoſed in a very natural and eaſy manner. The Editor has ſubjoined ſome Notes upon the *Harmonia Menſurarum*, and tells us (12), that Mr. Cotes was very young, when he wrote the three laſt mentioned Tracts; and that he left behind him ſome other Tracts, particularly *Compendium Arithmetices, Reſolutio Æquationum, Problema Dioptricum univerſale*, and *de Naturâ Curvarum*; all which pieces Dr. Smith informs us he deſigns to publiſh. Mr. Cotes likewiſe drew up an elegant courſe of Lectures upon Experimental Philoſophy; and intended to have made a great many improvements in Practical Aſtronomy, having made Flamſtead's and Caſſini's Tables more commodious for the computing of the Motions of the Sun and his Satellites, and began to draw up new ones for the Newtonian Theory of the Moon.

(10) Pag. 17.

(11) Pag. 64.

(12) In his *Preface* to the *Harmonia Menſurarum.*

[*B*] *We ſhall give Extracts of ſome original Letters of his to the learned and ingenious* William Jones *Eſq; F. R. S. in the Note.*]

" Sir, Febr. 15th 1711.

" I yeſterday received your moſt valuable and acceptable gift (13), together with your very kind Letter. I return you my hearty thanks for 'em both. Not having heard any thing of your Book till I ſaw it, I received it with the additional pleaſure of a ſurprize. You have highly obliged the mathematical part of the world by collecting into one volume thoſe curious and uſeful Treatiſes, which were before too much diſperſed, but eſpecially by the publication of the *Analyſis per Æquationes Infinitas*, and the *Methodus Differentialis*. I could heartily wiſh that nothing of Sir Iſaac's might be loſt. I hope you will endeavour (as you find an opportunity) to perſuade him to publiſh other papers; for I believe he has yet many excellent things in reſerve. About a year and a half ago (when I was laſt in town) I acquainted Mr. Ralphſon, that you had ſome papers of Sir Iſaac's in your hands, which were long ago communicated to Mr. Collins. I thought

(13) *Analyſis per Quantitatum Series, Fluxiones, ac Differentias, cum enumeratione Linearum tertii ordinis*, publiſhed by Mr. Jones at London 1711, in 4to.

to carry on those discoveries which he had designed for the public, dying June the 5th 1716 in the prime of his age, to the great regret of all lovers of the Mathematical Sciences.

" thought they might have been pertinent to his design of writing an History of the Method of Fluxions. I afterwards understood that you gave him a sight of those papers, and that he thought 'em not to be for his purpose, which I do now very much wonder at, if his intention was to do justice to Sir Isaac. If that was not his intention, I think your Preface has already sufficiently defeated all his attempts. We are now at a stand as to Sir Isaac's *Principia*; he designs to make some few experiments before we proceed any further: The first Book, and the first Sections of the second are printed off. The inclosed paper (14) is what I wrote about three years ago, and read to my auditors in our Schools in 1709. I have sent it to you, as it relates to the *Methodus Differentialis*, but more especially as a small acknowledgment of my gratitude for having received that and the other excellent Treatises from your hands, and as a token of my hearty friendship and sincere good-will to you. I am, &c."

(14) *De Newtoniana Methodo Interpolandi*, published since by Dr. Smith among the Additions to the *Harmonia Mensurarum*.

Cambridge Trinity-College.

Cambridge Sept. 30th 1711.

" Sir,

" I return you my thanks for your Letter, and the information you gave me concerning the State of Mathematicks at present in London. I shall be glad to see Mr. *De Moivre's Treatise of Chance*, when it comes out. His things are always very neat and curious. We have nothing of Sir Isaac Newton's, that I know of in manuscript at Cambridge besides the first draught of his *Principia*, as he read it in his Lectures; his *Algebra-Lectures*, which are printed; and his *Optick-Lectures*, the substance of which is for the most part contain'd in his printed Book, but with further improvements. I thank you for your kind offer of recommending my paper to the public; but I am of opinion, that it is not of so great use as to deserve to be printed after Sir Isaac's *Methodus Differentialis*. The reading of that excellent Treatise gave me occasion to consider the subject again. As my design related chiefly to the Construction of Tables; so I found and examined a great Variety of Methods; which might be employed for that purpose. But at last I pitched upon one, which I judged to be by much the simplest and most convenient of any of those, which offered themselves to my thoughts. The account of this Method may make a second part to be annexed to the paper I formerly sent you, if you and your mathematical friends shall think it of any use to be published. I have not as yet drawn it up in writing; otherwise it might have accompanied this Letter. The best description I can give you of it in few words is this (15): that in some respects it resembles Sir Isaac's Method in Propos. III. of his *Method. Differ.* but is in the main more nearly related to the Method of Mr. Briggs described in cap. 13. of his *Arithmetica Logarithmica*, Edit. London. Dr. Gregory Lib. V. Propo. XXV. of his *Astronomy* refers his reader to a Book of *Gabriel Mouton de Observationibus Diametrorum Solis & Lunæ apparentium*. Though I do not much rely upon the Doctor's recommendation, yet I should be glad to see the Book, or to have some short account of his way. If you could assist me in this respect, I should be much obliged to you for the favour. I have formerly sent to my Bookseller at London for it, but he could not procure it. I am very desirous to have the edition of the *Principia* finished; but I never think the time lost when we stay for Sir Isaac's further Corrections and Improvements of so very valuable a book, especially when this seems to be the last time he will concern himself with it. I am sensible his other business allows him but little time for these things; and therefore I don't hasten him so much as I might otherwise do: I am very well satisfied to wait till he has leisure. I am, &c."

(13) This Paper is likewise published by Dr. Smith in the same place.

Cambridge Nov. 11th 1711.

" Dear Sir,

" I have received *Mouton's* Book. I thank you for the favour you did me in sending it. I have look'd over what relates to his way of interpolation, but I can find no cause from thence to make any alteration. I beg your pardon that I have not yet sent you my second paper, I had finished it before I received your last Letter with the Book, but since that time I have not had leisure to transcribe it. I design to send with it a paper concerning *Logarithms* (16), which together with the others may serve to fill up a whole Transaction, if you shall think them of any use to be published after you have read them. The controversy concerning Sir Isaac's Philosophy is a piece of news, that I had not heard of. I think that Philosophy needs no defence, especially when it is attacked by Cartesians. One Mr. Green, a Fellow of Clare-Hall in our University, seems to have nearly the same design with those German and French Objectors, whom you mention. His Book (17) is now in our press, and is almost finished. I am told he will add an *Appendix*, in which he undertakes also to square the Circle. *Ex pede Herculem.* I need not recommend his performance any further to you. I am, &c."

(16) This is printed in the *Philosophical Transactions*, numb. 338. an. 1714.

(17) This book was published at Cambridge 1711 in 8vo under the following title: *The Principles of Natural Philosophy, in which is shewn the Insufficiency of the present Systems to give us any just Account of that Science, and the Necessity therein of some new Principles in order to furnish us with a true and real knowledge of Nature. By* Robert Green, *M. A.* There is subjoined to this book a Latin Treatise, intitled, *Geometria Solidorum sive materiæ, seu de variâ Compositione &c.*

" Cambridge May 5th 1716.

" Dear Sir,

" I take it very kindly of Dr. Taylor, that he has been pleased to give so favourable a representation of my Tables: and your Letter encourages me to give you some account of the principal part of that work, with which I did not acquaint the Doctor by reason of his short stay with me. I must therefore tell you, that Geometers have not yet promoted the inverse method of Fluxions by Conick Areas or by Measures of Ratios and Angles so far as it is capable of being promoted by those methods. There is an infinite field still reserved, which it has been my fortune to find an entrance into. Not to keep you any longer in suspense, I have found out a general and beautiful method by Measures of Angles and Ratio's for the Fluent of any Quantity, which can come under this form $\frac{dzz\,\overset{\theta}{\overline{\lambda}}\overline{\theta+\nu-1}}{\overline{c+fz^{\nu}}}$, in which d, e, f are any constant Quantities, z the variable, ν any Index, θ any whole Number affirmative or negative, $\frac{\theta}{\lambda}$ any Fraction whatever. The Fluents of this form, which have hitherto been considered are $\frac{dzz\,\overline{\theta\nu-1}}{c+fz^{\nu}}$, $\frac{dzz\,\overline{\theta\nu+\frac{1}{2}\nu-1}}{c+fz^{\nu}}$ These you remember are Sir Isaac's two first, and from these all his others are easily deduced. And as his irrational forms of the Quadratick Kind are derived from the rational, so from my general rational Form I deduce irrational ones of all kinds. Thus for instance, if $\frac{\theta}{\lambda}$ represent any affirmative or negative Fraction, the Fluent of any Quantity of this form $dzz\,\overline{\theta\nu-1}\times\overline{c+fz^{\nu}}\Big|^{\theta}_{\lambda}$ or of this kind $dzz\,\frac{\overline{\theta\nu-1}\,\overline{c+fz^{\nu}}\Big|^{\theta}_{\lambda}}{g+hz^{\nu}}$ and so of some others, depends upon the Measures of Ratio's and Angles. Mr. Leibnitz in the *Leipsick Acts* of 1702, pag. 218 and 219 has very rashly undertaken to demonstrate that the Fluent of $\frac{x}{x^4+a^4}$ cannot be expressed by Measures of Ratio's and Angles; and he swaggers upon the occasion (according to his usual vanity) as having by this Demonstration determined a Question of the greatest moment. Then he goes on thus: As the Fluent of $\frac{x}{x+a}$ depends up-

" on

ces. He lies interred in Trinity-College Chapel in Cambridge, with an epitaph written by Dr. Richard Bentley [*C*], Maſter of the ſaid College, who highly valued him.

" on the Meaſure of a Ratio, and the Fluent $\frac{x}{xx+aa}$ " of upon the Meaſure of an Angle; ſo he " has more than once expreſſed his wiſhes, " that the Progreſſion may be continued, and if " it be determined to what Problem the Fluents " of $\frac{x}{x^4+a^4}$, $\frac{x}{x^3+a^3}$ &c. may be referred; his " deſire is anſwered in my general Solution, which " contains an infinite number of ſuch Progreſſions. I " can go yet further, and ſhew him how to find by Mea- " ſures of Ratio's and Angles without any Exception " or Limitation the Fluent of this general Quantity " $\frac{\theta_n}{dzz+\frac{\dot{\partial}}{\lambda}\eta-1}$ or even this $\frac{\theta_n}{dzz+\frac{\dot{\partial}}{\lambda}\eta-1}$ / $e+fz^n+gz^{2n}$ / $e+fz^n+gz^{2n}+hz^{3n}$, " where θ, as before, repreſents any Integer, and the " Denominator λ of the Fraction $\frac{\dot{\partial}}{\lambda}$ repreſents any " Number in the ſeries 2. 4. 8. 16. 32 &c. any whole " Number being denoted by its Numerator $\dot{\partial}$. In " truth I am inclined to believe, that Liebnitz's grand " queſtion ought to be determined the contrary way, " and that it will be found at laſt, that the Fluent of " any rational Fluxion whatever does depend upon " Meaſures of Ratios and Angles, excepting thoſe " which may be had of infinite terms, even without " introducing Meaſures.

[*C*] *With an Epitaph written by Dr. Richard Bentley.*] It is as follows: *H. S. E.* Rogerus *Roberti Filius* Cotes, *Collegii hujus S.* Trinitatis *Socius, Aſtronomiæ & Experimentalis Philoſophiæ Profeſſor* Plumianus; *qui immaturâ morte præreptus pauca quidem ingenii ſui pignora reliquit, ſed egregia, ſed admiranda, ex inacceſſis matheſeos penetralibus felici ſolertiâ tum primum eruta. Poſt magnum illum* Newtonum *Societatis hujus ſpes altera & decus gemellum. Cui ad ſummam doctrinæ laudem omnes morum virtutumque dotes in cumulum acceſſerunt, eo magis ſpectabiles amabileſque, quod in formoſo corpore gratiores venirent. Natus* Burbagii *in Agro* Leiceſtrienſi *Jul. x.* 1682. *obiit Jun. v.* 1716.

T.

(*a*) Part 2. pag. 174, &c. of the Dutch edition.

(*c*) *Mercure Galant*, for March 1682, pag. 143.

COTIN (CHARLES) a native of Paris, and a Member of the French Academy, whom Monſieur Boileau has very much abuſed in his Satyrs. See a Vindication of him, and ſeveral circumſtances of his Life in Monſieur Perrault's *Paralleles* (*a*). See alſo the Letters collected by Richelet (*b*). He died in January 1682 (*c*).

(*b*) The Life of ſeveral French Authors are prefixed to them. That of Cotin is in pag. 56 of the Dutch edition 1699.

(*a*) Teiſſier, *Catalogus Catalogor.* &c. pag. 52.
(*b*) *Multa, vel potius multos collegit.* Scipio Gentil. *in Apolog. Apulcii*, p. 428.

COTTA (CATELLIANUS) wrote Scholiums *ad Mediolanenſium Statuta*, upon the Laws of the Milaneſe, and a ſmall Treatiſe concerning the Civilians, which he begins with Mutius Scevola, and finiſhes with Andrew Alciat (*a*). He wrote alſo a book intitled *Memorabilia*, which were printed at Venice in the year 1572, 8vo, and which is nothing but a compilation from other Authors (*b*). He owns it in the beginning of his books, which acquits him of the crime of Plagiariſm.

COTTERUS (CHRISTOPHER) one of the three Prophets, whoſe Revelations Comenius publiſhed. See KOTTERUS.

(*a*) Harpocration, *in voce* Κότυς.

COTYS King of Thracia, contemporary with Philip, Alexander's father, reigned twenty four years. He at firſt gave himſelf up to luxury and a voluptuous life; and being grown prouder by proſperity, he became ſo cruel, that he cut his own wife in two, beginning by her ſecret parts (*a*). Athenæus does not relate this fact thus, according to Delechamp's Tranſlation [*A*]. But that Tranſlation is erroneous, as the learned Mauſſac has very well obſerved [*B*]. Cotys dies a violent death; one Python killed him, and retired

[*A*] *He cut his own wife in two . . . Athenæus does not relate this fact thus, according to Dalechamp's Tranſlation.*] After he had ſaid, that Cotys, the moſt voluptuous Prince that ever reigned in Thracia (1), did not begin to be unfortunate, till after he had offended againſt Minerva, he adds the following particulars. Cotys pretended one day to marry that Goddeſs; the wedding-dinner was given; the nuptial chamber was prepared; the Bride only was wanting; Cotys, being very drunk, waited for her with the utmoſt impatience; and when he did not ſee her come, he fell into a violent paſſion. He ſent one of his guards to ſee whether ſhe was not yet arrived in the room prepared for her. The ſoldier returned, and ſaid he had not ſeen any body; which exaſperated the furious Prince to ſuch a degree, that he killed the meſſenger on the ſpot; he ſent another, who brought the ſame anſwer, and met with the ſame fate. He ſent a third, who thinking to avoid the misfortune of the two former, would not ſay he had met with no body; but boldly aſſerted, that Minerva had been a long while waiting for the King. But his impoſture had no better ſucceſs, than the former's ſincerity. For Cotys being taken with a ſudden fit of jealouſy, as tho' this third meſſenger had taken hold of the opportunity, which the bride's impatience might have offered him, fell upon him, and tore him in pieces, beginning with his ſecret parts. Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ὅτός ποτε καὶ ζηλοτυπήσας, τὴν αὐτοῦ γυναῖκα ταῖς αὐτοῦ χέρσιν ἀνέτεμε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰδοίων ἀρξάμενος. *Tum Rex zelotypia percitus, ne quid in uxorem ſuam auſus ille fuiſſet, manibus ſuis militem conſcidit, ac diſcerpſit, a pudendis exorſus* (2). This is Athenæus's account if you will follow his Tranſlator; but you muſt not follow him (3). He did not obſerve that the words Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ὅτός ποτε are the beginning of a new ſtory, and ſignify, *Rex iſte aliquando* (it happened once that this King &c.)

(1) Ὃς ἁπάντων τῶν βασιλέων τῶν ἐν τῇ Θράκῃ γεγενημένων μάλιστα περὶς ἡδυπαθείας καὶ τρυφὰς ὥρμησε. Athen. lib. 12. cap. 8. pag. 531.

(2) Idem, ibid. pag. 532. *Ex Theopompo.*

(3) I had done it, and correct now this error in this third edition, having been adviſed by Mr. Weyſſiére la Croſe.

[*B*] *The learned Mauſſac has very well obſerved it.*] He obſerves that Theopompus, in Athenæus, aſſerts the ſame thing as Harpocration does, namely, that Cotys tore his own wife in pieces, and he cenſures Dalechamp for tranſlating Athenæus as tho' the Meſſenger, and not the Queen herſelf had been thus cruelly treated. *Eruditiſſimus Dalecampius longiſſimè erravit a veritate hiſtoriæ, cum Græca verba Theopompi . . . . ita vertit . . . .* (4). *Imo e contrario mulierem propriam diſcerpſit: ut optime habet Harpocration, quod deſignat evidentiſſime illa verba* τὴν ἄνθρωπον: *falſiſſimum autem eſt eum conſcidiſſe tertium militem. Fraudi fuit ſine dubio eruditiſſimo illo interprete vox* ἄνθρωπον, *cui non animadvertit conjunctum eſſe articulum* τὴν, *& hoc in loco mulierem ſignificare. Hæc velim dicta in favorem juniorum* (5). i. e. " The moſt learned Dalechamp has " been very much miſtaken in his tranſlation of Theo- " pompus's Greek words. For on the contrary Cotys " tore his own wife in pieces; as it is very well ex- " preſſed by Harpocration, and evidently appears by " theſe words τὴν ἄνθρωπον; but it is abſolutely falſe, " that he tore the third ſoldier in pieces. This moſt " learned Tranſlator has been miſled by the word ἄν- " θρωπον, becauſe he did not obſerve, that there was " an article of the feminine gender prefixed to it, ſo " that it ſignifies in this place a woman. Let this be " obſerved for the ſake of young ſcholars."

(4) See the Greek words of Theopompus, and Dalechamp's Tranſlation above, quotation (2).

(5) Philippus Jacobus Mauſſacus, *Not. ad Harpocration*, pag. 221. editionis Lugd. Bat. 1683.

retired to Athens, where his action was nobly rewarded (*b*) [C]. He was assisted by his brother in the murther of this King, and it was in order to revenge their father, that they resolved upon this attempt. Aristotle, who acquaints me with this [D], observes, that one Adamas revolted against Cotys, to be revenged of an injury which he had received from him in his youth. This injury was, that he had been castrated. Cersobleptes Cotys's son succeeded his father in the Kingdom. He had a sister who was married to Iphicrates [E]. I believe this is the Cotys whom Plutarch mentions in his *Apophthegms* [F]. He speaks in another place of a COTYS King of Paphlagonia, who made an alliance with Agesilaus, and by that means married a beautiful girl (*c*). Livy mentions one COTYS King of the Odryses, who fought faithfully against the Romans for Perseus King of Macedonia (*d*). Tacitus speaks of some Princes named COTYS, of whom Moreri does not give us a very true account [G].

(*b*) Demosthen. *adverss. Aristocratem*, pag. 452, A.

(*c*) In *Vita Agesilai*, pag 601.

(*d*) Livius, lib. 42.

In

[C] *One Python killed him, and retired to Athens, where his action was nobly rewarded.*] When he committed the fact he was assisted by his brother Heraclides (6). He would not have found every where a sanctuary after this murther (7). But he thought that Athens would be a very good asylum for him, because that City had been a long time at war with Cotys. He retired therefore thither, and desired to be admitted a Citizen of Athens (8). He not only obtained that privilege (9), but they also gave him a golden crown, and loaded him with so many praises in the Orations delivered before the people, that he had room to think they raised the people's jealousy, by extolling too much the glory of the murther he had committed: so that he bethought himself of a device, to remove the envy, which began to be conceived against him (10). He came before the people, and declared, that he did not pretend to any share in the glory of that action; that he only lent his arm to some Deity, to whom therefore the whole merit of it ought to be ascribed. Diocles, in Diogenes Laertius (11), says only, that the Philosopher Pyrrho was honoured with the Freedom of Athens, as a reward for the murther of Cotys. The war had very much changed the heart of the Athenians, for they had formerly admitted Cotys a Citizen of their City, and given him a golden crown (12). It is asserted that he also gave them the Freedom of Thrace, in order to shew that he did not think himself beneath them. *Capax generosi spiritus illud quoque dictum Regis Cotys; ut enim ab Athenienſibus civitatem sibi datam cognovit; Et ego, inquit, illis meæ gentis jus dabo. Æquavit Athenis Thraciam, ne vicissitudine talis beneficii imparem se judicando humilius de origine sua sentire existimaretur* (13).

(6) Demosthenes, *adverss. Aristocratem*, pag. m. 445, C. See the following Remark.

(7) Demosth. ibid. pag. 446, C.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Ibid. pag. 445, C.

(10) Plutarchus, *de sui laude*, pag. 542, E, & *de gerenda Republica*, pag. 816 E.

(11) Lib. 9. num. 65.

(12) Demosthen. *adverss. Aristocratem*, pag. 445, B.

(13) Valer. Maximus, lib. 3. cap. 7. *circa finem.*

[D] . . *Python and his brother resolved upon this attempt in order to revenge their father. Aristotle . . . . acquaints me with this.*] It is in the tenth chapter of the fifth book of his Politicks, but we must correct something in it. Πάρων δὲ καὶ Ἡρακλείδης οἱ Αἴνιοι Κότυν διέφθειραν, τῷ πατρὶ τιμωρῆσαι. i. e. "Paro and "Heraclides of Ænos * killed Cotys, on purpose to "revenge their father." Thus it is in my edition of Aristotle (14), which is that of Geneva printed in 1605. But it should be Πύθων instead of Πάρων, and it must be translated *Python and Heraclides &c.* Let us not forget to observe, that Plutarch tells us, these two murtherers of Cotys had been Plato's disciples (15). See also Philostratus, Chapter the first, Book the fifth of Apollonius's Life, where he tells us, they were of the Academick Sect.

* A Town in Thracia.

(14) Pag. 305, D.

(15) Plut. *adv. Colotem.* pag. 1126.

[E] *His son . . . . had a sister, who was married to Iphicrates.*] Menestheus, who was born of this marriage, said one day, that he had more value for his mother, than for his father, because his mother had done all that lay in her power to make him an Athenian, whereas his father did all that he could, to make him a Thracian. *Menesthea filium reliquit* (Iphicrates), *ex Thressa natum, Coti Regis filia. Is cum interrogaretur*, utrum pluris matrem, patremve faceret; matrem, *inquit.* Id *cum multis mirum videretur: at ille* merito, *inquit*, facio: Nam pater, quantum in se fuit, Thracem me genuit; contra mater Athenienſem (16). Such was the pride of the Athenians; they preferred the title of Citizen of Athens before the quality of a King's son-in-law, or grand-son, and they openly rewarded the murtherers of a Crowned-Head. Demosthenes tells us, that Iphicrates, tho' loaded with honours in his own country, did yet engage in a naval battle against the Athenians in behalf of his father-in-law. He adds, that Cotys was so ungrateful for this service, that he would not shew the least civility for the Athenians, in order to obtain Iphicrates's pardon. On the contrary, he endeavoured to make him exasperate his fellow-citizens more and more, for he would employ him to attack other places belonging to them: and because he could not persuade him to it, he deprived him of the command of his troops, and reduced him to the sad necessity of seeking for a sanctuary in some corner of the earth: for when Iphicrates was out of favour at the Court of Cotys, he durst not retire to Athens; because he had but lately borne arms against his native country (17). I forgot to observe, that Anaxandrides the Poet, in Athenæus (18), rallies the entertainment, which Cotys gave the day his daughter was married with Iphicrates.

(16) Corn. Nepos, *in Iphicrate, sub fin.*

(17) *Ex* Demosth. *adv. Aristocrat.* pag. 447.

[F] *I believe this is the Cotys, whom Plutarch mentions in his Apophthegms.*] Plutarch's Cotys was a very passionate man, who punished his servants cruelly, when they committed the least fault. Some person had sent him a present of very fine earthen vessels, curiously adorned with several figures painted upon them: he rewarded the person, who gave him those vessels, but he caused them all to be broken in pieces (19), because he foresaw, that his servants could not avoid breaking such brittle ware, and that in such a case he could not forbear punishing them too severely (20). This agrees pretty well with our Cotys's character. Moreri applies it to another Cotys, who *followed Pompey's party*, says he: but the passages he quotes, do not contain any such thing, and I don't doubt, but he is mistaken. You will find his other blunders in the following remark. Observe, that I do not deny, there was a Cotys, King of Thrace, who sent his son (21) to Pompey at the head of 500 horse.

(18) Lib. 4. cap. 3. pag. 131.

(19) Plutarch, *in Apoph.* pag. 174.

(20) Compare this with what Augustus did at Vedius Pollio's house, *apud Senecam de Ira*, lib. 3. cap. 4. pag. m. 581. and Plutarch's *Advice, Lib. de Ira cohibenda*, pag. 461, E. to passionate people, not to keep precious ware.

[G] *Tacitus speaks of some Princes named Cotys, of whom Moreri does not give us a very true account.*] I. He says, that *in Nero's time, Cotys King of Thracia shared his Kingdom with his uncle Rhescuporis.* He should have said, that Augustus, after the death of Rhœmetalces (22), King of Thrace, divided the Kingdom between the son and the brother of the deceased Prince. Rhescuporis, who was the brother, had for his share the countries, that were the least cultivated and lay the nearest to the enemy. Cotys, who was the son, had the countries, which were nearest to Greece. Tacitus acquaints us with this in the LXIV Chapter of the IId Book of his *Annals.* II. So that Moreri was very much in the wrong to quote *Tacitus L.* 11 *&* 12 *Annal. & L.* 11. *Hist.* We meet indeed in Book the 11th with a COTYS, King of the lesser Armenia, whom Moreri mentions. But the 12th Book of the *Annals* does not speak of this Cotys, nor is there any Cotys at all mentioned in the second Book of the History; so that Moreri's quotations are very erroneous; for, besides the observation I have just now made we may ask him, why he did not quote any authority concerning the COTYS, *who*, as he says, *shared his Kingdom with Rhescuporis?* The COTYS, mentioned in the XIIth Book of the *Annals*, was brother of Mithridates King of Bosphorus. The Cotys of the XIth Book was probably the son of that Cotys whom his uncle treated so cruelly; (I shall speak of him below.) What would incline me to think so is, that when the Emperor Caligula gave the lesser Armenia and part of Arabia to Cotys, he gave this same Cotys's estates to Rhœmetalces (23). This Rhœmetalces was, without doubt, the same, who after the condemnation of Rhescuporis Cotys's murtherer, obtained from Tiberius part of Thrace, the rest being given to Cotys's sons (24). III. Moreri's third blunder consists in a consi-

(21) Named *Sadales*. *See* Cæsar, *de Bello Civ.* lib. 3. cap. 4. *See also* Lucan. lib. 5. ver. 34.

(22) It is, I think, the same whom Dion mentions, lib. 54. pag. m. 624. under the year 743. and lib. 55. pag. 651. under the year 759. He was, if I am not mistaken, the brother of one Rhascíporis, son of Cotys, killed in the year 743, according to Dion, pag. 624.

(23) Dio, lib. 59. *ad ann.* 791. pag. m. 745.

(24) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 2. cap. 67.

I inform thoſe who have not the third edition of this Dictionary (in French) that they muſt

omiſſion. He had before him an account abounding with moral inſtructions, of which Tacitus afforded him the materials: why then did he not make uſe of them? Let us not imitate his careleſsneſs. The two Princes, between whom Auguſtus divided Thrace, were of a very different character; Cotys was an honeſt man, polite, mild, and agreeable. Rheſcuporis was of a ſavage, cruel and ambitious temper, who could not bear a companion. *Ipſorumque Regum ingenia, illi mite & amœnum, huic atrox, avidum, & ſocietatis impatiens erat* (25). By this obſervation Tacitus prepares his readers to ſee without aſtoniſhment the Cataſtrophe, which he was going to deſcribe. None but very dull readers, but muſt expect, after ſuch an obſervation, to ſee Cotys deprived of his Dominions. It would be next to a miracle, if the portion of an honeſt man did not become the prey of a wicked fellow. During the Life of Auguſtus, Rheſcuporis, who dreaded his power, affected to live in friendſhip with his neighbour, and went on but ſlowly in his uſurpations; but as ſoon as he heard that Prince was dead, he invaded openly and violently his nephew's territories. Tiberius having been acquainted with it, let the two Princes know that he would have them put an end to their diſpute in a friendly manner. This was ſufficient to engage Cotys to diſarm; and as he thought others as honeſt as himſelf, he conſented to an interview, which Rheſcuporis propoſed to him, and the better to ſhew his candour, he accepted of the invitation which Rheſcuporis made him, to come to an entertainment which he would give him, with a pretence to confirm their new alliance. But after the entertainment he was bound in chains, and it was in vain that he inſiſted upon the laws of honeſty and hoſpitality. *Rheſcuporis ficta modeſtia, poſtulat* eundem in locum coiretur, poſſe de controverſiis colloquio tranſigi. *Nec diu dubitatum de tempore, loco, dein conditionibus, cum alter facilitate, alter fraude cuncta inter ſe comederent acciperentque. Rheſcuporis, ſanciendo, ut dictitabat, fœderi, convivium adjicit; tractaque in multam noctem lætitia, per epulas ac vinolentiam incautum Cotyn, & poſtquam dolum intellexerat* ſacra Regni, ejuſdem familiæ Deos, & hoſpitales menſas *obteſtantem, catenis onerat* (26). Rheſcuporis having made himſelf maſter of all Thrace, wrote to the Emperor, that he had been obliged to do it, in order to prevent a treaſon which Cotys was contriving againſt him (27). This is a treachery by which the moſt unjuſt offenders uſe to cover their blackeſt attempts. Tiberius anſwered him, that if he was guiltleſs, he ought not to have the leaſt miſtruſt, and ſhould ſet Cotys free, and come to Rome, there to have his cauſe tried. He choſe rather to be guilty of a complete crime, than of a crime committed but by halves, which is a much more ſubtle policy, than men imagine. He cauſed Cotys to be put to death, and gave out that he had killed himſelf. *Rheſcuporis inter metum & iram cunctatus maluit patrati quam incepti facinoris reus eſſe; occidi Cotyn jubet, mortemque ſponte ſumptam ementitur* (28). But the Divine Juſtice did not ſuffer him to enjoy long ſuch a wicked uſurpation: he was not cunning enough to eſcape the ſnares, which the Emperor laid for him (29); he was obliged to go to Rome, where the Senate doing juſtice to Cotys's widow, who had accuſed Rheſcuporis, deprived him of his Kingdom, and even of his liberty. He was conducted to Alexandria, and whether it was that he endeavoured to make his eſcape, or that they ſuppoſed him guilty of ſome new crime, they killed him. His ſon Rhœmetalces, who had not been concerned in his wickedneſs, had no ſhare in his puniſhment: Thrace was divided between him and the ſons of Cotys; and becauſe they were yet under age, they were put under the guardianſhip of Trebellienus Rufus, who was made Regent of the Kingdom. IV. Moreri's fourth blunder is, that he diſtinguiſhes Cotys, Rheſcuporis's nephew, from the Cotys, whom Ovid mentions: For we ought not to doubt, but the Cotys, to whom this Poet wrote an Elegy, is the ſame whom Tacitus commends, and to whom Auguſtus gave part of Thrace. Ovid beſtows great praiſes upon him, and begs his protection. He tells him in one paſſage, that the place of his baniſhment is in the neighbourhood of that King's Dominions (30), and in another paſſage he ſays, that he lives in that Prince's Forteſſes (31). This is ſomewhat obſcure. This ſame Epiſtle of Ovid acquaints us, that Cotys had ſtudied, and had even made ſome good verſes.

Adde quod ingenuas didiciſſe fideliter artes
Emollit mores, nec ſinit eſſe feros:
Nec Regum quiſquam magis eſt inſtructus in illis,
Mitibus aut ſtudiis tempora plura dedit.
Carmina teſtantur; quæ ſi tua nomina demas,
Threicium juvenem compoſuiſſe negem.

That is,

" Add to this, that the ſtudy of the liberal Arts im-
" proves the morals, and does not ſuffer us to be un-
" polite. There is no Prince in the world better ſkil-
" led in theſe than you are, nor has any King ſpent
" more time in thoſe agreeable exerciſes; witneſs your
" verſes, which, if your name was not prefixed to
" them, I would never believe they were written by a
" young Thracian."

Cotys's family was ſo ancient, that it deſcended from Eumolpus (32). Now Eumolpus was the perſon, who taught the Athenians the myſteries of their Religion (33). V. Laſtly we may explode what Moreri ſays, namely, that *Cotys was a certain King of the Getes, into whoſe territories Ovid was baniſhed.* It is certain, that Cotys's Kingdom was Thrace, and not the country of the Getes. Cotys held perhaps a garriſon at Tomos, the place of Ovid's baniſhment; but that is not being King of the Getes. So that Lipſius ſeems to have been miſtaken, when he ſaid, *in hujus regno vates ille exulavit, quod ſcire volo juventutem* (34). i. e. " This Poet (Ovid) was an exile in his (Cotys's) King-
" dom, which the youth ought to take notice
" of." Would ever a man, who lives in a Prince's dominions, petition him, that he would make him live ſecure in the neighbourhood of his Kingdom? And yet this is the concluſion of Ovid's requeſt (35).

Some are of opinion (36), that the King, to whom Ovid wrote, was the ſon of Cotiſo, King of the Getes, of whom Suetonius ſays, *M. Antonius ſcribit, primum eum* (Auguſtum) *Antonio, filio ſuo, deſpondiſſe Juliam; dein Cotiſoni, Getarum Regi, quo tempore ſibi quoque invicem filium Regis in matrimonium petiiſſet* (37). Theſe words acquaint us with two facts, which are not to be met with in any other Writer. I. That Auguſtus deſigned to marry his daughter Julia with Cotiſo King of the Getes. II. That he himſelf deſigned to marry the daughter of this Cotiſo. For, with a great Critick's leave (38), this is the ſenſe of Suetonius's words; which ſenſe is not to be refuted by Auguſtus's conſtant affection for his ſpouſe Livia: for it muſt be obſerved, that it is Mark Anthony who ſpeaks here, and that he did not much mind what he ſaid, when he intended to render Auguſtus odious. The moſt groundleſs reports, the leaſt ſuſpicions, were ſufficient for him, to make them the ſubject of his Manifeſto's. But I come back now, in order to confute thoſe, who aſſert, that Ovid wrote to this Cotiſo's ſon. I object Tacitus to them, who expreſly aſſert (39), Cotys King of a part of Thrace, in Tiberius's time had obtained that part of the Kingdom from Auguſtus, after the death of Rhœmetalces. Whence it follows that the Cotys, who reigned in Thrace during Ovid's baniſhment, was the ſon of this Rhœmetalces. Monſieur de Tillemont (40), who thought he was only his nephew was miſtaken: the cauſe of his error was probably this. He had ſeen, that about the year 738 ſince the building of Rome Rhœmetalces governed in Thrace, as guardian to his nephews the ſons of Cotys (41), and that in 759 Rhœmetalces and his brother Rheſcuporis drove the enemy out of the country (42): He thought therefore that the Cotys, to whom Auguſtus gave part of Thrace after the death Rhœmetalces was one of thoſe pupils, ſons of Cotys, to whom Rhœmetalces was guardian in the year 738. He would not have thought ſo, had he obſerved that Tacitus's account is ſtrongly ſupported by the praiſes, which Ovid beſtows on the courage of Cotys's father (43). Theſe praiſes ſuit very well with Rhœmetalces, who appears now and then in Hiſtory from the year 738, to the year 759 (44), and one muſt make a great many groundleſs ſuppoſitions, to make theſe praiſes belong to a Cotys, who died before the year 738, leaving his children under age, which gives us reaſons to believe, that he did not reign long.

(25) Idem, ibid. cap. 64. *ad ann.* 772.

(26) Idem, ibid. cap. 65.

(27) *Thracia omni potitus, ſcripſit ad Tiberium, ſtructas ſibi inſidias, præventum inſidiatorem.* Ibid.

(28) Ibid. cap. 66.

(29) Vell. Paterculus, lib. 2. chap. 129. reckons this amongſt the beſt managed intrigues of Tiberius.

(30) *Fama loquax veſtras, ſi jam pervenit ad aures,*
Me tibi finitimi parte jacere Soli.
Ovid. *Epiſt.* 9. lib. 2. *de Ponto*, ver. 2.

(31) *Tu quoque, fac profit intra tua Caſtra jacenti.* Ibid. ver. 37.

(32) Ibid. ver. 23 and 19.

(33) Plutarch, *de Exilio*, pag. 607, E.

(34) Lipſ. *in Tacit. Ann.* lib. 2. cap. 64.

(35) *Hac* (natali humo) *quoniam, careo, tua nunc vicinia præſtet,*
Inviſo poſſim tutus ut eſſe loco.

(36) See the *Ovidius Variorum*, 8vo, tom. 3. pag. 661.

(37) Sueton. in *Auguſt.* cap. 63.

(38) Caſaubon. *in hæc verba Suetonii.*

(39) *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 64.

(40) *Hiſtoire des Empereurs*, tom. 1. pag. m. 21.

(41) Dio. lib. 54. pag. 612.

(42) Idem, lib. 55. pag. 651, 652.

(43) *Non tibi Caſſandreus pater eſt....*
Sed quàm Marte ferox, & vinci neſcius armis
Tam nunquam facta pace cruoris amans. Ovid. *Epiſt.* 9. lib. 2. *de Ponto*, ver. 43.

(44) *See* Dio. lib. 54. pag. 612, 624. and 55. pag. 651.

must correct ſomething in the remarks [*A*] and [*B*] of this article. I have found that the learned Mauſſac's obſervation is well grounded (*e*).

(*e*) I am obliged for this to Monſ. Veyſſiere la Croſe.

COUSIN (GILBERT) in Latin *Cognatus*, born at Nozeret in Franche-Comté (*a*) in the year 1505, was a learned man, as he ſhewed by a great number of books, a catalogue of which may be ſeen in the Epitome of Geſner's *Bibliotheca*. He had been Eraſmus's ſervant [*A*], and found in him a maſter, who did juſtice to his great qualities. Eraſmus had a great eſteem for him, and taught him ſeveral things [*B*]. He procured him a Canonry at Nozeret, and offered him his own houſe upon very advantageous terms, when he found him weary of his living, becauſe of the law-ſuits to which it expoſed him. See the Letters XLVI, LI, and LV of the XXVIIth Book of Eraſmus. Couſin was ſtill living in the year 1563 [*C*]. He was not guilty of Plagiariſm with regard to the paſſage which Thomaſius cites (*b*), for his Notes upon Lucian were printed before Peter Pithou's *Adverſaria* had been publiſhed.

(*a*) *Epit. Bibliotb. Geſneri.*

[*A*] *He had been Eraſmus's ſervant.*] Here follows what Eraſmus wrote to Lewis de Vers, Abbot of Mount St. Mary, who was one of Couſin's relations. *Gilbertus Cognatus mihi jam pluſquam triennium fidelem & commodum præſtitit famulum, quem ego tamen ob mores liberales non tam pro famulo habui, quam pro convictore, & in ſtudiorum laboribus ſocio. Proinde & tuæ reverendæ amplitudini gratulor talem cognatum, & illi multo magis tam amicum & benignum patronum.* i. e. "Gilbert Couſin has ſerved me above three years "faithfully and well; and as he has a generous mind, "I treat him rather as a companion, and a partner "of my ſtudies, than as a ſervant. I congratulate "your Reverence for having ſuch a relation, and him "much more, for having ſuch a friend and kind pa-"tron as you are." I have extracted this from the XLVIth Letter of Eraſmus's XXVIIth book; this Letter is dated December the 11th 1533.

[*B*] *Eraſmus . . . taught him ſeveral things.*] Eraſmus reckons this amongſt the advantages which Couſin met with in his ſervice; he even pretends, that he preſerved him from the contagious danger of the new opinions. *Spero autem fore, ut illum temporis apud me peracti non pœniteat, nam præter eruditionis fructum, quod ex mea conſuetudine cepit haud pœnitendum. . . . poterat alibi nonnihil attrahere contagii a Sectarum amatoribus; apud me vero, etiam ſi quid attraxiſſet, purgari potuit* (1). I do not know what Couſin's opinions were during Eraſmus's life; however I do not doubt, but he was afterwards either a Proteſtant, or a favourer of the Proteſtants (*a*).

(1) Eraſmus, Epiſt. 46. lib. 27.

(*a*). The reading of his *Adagia* does ſtrongly incline us to believe it. See amongſt others, the chapter intitled, *Magis fantaſticus quam Papæ Mula.* i. e. "More fantaſtical than the Pope's Mule." CRIT. REM.

[*C*] *He was ſtill living in the year* 1563.] This appears from the advertiſement to the reader, which Marc Hopperus prefixed to the edition of Lucian publiſhed at Baſil in the year 1563. He beſtows there a great many praiſes upon Gilbert Couſin, whoſe Notes upon Lucian were inſerted in that edition.

(*a*) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 120. 2d edit. London 1721. and Sir Thomas Pope-Blount's *Remarks upon Poetry with Characters and Cenſures of the moſt conſiderable Poets, whether Antient or Modern, extracted out of the beſt and choiceſt Criticks*, pag. 48. of the *Characters and Cenſures*: edit. London 1694, in 4to.

☞COWLEY (ABRAHAM), one of the greateſt Engliſh Poets of the ſeventeenth Century, was born in Fleetſtreet near the end of Chancery-Lane in London in the year 1618. His father, who was a Grocer, dying before the ſon was born, his mother by her endeavours and friends procured him to be admitted a King's Scholar in Weſtminſter (*a*). The occaſion of his firſt inclination to Poetry, was his caſual lighting on Spenſer's *Fairy Queen*, when he was but juſt able to read [*A*]; and this inclination was ſo far improved in him, that at thirteen years of age he began to write ſeveral Poems, a collection of which was publiſhed in 1633, when he was but fifteen years old [*B*]. While he was at School he had this defect in his memory, that his Teachers could never bring it to retain the

[*A*] *The occaſion of his firſt inclination to Poetry was his caſual lighting upon Spenſer's* Fairy Queen, *when he was but juſt able to read.*] He informs us of this circumſtance in his *Eſſay upon himſelf*, where he writes as follows; *I believe I can tell the particular little chance, that filled my head firſt with ſuch chimes of verſe, as have never ſince left ringing there. For I remember when I began to read, and take ſome pleaſure in it, there was wont to lie in my mother's parlour (I know not by what accident, for ſhe herſelf never in her life read any book but of devotion) but there was wont to lie* Spenſer's *Works. This I happened to fall upon, and was infinitely delighted with the ſtories of the Knights, and Giants, and Monſters, and brave Houſes, which I found every where there (though my underſtanding had little to do with all this,) and by degrees with the tinkling of the rhyme and dance of numbers, ſo that I think I had read him all over before I was twelve years old, and was thus made Poet as immediately as a child is made an eunuch.*

[*B*] *At thirteen years of age he began to write ſeveral Poems, a collection of which was publiſhed in* 1633, *when we was but fifteen years of age.*] Dr. Sprat in his Life of him (1) is miſtaken in aſſerting that this Collection was publiſhed in the thirteenth year of his age, ſince Mr. Cowley was born in 1618, and this Collection was printed at London 1633 in 4to, under the title of *Poetical Bloſſoms*, and contained *Antonius* and *Melida*, and the *Tragical Hiſtory of Pyramus and Thiſbe*; the former dedicated to Dr. John Williams Biſhop of Lincoln, and the latter to Mr. Lambert Osbaldeſton, Maſter of Weſtminſter-ſchool. Before both is his picture with his age ſet over it, viz. 13, but falſe, as Mr. Wood obſerves (2). There are alſo verſes made by his ſchool-fellows in commendation of them; and at the end are two Elegies, one on Dudley Lord Carleton, and another on his kinſman Richard Clerk of Lincoln's-Inn Gent. and *A Dream of Elyſium*. Dr. Sprat (3) tells us, that there are many things in theſe Poems, that *might well become the vigour and force of a manly wit.* Mr. Cowley in his *Eſſay upon himſelf* gives us ſome ſtanza's of an Ode, printed in this Collection, and written when he was but thirteen years old. "The beginning of it, ſays "he, is boyiſh, but of this part, which I here ſet down "(if a very little were corrected) I ſhould hardly now "be much aſhamed."

(1) Prefixed to his Works.

(2) *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 120.

(3) *Ubi ſupra.*

IX.

This only grant me, that my means may lie
Too low for envy, for contempt too high.
Some honour I would have,
Not from great deeds, but good alone.
The unknown are better than ill known.
Rumour can ope' the grave:
Acquaintance I would have, but when't depends
Not on the number, but the choice of friends.

X.

Books ſhould, not buſineſs, entertain the light,
And ſleep, as undiſturb'd as death, the night.
My houſe a cottage more
Than palace, and ſhould fitting be
For all my uſe, no luxury.
My garden painted o'er
With Nature's hands, not art's, and pleaſures yield,
Horace might envy in his Sabine *field.*

the ordinary rules of Grammar. However he ſupplied that want by converſing with the books themſelves, from whence thoſe rules had been drawn. That no doubt was a better way, though much more difficult; and he afterwards found this benefit by it, that having got the Greek and Roman Languages, as he had done his own, not by precept but uſe, he practiſed them not as a ſcholar but as a native. He was afterwards removed to Trinity-College in the Univerſity of Cambridge, of which he was elected Scholar in 1636 (*c*), where by the progreſs and continuance of his wit, it appeared that two things were joined in it, which ſeldom met together, that it was both early-ripe and laſting (*d*). His exerciſes of all kinds were received by the Univerſity with prodigious applauſe, and with this particular praiſe, that they were not only fit for the obſcurity of an Academical life, but to have been ſhewn on the true Theatre of the world. In 1638 he publiſhed a Paſtoral Comedy, intitled *Love's Riddle* [*C*], and a Latin Comedy, intitled *Naufragium Joculare* [*D*]. Before the twentieth year of his age he laid the deſign of divers of his moſt maſculine works, which he finiſhed long after (*e*). He took the degree of Maſter of Arts, and in the beginning of the year 1643, was with ſeveral Gentlemen ejected out of his College, and obliged to quit the Univerſity; upon which he retired to Oxford, and ſettled in St. John's College (*f*), and under the name of a *Scholar of Oxford* publiſhed the ſame year a Satyr, intitled, *The Puritan and the Papiſt* [*E*]. In St. John's College he proſecuted his ſtudies with great ſucceſs; nor in the mean time was he wanting to his duty in the war itſelf; for he was preſent and in ſervice in ſeveral of the King's journies and expeditions. By theſe occaſions and the report of his uncommon merit he ſoon gained the friendſhip of the chief perſons of the Court and the Gown, whom the fortune of war had drawn together, and particularly of the Lord Falkland, one of the Principal Secretaries of State (*g*). He left Oxford a little before the ſurrender of it to the Parliament, and went to Paris, where he was ſettled in the family of Henry Lord Jermyn, afterwards Earl of St. Alban's [*F*], who having a great reſpect for him, he by that Nobleman's intereſt was deſigned for the Maſterſhip of the Savoy, "which tho' "granted, ſays Mr. Wood (*b*), to his high merit by both the Charles's Iſt and IId, yet "by certain perſons, enemies to the Muſes, he loſt that place." He was abſent from his native country above twelve years, according to Dr. Sprat (*i*), or ten years, according to Mr. Wood (*k*) [*G*], which were wholly ſpent either in bearing a ſhare in the diſtreſſes of the Royal Family, or labouring in their affairs [*H*]. His Poems, intitled the

(*c*) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, and Sir Thomas Pope Blount, *ubi ſupra*.

(*d*) Sprat, *ubi ſupra*.

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

(*f*) Wood, *ubi ſupra*.

(*g*) Sprat, *and* Wood, *ubi ſupra*.

(*b*) *Ubi ſupra*. See likewiſe *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 271.

(*i*) *Ubi ſupra*.

(*k*) *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 3. col. 120.

XI.

Thus would I double my life's fading ſpace,
For he that runs it well, twice runs the race.
And in this true delight,
Theſe unbought ſports, that happy ſtate,
I would not fear, nor wiſh my fate,
But boldly ſay each night,
To morrow let my Sun his beams diſplay,
Or in clouds hide them; I have liv'd to day.

[*C*] *In* 1638 *he publiſhed a* Paſtoral Comedy, *intitled*, Love's Riddle.] It was written while he was at Weſtminſter-School, and dedicated to Sir Kenelm Digby, and printed at London 1638. Mr. Gerard Langbaine (5) tells us that it was firſt printed with his *Poetical Bloſſoms* London 1633 in 4to, and ſince printed in the ſecond volume of his works in fol. London 1681. "If this Play, *continues he*, be conſidered according to the Author's years at that time, it will "certainly be allowed ſtandard; or at leaſt needs no "other apology than what the Author makes for it "in his Dedication to his Patron,"

(4) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, col. 121.

(5) *Account of the Engliſh Dramatic Poets*, pag. 82. edit. Oxford 1691.

Take it as early fruits, which rare appear,
Though not half ripe, but worſt of all the year;
And if it pleaſe your taſte, my Muſe will ſay,
The Birch, which crown'd her then, is grown a Bay.

[*D*] *A Latin Comedy, intitled*, Naufragium Joculare.] It was acted before the Univerſity of Cambridge in Trinity-College February 2d 1638, and was printed at London 1638 in 8vo (6).

(6) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, *and* Langbaine, pag. 86.

[*E*] *Under the name of a* Scholar of Oxford, *publiſhed in* 1643 *a Satyr, intitled*, The Puritan and the Papiſt.] It was printed in one ſheet and an half in 4to, and was republiſhed at London 1682 in 4to in a Book intitled, *Wit and Loyalty revived in a Collection of ſome ſmart Satyrs in Verſe and Proſe on the late Times.* The Writer of the *Preface* complains, that this Satyr of Mr. Cowley was not publiſhed by the Editor of his firſt Collection of Poems, and gives two preſumptive reaſons of it, and wonders that his Poem called *Brutus*, and that upon the Biſhop of Lincoln's Enlargement from the Tower, which he imagines not to have been written by our Author, have met with ſo good fortune as to have a place there (8).

(8) *See* Wood, col. 121.

[*F*] *Went to Paris, where he was ſettled in the Family of Henry Lord Jermyn, afterwards Earl of St. Albans.*] Dr. Sprat tells us (9), that the firſt occaſion of his entering into buſineſs was the Elegy, which he wrote upon Mr. William Harvey's Death, and which brought him into the acquaintance of Mr. John Harvey, the brother of his deceaſed friend, from whom he received many offices of kindneſs through the whole courſe of his life, *and principally this, that by his means he came into the ſervice of my Lord St. Albans.* But Mr. Wood gives us this account (10), that when Mr. Cowley came to Paris, he fell into the acquaintance of Dr. Stephen Goffe, a Brother of the Oratory, by whoſe means he was preferred and placed in the Family of the Lord Jermyn.

(9) *Ubi ſupra.*

(10) Col. 120. See likewiſe *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 271.

[*G*] *He was abſent from his native country above twelve years, according to Dr. Sprat, or ten years, according to Mr. Wood.*] The latter of theſe Writers obſerves (11), that he left Oxford a little before the ſurrender of that city to the Parliament, which was in June 1646; and ſince Mr. Cowley returned to England in 1656, Mr. Wood is in the right in aſſerting, that our Author *was abſent from his native country about ten years*, and not *above twelve years*, as Dr. Sprat imagined.

(11) *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 120.

[*H*] *Which were wholly ſpent either in bearing a ſhare in the diſtreſſes of the Royal Family, or labouring in their affairs.*] To this purpoſe he performed ſeveral dangerous journeys into Jerſey, Scotland, Flanders, Holland, or wherever elſe the King's troubles required his attendance. But the chief teſtimony of his fidelity was the laborious ſervice, which he underwent in maintaining the conſtant correſpondence between King Charles I and his Queen. In that weighty truſt he behaved himſelf with indefatigable induſtry and unſuſpected ſecrecy. For he cyphered and decyphered with his own hand the greateſt part of all the Letters, which paſſed between their Majeſties, and managed a vaſt intelligence in many other parts; which for ſome years together took up all his days, and two or three nights every week. In the *Miſcellanea Aulica: Or a Collection of State Treatiſes, never before publiſhed: containing*

the *Miſtreſs*, were printed at London 1647 in 8vo [*I*], and his Comedy, intitled *The Guardian* in 1650 [*K*]. In the year 1656 (*l*) it was thought proper by thoſe on whom he depended, that he ſhould come over into England, and under the pretence of privacy and retirement ſhould take occaſion of giving notice of the poſture of affairs in the Nation. Upon his return he publiſhed an edition of his Poems [*L*]. He was ſoon after ſeized

(*l*) Idem, ibid.

containing Letters of King Charles *and King* James II, *in their exile; from the Earl of Arlington to Sir Bern. Gaſcoign, about the intended Match of the Duke of York with the Archduchеſs of Inſpruch; a Deſcription of Germany, its Government &c. By Sir B. Gaſcoign &c. Faithfully collected from their Originals by Mr. Thomas Brown.* London 1702 in 8vo, we have ſeveral Letters of Mr. Cowley to Mr. Bennet, afterwards Earl of Arlington, containing a ſhort account of King Charles II's affairs before he went to be crowned in Scotland in 1650.

[*I*] *His Poems, intitled* the Miſtreſs, *were printed at London* 1647 *in* 8*vo.*] They were printed under this title, *The Miſtreſs; or ſeveral Copies of Love-Verſes.* In the Preface to his Poems publiſhed at London 1656 in fol. ſpeaking of theſe Poems, he tells us, that *Poets are ſcarce thought Freemen of their Company without paying ſome duties, and obliging themſelves to be true to love. Sooner or later they muſt all paſs through that tryal, like ſome Mahometan Monks, that are bound by their Order, once at leaſt in their life to make a pilgrimage to Mecca.*

In furias ignemque ruunt, Amor omnibus idem.

But we muſt not always make a judgment of their manners from their writings of this kind, as the Romaniſts uncharitably do of Beza, for a few laſcivious Sonnets compoſed by him in his youth. It is not in this ſenſe that Poeſy is ſaid to be a kind of painting; it is not the picture of the Poet, but of things and perſons imagined by him. He may be in his own practice and diſpoſition a Philoſopher, nay a Stoick, and yet ſpeak ſometimes with the ſoftneſs of an amorous Sappho:

Feret & Rubus aſper Amomum.

He profeſſes too much the uſe of Fables (though without the malice of deceiving) to have his teſtimony taken even againſt himſelf. " Neither would I here be miſunder-
" ſtood, as if I affected ſo much gravity, as to be a-
" ſhamed to be thought really in love. On the con-
" trary I cannot have a good opinion of any man,
" who is not at all capable of being ſo. But I ſpeak
" to excuſe ſome expreſſions (if ſuch there be) which
" may happen to offend the ſeverity of ſupercili-
" ous readers, for much exceſs is to be allowed in
" love, and even more in Poetry, ſo we avoid the two
" unpardonable vices in both, which are *Obſcenity*
" and *Profaneneſs*, of which I am ſure if my words
" be ever guilty, they have ill repreſented my thoughts
(12) *Ubi ſupra.* " and intentions." Dr. Sprat (12) tells us, that he is *not aſhamed to commend Mr.* Cowley's Miſtreſs, and only excepts one or two expreſſions, which he wiſhed he could have prevailed with thoſe, who had the right of the other edition, to have left out. *But of all the reſt,* ſays he, *I dare boldly pronounce, that never yet ſo much was written on a ſubject ſo delicate, that can leſs offend the ſevereſt rules of Morality. The whole Paſſion of Love is intimately deſcribed, with all its mighty train of hopes and joys and diſquiets. Beſides this amorous tenderneſs, I know not how in every copy there is ſomething of more uſeful knowledge very naturally and gracefully inſinuated, and every where there may be ſomething found to inform the minds of wiſe men, as well as to move the hearts of young men or women.*

[*K*] *His Comedy, intitled,* The Guardian.] It was acted before Prince Charles at Trinity College in Cambridge March 12, 1641, and printed at London in
(13) Wood, col. 121. 4to 1650 (13). He tells us himſelf in the *Preface* to his Poems, that " it was made and acted before the Prince
" in his paſſage through Cambridge towards York at
" the beginning of the late unhappy war, or rather
" neither made, nor acted, but rough-drawn only,
" and repeated; for the haſte was ſo great, that it
" could neither be reviſed or perfected by the Author,
" nor learned without Book by the Actors, nor ſet
" forth in any meaſure tolerably by the officers of the
" College. After the Repreſentation, (which, I con-
" feſs, was ſomewhat of the lateſt) I began to look it
" over, and changed it very much, ſtriking out ſome
" whole parts, as that of the *Poet* and the *Soldier*;
" but I have loſt the copy, and dare not think it de-
" ſerves the pains to write it again, which makes me
" omit it in this publication, though there be ſome
" things in it, which I am not aſhamed of, taking
" the excuſe of my age and ſmall experience in hu-
" man converſation when I made it. But as it is, it
" is only the haſty firſt ſetting of a picture; and there-
" fore like to reſemble me accordingly." Mr. Langbaine aſſures us (14), that this Comedy, notwithſtanding Mr. Cowley's modeſt opinion of it, was acted ſeveral times after privately, during the prohibition of the ſtage, and after the Reſtoration publicly at Dublin, and never failed of applauſe. This Mr. Langbaine ſuppoſes put our Author upon reviſing it, and there being many things in it, which he diſliked, and finding himſelf at leiſure in the country, he altered it almoſt throughout, and then permitted it to appear publicly on the ſtage under a new title, as indeed it was in a manner a new Play, calling it *The Cutter of Coleman-Street.*

(14) *Ubi ſupra,* pag. 81.

[*L*] *Upon his return he publiſhed a new edition of his Poems.*] They were printed at London 1656 in fol. and contained, I. *Miſcellanies.* II. *The Miſtreſs, or Love-Verſes.* III. *Pindarique Odes, written in imitation of the ſtyle and manner of the Odes of Pindar. With Notes &c.* In the Preface he tells us, that upon his return to England, he met with a Book, intitled, *The Iron Age,* publiſhed under his name, which he abſolutely diſclaims; and then proceeds to give an account of the Poems contained in that volume. With regard to the *Pindaric Odes,* he tells us, that he was in great doubt whether they will be underſtood by moſt readers; nay even by very many, who are well enough acquainted with the common roads and ordinary tracks of Poetry. " They either are, *ſays he,* or at leaſt
" were meant to be of that kind of ſtyle, which Dion.
" Halicarnaſſeus calls Μιγαλοφυὶς κ᾽ ἠδὺ μετὰ δεινότη-
" τος, and which he attributes to Alcæus. The di-
" greſſions are many and ſudden, and ſometimes long
" according to the faſhion of all Lyriques, and of
" Pindar above all men living. The figures are unu-
" ſual and bold even to temerity, and ſuch as I durſt
" not have to do withal in any other kind of Poetry.
" The numbers are various and irregular, and ſome-
" times (eſpecially ſome of the long ones) ſeem harſh
" and uncouth, if the juſt meaſures and cadencies be
" not obſerved in the pronunciation. So that almoſt
" all their ſweetneſs and numeroſity (which is to be
" found, if I miſtake not, in the rougheſt, if rightly
" repeated), lies in a manner wholly at the mercy of
" the reader." Dr. Sprat (15) obſerves, that the occaſion of his falling into this way of writing was his accidental meeting with Pindar's works, in a place, where he had no other Books to direct him, and that having then conſidered at leiſure the height of his invention, and the majeſty of his ſtyle, he tried immediately to imitate it in Engliſh; and *performed it without the danger, that Horace preſaged to the man, who ſhould dare to attempt it.* Mr. Dryden tells us (16), that our Author *brought* Pindaric *Verſe as near perfection as was poſſible in ſo ſhort a time. But,* ſays he, *if I may be allowed to ſpeak my mind modeſtly, and without injury to his ſacred aſhes, ſomewhat of the purity of Engliſh, ſomewhat of more equal thoughts, ſomewhat of ſweetneſs in the numbers, in one word, ſomewhat of a finer turn and more Lyrical Verſe is yet wanting. As for the ſoul of it, which conſiſts in the warmth and vigour of fancy, the maſterly figures, and the copiouſneſs of imagination, he has excelled all others in this kind. Yet if the kind itſelf be capable of more perfection, tho' rather in the ornamental parts of it, than the eſſential, what rules of morality or reſpect have I broken in naming the defects, that they may hereafter be amended? Imitation is a nice point, and there are few Poets, who deſerve*

(15) *Ubi ſupra.*

(16) Preface to the *Firſt Part of Miſcellany Poems,* publiſhed by Mr. Dryden, pag. 32, 33. 4th edit. London 1716, in 24mo.

to

ſeized and confined for ſome time [*M*]; "but afterwards complying, as Mr. Wood tells "us (*m*), with the men then in power, (which was much taken notice of by the Royal "Party) he obtained an order to be created Doctor of Phyſic, which being done "to his mind (whereby he gained the ill-will of ſome of his friends) he went into France "again, having made a copy of verſes on *Oliver's* death." This account of Mr. Wood reflects upon Mr. Cowley's loyalty; but Dr. Sprat endeavours to vindicate him from all imputations of that kind [*N*]; and informs us, that after his return to France, he remained in the ſame ſtation as before till near the time of the Reſtoration (*n*), upon which he wrote an Ode, and printed it at London 1660, in 4to. In 1662 he publiſhed his *two Books of Plants* in 8vo, reprinted at London 1668 and 1678, with his other Latin Poems [*O*]. At the Reſtoration he was now paſt the fortieth year of his age; the greateſt

(*m*) *Ubi ſupra.*

(*n*) He was actually created Doctor of Phyſick Decem. 2d 1657. Idem, ibid.

to be models in all they write. The Earl of Mulgrave, afterwards Duke of Buckingham, ſpeaking of the nature of *Pindaric Odes*, writes as follows (17):

(17) *Eſſay on Poetry.*

The Poet here muſt be indeed inſpir'd,
With fury too, as well as fancy fir'd.
Cowley *might boaſt to have perform'd this part,*
Had he with nature join'd the rules of art;
But ill expreſſion gives ſometimes allay
To that rich fancy, which can ne'er decay.

(18) Preface to his *Pindarique Ode to the Queen*, publiſhed in his Works, vol. 3. pag. 344, 345. edit. London 1730, in 12mo.

Mr. Congreve (18) having excepted againſt the irregularity of the meaſure of the Engliſh Pindaric Odes, obſerves, that "there is that great deference due to the me-"mory, great parts, and learning of Mr. Cowley, that "nothing ſhould be objected to the latitude he has taken "in his *Pindaric Odes*. The beauty of his Verſes are "an atonement for the irregularity of his Stanza's; "and tho' he did not imitate *Pindar* in the ſtrictneſs of "his numbers, he has very often happily copied him "in the force of his figures, and ſublimity of his "ſtyle and ſentiments." With regard to his *Davideis, a ſacred Poem of the troubles of David*, in four Books, our Poet tells us (19) that he deſigned it to conſiſt of twelve Books, not for the Tribes ſake, but after the pattern of Virgil; and intended to cloſe all with that moſt poetical elegy of David on the Death of Saul and Jonathan. Dr. Sprat (20) obſerves, that this Poem was wholly written in ſo young an age, that if we ſhall reflect on the vaſtneſs of the argument, and his manner of handling it, he may ſeem like one of the miracles, that he there adorns, like a boy attempting Goliah. "I have often heard you, *continues Dr.* "*Sprat addreſſing himſelf to Mr. Martin Clifford*, de-"clare, that he had finiſhed the greateſt part of it, "while he was yet a young Student at Cambridge. "This perhaps may be the reaſon, that in ſome places "there is more youthfulneſs and redundance of fancy, "than his riper judgment would have allowed. . . . . "But for the main of it, I will affirm, that it is a bet-"ter inſtance and beginning of a divine Poem, than "I ever yet ſaw in any language. The contrivance "is perfectly ancient, which is certainly the true "form of Heroic Poetry, and ſuch as was never yet "out-done by any new devices of modern Wits. The "ſubject was truly divine, even according to God's "own heart. The matter of his invention all the "treaſures of knowledge and hiſtories in the Bible. "The model of it comprehended all the learning of "the Eaſt. The characters lofty and various; the "numbers firm and powerful; the digreſſions beauti-"ful and proportionable; the deſign to ſubmit mor-"tal wit to heavenly truths; in all there is an admi-"rable mixture of human virtues and paſſions, with "religious raptures." Mr. Thomas Rymer (21) is of opinion, that a more happy genius for Heroic Poeſy appears in our Author, than either in *Spenſer* or *Davenant*; and that *he underſtood the purity, the perſpicuity, the majeſty of ſtyle, and the virtue of numbers. He could diſcern what was beautiful and pleaſant in nature, and could expreſs his thoughts without the leaſt difficulty or conſtraint. He underſtood how to diſpoſe of the matters, and to manage his digreſſions. In ſhort, he underſtood* Homer *and* Virgil, *and as prudently made his advantage of them. Yet as it may be lamented, that he carried not on the work ſo far as he deſigned, ſo it might be wiſhed, that he had lived to reviſe what he did leave us. I think the troubles of David is neither title nor matter proper for an heroic Poem, ſeeing it is rather the actions, than the ſufferings, that make an Heroe. Nor can it be defended by* Homer's Odyſſeis, *ſince Ulyſſes's ſufferings conclude with one great and perfect action.* But notwithſtanding this cenſure of Mr. Rymer, he afterwards tells us, that in the "*Davideis* (fragment "and imperfect as it is) there ſhines ſomething of a "more fine, more free, more new, and more noble "air, than appears in the *Hieruſalem of Taſſo*, which, "for all his care, is ſcarce perfectly purged from pe-"dantry."

(19) Preface, *ubi ſupra.*

(20) *Ubi ſupra.*

(21) Preface to his *Tranſlation* of Father Rapin's *Reflections upon Ariſtotle's Treatiſe of Poetry.*

[*M*] *He was ſoon after ſeized and confined for ſome time.*] Dr. Sprat tells us (22), that while he lay hid in London, he was ſeized on by miſtake, the ſearch having been intended after another Gentleman of conſiderable note in the King's party. "Being made a "priſoner, he was often examined before the uſurpers, "who tried all imaginable ways to make him ſer-"viceable to their ends. That courſe not prevail-"ing, he was committed to ſevere reſtraint, and ſcarce "at laſt obtained his liberty upon the hard terms of "a thouſand pound bail, which burden Dr. Scarbo-"rough very honourably took upon himſelf. Under "theſe bonds he continued till the general redemp-"tion."

(22) *Life of Cowley.*

[*N*] *But Dr. Sprat endeavours to vindicate him from all imputations of that kind.*] He obſerves, that ſome perſons had attempted to bring Mr. Cowley's loyalty in queſtion upon occaſion of a few lines in the Preface to one of his Books; but that the real ſtate of the caſe was thus. Upon his coming over he found the condition of the Royal party very deſperate. He perceived the ſtrength of their enemies ſo united, that till it ſhould begin to break within itſelf, all endeavours againſt it were like to prove unſucceſsful. On the other ſide he beheld their zeal for the King's cauſe to be ſtill ſo active, that it often hurried them into inevitable ruin. He ſaw this with much grief. And though he approved their conſtancy as much as any man living, yet he found their unſeaſonable ſhewing it did only diſable themſelves, and give their adverſaries great advantages of riches and ſtrength by their defeats. He therefore believed, that it would be a meritorious ſervice to the King, if any man, who was known to have followed his intereſt, could inſinuate into the uſurper's minds, that men of his principles were now willing to be quiet, and could perſuade the poor oppreſſed Royaliſts to conceal their affections for better occaſions. And as for his own particular, he was a cloſe priſoner, when he wrote that againſt which the exception is made; ſo that he ſaw it was impoſſible for him to purſue the ends, for which he came thither, if he did not make ſome kind of declaration of his peaceable intentions. This was then his opinion; *and the ſucceſs of things*, ſays Dr. Sprat, *ſeems to prove, that it was not very ill grounded. For certainly it was one of the greateſt helps to the King's affairs about the latter end of that tyranny, that many of his beſt friends diſſembled their counſels, and acted the ſame deſigns under the diſguiſes and names of other parties.*

[*O*] *In* 1662 *he publiſhed his* two Books of Plants *in* 8vo, *reprinted at London in* 1668 *and* 1678 *with his other Latin Poems.*] He added *four Books of Plants* to the two former; and all his Latin Poems were printed in the edition of London 1678, in 8vo, with his picture before it, and a ſhort account of his Life in Latin by Dr. Sprat, under the following title: *Abrahami Cowleii Angli Poemata Latina; in quibus continentur ſex Libri Plantarum, viz. duo* { *Herbarum* / *Florum* / *Sylvarum* } *&* *unus Miſcellaneorum. Huic Editioni ſecundæ acceſſit Index rerum antehac deſideratus.* An Engliſh Tranſlation of the fifth book of Plants was printed at Lon-

eſt part of which had been ſpent in a various and tempeſtuous condition (o); and "not "finding, according to Mr. Wood (p), that preferment conferred upon him, which he "expected, while others for their money carried away moſt places, he retired diſcontented "into Surrey," where he ſpent the remaining part of his life in a private and ſtudious manner, chiefly at Chertſey, where he had a leaſe of a farm held of the Queen, procured for him by George Duke of Buckingham from the Earl of St. Alban's (q). Dr. Sprat, who repreſents his retirement as the effect of choice, and not of diſcontent, obſerves (r), that he obtained a plentiful eſtate by the favour of that Earl, and the bounty of the Duke of Buckingham; and that though he had frequent invitations to return to buſineſs, yet he never gave ear to any perſuaſions of profit or preferment. However the Writer of a Letter in the *Spectator* (s) tells us, "that though our Poet tells the ſtory of Aglaus (t) "with ſo much pleaſure, it was not till after frequent diſappointments that he termed "himſelf the *melancholy Cowley*, and he praiſed ſolitude, when he deſpaired of ſhining "in a Court." He died at a houſe called the Porch-Houſe towards the Weſt-end of Chertſey in Surrey July the 28th 1667, aged forty nine years; and his body being attended by a great number of perſons of the moſt eminent quality was interred Auguſt the third in Weſtminſter-Abbey near the aſhes of Chaucer and Spenſer, where a monument was erected to his memory in May 1675 by George Duke of Buckingham, with a Latin inſcription, written by his friend Dr. Thomas Sprat, afterwards Biſhop of Rocheſter (u). King Charles II, upon the news of his death, declared, that *Mr.* Cowley *had not left a better man behind him in England.* There have been many editions of his works [P]. He

(o) Idem, ibid.
(p) *Ubi ſupra.*
(q) Idem, ibid.
(r) *Ubi ſupra.*
(s) Num. 613. vol. 8. pag. 212. edit. London 1715 in 12mo.
(t) Printed among his *Eſſays in Verſe and Proſe.*
(u) Wood, col. 121.

don 1680 in 4°; and all the ſix books were tranſlated by ſeveral hands, and publiſhed at London in fol. Dr. Sprat obſerves (23) that in "his Latin Poems he has expreſ- "ſed to admiration all the numbers of verſes and fi- "gures of Poeſy, that are ſcattered up and down a- "mongſt the antients. There is hardly to be found "in them all any good faſhion of ſpeech or colour of "meaſure, but he has comprehended it, and given "inſtances of it, according as his ſeveral arguments "required either a majeſtic ſpirit, or a paſſionate, or "a pleaſant. This is the more extraordinary in that "it was never yet performed by any ſingle Poet of "the antient Romans themſelves. They had the "Language natural to them, and ſo might eaſily have "moulded it into what form or humour they pleaſed; "yet it was their conſtant cuſtom to confine all their "thoughts and practice to one or two ways of writ- "ing, as deſpairing ever to compaſs all together." The occaſion of his chooſing the ſubject of his ſix Books of Plants, was this: When he returned to England, he was adviſed to diſſemble the main intention of his coming over under the diſguiſe of applying himſelf to ſome ſettled profeſſion. And that of Phyſic was thought moſt proper. To this purpoſe, after many Anatomical diſſections, he proceeded to the conſideration of Plants; and having furniſhed himſelf with books of that nature, retired into a fruitful part of Kent, where every field and wood might ſhew him the real figures of thoſe Plants, of which he read. Thus he ſpeedily maſtered that part of the art of medicine. But then, as one of the Ancients did before him in the ſtudy of the Law, inſtead of employing his ſkill for practice and profit, he preſently digeſted it into that form, which we behold. *The two firſt books treat of* Herbs, *in a ſtyle reſembling the Elegies of Ovid and Tibullus in the ſweetneſs and freedom of verſe, but excelling them in the ſtrength of the fancy and vigour of the ſenſe. The* third *and* fourth *Diſcourſe of* Flowers *in all the variety of* Catullus *and* Horace's *numbers; for the laſt of which Authors he had a peculiar reverence, and imitated him not only in the ſtately and numerous pace of his Odes and Epodes, but in the familiar eaſineſs of his Epiſtles and Speeches. The two laſt ſpeak of* Trees *in the way of Virgil's* Georgics. *Of theſe the ſixth book is wholly dedicated to the honour of his country. For making the Britiſh Oak to preſide in the Aſſembly of the Foreſt-trees, upon that occaſion he enlarges on the hiſtory of our late troubles, the King's affliction and return, and the beginning of the Dutch war; and manages all in a ſtyle, that to ſay all in a word, is equal to the greatneſs and valour of the Engliſh Nation.* The Books of *Plants* are highly commended by the Author of *Alterius Delectus ſpecimen, ex nuperis maximè Poetis ab Electoribus prætermiſſis* (24), ſubjoined to *Epigrammatum Delectus ex omnibus tum veteribus tum recentioribus Poetis accuratè decerptus*; printed at London 1689 in 24°.

(23) *Life of Cowley.*
(24) Pag. 8. 1689, in 24°.

[P] *There have been many editions of his Works.*] There was an edition of them printed at London 1707 in two volumes in 8vo. In the laſt volume we have, *A propoſition for the advancement of experimental Philoſophy*; a *Diſcourſe by way of viſion concerning the government of* Oliver Cromwell; and *ſeveral Diſcourſes by way of Eſſays in verſe and proſe.* Dr. Sprat obſerves (25), that he intended theſe *Diſcourſes* as a *real character of his own thoughts upon the point of his retirement*; and deſigned to have added to them many others, and dedicated them all to the Earl of St. Alban's as a teſtimony of his entire reſpects to him, and *a kind of Apology for having left human affairs in the ſtrength of his age, while he might ſtill have been ſerviceable to his country.* The ſame Writer likewiſe informs us, that it was his reſolution during his retirement to ſearch into the ſecrets of divine and human knowledge, and betake himſelf to the ſtudy of nature; and that he intended to have publiſhed a Diſcourſe concerning Style, and taken a review of the principles of the primitive Church; which examination he purpoſed ſhould reach to our Saviour's and the Apoſtles Lives, and their immediate ſucceſſors for four or five Centuries, till intereſt and policy prevailed over devotion. He hoped to have abſolutely compaſs'd it in three or four years, and when that was done, there to have fixed for ever, without any ſhaking or alteration in his judgment. "Indeed, ſays Dr. Sprat, "it was a great damage to the Church that he lived "not to perform it. For very much of the primi- "tive light might have been expected from a mind, "that was endued with the primitive meekneſs and "innocence. And beſides ſuch a work coming from "one, that was no Divine, might have been very "uſeful for this age, wherein it is one of the princi- "pal cavils againſt Religion, that it is only a mat- "ter of intereſt, and only ſupported for the gain of "a particular profeſſion". In the *Miſcellany Poems* publiſhed by Mr. Dryden (26) we have *A Poem on the Civil War, begun in the year* 1641. *By Mr. Abraham Cowley. Not printed in any edition of his Works.* The publiſher tells the reader, that meeting accidentally with this Poem in Manuſcript, and being informed that it was a piece of the incomparable Mr. Abraham Cowley's, he thought it unjuſt to hide ſuch a treaſure from the world. "I remembered, "ſays he, that our Author in the preface to his "*Works*, makes mention of ſome Poems, written by "him on the late *Civil Wars*, of which the follow- "ing is unqueſtionably a part. In his moſt imper- "fect and unfiniſhed pieces you will diſcover the "hand of ſo great a maſter. And (whatever his "own modeſty might have adviſed to the contrary) "there is not one careleſs ſtroke of his but what "ſhould be kept ſacred to all poſterity. He could "write nothing that was not worth the preſerving, "being habitually a Poet, and always inſpired. In "this piece the judicious reader will find the turn "of verſe to be his; the ſame copious and lively "imagery of fancy, the ſame warmth of paſſion and

(25) *Life of Cowley.*
(26) Part 3. pag. 225, & ſeqq. edit. 4. London 1716.

He was a man of a very amiable character [Q], as well as an admirable genius [R]. The *Spectator* tells us (*t*), that our Author's "magnanimity is as much above that of other con-
"siderable men as his underſtanding; and it is a true diſtinguiſhing ſpirit in the elegant
"Author, who publiſhed his Works, to dwell ſo much upon the temper of his mind and
"delicacy of wit that ſparkles in all his writings.
"And certainly no labour of a genius ſo rich in its
"ſelf and ſo cultivated with Learning and Manners,
"can prove an unwelcome preſent to the world."
This Poem had been printed at London 1679, in 4to.

(*t*) Num. 114. vol. 2. pag. 118. 2d edit. London 1713.

[Q] *He was a man of a very amiable character.*] He had a perfect natural goodneſs, which neither the uncertainties of his condition, nor the largeneſs of his wit could pervert. Nothing vain or fantaſtical, nothing flattering or inſolent appeared in his humour. He had great integrity and plainneſs of manners. There was nothing affected or ſingular in his habit, perſon, or geſture. In his ſpeech neither the pleaſantneſs excluded gravity, nor was the ſobriety of it inconſiſtent with delight. None but his intimate friends ever diſcovered he was a great Poet by his diſcourſe. His learning was large and profound, well compoſed of all antient and modern knowledge. But it ſate exceedingly cloſe and handſomly upon him; it was not imboſs'd in his mind, but enamell'd. He never guided his life by the whiſpers or opinions of the world; yet he had a great reverence for a good [reputation. He was a paſſionate lover of liberty and freedom from reſtraint both in actions and words. But what honeſty others receive from the direction of Laws, he had by native inclination; and he was not beholden to other men's wills, but to his own, for his innocence. He performed all his natural and civil duties with admirable tenderneſs. His friendſhips were inviolable. His thoughts were never above nor below his condition. He was accompliſhed [with all manner of abilities for the greateſt buſineſs, if he would but have thought ſo himſelf (27).

(27) Dr. Sprat.

[R] *As well as admirable genius.*] We ſhall give the judgment of ſeveral Writers upon it. Sir John Denham gives the following character of it (28).

(28) Denham's Poems, pag. 90, 91. of the 3d edit.

Old mother Wit and Nature gave
Shakeſpear *and* Fletcher *what they have:*
In Spencer *and in* Johnſon *art*
Of flower Nature got the ſtart.
(29) Cowley. *But both in* him (29) *ſo equal are,*
None knows, which bears the happieſt ſhare:
To him no Author was unknown,
Yet what he wrote was all his own.
He melted not the antient gold,
Nor with Ben Johnſon *did make bold*
To plunder all the Roman ſtores
Of Poets and of Orators.
Horace *his wit and* Virgil's *ſtate*
He did not ſteal, but emulate;
And when he would like them appear,
Their garb, but not their cloaths, did wear.

(29) Cowley.

In the *Seſſion of the Poets* printed in the *Miſcellany Poems publiſhed by Mr. Dryden* (30), we have the following lines upon our Author.

(30) Part 2. pag. 90, & *ſeqq.* 4th edit. London 1716.

Savoy-*miſſing* (31), Cowley *came into the Court,*
Making apologies for his bad Play;
Ev'ry one gave him ſo good a report,
That Apollo *gave heed to all he could ſay.*
Nor would he have had, 'tis thought, a rebuke,
Unleſs he had done ſome notable folly:
Writ verſes unjuſtly in praiſe of Sam. Tuke (32),
Or printed his pitiful Melancholy.

(31) See above in the Text of this Article.

(32) Mr. Cowley wrote a copy of verſes in commendation of Sir *Samuel Tuke's Adventures of Five Hours*, printed at London 1662, in 4to.

Mr. Addiſon (33) writes of him as follows:

(33) *Account of the greateſt Engliſh Poets.* To Mr. H. S. April 3, 1689.

"Great *Cowley* then, a mighty genius, wrote,
"O'er-run with wit, and laviſh of his thought:
"His turns too cloſely on the reader preſs:
"He more had pleas'd us, had he pleas'd us leſs.
"One glitt'ring thought no ſooner ſtrikes our eyes
"With ſilent wonder, but new wonders riſe.
"As in the Milky-way a ſhining white
"O'erflows the heav'ns with one continued light;
"That not a ſingle ſtar can ſhew his rays,
"Whilſt jointly all promote the common blaze.
"Pardon, great Poet, that I dare to name
"Th' unnumber'd beauties of thy verſe with blame.
"Thy fault is only wit in its exceſs,
"But wit like thine in any ſhape will pleaſe.
"What muſe but thine cou'd equal hints inſpire,
"And fit the deep-mouth'd Pindar to thy lyre?
"Pindar, whom others, in a labour'd ſtrain
"And forc'd expreſſion, imitate in vain.
"Well-pleas'd in thee he ſoars with new delight,
"And plays in more unbounded verſe, and takes a nobler flight."

Mr. Addiſon (34) having obſerved that Mr. Locke in his *Eſſay of Human Underſtanding* has given us the beſt account of Wit in ſhort, that can any where be met with, defining *Wit to lie in the aſſemblage of Ideas, and putting thoſe together with quickneſs and variety, wherein can be found any reſemblance or congruity, thereby to make up pleaſant pictures and agreeable viſions in the fancy*; and that *true wit generally conſiſts in the likeneſs of ideas, and is more or leſs wit, as this likeneſs in ideas is more ſurprizing and unexpected*; tells us, that beſides this *true* wit, which is *a ſimilitude in Ideas*, and *falſe wit*, which is only a *ſimilitude in words*, there is another of a middle nature, that has ſomething of both in it; and that Ovid is the greateſt admirer of this *mixed wit* of all the Antients, as Cowley is among the Moderns. He explains the nature of this mixed wit in this manner (35). "When
"in two ideas, that have ſome reſemblance with each
"other, and are both expreſſed by the ſame word,
"we make uſe of the ambiguity of the word to
"ſpeak that of one idea included under it, which is
"proper to the other. Thus, for example, moſt
"languages have hit on the word, which properly
"ſignifies fire, to expreſs love by (and therefore we
"may be ſure there is ſome reſemblance in the ideas
"mankind have of them;) from hence the witty
"Poets of all languages, when they have once cal-
"led Love a Fire, conſider it no longer as the paſſion,
"but ſpeak of it under the notion of a real fire; and
"as the turn of wit requires, make the ſame word
"in the ſame ſentence ſtand for either of the ideas
"that is annexed to it. When *Ovid's Apollo* falls in
"love, he burns with a new flame; when the Sea-
"nymphs languiſh with this paſſion, they kindle in
"the water: the Greek Epigrammatiſt fell in love
"with one, that flung a ſnow ball at him, and there-
"fore takes occaſion to admire how fire could be
"thus concealed in ſnow. In ſhort, whenever the
"Poet feels any thing in his love that reſembles
"ſomething in fire, he carries on this agreement
"into a kind of allegory; but if, as in the preceding
"inſtances, he finds any circumſtance in his love con-
"trary to the nature of fire, he calls his love a fire,
"and by joining this circumſtance to it ſurpriſes his
"reader with a ſeeming contradiction". The ſame Author writes to this purpoſe in another of his works (36), and having ſtated the notion of *mixt wit*, tells us, that "it abounds in Cowley more than in any other
"Author that ever wrote"; and remarks, that as the paſſion of love in its nature has been thought to reſemble fire, the witty Poets have therefore taken an advantage from the doubtful meaning of the word fire to make an infinite number of witticiſms. Mr. Addiſon illuſtrates this by remarking, that Cowley obſerving the cold regard of his miſtreſs's eyes, and at the ſame time their power of producing love in him, conſiders them as burning-glaſſes made of ice; and finding himſelf able to live in the greateſt extremities of love, concludes the Torrid Zone to be habitable. When his miſtreſs has read his Letter written in juice of Lemon by holding it to the fire, he deſires her to read it over a ſecond time by love's flames. When ſhe weeps, he wiſhes it were inward heat that diſtilled thoſe drops from the Limbeck. When ſhe is abſent

(34) Notes on his *Tranſlations from Ovid's Metamorphoſes*; publiſhed in his *Miſcellaneous Works*, vol. 1. pag. 248, 249. edit. London 1726, in 12mo.

(35) Ibid. pag. 249.

(36) *Spectator*, vol. 1. num. 62.

" and the moderation of his desires. By this means he has rendered his friend as amiable " as famous."

sent he is beyond eighty, that is, thirty degrees nearer the Pole than when she is with him. His ambitious love is a fire, that naturally mounts upwards; his happy love is the beams of heaven, and his unhappy love flames of hell. When it does not let him sleep, it is a flame, that sends up no smoke; when it is opposed by counsel and advice, it is a fire, that rages the more by the winds blowing upon it. Upon the dying of a tree, in which he had cut his loves, he observes that his written flames had burnt up and withered the tree. When he resolves to give over his passion, he tells us, that one burnt like him, for ever dreads the fire. His heart is an Ætna, that instead of *Vulcan's* shop incloses *Cupid's* forge in it. His endeavouring to drown his love in wine, is throwing oil upon the fire. He would insinuate to his mistress, that the fire of love, like that of the Sun (which produces so many living creatures) should not only warm, but beget. Love in another place cooks pleasure at his fire. Sometimes the Poet's heart is frozen in every breast, and sometimes scorched in every eye. Sometimes he is drowned in tears, and burnt in love, like a ship set on fire in the middle of the Sea.

" The reader may observe, *concludes Mr. Addison*, " in every one of these instances, that the Poet mixes " the qualities of fire with those of love; and in the " same sentence speaking of it both as a passion and " as a real fire, surprizes the reader with these seeming resemblances or contradictions, that make up " all the wit in this kind of writing. Mixt wit " therefore is a composition of pun and true wit, and " is more or less perfect, as the resemblance lies in " the ideas or in the words. Its foundations are " partly laid in falshood and partly in truth: reason " puts in her claim for one half, and extravagance " for the other. The only province therefore for " this kind of wit is epigram, or those little occasional Poems, that in their own nature are nothing " else but a tissue of epigrams. I cannot conclude " this head of *mixt wit*, without owning, that the " admirable Poet, out of whom I have taken the examples of it, had as much true wit, as any Author " that ever writ, and indeed all other talents of an " extraordinary genius." T

CRANTOR, a Greek Philosopher and Poet [*A*], was born at Solos in Cilicia. He left his native country, where he was admired, and went to Athens, and there studied with Polemon under Xenocrates (*a*) [*B*]. Polemon succeeding Xenocrates in the Academy towards the end of the 116th Olympiad (*b*), had the pleasure to see amongst his scholars the same Crantor, who had been formerly his fellow-disciple. This was a great honour to him, for the scholar was learned enough to teach Philosophy; and the world was so sensible of it, that when during a sickness he retired into the temple of Æsculapius (*c*), several persons resorted thither, with an intention to study under him, imagining that he designed to establish a school there. Arcesilaus, his favourite, did not go thither with the same view, but because he hoped, that Crantor would recommend him effectually to Polemon. He obtained what he desired, and Crantor was so far from being angry with his petition, that as soon as he was recovered, he became himself one of Polemon's disciples (*d*). He was considered as one of the chief supporters of the Platonic Sect [*C*], and he was the first who wrote Commentaries upon Plato's Works (*e*). If he did not explain other things more clearly, than he did what relates to the nature of our soul (*f*), he wanted a new Commentator himself as well as Plato. He wrote a book of Consolation, which is lost, and was very much esteemed [*D*]. He was not very old when he

(a) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 24. Instead of *Polemon*, we read *Philemon* in Moreri.

(b) *See* Diog. Laert. *in Xenocrate*, lib. 4. num. 14.

(c) Idem, ibid.

(d) Laert. ibid. num. 25.

(e) Πρῶτος τῶν Πλατώνος ἐξηγητής. Proclus, lib. 1. *in Timæum*, *apud* Menagium, *Not. in Diog. Laert.* lib. 4. num. 27.

(f) See his opinions upon this subject in Plutarch's Treatise. Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονίας, pag. 1012, &c.

[*A*] *He was a Greek . . . Poet.*] It is observed, that after he had sealed up his Poems, he lodged them in the Temple of Minerva at Solos (1). Compare this with what I have said of Heraclitus in the Remark [*E*] of the article EURIPIDES.

(1) Diogen. Laert. lib. 4. num. 25.

[*B*] *He studied with Polemon under Xenocrates.*] Charles Stephens, Lloyd and Hofman should not have said, that he was Plato's disciple with Xenocrates and Polemon.

[*C*] *He was considered as one of the chief supporters of the Platonic Sect.*] Cicero affords me the proof of this in the following words. *Crantor ille, qui in nostra Academia vel in primis fuit nobilis* (2). i. e. " Crantor, " who was eminent even amongst the most illustrious " of our Academy." He seldom forgets him, when he mentions Plato's first successors. *Speusippus Platonis sororis filius, & Xenocrates, qui Platonem audierat, & qui Xenocratem Polemo & Crantor, nihil ab Aristotele, qui una audierat Platonem magnopere dissensit . . . . Arcesilas primum &c* (3). Observe by the way, that this passage may serve to confute the Authors of Dictionaries, whom I have censured in the foregoing Remark. They assert that Xenocrates and Polemon introduced new doctrines into Plato's School. You will find the whole passage of Cicero in the article ARCESILAUS (4), with some other passages (5), which confirm what I ascribe to the Roman Orator, and if you have a mind to know, how much Crantor was esteemed, read the following lines from Horace,

(2) Cicero, *Tusculan.* lib. 3. cap. 6.

(3) Idem, *De Orat.* lib. 3. cap. 18.

(4) Quotation (42) of the Article ARCESILAUS.

(5) Add to them a passage from the book *de Finib.* lib. 5. cap. 1.

Qui quid sit pulcrum, quid justum, quid utile, quid non
Plenius ac melius Chrysippo & Crantore dicit (6).

This is said of Homer.

(6) Horat. Epist. 2. lib. 1. ver. 3.

[*D*] *He wrote a Book of Consolation, which . . . was very much esteemed.*] It is quoted under that title in the first Book of the Tusculan Questions. *Simile quiddam est in Consolatione Crantoris* (7). What follows in Cicero proves, that Crantor did not forget the common topic of men's miseries, which indeed cannot be well omitted in a work upon that subject. Is it possible to argue against a father, who laments the death of his children? is it possible, I say, to collect arguments in order to comfort him, without remembring to what misfortunes the life of man is subject, and which an infinite number of persons would have escaped, had they not lived long? Here follows an Answer, which a father received by an Oracle from the dead (8).

(7) Cicero, *Tuscul.* 1. cap. 48.

(8) *Psychomanteum.*

Ignaris homines in vita mentibus errant.
Euthynous potitur fatorum munere læto,
Sic fuit utilius finire ipsique tibique.

You weep for the death of a son, and you ask what is the cause of so great a misfortune: know then, that men are ignorant. He enjoys the blessed favour, which fate bestowed upon him; it was both his interest and yours, that he should leave this world (9). You have there a passage from Crantor's Book. I believe the title of his work was περὶ πένθους *de Luctu* (concerning grief:) for thus Diogenes Laertius gives it; I shall quote his own words, because they contain a very great commendation: Θαυμάζεται δὲ αὐτῆ μάλιστα βιβλίον τὸ περὶ πένθους (10). i. e. " His Book concerning mour- " ning (11) is chiefly admired." I must quote the following passage for the same reason. *Legimus omnes Crantoris veteris Academici de Luctu, est enim non magnus verum aureolus, & ut Tuberoni Panætius præcipit, ad verbum ediscendus libellus* (12). i. e " We have " read the treatise of mourning, written by Crantor " of the ancient Academy. It is not indeed a large " book, but worth its weight in gold, and it deserves

(9) *Apud* Cic. *Tuscul.* 1. cap. 48. *ex* Crantor. Plutarch relates this more at length, *De Consolatione*, pag. 109; tho' he does not quote Crantor.

(10) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 27.

(11) Thus it must be translated, and not concerning *pain* or *grief* (douleur) as Moreri has done.

(12) Cicero, *Academic. Quæst.* lib. 4. cap. 44.

he died (g) of a dropsy (h). He left his estate to Arcesilaus; it amounted to twelve talents (i). It is not true, as some have asserted (k), that *he taught in the Academy after the death of Crates the Philosopher*, for he died before Crates and Polemon (l).

(g) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 25.
(h) Idem, ibid. num. 27.
(i) Idem, ibid. num. 25.
(k) Monsr. Foucher, pag. 28. of his *Histoire de la Philosophie des Academiciens.*
(l) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 27.

" to be learnt by heart word for word, as Panætius advises Tubero." It will be of some use to observe on what occasion this was said: it was in order to prove, that the ancient Academy did not teach the Indolence or Insensibility, which was a part of the Stoic's System. One of the persons introduced by Cicero proves the contrary, by this little Book of Crantor; and it is certain that this Philosopher did not approve the doctrine of the Stoicks, and asserted, that the being free from all passions would cost too dear, since we could not obtain it, but by making the body senseless, and the soul savage. Μὴ γὰρ νοσοῖμεν (φησὶν ὁ Ἀκαδημαϊκὸς Κράντωρ) νοσήσασι δὲ παρεῖη τὰς αἰσθήσεις εἴτ' ὑπ' ἰτέμνοιτό τι τῶν ἡμετέρων, εἴτ' ἀποσπῶτο. Τὸ γὰρ ἀνώδυνον τοῦτο οὐκ ἄνευ μεγάλων ἰσχύσεται μισθῶν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τιθηριῶσθαι γὰρ εἰκὸς, ἐκεῖ μὲν σῶμα τοιοῦτον, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ψυχήν (13). That is, " It were to be wished (says Crantor the Academick) " that we were never sick. But if we are sick, we " cannot but have a sense of it; whether some part " of our body be cut or torn off. For such an insen- " sibility cannot be obtained without a great detri- " ment to man; for his body and soul must first be " entirely made savage and wild." Cicero has related the same reflection of Crantor. See the margin (14).

(13) Plutarch. *De Consolatione*, pag. 102. D.

(14) *Minime*, inquit (Crantor) *assentior his, qui istam nescio quam indolentiam magnopere laudant, quæ nec potest ulla esse, nec debet. Nec ægroto etiam, inquit, nisi it, qui fuerat sensus, adsit, sive secetur, quid sive avellatur a corpore. Nam istud nihil dolere, non sine magna mercede, contingit immanitatis in animo, stuporis in Corpore.* Cicero, *Tuscul. Quæst.* lib. 3. cap. 6.

We learn from Plutarch, that Crantor composed this Book in order to comfort Hippocles, who had lost his children (15). Plutarch borrowed some reflections from this Treatise, which he employed in his work upon Consolation, addressed to Apollonius. This same Book of Crantor was of great use to Cicero, who extracted several things from it, when he wrote upon the same subject: He owned it, and therefore Pliny did not rank him amongst the Plagiaries. *Scio enim*, says he (16), *conferentem auctores me deprehendisse a juratissimis & proximis veteres transcriptos ad verbum, neque nominatos: non illa Virgiliana virtute ut certarent, non Ciceroniana simplicitate, qui in libris de Republica Platonis se comitem profitetur; in Consolatione filiæ Crantorem, inquit, sequor.* i. e. " For I know, that " by comparing Authors, I have found that the most " credible writers, and they who come next to them, " have transcribed the Ancients word for word, and " even, without quoting them. They have not imi- " tated Virgil's sincerity, nor Cicero's plain-dealing; " who in his Book concerning the Commonwealth " owns that he follows Plato, and in his *Consolatio* " (Comfort) to his daughter, I imitate Crantor, says " he." Father Hardouin observes in his Note upon these words of Pliny, that Cicero said, Crantor intitled his work *De luctu minuendo*. But it is certain, that in the passage (17) quoted by this learned Jesuit, Cicero speaks of his own work, and not of Crantor's. Monsieur Dacier asserts (18), that Cicero had the following words in his *Consolation*. *Sed ego Crantorem sequor, cujus legi brevem illum quidem, sed vere aureum, & ut Panætio placuit, ad verbum ediscendum de Luctu librum, qui acutè universam doloris medicinam complexus est.* He supposes, that this passage is different from that in the second Book of his *Academick Questions*. I have not met with it in the fragments, which have been collected in the Book *de Consolatione*, but it is to be found in the Book, which Sigonius would pass upon the world, with the same title, for Cicero's work. Monsr. Dacier is not perhaps of the same opinion with those Criticks, who thought that Sigonius endeavoured to impose upon the publick. Observe, that one of the Reflections, which Cicero borrowed from Crantor, is, that we come into the world in order to atone for our sins. *Cicero, cum in principio Consolationis suæ dixisset, luendorum scelerum causa nasci homines; iteravit id ipsum postea, quasi objurgans eum, qui vitam pœnam non esse putet* (19). i. e. " Cicero " having said in his *Consolatio*, that men are born to " atone for their sins; repeated the same thing after- " wards, as tho' he would reprove them, who denied " this life to be a punishment." Compare this with the following Greek passage from Plutarch, and you will find, that I am in the right. Πολλοῖς γὰρ καὶ σοφοῖς ἀνδράσιν (ὡς φησι Κράντωρ) ὀ γὺν ἀλλὰ πάλαι κέκλαυσαι τ' ἀνθρώπινα, τιμιφίαν ἡγεμένους εἶναι τὸν βίον, καὶ ἀρχὴν τὸ γένεσθ' ἀνθρώπον συμφορὰν τὴν μεγίστην (20). i. e. " A great many wise men, as Crantor asserts, " have not only of late, but even long ago bewailed " the condition of mankind, being of opinion, that " this life is a punishment, and that to be born was " the greatest misfortune." The learned Casaubon had not took notice of Pliny's words, which I have quoted; for in order to confirm his conjecture, that Cicero had made use of Crantor's book, he quotes only St. Jerom. *Eum libellum . . . dubium non est, quin in suo de Consolatione magnam partem expressisset* (Cicero), *quod & Hieronymus his verbis testatur.* Legimus, *inquit*, Crantorem, cujus volumen ad confovendum dolorem suum secutus est Cicero (21). i. e. " It is certain, " that Cicero transcribed a great part of that Book in " his *Treatise of Consolation*; as St. Jerom witnesses " in the following words; *We have read Crantor*, " says he, whose Book Cicero imitated, in order to " cherish his grief."

(15) Plutarch. *De Consolat.* pag. 104, *B.*
(16) Plin. *in Præfat.*
(17) Epist. 21. lib. 12. *ad Attic.* It is the 20th in Grævius's edition.
(18) Dacier, *sur la 2 Epitre du 1 Livre d'Horace*, pag. m. 142, 143. *de viii tome.*
(19) Lactant. lib. 3. cap. 18. pag. m. 197.
(20) Plutarch. *De Consolat.* pag. 115, B.
(21) If. Casaubon. *Not. Diog. Laert.* lib. 4. num. 27.

CRATERUS, the Author of a book, the loss of which ought to be regretted [*A*], was a Macedonian (*a*). We must not however believe with Vossius, that he is the same Craterus

(a) Plutarch. *in Aristide, sub finem*, pag. 234, F.

[*A*] *He was the author of a Book, the loss of which ought to be regretted.*] It was a Collection of the Decrees of the Athenians (1). How many difficulties might be solved by that Book, if it were extant? How many particulars should we not find there concerning the great men, who were banished, or otherwise ill-used in that famous Commonwealth. Craterus was a very accurate Writer; he related the form of the accusation and the judgment, which had been given, and quoted the Authors, who furnished him with these materials (2). There is even room to believe, that he had inserted the Treaties of Peace entire into his work (3). I believe Mr. de Maussac would have bought such a Book, tho' it had cost never so much, notwithstanding all the scorn and indignation he seems to have for the modern compilers of Decrees and Sentences (4). *Hodie*, says he, *nos hujusmodi homines e rivio vocamus* Collecteurs d'Arrests; *ad quorum nugas & somnia excudenda & typis mandanda divina hæc excudendi Ars potius inventa videtur, quam ad seria & non ita futiles doctorum virorum lucubrationes, posteris imperitiam hujus sæculi hominum miraturis, & typographorum avaritiam contempturis relinquendas* (5). i. e. " That common sort of men we call in French " *Collecteurs d'Arrets*, (Compilers of Decrees:) and it " seems that the noble Art of Printing was invented " to usher into the world their trifles and dreams, ra- " ther than to publish the least idle and more serious " lucubrations of learned Men; whence it will happen " that posterity will wonder at the ignorance of this " Age, and despise the covetousness of our Booksel- " lers."

(1) Schol. Aristoph. *in Ran. Act.* 1. *Sc.* 7.
(2) Τούτων οὐδὲν ἔγραψεν ὁ Κράτερος τεκμήριον παρέσχεν, οὔτε δίκην οὔτε ψήφισμα, καίτοι, εἰ δεῖ γράφειν τὰ τοιαῦτα, καὶ παρατίθεσθαι τοὺς ἱστοροῦντας. Plutarch. *in Aristide*, pag. 335, A.
(3) *See* Plutarch. *in Cimone*, pag. 487, A. and above, quotation (83) of the article CIMON.
(4) You will find in *Furetiere's Dictionary* the names of several of such Compilers under the word *Arrestegraphe.*
(5) Maussac, *Not. in Harpocrat. voce* Ἀρκτῶσαι.

AN objection upon the complaints made against the Booksellers.

Observe by the by, that it is no new thing to hear the learned complain, that the Booksellers choose rather to print bad than good Books. We should not complain of the Booksellers, but of the Readers; for if the Booksellers found their account as well in the printing of good Books as they do the printing of others, I do not doubt but they would prefer good copies before bad ones. I call those Books good, which are so really in themselves, and not those which are good only in the Bookseller's style.

You will find this confirmed by Monsieur Du Pin. " There are an infinite number of small French Books " published every day, and there is scarce one ancient " Book either Greek or Latin printing. It is true, " the Booksellers say it is not their fault, but that of " the public: That the former sell well, and they " get estates by them, whereas the latter rot in their " shops, and they are often ruined by them. We must " therefore blame the men of this Age for this, who " are become capricious, and having lost all taste

" for

Craterus, who had a great ſhare in Alexander's friendſhip [*B*]. It is ſurpriſing that Pinedo knew nothing of him, but what he found in Voſſius [*C*]. Moreri has been very much miſtaken, with regard to CRATERUS, Alexander's favourite (*b*).

(*b*) See the Remark [*B*].

" for antiquity, like nothing, but what is new. True " and ſolid learning is out of date, and men are ſa- " tisfied, if they do but know things ſuperficially. " They do not ſtudy thoroughly, they learn antiqui- " ty in modern Authors, and ſeldom conſult the ori- " ginals. This is a ſad miſfortune for the Republick " of Letters, and it is much to be feared, that this " ſuperficial way of ſtudying will at laſt throw us in- " to a worſe condition, than the ignorance of former " times was (6)."

(6) Du Pin, *Nouvell. Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* tom. 2. pag. 200. Dutch edition.

[*B*] *We muſt not believe with Voſſius, that he is the ſame Craterus, who had a great ſhare in Alexander's friendſhip.*] I wonder Voſſius could propoſe ſuch a conjecture as this is. *Suſpicor eſſe eum ipſum, qui cum Alexandro M. militavit, de quo ſequenti libro dicemus* (7). He offers the ſame conjecture again, when he ſpeaks of the Craterus, who accompanied Alexander. *Fortaſſe idem eſt ille Craterus Macedo, de quo inter incertæ ætatis ſcriptores dictum fuit libro tertio* (8). He had quoted Strabo, who mentions a certain Letter of Craterus to his mother Ariſtopatra, and who ſays, that this Letter contains ſeveral incredible things, which do not agree with any other account (9). This relates to the Indies. I am apt to believe, that this Letter was ſuppoſititious: for tho' it be poſſible, that the favourite of a great Monarch, and one of the chief Commanders of a Conqueror's Army, ſhould divert himſelf with writing a Letter full of falſe ſtories, yet I do not think it probable, that he ſhould write ſuch things to his own mother. I think it much leſs probable, that a great Lord like Craterus, eminent in the ſhare he had in Alexander's conqueſt and friendſhip, ſhould reſolve to make a collection of all the Decrees of the Athenians, with all their circumſtances, and all the neceſſary quotations. This was a Lawyer's Province; it required a man covered with the duſt of Regiſters and ancient Records, and not with the duſt that comes from roads and camps. As for an hiſtory of Alexander's actions, an account of his campaigns, it is another thing; I own that Craterus, that Conqueror's favourite, might have gained a great reputation that way; and he really applied himſelf to it, if we may depend upon Moreri. *Craterus*, ſays he, *gave great proofs of his wit, by the beautiful works he wrote concerning Alexander's conqueſts. Strabo, who mentions them, quotes in his fifteenth Book a Letter of Craterus.* This is ſuppoſing, that Strabo diſtinguiſhes this Letter from the Account of Alexander's Conqueſts: but this is falſe; for he mentions only that Letter. Freinſhemius indeed ranks Craterus amongſt the Hiſtorians of Alexander; but we need only conſider how he expreſſes himſelf, to be ſatisfied, that we know nothing of this. *Craterus cum ſub Alexandro res gereret, ejus hiſtoriam dicitur conſcripſiſſe* (10). i. e. " It is ſaid, that when Craterus ſerved un- " der Alexander, he wrote his Hiſtory." Voſſius, the only Author, whom Moreri had examined, ſpeaks only of the Letter mentioned by Strabo, ſo that all we can affirm, is, that Craterus wrote a Letter concerning the Wonders of the Indies. For my part, I cannot but think it ſpurious. I alſo think, that if this Craterus had made the compilation of the Decrees of the Athenians, Plutarch or ſome of the Authors, who quote it, would have mentioned the employment he had under Alexander the Great, and that ſince they do not mention it, their ſilence is an argument againſt Voſſius.

(7) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Græc.* lib. 3. pag. 347.

(8) Idem, ibid. lib. 4. pag. 462.

(9) Ἐκδίδοται δέ τις καὶ Κρατέρου πρὸς τὴν μητέρα Ἀριστοπάτραν ἐπιστολὴ, πολλά τε ἄλλα παράδοξα φράζουσα, καὶ οὐχ ὁμολογοῦσα οὐδενί. Strabo, lib. 15. pag. 484.

(10) Freinſhem. *Prolegom. ad Q. Curtium*, cap. 4.

[*C*] . . . . *Pinedo knew nothing of him, but what he found in Voſſius.*] What Voſſius has ſaid of Craterus, the Collector of Decrees, amounts to this; that Plutarch cites him for his voucher; that Stephanus Bizantinus quoted the third and ninth Book of his Decrees (11), and that Harpocration under the word Ἀνδρων, quotes the ſame work (12). Pinedo, having ſet down the places where Stephanus Bizantinus quotes Craterus, and a paſſage, where the quotation was wrong, refers us to Voſſius, and owns frankly, that he muſt ſtop there (13). I am certain, he would not have ſtopt there, had he been acquainted with Mauſſac's Obſervations. This learned critic obſerves, that the Tranſcribers have often changed the name of *Craterus* into *Carterus* (14), and inſtances in the following words of Pollux (15). Καρτέρῳ πιστεύειν τῷ τὰ ψηφίσματα συναγαγόντι; he corrects a blunder of the Tranſlator, who inſtead of ſaying *to believe Craterus the compiler of the Decrees, Cratero fidem habere, qui decreta in unum collegit*, tranſlates, *to believe Carterus who gathered the Votes, Carterio fidem habere ſuffragia poſcenti.* He corrects a conſiderable error in Suidas; Craterus's ninth Book of Sophiſms is there quoted (16). Thus it is that Books are multiplied; how many perſons are there, who would think, that beſides the Compilation of Decrees, Craterus alſo made a Compilation of Sophiſms? The changing of one ſyllable might occaſion this error (17). Mauſſac alſo conjectures, that inſtead of Κρατίνῳ ἐν τοῖς ψηφίσμασι, we ſhould read Κρατέρῳ (18) in a paſſage of Harpocration (19). It is true, that he alſo thinks, that Cratinus, the Comic Poet, wrote perhaps a Play intitled, ψηφίσματα (the Decrees). Valeſius declared, that we muſt write Craterus inſtead of Cratinus (20). Here follows ſomething that deſerves more attention, Mauſſac obſerves, that Alexis compoſed a Poem againſt Craterus, juſt ſo, ſays he, as Ariſtotle wrote one againſt Hermias (21). I will not inſiſt much upon two ſmall blunders that are here, and which Henricus Valeſius did not obſerve: the one, that he ſhould have ſaid *Alexinus* and not *Alexis*; the other, that Ariſtotle wrote a Hymn to the honour of and not againſt Hermias. Let this paſs: but we muſt obſerve, that Mauſſac's Remark affords ſome means to gueſs at the time in which Craterus lived, and which Voſſius did not dare to determine even by gueſs. After what manner ſoever Athenæus's words are explained, it ſeems, that we may infer from them, that Craterus and Alexinus were contemporaries; for it is not probable, that Alexinus would have written a Poem either for or againſt Craterus, if he had never had any correſpondence with him. Παιὰν δ' ἐστὶ κατ' αὐτοῦ εἰς Κρατερὸν τὸν Μακεδόνα γραφείς, ὃν ἐποιήσατο Ἀλεξῖνος ὁ διαλεκτικὸς . . . ᾄδεται δὲ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς κιθαριζομένου γέ τινος παιδός (22). i. e. " There " is a Hymn written againſt Craterus the Macedonian, " which Alexinus the Dialectician compoſed. It is " ſung at Delphos, whilſt a child plays upon the lyre." I know that Alexinus, being a great diſputer (23), and a ſubtle dialectician, would have attacked the dead and the living, if the queſtion had been with regard to Philoſophy (24). But this was not Craterus's caſe. Now if he lived in the time of Alexinus, we may place him towards the 120th Olympiad. For Alexinus was Eubulides's diſciple, who was contemporary with Ariſtotle. See Diogenes Laertius's ſecond Book, *Num.* 109. But Valeſius overthrows here the foundation of our building (25). He pretends that Mauſſac is miſtaken in ſuppoſing that the Craterus in the paſſage from Athenæus in the Compiler of the Decrees. It is againſt Craterus the ſucceſſor of Alexander, ſays he, that the Poem was written. He does not ſupport this aſſertion with any argument, and cites no authority. Many things might be ſaid for and againſt his opinion, but this would be diſputing without hopes of diſcovering any thing certain. Some perſon, who has leiſure, will perhaps endeavour to clear up this point. I ſhall cloſe this remark with obſerving, that the Scholiaſt upon Ariſtophanes quotes our Craterus twice at leaſt, with regard to the ſentence, which was given againſt the impious Diogenes. See the article DIAGORAS (26).

(11) *Citat tertium & nonum è Crateri Libris, περὶ ψηφισμάτων, de Scitis ſive Decretis.* Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* pag. 347.

(12) Idem, pag. 462.

(13) *See* Voſſium, *de Hiſt. Græcis, lib.* 3, *& lib.* 4. *cap.* 9. *Ego enim nihil de illo memoratu dignum habeo dicere.* Pinedo, *in Steph.* pag. 759.

(14) Mauſſac, *in Harpocrat. Voce* Ἀνδρων.

(15) Lib. 8. cap. 10.

(16) *In voce* Νύμφαιον. I do not find that error in Æmilius Portus's edition of Suidas, printed at Geneva in 1619.

(17) *Non σοφίσματα ſed ψηφίσματα Craterus ille congerat.* Mauſſac, *in Harpocrat. voce* Ἀνδρων.

(18) Mauſſac ſhould have written Κρατερῷ.

(19) *In* Ἀρκτινοσας.

(20) Valeſ. *Not. in Not. Mauſſac*, pag. 99.

(21) Mauſſac, *in* Harpocrat. *Voce* Νύμφαιον.

(22) Athen. lib. 15. pag. 606.

(23) He was ſurnamed *the Dialectician*, as appears from Athenæus's words, which I have juſt now quoted. *See* Diog. Laert. lib. 2. in Euclid. num. 109.

(24) Jonſius, lib. 2. cap. 2. ſays, that Alexinus wrote againſt Ariſtotle: he cites Hierocles and Hermippus. He is miſtaken with regard to the latter. Hermippus, ſays lib. 1. *de Ariſtotele apud Athenæum lib.* 15. *cap.* 16. *Alexini in Ariſtotelem petulantiam notat.* Athenæus does not relate this.

(25) Valeſius, *Not. in Notas Mauſſaci*, pag. 99.

(26) Surnamed the *Atheiſt*, at the end of the remark [*D*].

CRATIPPUS, a Peripatetick Philoſopher, had a very great reputation [*A*]. He was

[*A*] *He had a very great reputation.*] This appears by Cicero's words. *Cratippus Peripateticorum omnium, quos quidem ego audierim, meo judicio, facile princeps* (1). i. e. " In my opinion Cratippus is by far the greateſt " of all the Peripatetick Philoſophers, whom I ever " heard." Let us obſerve on what occaſion this Encomium was beſtowed upon him; it was, when Cicero had ſaid, that Cratippus came from Mitylene to Epheſus,

(1) Cicero, *de Univerſitate*, cap. 1.

was of Mitylene, and taught Philoſophy there. He went afterwards to Athens (*a*), where he followed the ſame profeſſions, and had amongſt his diſciples Cicero's ſon. This great Orator had a high eſteem for him (*b*), and prevailed upon Cæſar to grant him the freedom of Rome, after which he engaged the Areopagus to make a decree, by which Cratippus was deſired to continue at Athens, as an ornament to the City (*c*), and to read Lectures to the youth there (*d*). We may be perſuaded, that theſe Lectures muſt have been very uſeful and inſtructive, ſince Brutus went to hear them when he was making preparations for the war againſt Mark Anthony (*e*). There are circumſtances, which prove, that he was none of thoſe Profeſſors, who have no knowledge of the world, for he was not obſtinate in diſputing with Pompey upon Divine Providence [*B*], at a time when this Roman General's misfortunes rendered him leſs capable to yield to the arguments

(*a*) See the Remark [*A*].

(*b*) See the ſame Remark.

(*c*) Ὡς κοσμοῦντα τὴν πόλιν. Plut. *in Cicerone*, pag. 873, A.

(*d*) Plutarch. *in Cicerone*, pag. 873, A.

(*e*) Plutarch. *in Bruto*, pag. 994. F.

ſus, to pay his reſpects to him, who was going to command in Cilicia (2) The beginning of the firſt Book of Cicero's offices is another proof of Cratippus's merit. *Quamquam te, Marce fili, annum jam audientem Cratippum, idque Athenis, abundare oportet præceptis, inſtitutiſque Philoſophiæ, propter ſummam & doctoris auctoritatem, & urbis, quorum alter te ſcientia augere poteſt, altera exemplis, tamen &c* (3). That is, "Since it is now a year, my dear ſon Marc, that you "ſtudy under Cratippus, and that at Athens, you "ought to be very much improved in the knowledge "of the precepts and maxims of Philoſophy, conſi- "dering the great reputation both of your teacher and "of the city where you are, the one being capable to "impart wiſdom to you, and the other to furniſh you "with great examples, yet, &c." We meet with a greater Encomium ſtill, in a third Book of the ſame Treatiſe. *Quamquam à Cratippo noſtro, principe hujus memoriæ Philoſophorum, hæc te aſſidue audire atque accipere confido, tamen conducere arbitror talibus aures tuas vocibus undique circumſonare . . . ſuſcepiſti onus præterea grave & Athenarum & Cratippi; ad quos cum tanquam ad mercaturam bonarum artium ſis profectus, inanem redire turpiſſimum eſt dedecorantem & urbis auctoritatem & magiſtri* (4). i. e. "Tho' I truſt, that you "hear theſe things continually from our friend Cra- "tippus, the beſt Philoſopher of this Age, yet I think "it uſeful, that ſuch precepts be from all ſides impart- "ed to you. . . . . you have taken a heavy taſk upon "you, with regard both to the Athenians and to Cra- "tippus; you are gone, as it were, to a plentiful "market of ſcience and learning; to come back with "empty hands, would be the greateſt ſhame in the "world, and an affront to the reputation both of the "City and of your Maſter."

(2) In the year 702 ſince the building of Rome.

(3) Cic. *de Officiis*, lib. 1. *init.* cap. 1. See alſo the 2d chap. of the 2d book of the ſame work.

(4) Idem, ibid. lib. 3. cap. 2. pag. m. 283.

[*B*] *He was not obſtinate in diſputing with Pompey upon Divine Providence.*] Pompey, after the battle of Pharſalia, went to Mitylene to meet his ſpouſe (5). His whole Fleet conſiſted only of one ſingle ſhip, which he had borrowed. On his arrival the inhabitants flocked to the Sea-ſhore, and deſired him to enter their city, but he thanked them. Cratippus was one of them who went to pay their reſpects to him. Pompey *complained, and diſputed a little upon divine Providence; but Cratippus gently yielded to him, giving him hopes of better times, leſt he ſhould have tired and vexed him, by anſwering and refuting his objections. For Pompey might have aſked him, how the Providence of the Gods appeared in what had happened to him; Cratippus's anſwer ſhould have been, that the ill management of publick affairs at Rome required that the Commonwealth ſhould be governed by a ſingle perſon; then he might have put this queſtion to him. How, and by what arguments, will you have us believe, Pompey, that you would have made a better uſe of fortune, had you been the conqueror, than Cæſar has done, or will do? But this muſt be left to the Providence of the Gods, to manage it as they pleaſe* (6). Cratippus behaved on this occaſion like a man of wit. If his knowledge had extended no farther than ſchool-learning, he would have followed Pompey till he went on board, and would have had the laſt word: He would have carried his common-place arguments to the laſt reply, and would have took a pride in vanquiſhing him in a diſpute more fully, than Cæſar had done in a drawn battle. He had not underſtood, that the circumſtances Pompey was in did not ſuffer this, and that we ought to act with regard to the paſſions of the ſoul, as we do with regard to the diſeaſes of the body. Purging and bleeding, which if performed in good time, may ſave a patient's life, will kill him if unſeaſonably preſcribed. The ſame muſt be ſaid with regard to the paſſions; we muſt chooſe a convenient time, if we will labour effectually to cure them. You will bring afflicted perſons much eaſier to reaſon, if you let them take ſome advantage over you; ſuffer yourſelf to be vanquiſhed ſometimes, do not anſwer all their reflections, or if you will refute them, do it ſide-ways, if I may ſay ſo, and indirectly, and in ſuch a manner that your anſwer be attended with complacency and condeſcenſion; and laſtly be the firſt that is ſilent, keeping your arguments for a better opportunity; time will diſpoſe the patient to make a better uſe of your Philoſophy.

(5) Plutarch *in Pompeio*, pag. 658.

(6) Plutarch, *in Pompeio*, pag. 659.

Impatiens animus, nec adhuc tractabilis arte
Reſpuit, atque odio verba monentis habet.
Aggrediar melius tunc, cum ſua vulnera tangi
Jam ſinet, & veris vocibus aptus erit.
Quis matrem, niſi mentis inops, in funere nati
Flere vetet? Non hoc illa monenda loco.
Cum dederit lachrymas, animumque impleverit ægrum;
Ille dolor verbis emoderandus erit.
Temporis ars medicina fere eſt, data tempore proſunt,
Et data non apto tempore vina nocent.
Quin etiam accendas vitia, irriteſque vetando;
Temporibus ſi non aggrediare ſuis (7).

(7) Ovidius, *de Remedio amoris*, ver. 123, & *ſeq.*

Cratippus was not acquainted with this method, and knew very well how to employ it towards Pompey. This great man was not then in a condition to reaſon calmly upon Providence; his wound was too freſh ſtill; and the refuting of his complaints would have but vexed him more and more: the contradicting of him would have ſerved only to exaſperate and tranſport him with anger. His complaints were like a fire, which would have blazed more and more by being ſtirred, and which, if left to itſelf, it might be hoped it would ſoon be extinguiſhed for want of ſtirring (8). It was therefore better to break off the diſpute. But a Pedant, a Philoſopher, who had been nothing but a Philoſopher, would have acted quite the contrary. Obſerve, that there are Writers of the ſeventeenth Century, who aſſert, that Cratippus did really make the anſwer contained in the paſſage from Plutarch, which I have quoted above. They are admirable people indeed, who pretend to know theſe things better than the ancient Hiſtorians, or to ſpeak more properly, who taking no pains to conſult the originals, corrupt and ſpoil Hiſtory. The Jeſuit Biſſelius ſuppoſes, that Cratippus told Pompey, that conſidering the diſorders of the Commonwealth, Rome muſt periſh of neceſſity, unleſs it were reduced under a monarchical Government (9). He adds, that they who heard this anſwer, aſked Cratippus, Why then did the Gods, if they be wiſe, chooſe rather to grant this Monarchy to Cæſar than to Pompey? And that the Philoſopher anſwered, Do you know, whether Pompey would have governed better than Cæſar? The Gods alone know it (10). Muſt we wonder, that News-Writers ſhould give falſe accounts of what they have been told? Do Authors relate well, what they might read in Plutarch? They might read there, that Cratippus choſe rather to be ſilent, becauſe otherwiſe he would have been obliged to anſwer this and that; and they are ſo bold as to aſſert, that he really anſwered all theſe things, and that after he had ſaid them, he went away, that he might not be obliged to reply ſhocking truths. *Inter hæc ne Pompeio ſe pluribus fortaſſis impugnaturo, veridicis reſponſis moleſtiam aggravaret, obticuit Cratippus, & abivit* (11).

(8) *Vidi ego jactatas mota face creſcere flammas; Et vidi, nullo concutiente, mori.*

(9) Joannes Biſſelius, *Ruinar. illuſtr. Decade* 4. *Part* 4. pag. 2856.

(10) *Cujus mehercule eventus præſcientia penes ſolos* (adjecit) *immortales, penes nos, nihil minus eſt.* Idem, ibid.

(11) Idem, ibid.

Let

ments that might have been propoſed to him. He knew alſo how to make himſelf agreeable to his diſciples, and to pleaſe them by the delights of his converſation, which was free from that pedantick gravity [C], which others cannot get rid of, and which is proper only to diſcourage young people. He wrote ſome books concerning Divination, and expoſed himſelf to an inconveniency, which is ſeldom avoided by thoſe, who explode ſome doctrines only by halves. It was proved to him, that the arguments he made uſe of to ſupport what he admitted were alſo proper to eſtabliſh that part of the ſyſtem which he rejected [D]. Moreri ſays without any ground, that he taught at Athens *in the year 706 ſince the building of Rome* (f).

(f) He was ſtill at Mitylene after the battle of Pharſalia in the year 705 (and not in 706 as Jonſius ſays, pag. 203) and no Author tells us, that he left that City the next year.

CREECH

Let us ſay here, that it has been obſerved, that Pompey did not begin to be unfortunate, but when he ſupported the good cauſe (12): You will ſee this in a paſſage from la Mothe le Vayer, where you will alſo find an opinion contrary to mine concerning Cratippus's behaviour. There is a certain wiſdom, *which abounds with vanity, and in its arrogance dares to find fault with the decrees of Heaven, and to controul God's Providence. Such was Cato's wiſdom, when he aſked, what the Providence of the Gods was, when they ſuffered Pompey to be invincible, when he did nothing that was reaſonable, and laboured only to ſatisfy his own ambition; whereas when he declared for the good cauſe, and fought to ſupport the liberty of his country, his fortune failed him, and he fell before Cæſar, who was the Uſurper* *. *Pompey himſelf, being ſelf-conceited, held the like diſcourſes to the Philoſopher Cratippus in the Iſland of Mitylene, after his overthrow at Pharſalia. Plutarch commends this Philoſopher for his prudent compliance with this great and unfortunate General's opinions, being contented to give him ſome hopes of better times. But in my opinion he had done much better had he had leſs of that worldly prudence, and if he had repreſented to Pompey, what reſpect is due to the Decrees of the Almighty; for thus he might have diſſuaded him from his impiety, which made him blaſpheme againſt that Providence, of which we, weak mortals, cannot comprehend the motives nor the end, though it is always directed for the general good of all mankind. I think Cratippus's Philoſophy had been neither leſs prudent, nor leſs comfortable, had he followed that method; nay, it would have been much wiſer, ſince there would have been nothing baſe in it, nothing that could flatter Pompey's paſſion and anger, which did only incenſe God more and more againſt him* (13).

(12) *O rem miſeram! malas cauſas ſemper obtinuit, in optima concidit.* Cicero, *Ep.* 25. *libri* VII *ad Atticum.*

* Plutarch. *in Cat. & Pomp.*

(13) La Mothe le Vayer, Dialogue 6. *de la promenade*, pag. 104. of the 13th vol. of his works. See alſo pag. 146. where he confutes thoſe who excuſe Cratippus.

[C] *He knew . . . . how to pleaſe* his diſciples *by the delights of his converſation, which was free from a pedantick gravity.*] We find this in a Letter of Cicero's ſon's. *Cratippo me ſcito*, ſays he (14), *non ut diſcipulum, ſed ut filium eſſe conjunctiſſimum. Nam cum & audio illum libenter, tum etiam propriam ejus ſuavitatem vehementer amplector. Sum totos dies cum eo, noctiſque ſæpenumero partem. Exoro enim ut mecum quam ſæpiſſime cœnet. Hac introducta conſuetudine, ſæpe inſcientibus nobis & cœnantibus obrepit, ſublataque ſeveritate philoſophiæ, humaniſſime nobiſcum jocatur. Quare da operam ut hunc talem, tam jucundum, tam excellentem virum videas quamprimum.* i. e. "Know then, "that Cratippus loves me not as a diſciple but as a ſon: "and as I am very well pleaſed to hear his lectures, "ſo I am extremely delighted with his ſweet temper. "I paſs whole days with him, and often part of the "night. I have prevailed upon him to ſup with me "very often: and this being now cuſtomary, he comes "often to us unawares, when we are at ſupper, and "laying aſide his philoſophical gravity, he is ſo kind "as to laugh and joke with us. Therefore I beg of "you, that you would endeavour to ſee ſuch an agree"able and excellent man, as ſoon as you can." This is a very great encomium which he paſſes on his Profeſſor, and he could not but make a great progreſs under ſuch a maſter; and therefore when Tribonius would take young Cicero with him into Aſia, he reſolved to take Cratippus alſo along with him (15). Cratippus had brought ſome learned men from Mitylene to Athens with him, I do not doubt but they were his pupils. Young Cicero writes as a great piece of news, that he was very intimate with them. *Utor familiaribus & quotidianis convictoribus, quos ſecum Mitylenis Cratippus adduxit, hominibus & doctis & illi probatiſſimis* (16). You may look upon this as a proof, that Cratippus made very good ſcholars. Let us take notice here of a miſtake of Jonſius. He ſays, that Cicero's ſon had a very great ſhare in this Philoſopher's friendſhip, at Athens in the year 708 from the building of Rome (17). This is a chronological error; for the Treatiſe *de Officiis*, written after Cæſar's death, proves that this young man had ſtudied then but one year at Athens under Cratippus.

(14) Epiſt. 21. lib. 16. *Ciceron. ad Familiares*, pag. m. 455.

(15) Epiſt. 16. lib. 12. *Ciceronis ad Familiares.*

(16) Ibid. Epiſt. 21. lib. 16. pag. 457.

(17) Jonſius, *de Scriptor. Hiſt. Phil.* pag. 203.

[D] *The arguments . . . to ſupport what he admitted, were alſo proper to eſtabliſh that part of the Syſtem, which he rejected.*] He admitted a Divination by dreams and in a frenzy; his hypotheſis or ſyſtem was as follows. He maintained, that the ſoul of man had her origin partly from a divine Mind, which is without us, and that that part of the ſoul, which has ſenſations, which moves and deſires, is not ſeparated from the body; but that the part, which is endowed with reaſon and underſtanding has more ſtrength, when it is leſs connected with matter (18). He grounded his ſyſtem upon an opinion of Ariſtotle, which Averroes has explained, in order to infer from it his monſtrous doctrine of an univerſal Mind, which he ſuppoſes to be the ſame in every individual perſon. After this, Cratippus collected as many inſtances as he could; he obſerved that the event had confirmed ſuch and ſuch dreams, and ſuch or ſuch predictions; then he argued after the following manner. It is impoſſible to ſee without eyes; it's true, they do not always inform us right; however if they do but once diſcover the truth to us, we may conclude hence with certainty, that we have organs to ſee with. Thus if there was no *Divination* at all, one could never divine; but tho' there be a Divination it does not follow from thence, that what we divine muſt always happen. Yet as we ſometimes divine the truth, it is plain, that there muſt be an art or power of divining (19). Let me beg leave to obſerve here, that Cicero did not much mind accuracy in this part of his work; I do not think it is poſſible, to repreſent a man's opinion more careleſly, than he has done that of Cratippus; I could eaſily prove it, if this was a proper place to explain the true rules of Parallels and Antitheſes. He refutes with more clearneſs Cratippus's compariſon, and the conſequences he infers from it. He ſays, that the eyes which diſcover the truth are directed by nature, and by ſenſation. But if our ſoul divines the truth by dreams or extaſies, it happens only by chance (20). Cratippus's conſequences were grounded upon this ſuppoſition, that it was not by chance, ſo many dreams and ſo many predictions happened to be true. Cicero denies this ſuppoſition, and aſſerts, that all this was owing to mere chance. He then makes uſe of an argument *ad hominem*. You reject, ſays he, the Divinations of the Augurs, and Auſpices, thoſe of the Aſtrologers, &c. and yet they proved ſometimes to be true; it follows therefore, either that you reject them without reaſon, or that you admit without reaſon your two ways of divining. I cannot imagine what Cratippus could have anſwered to this; but let us tranſcribe Cicero's own words; they very well deſerve it. *Aſſumit Cratippus hoc modo; ſunt autem innumerabiles præſentiones non fortuitæ; at ego dico, nullam. Vide quanta ſit controverſia, jam aſſumptione non conceſſa nulla concluſio eſt. At impudentes ſumus, qui quod tam perſpicuum ſit non concedamus. Quid eſt perſpicuum? Multa vera, inquit, evadere. Quid quod multo plura falſa? Nonne ipſa varietas, quæ eſt propria fortunæ, fortunam eſſe cauſam, non naturam eſſe docet? Deinde ſi tua iſta concluſio, Cratippe, vera eſt (tecum enim mihi res eſt) nonne intelligis eadem uti poſſe & aruſpices, & fulguratores, & interpretes oſtentorum, & augures, & ſortilegos, & Chaldæos; quorum generum nullum eſt, ex quo non aliquid, ſicut prædictum ſit, evaſerit? Ergo aut ea quoque genera divinandi ſunt, quæ tu rectiſſime improbas; aut ſi ea non ſunt, non intelligo, quur hæc duo ſint, quæ relinquis. Qua ergo ratione hæc inducis, eadem illa poſſunt eſſe quæ tollis* (21). I do not doubt, but the Cratippus, whom Tertullian placed in the Catalogue of thoſe who wrote Books upon Dreams (22), is the ſame with him, who is the ſubject of this article.

(18) Cicero, lib. 1. *de Divinat.* cap. 32.

(19) Idem, ibid.

(20) *Oculi vera cernentes utuntur natura atque ſenſu. Animi ſi quando vel vaticinando, vel ſomniando vera viderunt, uſi ſunt fortuna atque caſu.* Idem, ibid. lib. 2. cap. 48.

(21) Idem, ibid.

(22) Tertullian. *lib. de Anima.*

☞CREECH (THOMAS), an eminent Poet in the ſeventeenth Century, was ſon of Thomas Creech Gent. and born at Blandford in Dorſetſhire in the year 1659. He was educated in Grammar under Mr. Thomas Curganven of Sherbourne, to whom he inſcribes one of the Idylliums of Theocritus which he had tranſlated. He was entered a Commoner of Wadham-College in the Univerſity of Oxford [*A*] in Lent-Term 1675, being then ſixteen years of age, and was placed under the tuition of Mr. Robert Pitt, and afterwards of Mr. Peter Balch, Fellows of that College. September the 28th in the year following he was admitted ſcholar of that houſe (*a*). October 27, 1680 (*b*), he took the degree of Bachelor of Arts, and the ſame year was appointed by his Tutor Mr. Balch, then one of the Proctors of the Univerſity, his Quadrageſimal Collector of the Bachelors, who were to determine in the latter end of that year; at which time, ſays Mr. Wood (*c*), he was accounted a good Philoſopher and Poet, and a ſevere Student. June the 13th 1683 he took the degree of Maſter of Arts (*d*), and not long after was elected Probationer-Fellow of All-Souls-College [*B*]; "at which time, ſays the Writer above-"quoted (*e*), he gave ſingular proof of his claſſical Learning and Philoſophy before "thoſe that were his examiners." He ſoon began to diſtinguiſh himſelf by the works which he publiſhed [*C*]; but Father Niceron tells us in his *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire des Hommes Illuſtres* (*f*), that they were of no great advantage to his fortune, ſince his circumſtances were always very indifferent. He died in a very unfortunate manner; for Monſieur Bernard in his *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (*g*) informs us, that in the year 1700 he fell in love with a woman, who treated him with great neglect, tho' ſhe was complaiſant enough to ſeveral others. He could not digeſt this affront, and reſolved not to ſurvive it. Upon which he ſhut himſelf into his ſtudy, where he hanged himſelf about the end of June 1700, and was found three days after in that circumſtance. Mr. Giles Jacob in his *Lives and Characters of all the Engliſh Poets* (*h*) gives us a different account of this affair; for having obſerved that he was a man of excellent parts, ſound judgment, and perfectly maſter of the Greek and Latin tongues, he tells us, that he was naturally

(*a*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 1104. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*b*) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 212.

(*c*) *Athen. Oxon. ubi ſupra.*

(*d*) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 221.

(*e*) Idem, *Athen. Oxon. ubi ſupra.*

(*f*) Vol. 31. pag. 44. edit. de Paris 1735.

(*g*) For September 1701.

(*h*) Vol. 1. pag. 39. edit. London 1723, in 8vo.

[*A*] *Entered a Commoner of Wadham-College in the Univerſity of Oxford.*] Mr. Wood (1), as we have obſerved in the text of this article, tells us, that this Father was a Gentleman; but Mr. Giles Jacob in his *Lives and Characters of all the Engliſh Poets* (2) aſſerts, that his parents circumſtances not being ſufficient to ſupport him in a liberal education, his diſpoſition and capacity for learning raiſed him a patron in Colonel Strangeways, whoſe generoſity ſupplied that defect; and that this Gentleman ſent him to Wadham-College, where he was admitted a ſcholar on the foundation.

(1) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 1104. 2d edit. London 1721.

(2) Vol. 1. pag. 39. edit. London 1723, in 8vo.

[*B*] *And not long after was elected Probationer-Fellow of All-Souls College.*] Mr. Jacob obſerves (3), that the great reputation of his Tranſlation of Lucretius recommended him to that College, where he was elected Fellow.

(3) *Ubi ſupra.*

[*C*] *He ſoon began to diſtinguiſh himſelf by the works, which he publiſhed.*] The Catalogue of them is as follows: I. A Tranſlation of Titus Lucretius Carus, the Epicurean Philoſopher, *de Naturâ Rerum*, printed at Oxford 1682 in 8vo, and recommended by a Latin Diſtich of Dr. Edward Bernard, Savilian Profeſſor of Aſtronomy in that Univerſity, and by a copy of Engliſh Verſes of Mr. Thomas Brown of Chriſt-Church. This Tranſlation was reprinted at Oxford 1683 in 8vo, and was uſhered into the world by the recommendatory Poems of Mr. Dryden, Mr. Thomas Flatman, Mr. Nahum Tate, Mrs. Behn, Mr. Thomas Otway, John Evelyn Eſq; Edmund Waller Eſq; Mr. Thomas Adams, and Mr. Richard Duke. Mr. Dryden in the *Preface* to the *Miſcellany Poems* publiſhed by him ſpeaks of this Tranſlation in terms of the higheſt approbation, and ſtiles Mr. Creech *the ingenious and learned Tranſlator of Lucretius.* A certain Writer † treats Mr. Creech with great ſeverity on account of this Tranſlation; for having obſerved, that *the only Book now in being, which from one end to the other is an open defenſe of Atheiſm, is that of* Lucretius, he tells us, that this "moſt impious Book in Charles II's reign was with "infinite pains turned into Engliſh Verſe, that the "ſmoothneſs and ſweetneſs of the metre might ſupply "what was wanting in the argument; that the ele-"gance of the expreſſion, the melodious harmony of "numbers, and all thoſe other bewitching beauties, "which attend good Poetry, might inſenſibly inſtil "the poiſon into the minds of unthinking people, e-"ſpecially of the youth, whoſe imagination is gene-"rally too ſtrong for their reaſon, and their fancy too "powerful for their judgment. And this celebrated "Tranſlation was not only made by an Oxford Scho-"lar, (who was thereupon preferred) but it was li-"cenſed by the Univerſity of Oxford, where he was "look'd on as a raw lad, that had not read the *Lu-"cretius* of Creech, who died, as he lived, like a true "Atheiſt; but being a High-Church Prieſt, his mur-"dering himſelf was not made to paſs for a judg-"ment." II. *Titi Lucretii Cari de Rerum Naturâ Libri ſex, quibus Interpretationem & Notas addidit Thomas Creech.* Oxon 1695 in 8vo. It was dedicated to Mr. Chriſtopher Coddrington, Fellow of All-Souls-College, and afterwards Governor of Barbadoes Another Edition *priori multo auctior* was publiſhed at London 1717 in 8vo. III. In a collection of *Miſcellany Poems, containing a new Tranſlation of Virgil's Eclogues, Ovid's Love-Elegies, Odes of Horace, and other Authors*; printed at London 1684 in 8vo, Mr. Creech has theſe Tranſlations from Latin into Engliſh; 1. *The ſecond Elegy of Ovid's firſt Book of Elegies.* 2. *The 6th, 7th, 8th, and 12th Elegies of Ovid's ſecond Book of Elegies.* 3. *The ſecond and third Eclogue of Virgil's Eclogues.* 4. *The Story of Lucretia out of Ovid* de Faſtis, *Book II.* IV. *The Odes, Satyrs, and Epiſtles of Horace tranſlated into Engliſh.* London 1684 in 8vo, dedicated to John Dryden Eſq;. This Tranſlation was reprinted likewiſe at London 1718 in 24° under the following title: *The Works of Horace in Latin and Engliſh in two volumes. The Engliſh Verſion by Mr. Creech. The fifth Edition.* V. *A Tranſlation of the Idylliums of Theocritus, with Rapin's Diſcourſe of Paſtorals.* Oxford 1684 in 8vo, dedicated to Mr. Arthur Charlet of Trinity College Oxon. VI. *The Life of Pelopidas*, printed among *the Lives of illuſtrious Men*, written in Latin by Cornelius Nepos, and tranſlated into Engliſh by ſeveral hands, and printed at Oxford in 8vo. VII. *A Tranſlation of the XIIIth Satyr of Juvenal*, with Notes, printed in the Engliſh Tranſlation of the Satyrs of Juvenal and Perſius, publiſhed at London 1693 in fol. VIII. *A Tranſlation into Engliſh of the Verſes prefixed to Mr. Quintinie's* Compleat Gardiner, printed with the Tranſlation of that Book at London 1690 in fol. IX. *A Tranſlation of the Lives of Solon and Pelopidas*, publiſhed in the *firſt* and *ſecond* Volume of *Plutarch's Lives tranſlated from the Greek by ſeveral hands*, and printed at London 1683 and 1684 in 8vo. X. *Laconic Apotheghms; or remarkable Sayings of the Spartans*, tranſlated from the Greek of Plutarch, and printed in the firſt Volume of *Plutarch's Morals tranſlated by ſeveral hands.* London 1684 in 8vo; and a Tranſlation of *A Diſcourſe concerning Socrates his Dæmon*, and the *two firſt Books of the Sympoſiacs*, tranſlated from the Greek, and publiſhed in the ſecond Volume of *Plutarch's Morals.* XI. A Tranſlation of *Manilius's Aſtronomicon.* A Tranſlation of *Plutarch's* Life of *Cleomenes.* H.

† Nation Vindicated from the Aſperſions caſt on it in a late Pamphlet intiled, *A Repreſentation of the preſent State of Religion, &c.* Part 2. pag. 38, 39. edit. London 1712, in 8vo.

naturally of a moroſe temper, and too apt to deſpiſe the underſtandings and performances of others. "This made him leſs eſteemed than his great merit deſerved; and his reſentments on this account frequently engaged him in thoſe heats and diſputes, which in the end proved fatal to him. He was preſented by the College to the Living of Welling in Hertfordſhire; but before he left Oxford (the cauſe unknown) he unfortunately made away with himſelf in the year 1701." There appears to be an inconſiſtency in this paſſage; for Mr. Jacob's aſſertion, that the *heats and diſputes*, which our Author's moroſe temper and too great a contempt of others engaged him in, *proved in the end fatal to him*, can hardly be reconciled with his obſerving afterwards, that the *cauſe* of his death *was unknown*. The Abbé du Bos (*i*) ſtiles him the *beſt Commentator upon Lucretius*, but obſerves that Mr. Creech is miſtaken in his life of that Poet, in aſſerting that he died the ſame day, on which Virgil was born. Mr. Dryden ſtiles him *a learned and judicious Writer* (*k*).

(*i*) *Reflexions Critiques ſur la Poeſie & ſur la Peinture*, tom. 2. pag. 125. edit. Utrecht 1732, in 12mo.

(*k*) Dedication of his *Tranſlation of Virgil's Æneid.* See *Virgil's works tranſlated into Engliſh Verſe by Mr. Dryden*, vol. 2. pag. 424. edit. London 1730, in 8vo.

CREMONIN (CÆSAR) Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Ferrara for ſeventeen years, and for forty years at Padua [*A*], was born at Cento in the Modeneſe (*a*) in the year 1550. He gained ſo great a reputation, that Kings and Princes would have his picture. His Lectures were exceedingly eſteemed, but his printed works did not ſell very well [*B*]. He has been reckoned a Free-thinker, who did not believe the immortality of the ſoul [*C*], and

(*a*) This is the opinion of Imperialis, and of Craſſo; but Jerom Baruffaldus refutes it, and ſays, that Cento is in the Ferrareſe.

[*A*] *He was a Profeſſor of Philoſophy . . . . . for forty years at Padua.*] He had been firſt Collegue to the celebrated Picolomini, who was firſt Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Padua, and after that great man's death, he was preferred to the ſame poſt. His method was this: He firſt explained Ariſtotle's doctrine, and then cleared up the difficulties either according to his own opinion, or according to the expoſition of Alexander Aphrodiſæus. He hardly ever mentioned the diſputes of the Schoolmen, he openly deſpiſed the opinions of the moderns, and laboured only to revive thoſe of the Ancients. He delivered his Lectures ſo agreeably and with ſuch a gravity, that it would be difficult to find any Profeſſor like him in that reſpect. His private converſations with his ſcholars were not very remarkable: his affability and politeneſs appeared more in them than his learning (1). I do not think he deſerves to be blamed for it: for after all, our mind cannot always be bent, and the more a man labours for his public Lectures, the more does he want ſome relaxation in his private converſations; they would become extremely fatiguing, if a man was obliged to be cloſely intent upon the diſcuſſing of ſome difficult point. One muſt then be at liberty to ramble from one thing to another, and to touch but ſlightly upon ſuch ſubjects, as are ſtarted in the courſe of the converſation. This is the moſt agreeable and moſt honeſt entertainment, which a Doctor can procure himſelf, whoſe function is to teach publickly.

(1) *Ex* Joanne Imperiali, *in Muſæo Hiſtor.* pag. 173.

[*B*] *His Lectures were exceedingly eſteemed, but his printed works did not ſell very well.*] This wants to be explained, otherwiſe I ſhould not give a true repreſentation of my Author's meaning. The works which Cremonin cauſed to be printed, ſays he, grow mouldy in the Bookſeller's ſhops, but what he dictated to his ſcholars, whilſt he was a walking, according to the cuſtom of the Peripateticks, is ſo excellent, that it is impoſſible to wiſh for any thing more agreeable or more perfect, for diſcovering the myſteries of Philoſophy. *Illud nobis mirandum, quod elaborata ipſius opera typis excuſa, in officinis hactenus evileſcunt: ſcripta vero peripatetico more diſcipulis ab ipſo deambulante dictata ſic excellunt, ut nihil ad arcana philoſophiæ detegenda perfectius ac ſuavius deſiderari poſſit* (2). That we ſhould more admire a Sermon or a Lecture, when we hear it delivered, than when we read it (3), is nothing extraordinary, nay it is even very common. That a man, who ſpeaks in public, ſhould better ſucceed, when he gives himſelf up to the ſtrength and fire of his imagination, than when he writes his diſcourſe down, and meditates with all poſſible care what he has to ſay, is not ſo common, and yet it is not very extraordinary neither: that an Author's works ſhould be more eſteemed when they are handed about in manuſcript, than after they are printed, is a thing which happens frequently (4): but here follows ſomething more extraordinary. What Cremonin dictated to his ſcholar, was abſolutely perfect, and what he publiſhed was expoſed to the utmoſt contempt. This is what Imperialis aſſerts. This may be accounted for by two ſuppoſitions: firſt, by ſaying that Cremonin was one of thoſe Authors who ſpoil their own works, by reviſing and correcting them, or whoſe whole ſtrength conſiſts only in the firſt ſallies of their imagination, which ſlackens and grows dull, when they follow cloſely the ſeries of a profound meditation. The ſecond ſuppoſition is, that Imperialis did not well expreſs himſelf, and that in order to give us a true account of the matter, he ſhould have told us, that Cremonin's works, which were thought to be excellent, as long as there were but manuſcript copies of them, loſt all their reputation as ſoon as they were printed. This laſt ſuppoſition ſeems more probable to me than the former; for if the miſchief had been owing to Cremonin's ſpoiling his works, when he prepared them for the preſs, it might have been remedied by means of the manuſcript copies, which were in his diſciples hands. Some officious friend would have reſtored him to his reputation, by publiſhing his admirable writings, as he had dictated them.

(2) Imperialis, *in Muſæo Hiſtorico*, pag. 174.

(3) See above, Rem. [*O*] of the Art. CASSIUS SEVERUS (TITUS), and Remark [*K*] of the article HORTENSIUS (Quintus), and remark [*C*] of the article NARNI.

(4) Mr. Varillas is an inſtance of this.

[*C*] *He has been reckoned a Free-thinker, who did not believe the immortality of the ſoul.*] Several Authors aſſert, that it was for this reaſon he would have his epitaph be *Cæſar Cremoninus hic totus jacet.* i. e. "Here lieth Cæſar Cremonin entire." If there were no other arguments but this, it would not be an eaſy matter to prove him a Free-thinker; for the celebrated Profeſſor Giſbert Voetius having alledged that argument, retracted it afterwards, becauſe the ſame friend, who had furniſhed him with it, let him know that it was grounded upon a falſe ſtory. *Antehac*, ſays he (5), *ab eruditiſs. Viro & amico mihi communicatum erat, Epitaphium quod dicebatur ſibi feciſſe.* Totus Cremoninus hic jacet. *Sed poſtea ab eodem aliunde aliter informato monitus revocavi illud in prima hujus diſputationis editione.* For want of this proof, he alledges another, which has not much weight in it; it is as follows. Fortunius Licetas relates, that having undertook to refute Alexander Aphrodiſæus's opinion concerning the nature of the ſoul, he was not diſſuaded from purſuing this commendable deſign by Cremonin his Collegue, and by Lewis Albertus Profeſſor of Divinity, who threatned him, that they would write againſt his book. They were both, ſays he (6), Frederic Pendaſius's diſciples, and very much addicted to Alexander Aphrodiſæus's opinion. It is plain, that ſince a Profeſſor of Divinity at Padua threatened to write in ſupport of that opinion, he could not pretend that Alexander Aphrodiſæus maintained the mortality of the ſoul. Common ſenſe will tell you, that neither in Italy nor in any other place, a Divine would not dare to write in favour of an opinion, which he ſhould acknowledge to be inconſiſtent with the ſoul's immortality: if therefore Cremonin held no other opinion but that which the Divinity-Profeſſor boaſted he would maintain, he was ſufficiently orthodox with regard to the immortality of the ſoul. We want therefore other proofs of his having been a Free-thinker; as I do not aſſert any thing upon my own authority, I am not obliged to find them.

(5) Voet. *Selectorum Diſputat. Theol.* vol. 1. pag. 206.

(6) *Ambo Doctrinæ Aphrodiſæi cultores non ſemel dixerint, ſe Volumini meo contradicturos, qui nulla contradictione relicta diem obeuntes fato ceſſerint.* Fortun. Licetas, *Hiſt. proprior, Operum.* cap. 16. *apud* Voetium, ibid.

Here follows a paſſage, which is curious enough: I have extracted it from one of Balſac's Letters, in which he recommends one Monſieur Drouet to Monſieur

and whoſe opinions upon other ſubjects were far from agreeing with the Chriſtian Religion [*D*]. He died of the Plague in 1630, and was buried in the Convent of St. Juſtina, to which he had left his whole eſtate. He was extremely civil to every body, he knew very well how to affect an obliging countenance; he was even too ſcrupulouſly addicted to the ceremonies or offices of civility; but in reality he never was any perſon's friend faithfully and with ſincerity. He took a delight in ſetting his ſcholars at variance; he affected to be impartial amongſt their ſeveral factions; he could with his utmoſt eaſe hide his ſentiments under an artful kindneſs, whilſt at the ſame time he laboured with all his heart, to keep up the quarrels, eſpecially to the detriment of thoſe ſcholars, whom he knew not to be of his ſide (*b*). There is in the firſt volume of the *Mercurius Jeſuitarum* (*c*) the Oration which he delivered in 1591 before the Senate of Venice in favour of the Univerſity of Padua againſt the Jeſuits. His titles were unknown to one of Count Ullefeld's Hiſtorians [*E*]. Father Rapin, who makes him flouriſh in the fifteenth Century (*d*) in the Univerſity of Piſa (*e*), is very much miſtaken.

(*b*) Taken from Imperialis, *in Muſæo Hiſtorico*, pag. 173.

(*c*) Pag. 490.

(*d*) Rapin, *Compar. de Platon & d'Ariſtote*, pag. m. 399.

(*e*) Rapin, *Reflexions ſur la Philoſoph.* pag. m. 360.

fieur de Lorme, the King's Phyſician. *If you open to him the myſteries of the Arabians (he is perfectly well acquainted with thoſe of the Greeks) he will hear you, neither like a profane perſon, nor like one newly initiated. His name is written in a large character in the Records of the Univerſity of Padua. When he came from the great Cremonin's School he was almoſt as great and as learned as he. Yet he was not a blind follower of his late maſter: I can aſſure you that he admits only his lawful ſentiments, and never was a believer more perſuaded, than he is, that* the God of Abraham, of Iſaac, and of Jacob is not the God of the dead, but of the living, &c (7).

(7) Balzac, *Lettres choiſies*, pag. 35. of the Dutch edition.

Lorenzo Craſſo's work, which I had not by me, when this article was printed the firſt time, is ſince come into my hands. I find there the confirmation of a conjecture, which I then thought of; namely, that Cremonin did not maintain abſolutely the Mortality of the Soul, but only in caſe Ariſtotle's ſentiment was to be followed. This queſtion *de facto*, which is after all of very little importance, has been a long while controverted in the Schools of Italy, and yet there was no reaſonable ground to ſtyle thoſe Hereticks, who aſſerted, that Ariſtotle did not hold the Soul's Immortality. Such was Cremonin's reſtriction. *E veleno d'animo contagioſo l'inſegnare che l'anima dell' huomo ſoggetto alla corruzione non differiſca nella morte dell' huomo da quella de' bruti, com' egli faceva, ancorche ſagacemente aſſeriſſe ſoſtener ciò ſolamente in ſentenza d'Ariſtotile* (8). Moreri has omitted this *proviſo* mentioned by Lorenzo Craſſo, which is a very capital omiſſion on this occaſion. Obſerve, that this is almoſt the only circumſtance, which Lorenzo has added to Imperialis's account. He is ſo much the more to be commended for this addition, that he was perſuaded, Cremonin's reſtriction was only an artifice. He aſſerts that he had no Religion at all, and adds, that ſome perſons ſuſpected he had inſpired ſeveral of his moſt truſty diſciples with the ſame wicked opinions. *Fù ben compoſto di corpo, auſtero di volto, brieve di ſonno, ambizioſo di ſaper molto, finto di coſtumi,* LONTANO D'OGNI RELIGIONE, *havendo ſecondo il parer d'alcuni fatto non pochi allievi confidenti di queſta prava ſua dottrina* (9).

(8) Lorenzo Craſſo, *Elogii d'huomini letterati*, tom. 2. pag. 124.

(9) Idem, ibid. pag. 125.

[*D*] . . . *His opinions upon other ſubjects were far from agreeing with the Chriſtian Religion.*] It was found that his explications concerning Fate, the world and the minds that preſide over the celeſtial motions, were erroneous, and that he yet maintained them more zealouſly, than a Chriſtian ought to have done (10).

(10) Imperialis, *in Muſæo Hiſtorico*, pag. 174.

[*E*] . . . *His titles were unknown to one of Count Ullefeld's Hiſtorians.*] This Hiſtorian's name is Rouſſeau de la Vallette: his hiſtorical Novel, entitled *Le Comte d'Ullefeld*, was printed at Paris in the year 1677. We read there, that this Count having deſerved, by the follies of his youth, to be expelled his father's houſe, met with *Signor Cremonini a noble Venetian at Padua*, engaged in a very ſtrict friendſhip with him, and was ſo much improved by his converſations during the ſpace of one year, that he has often confeſſed, he was indebted to him for the beſt part of his learning.

CRESPET (PETER) a Celeſtine Monk, and Prior of the Convent of that Order at Soiſſons, publiſhed in the ſixteenth Century ſeveral works [*A*], by which it appeared, that he read a great deal, and made a vaſt number of Compilations, both from Eccleſiaſtical and Prophane Authors. You may ſee in Moreri, that he was *a native of Sens* (*a*), and died in 1595. But it ſhould not have been added, that he lived *at a time when Polite Literature was very much neglected.*

(*a*) He ſtyles himſelf in the title of his books *A Celeſtine of Paris*; but that may ſignify, that it was at Paris he entered into the Order of the Celeſtines.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral works.*] His *Jardin de Plaiſir & de Recreation ſpirituelle*, (Garden of ſpiritual Pleaſure and Recreation) was printed at Paris in two volumes 8vo, in the year 1602. It is an edition which he had reviſed and corrected. It is divided into five parts, which contain ſeveral diſcourſes, *concerning the nature, origin, conditions, effects, and heinouſneſs of the ſins, which ought to be ſhut out or extirpated out of the garden of the ſoul; as alſo concerning the nature, admirable effects, and excellencies of the virtues, which ought to be planted and happily cultivated and improved there.* He added to it *an encomiaſtical Treatiſe concerning the excellencies of thoſe virtues, namely, chaſtity, virginity and continence, though he had already ſufficiently treated of theſe noble virtues in the ſix Books concerning Continence, which he had tranſlated from the Latin of Monſieur d'Eſpenſe in the preliminary Epiſtle of theſe Books, and again in his myſtical Granade, Treatiſe the 1ſt, Sect.* 9 (1). The Dedication of the firſt volume of this *Garden* is dated October the firſt 1586, and that of the ſecond volume, May the firſt, 1587. He quotes now and then in this Book his diſcourſes concerning the origin, excellency and immortality of the ſoul. He alſo wrote ſome diſcourſes upon the hatred of Satan, which have often been cited by Martin del Rio in his *Diſquiſitiones Magicæ*. He publiſhed beſides the Latin *Summa eccleſiaſticæ Diſciplinæ & totius Juris Canonici*; i. e. "An Abridgment of the "Church Diſcipline, and of the whole Canon-Law."

(1) Creſpet, *Jardin de Plaiſir & de Recréation ſpirituelle*, at the end of the 2d vol. pag. m. 451.

CRESPIN (JOHN) in Latin *Creſpinus*, a famous Printer at Geneva, whither he retired for the ſake of his Religion in the year 1548 (*a*), was of the Province of Artois (*b*). He applied himſelf with great ſkill and diligence to the printing of ſeveral books (*c*), and eſpecially of a Greek and Latin Lexicon [*A*], and of a Martyrology of the Proteſtants (*d*). He died of the Plague at Geneva in the year 1572 (*e*). Euſtace Vignon, his ſon-in-law,

(*a*) Melchior Adam, *in Vita Theod. Bezæ*, pag. 205.
(*b*) Beza, *Reſponſ. ad Balduinum*, pag. 316. tom. 2. *Oper.*
(*c*) Idem, ibid.

(*d*) Melchior Adam, *in Vita Th. Bezæ*, pag. 205. obſerves that this *Martyrology* was firſt printed in Latin in 8vo, in the year 1556, and ſince in 4to in 1560.

[*A*] *He applied himſelf . . . to the printing . . . of a Greek and Latin Lexicon.*] It was not in the year 1595, as Valerius Andreas (1), and Konig (2) aſſert, for he died in 1572. Several Bibliographers ſtumble upon this ſtone, they aſcribe to a man even the editions of his Book, which have been printed after his death.

(1) Valer. Andreas, *Bibliotb. Belg.* pag. 488.
(2) Konig, *Bibliotb.* pag. 223.

(*e*) Beza, Ep. 64. pag. 278. tom. 3. *Operum*.

in-law, continued to ſupport the reputation of his Printing-houſe (*f*). Valerius Andreas Deſſelius relates, that Creſpin, the ſon of a Civilian of Arras, ſtudied five years at Lovain, and that there was a great friendſhip between him and Francis Baudouin, which continued very long, and that he wrote Notes upon the Inſtitutes, and a Treatiſe concerning Apoſtates [*B*] &c. (*g*). He does not mention a book, which has been often reprinted, and which Baudouin very much deſpiſed [*C*]. You will find in Moreri ſome circumſtances which I would not repeat, and ſome errors, of which I ſhall take notice below [*D*]. I ſhall alſo mention thoſe, which have been committed in the Hiſtory of Printing [*E*]. Conrad Badius printed ſome time for our Creſpin [*F*].

(*f*) Idem, Præfat. tom. 2. *Operum.*

(*g*) Valer. And. Deſſelius, *Bibl. Belgica*, pag. 417.

[*B*] . . . . *A Treatiſe concerning Apoſtates.*] It is a Commentary upon the third Law of the Code *De Apoſtatis.* He wrote it in favour of Calvin againſt Baudouin, and to oppoſe the latter's Commentary upon the Laws *de famoſis Libellis* (concerning Libels.) Baudouin complains bitterly of this, and inveighs againſt this old friend, with whom he had ſtudied (3).

(3) See his 2d Anſwer to *John Calvin*, pag. 73, & *ſeq.* edit. Colon. 1562.

[*C*] *He does not mention a Book, which has been often reprinted, and which Baudouin very much deſpiſes.*] Creſpin diſplays a great zeal in it againſt Popery, and for the improvement of the Reformed. It is intitled, *L'Eſtat de l'Egliſe, avec le Diſcours des tems depuis les Apoſtres juſques au préſent.* i. e. "The State of the "Church, with an hiſtorical Account from the time "of the Apoſtles to this preſent time." I have quoted it ſometimes. The edition I make uſe of is that of Bergen-ap-Zoom 1605, 4to, reviſed and augmented by John Taffin, Miniſter of the French Church at Fleſſingen. The outrageons judgment, which Baudouin paſſed upon this work of Creſpin, is as follows. *Si qua unquam fuit putida & inſulſa farrago vanitatis atque falſitatis, ſi qua impura ſentina fabularum, atque ἀνιστορησίας, illam profecto eſſe altiſſima voce profiteri cogimur* (4). i. e. "If there be any diſagreeable and inſipid medley of idle and falſe ſtories, if any common ſink of fables and untruths, we are really forced to cry aloud, that it is this Book." Obſerve, that Baudouin ſpoke there as an enemy of the Author.

(4) *Reſponſio pro Balduino ad Calvinum & Bezam*, folio 98.

[*D*] *You will find . . . ſome errors in Moreri of which I ſhall take notice below.*] I. Creſpin did not retire to Geneva, *with a deſign, to publiſh his works there*, but to enjoy liberty of conſcience. It is true that he and Beza thought immediately of aſſociating together, in order to eſtabliſh a printing-houſe (5), and that Beza having met with another employment, Creſpin alone carried on the undertaking. But this does not excuſe Moreri; for his words do not in the leaſt acquaint the reader, with what he ought to have told them; they plainly ſignify, that Creſpin went to Geneva, in order to ſeek for ſome Bookſellers, who would print the Books, which he had either wrote himſelf, or collected together. II. It is not true, that before he went to Geneva, *he had already publiſhed Heſiod; Nomenclatura actionum; Inſtitutionum Imperialium Lib. IV, &c.* III. Nor that *his poverty forced him to go to ſervice at Geneva in order to get a livelihood.* IV. Nor that Balduin acquaints us with this. If we would know, whence all theſe blunders ſprung, we need only to look upon the following words of Valerius Andreas. *Vixit dein in Galliis, profeſſione typographicæ ac literariæ exercitationis clarus; uſus annos multos amico Franc. Balduino, quocum a pueris educatus fuerat. Criſpinum tamen poſtea* omnis humanitatis non minus quam juris oblitum fuiſſe, ex quo factus eſt ſervus Allobrox, *ſcribit Bald. in Reſponſione ſua ad Joan. Calvinum, p.* 89 (6). This is what made Moreri ſay, that Criſpin publiſhed ſome Books, before he went to Geneva, and that afterwards he was a ſervant. He did not in the leaſt underſtand the ſenſe of Baudouin's words. They ſignify, that Creſpin forgot all the duties of humanity and juſtice, ſince he ſubmitted to Calvin's yoke. I wonder Moreri did not think that Baudouin's meaning was, that Creſpin loſt all his knowledge in the Law ſince his apoſtaſy. There would have been ſomething wonderful in this; nor would it have been the firſt time, that it had been aſſerted, that a man's changing his Religion, made him loſe all his wit, ſtyle, learning &c.

(5) Melch. Adam, *in Vita Bezæ*, pag. 205.

(6) Val. Andreas, *Bibl. Belg.* pag. 487.

[*E*] *I ſhall mention the errors that have been committed in the Hiſtory of Printing.*] It is there ſaid (7), I. That John Creſpin having ſtudied five years at Lovain, *came afterwards to France, to ſtudy the Law there with Francis Balduin, his intimate friend, under Gabriel Mudé and other Doctors of the Law.* II. That he became there very famous *by his ſkill in the Art of printing.* III. That he printed there a very correct edition of the New Teſtament in Greek, in 1564, and Homer and Theocritus in 1570. IV. That he was *obliged to retire to Geneva for the ſake of his Religion, and that he wrote and printed in that city* Lexicon Criſpini, *in folio, and in quarto.* V. That *Caſaubon was one of his Authors.* Several errors have been here occaſioned by a miſtake of Valerius Andreas. He was in the wrong to ſay, that Creſpin gained a reputation in France by his ſkill in printing; for he did not apply himſelf to that trade but after he had left France. But other errors have been built upon this bad foundation of Valerius Andreas. It is ſuppoſed that Creſpin did not retire to Geneva till after the year 1570; it is aſſerted, that before that time he had printed ſeveral Books in France, and that his Lexicon was printed after the year 1570. All this falls to the ground, as ſoon as this truth is eſtabliſhed, namely, that he retired to Geneva about the year 1548, and that his *Lexicon Græco-Latinum* was publiſhed before the year 1562. *Tu . . . . oblitus te aliquando Lugduni fuiſſe Sebaſtiani Gryphii mancipium, bono & honeſto, id eſt tui penitus diſſimili viro* (Criſpino) *vitio vertis, quod Lexicon Græco-Latinum, quale ante editum fuit, maximo tum ſumptu, tum labore, in publicum emiſerit* (8). i. e. "You . . . have forgot that you was a ſervant to Sebaſtian Gryphius at Lyons, and you find fault with "that good and honeſt man, that is, who differs in"tirely from you, becauſe he publiſhed with a great "deal of coſt and pains a Greek and Latin Lexicon, "as it had been printed before." Thus Beza ſpoke in his anſwer to a work, which Baudouin had publiſhed in the year 1562. The other errors in the *Hiſtory of Printing* are ſuch, as are not owing to Valerius Andreas. He had ſaid as plainly as could be wiſhed, that Creſpin heard the Lectures of Gabriel Mudeus and of the other Profeſſors, at Lovain, and not in France (9). He does not ſay, that Creſpin went into France with Baudouin. It muſt be remembred, that Caſaubon was not yet fourteen years old, when John Creſpin died. How then could he be one of his Authors? This error is probably owing to this: Theocritus was reprinted after Creſpin's death, with Caſaubon's Notes (10), and Creſpin's Preface. This might make ſome perſons think, that it was he, who publiſhed this new Edition.

(7) La Caille, *Hiſtoire de l'Imprimirie*, pag. 148.

(8) Beza, *Reſponſ. ad Franciſc. Balduin.* pag. 216. tom. 2. *Operum.*

(9) *Lovanium miſſus* Gabrielem Mudæum, *alioſque Anteceſſores quinquennium totum* ANTE *aditam Galliam audivit.* Valer. Andr. *Bibl. Belg.* pag. 487.

[*F*] *Conrad Badius printed ſome time for our Creſpin.*] I have ſeen at the end of a little Book in 8vo theſe words. *A Geneve, de l'Imprimerie de Jean Creſpin, par Conrad Badius*, 1550. i. e. "At Geneva, from "John Creſpin's printing-houſe, by Conrad Badius, "1555." This little Book is a work of Calvin's, intitled, *Traité très excellent de la vie Chreſtienne.* i. e. "A very excellent Treatiſe of a Chriſtian Life."

(10) Theſe Notes are under the name of *Iſaacus Hortus bonus*: He made them at the requeſt of Euſtace Vignon, who reprinted *Theocritus.* They are dated in Auguſt 1584.

CRISPUS (JOHN BAPTIST) a good Divine and a good Poet lived in the ſeventeenth Century; he was born at Gallipoli in the Kingdom of Naples. His chief work is that which was printed at Rome in the year 1594 in folio, *De Ethnicis Philoſophis*

Philoſophis caute legendis [*A*]. i. e. "That we muſt take care how we read the Heathen Philoſophers." See Toppi's *Biblioteca Napoletana.*

[*A*] *His chief work is that . . . .* De Ethnicis Philoſophis caute legendis.] Here follows, what Poſſevin ſaid of it. *Vir vere Philoſophus, qui nimirum acri, & quali Chriſtianum decet judicio, Philoſophiam expendit, librum ſic grandem de Philoſophis caute legendis ita ſcripſit, ut quæcunque hæreſes a philoſophis minus cautis manârunt, eæ indicatæ ſunt, ut ſolidis rationibus confutatæ, ex divinis Scripturis & Patribus, ex Synodorum decretis, ex Scholaſticis, quibus cautionibus præmuniti Philoſophi, ſive publici Profeſſores inoffenſo pede curriculum hoc decurrent, tantamque ancillam recta adducent ad arcem* (1). i. e. "This true Philoſopher, who with ſagacity and "with ſuch a judgment, as becomes a Chriſtian, explains Philoſophy, wrote a pretty large Book, to "ſhew, that the Philoſophers muſt be cautiouſly read; "he points out all the hereſies, which ſprung from "the imprudent reading of Philoſophers; he refutes "theſe hereſies, by the holy Scripture, the Fathers, "the Decrees of the Councils, and the Schoolmen, "that the Philoſophers or public Profeſſors being thus "forewarned, might go on in their courſes without "danger, and conduct ſo great an hand-maid to the "deſigned end." Father Merſenne has inſerted a long paſſage from Criſpus's work in one of his Books (2). It is a paſſage in which he confutes the myſtical Divines. The reaſon, why Father Merſenne tranſcribed that paſſage deſerves to be known. It is, ſays he, becauſe this Author, whoſe work is pretty ſcarce, has very elegantly confuted that ſort of Divines. *Quod attinet ad ſecretiores illos Theologos, quos Venetus tam importune & tam frequenter inculcat, bene mihi philoſophatus videtur Joannes Baptiſta Criſpus, cujus hic ideo integram ſententiam libet attexere, præſertim cum Auctor ille rariſſimus eſſe videatur, & elegantiſſimo ſtylo ſecretiores illos Theologos configat* (3).

(1) Poſſev. *Apparat. Sacr.* tom. 2. pag. 117.

(2) At the end of his *Obſervationes & Emendationes in Problemata Georgii Venti in Geneſin.*

(3) Marinus Merſennus, *in Problem. Veneti*, pag. 428.

Criſpus's other works are two Orations concerning the War againſt the Turcs, printed at Rome in 1594, in 4to. *De Medici Laudibus, Oratio ad cives ſuos Gallipolitanos*, printed at Rome in 1591, in 4to. The Life of Sannazarius, printed at Rome in the year 1583, and reprinted at Naples in the year 1633, in 8vo. A Draught of the city of Gallipoli, dedicated to Flaminio Caraccioli January the 11t, 1591 (4).

(4) Taken from Toppi, *Biblioteca Napoletana.*

(a) Κριτίας μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἐν τῇ ὀλιγαρχίᾳ πάντων πλοκτιώτατός τε καὶ βιαιότατος ἐγένετο. *Critias enim, quum ad paucos perveniſſet civitatis ſtatus, unus ex illis factus longe omnium avariſſimus ac violentiſſimus fuit.* Xenophon, *de Factis & Dictis Socratis*, lib. 1. pag. m. 415. See the Remark [*A*].

CRITIAS, one of Socrates's ſcholars, was ſo far from improving by the Lectures of that Philoſopher, that he became a very wicked man. He ſhewed it chiefly when Athens, his native city, being ſubdued by Lyſander, the General of the Lacedæmonians, was made ſubject to thirty Tyrants. He was one of the thirty, and the moſt unjuſt of them all (*a*). He not only deſigned to render the city of Athens extremely miſerable, but to turn all Attica into a deſart [*A*]. It is ſaid that his injuſtices did Socrates a prejudice in the opinion of the people [*B*]; their reſentment againſt the ſcholar reflecting on the maſter: but Xenophon has refuted thoſe who maliciouſly imputed to Socrates the licentious lives of ſome of his diſciples [*C*]. It is certain that Critias did not love Socrates, and

[*A*] *He deſigned . . . to make a deſart of all Attica.*] His malice againſt his native country appeared from the time when he retired into Theſſaly, where he ceaſed not to ſpeak ill of the Athenians. He repreſented them as a people who had the moſt wicked cuſtoms in the world (1). Being returned to Athens, he there did infinite ſervice to the Lacedæmonians, he perſuaded Lyſander to demoliſh the walls, and he laid a deſign in concert with them to diſpeople all Attica, and turn it into paſture ground. Ἐπὶ λαμπρῶς μὲν ἐλακώνισε, πρῶτόν τε τὰ ἱερὰ, καθῄρει δὲ διὰ Λυσάνδρου τὰ τείχη, ὃς δ' ἤλαυνε τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὸ σῆναί σοι τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀφῃρεῖτο, πόλεμον Λακωνικὸν εἰπὼν ἐς πάντας, εἴ τις τὸν Ἀθηναίων φεύγοντα δέξαιτο, ἀμότητί τε καὶ μιαιφονίᾳ τοὺς τριάκοντα ὑπερβάλλετο, βουλεύματός τε αὐτοῦ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ξυνελάμβανεν ὡς μηλόβοτος ἡ Ἀττικὴ ἀποφαντεῖν τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀγέλης ἐκκενωθεῖσα, κάκιστος ἀνθρώπων ἐμοί γε φαίνεται ξυμπάντων, ὧν ἐπὶ κακίᾳ ὄνομα. *Cum ille aperte Lacedæmoniis faveret, proderet ſacra, per Lyſandrum mœnia deſtrueret, quoſque Athenienſes expulerat quominus in ulla Græciæ parte conſiſterent, prohiberet, Laconicum edicens bellum omnibus imminere ſi quis exulantem Athenienſem exciperet, truculentia & cædibus triginta tyrannos ſuperaret, deteſtabileque conſilium cum Lacedæmoniis iniret ut Attica pecorum nutrix efficeretur, virorum armentis ſpoliata, his de cauſis mihi omnium hominum peſſimus fuiſſe videtur qui ob ſcelera fuerunt famoſi* (2). i, e. "Since "he openly favoured the Lacedæmonians, revealed "the ſacred myſteries, razed the walls by Lyſander, "and would not ſuffer the Athenians whom he had "baniſhed to remain in any part of Greece, threatening all with the arms of Lacedæmon, if any one "ſhould receive an Athenian exile; ſince he exceeded "the whole thirty in cruelty and murders, and concerted a deteſtable deſign with the Lacedæmonians, "to diſpeople Attica and turn it into paſture for cattle; for theſe reaſons I take him to have been the "moſt wicked of all men who have been famed for "villany." He was the cauſe of the death of Alcibiades; for Lyſander did not engage the Perſians to make away with him, till he had been aſſured by Critias and the other Tyrants of Athens, that the order which he had eſtabliſhed in that City would ſoon be overturned, if that man was not diſpatched. *Critias cæterique tyranni Athenienſium certos homines ad Lyſandrum in Aſiam miſerunt qui eum certiorem facerent niſi Alcibiadem ſuſtuliſſet, nihil earum rerum fore ratum quas ipſe Athenis conſtituiſſet. Quare ſi ſuas res geſtas manere vellet, illum perſequeretur* (3).

(1) Διαβάλλων δ' Ἀθηναίους ὡς πλεῖστα ἀνθρώπων ἁμαρτάνοντας. *Athenienſes vero perſtringens quod præ cæteris errarent maxime.* Philoſtrat. *in Vitis Sophiſtarum*, pag. 505.

(2) Idem, pag. 504, 505.

(3) Cornel. Nepos, *in Alcibiade*, cap. 10, *init.*

[*B*] *It is ſaid that his injuſtice did Socrates a prejudice in the opinion of the people.*] The Orator Æſchines made no doubt of it, ſince in one of his Orations he ſpoke thus to the people of Athens: Ὑμεῖς, ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, Σωκράτη μὲν τὸν σοφιστὴν ἀπεκτίνατε ὅτι Κριτίαν ἐφάνη πεπαιδευκὼς ἕνα τῶν τριάκοντα, τῶν τὸν δῆμον καταλυσάντων. *Vos, Athenienſes, Socratem ſapientem illum occidiſtis quod Critiam inſtituiſſet unum XXX virorum qui populum oppreſſerunt* (4). i. e. "You, O "Athenians, have put the wiſe Socrates to death, "becauſe he appeared to have inſtructed Critias, one "of the thirty deſtroyers of the people."

(4) Æſchines, *Orat. in Timarchum*, pag. mo 194, B.

[*C*] *Xenophon has refuted thoſe who . . . imputed to Socrates the licentious lives of ſome of his diſciples.*] The enemies of that Philoſopher laid to his charge all the evils which Critias and Alcibiades, two of his ſcholars, had brought on the Athenians. Xenophon ſhews this to have been very unjuſt. He ſays that theſe two Scholars of his attended Socrates only to learn the art of ſpeaking, which they deſign to make an ill uſe of to ſatisfy the inordinate ambition which conſumed them (5). He affirms that though they were ſo little inclined to imitate Socrates, that if God had given them their choice either of dying, or being obliged to live as that Philoſopher did, they would have accepted the firſt condition; they failed not however to behave themſelves with decency while they were under his direction (6). They did not give a looſe to their vicious inclinations, till they had left his School. Critias fled to Theſſaly, and was there corrupted by converſing with very wicked people (7). Others doubt whether he did not rather corrupt the Theſſalians, and they aſſert that he endeavoured to eſtabliſh tyranny among them (8). This was his humour; he loved innovations and diſturbances in a State. Xenophon obſerves that Socrates ſpared not to reprove this Scholar (9). "Having once perceived "that Critias was fallen in love with Euthydemus, "and did his utmoſt to obtain of him the laſt favours which are ſought by the voluptuous, he firſt "endeavoured to divert him from his deſign, telling "him it was unworthy a generous mind, and a man "of

(5) Xenoph. *de Factis & Dictis Socratis*, lib. 1, pag. m. 415.

(6) Καὶ Κριτίας δὲ καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδης ἕως μὲν Σωκράτει συνῆστην, ἐδυνάσθην ἐκείνου χρωμένω συμμάχω τῶν μὴ καλῶν ἐπιθυμίων κρατεῖν. *Itaque Critias atque Alcibiades, dum Socratis conſuetudine utebantur, potuerunt illius ſubſidio pravas ſuperare cupiditates.* Idem, ibid. pag. 416.

(7) Idem, ibid.

(8) Philoſtratus, *in Vitis Sophiſtarum*, p. 504, 505.

(9) Xenophon, *de Factis & Dictis Socratis*, pag. 417.

and that he forbade him to teach any perſon (b). One of the crimes which drew on him the greateſt hatred was his having been the moſt violent promoter of the death of Theramenes, and having endeavoured with all his might to prevent thoſe who had been expelled Athens by the faction of the thirty Tyrants, from finding any aſylum in Greece (c); for the cities which ſhould receive them were threatened with war (d). So many people had been baniſhed that they were able to form a little army, which reſolved to enter the city by force, and to reſtore it to liberty. They poſſeſſed themſelves of the Piræeus under the conduct of Thraſybulus, and though they were forced to abandon it, they did not loſe courage (e); but ſuſtained two attacks with a great deal of vigour, and in the laſt they killed Critias who fought valiantly (f). Such was the end of this man, who was valuable in other reſpects, on account of the nobleneſs of his birth [D], his eloquence [E], and

(b) Idem, pag. 417.

(c) Idem, lib. 2. *de Geſtis Græcorum.*

(d) Philoſtratus, *in Vitis Sophiſtar.* pag. 503.

(e) Xenoph. *de Geſtis Græcor.* lib. 2.

(f) Cornel. Nepos, *in Thraſybulo*, cap. 2.

" of honour, inceſſantly to importune the perſon " whoſe eſteem one is deſirous of gaining, and to " act the beggar, to obtain a diſhonourable thing " of him. And as Critias yielded not at the firſt " attack, it is ſaid that Socrates declared in the preſence of ſeveral perſons, and of Euthydemus himſelf, that Critias had the itch of a ſwine, and deſired to rub himſelf againſt Euthydemus, as ſwine " do againſt ſtones. After this, Critias always bore " him a grudge: and during the tyranny of the " thirty, of whom he was one, when he, together " with Charicles, had the care of the civil government, he was far from forgetting the affront; " and to revenge himſelf, he made a Law, whereby " he forbade the art of reaſoning to be taught in Athens." I ſet down this whole paſſage from the Tranſlation of Mr. Charpentier, of the French Academy. Here is a part of it according to the Greek: Λέγεται τὸν Σωκράτη, ἄλλων τε πολλῶν παρόντων καὶ τοῦ Εὐθυδήμου, εἰπεῖν ὅτι οἴκοι δοκοίη πάσχειν ὁ Κριτίας, ἐπιθυμῶν Εὐθυδήμου προσκνᾶσθαι ὥσπερ τὰ ὑδία τοῖς λίθοις. *Socratem cum aliis multis præſentibus, tum etiam ipſo Euthydemo dixiſſe ferunt, Critiam in Euthydemum porcorum more, qui ſe ſaxis affricare ſolent, affici.*

[D] *He was valuable . . . . on account of the nobleneſs of his birth.*] He was deſcended from Dropides the brother of Solon. This Dropides was the father of Critias, and he of Callæſchrus, who was the father of our Critias. It is ſaid that Solon was deſcended from Codrus King of Athens, and that going higher back Neleus and Neptune were found among his firſt anceſtors (10). By the way, I am ſurprized that Proclus, on a paſſage of Plato very ſufficient to refute thoſe who aſſure us that Dropides was the brother of Solon, ſhould make a Commentary wherein he declares in favour of that fraternal relation, without anſwering the objection which his Text might have ſuggeſted. Critias there ſays (11) that Solon had told Dropides a certain ſtory; for, adds he, Solon lived familiarly and in great friendſhip with Dropides, ἦν μὲν γὰρ οἰκείῳ καὶ σφόδρα φίλῳ. Would this reaſon be alledged in ſpeaking of two brothers?

(10) Diog. Laertius, *in Platone*, lib. 3. num. 1. *See alſo* Plato, *in Charmide*, pag. m. 463, C.

(11) In *Platon. Timæo*, pag. m. 1042, C.

[E] *. . . . his Eloquence.*] Here is what Cicero ſays of it: *Huic ætati ſuppares Alcibiades, Critias, Theramenes, quibus temporibus quod dicendi genus viguerit, ex Thucydidis ſcriptis, qui ipſe tum fuit, intelligi maxime poteſt: grandes erant verbis, crebri ſententiis, compreſſione rerum breves, & ob eam ipſam cauſam interdum ſubobſcuri* (12). i. e. " In this age flouriſhed Alcibiades, " Critias, and Theramenes, who were contemporaries; " and what ſort of eloquence was at that time in " vogue may be beſt learned from Thucydides, who " himſelf lived in thoſe days: they uſed lofty words, " and ſententious expreſſions, affecting great conciſeneſs, for which very reaſon they were ſometimes a " little obſcure." Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus has given an advantageous idea of the eloquence of Critias (13); but he makes it to be of a quite different character from that which Cicero has juſt given us. It is plain Cicero ſuppoſes that to know the eloquence of Critias we need only conſider the ſtyle of Thucydides. He ſuppoſes, no doubt, that the conciſe and ſententious manner of expreſſion, which reigns in that famous Hiſtorian, was in faſhion in thoſe times, and that Critias and the other Orators whom he names, followed no other method in their Orations. Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus, on the other hand, aſſures us that Thucydides had no imitators, and to prove it he refers his readers to Critias by name. *Ad eos autem qui Thucydidis orationem ad veterem atque illis temporibus uſitatam dicendi rationem referunt, neque obſcuro neque prolixo mihi ſermone opus erit. Quibus illud dici poteſt; cum multi eſſent Athenis & Oratores, & Philoſophi, quo tempore bellum inter Peloponnenſes atque Athenienſes gerebatur, neminem tamen repertum eſſe, qui hunc dicendi modum uſurparit, neque Andocidem, neque Antiphontem, neque Lyſiam, qui Oratores erant: neque Critiam, neque Antiſthenem, neque Xenophontem, qui Socraticam philoſophandi rationem ſectabantur* (14). i. e. " In anſwer to " thoſe who are of opinion that the language of Thucydides was the ancient way of ſpeaking, which was " at that time in uſe, I need be neither obſcure nor " prolix. It may be ſufficient to ſay, that tho' there " were many Orators and Philoſophers at Athens, during the war between the Peloponneſians and the Athenians, yet we know of none who imitated his " method, neither Andocides, Antiphon, or Lyſias, " who were Orators; nor Critias, Antiſthenes, or Xenophon, who followed the Socratic way of philoſophizing." Cicero, in another place, changes his note a little; he agrees that Critias was not ſo conciſe as Thucydides: I know not why he makes ſome difference as to time between Critias and Alcibiades; for, in the utmoſt rigour of expreſſion, they ought to be deemed contemporaries. I ſet down the words of Cicero; by which it will appear that ſome of Critias's writings were remaining in his time. *Antiquiſſimi fere ſunt quorum quidem ſcripta conſtent, Pericles, atque Alcibiades, & eadem ætate Thucydides, ſubtiles, acuti, breves, ſententiis magis quam verbis abundantes. Non potuiſſet accidere, ut unum eſſet omnium genus, niſi aliquem ſibi proponerent ad imitandum. Conſequuti ſunt hos Critias, Theramenes, Lyſias. Multa Lyſiæ ſcripta ſunt, nonnulla Critiæ, de Theramene audivimus; omnes etiam tum retinebant illum Periclis ſuccum, ſed erant paulò uberiore filo* (15). i. e. " The moſt ancient writers almoſt of whom we have any certain remains, Pericles, and Alcibiades, and Thucydides " their contemporary, were ſubtil, acute, conciſe, " abounding more in ſentences than words. It could " not poſſibly happen that the ſtyle of them all ſhould " be of the ſame kind, unleſs they had propoſed ſome " one for their imitation. Theſe were followed by " Critias, Theramenes, and Lyſias. We have many " pieces of Lyſias extant, and ſome of Critias; of " Theramenes we have only heard: they all even at " that time retained the pithy ſtyle of Pericles, but " were ſomewhat more copious." Father Cauſſin reckons Critias among the ancient Sophiſts, and praiſes him highly. *Non obſcuri quoque nominis inter veteres Sophiſtas Critias qui in gravi genere dicendi exercitatiſſimus fuit. Nec tamen gravitatem verbis poeticis aut dithyrambicis metiebatur, ſed vocabulis maxime propriis, ut natura poſtulat, concinnabat orationem. Inſigni præterea brevitate & magna Atticiſmi temperie loquutus, nihil habet inſolens aut ineptum* (16). i. e. " Critias alſo " was of no obſcure name among the old Sophiſts, " being perfectly well ſkilled in the grave manner of " ſpeaking. However he did not heighten the ma" jeſty of his diſcourſe by poetical or bombaſt expreſ" ſions, but made choice of the moſt proper terms, as " the nature of his ſubject required. Beſides, he " ſpoke with remarkable conciſeneſs, and a judicious " mixture of the Attic elegance, without any harſh" neſs or impropriety." He cites Hermogenes in his favour (17): but I ſhould rather chuſe to acquaint my readers that he was one of the thirty Tyrants of Athens, than ſimply to call him a Sophiſt. I agree however that Philoſtratus, giving too great a latitude to the word, has placed Critias among the old Sophiſts. We have ſeen that he makes him to have been a wicked villain; and we ſhall preſently ſee that he praiſes him

(12) Cicero, *in Bruto*, cap. 7.

(13) See his *Opera Rhetorica & Critica*, pag. 145, 228, 425, of the 8vo Edition, 1615.

(14) Ibid. pag. 425.

(15) Cicero, *de Oratore*, lib. 2. cap. 22.

(16) Cauſſin. *de Eloquentia*, lib. 1. pag. m. 18, 19.

(17) *Ab Hermogene judicatur* . . . . Ibid.

and the Verſes which he compoſed [*F*]. He has been praiſed more by Plato than by Proclus [*G*], Plato's Commentator. He has been reckoned in the number of thoſe who dogmatized againſt the exiſtence of God [*H*]. It would be no ſurprize

him highly on account of his eloquence, nearly in the ſame words which Father Cauſſin has made uſe of. Τὴν δὲ ἰδίαν τῷ λόγῳ δογμαλίας ὁ Κριτίας ϗ πολυγνώμων, συμνολογῆσαί τι ἱκανόταλ⊙, ὃ τὴν ἀθυμοδόδη συμνολογίαν, ὐδὲ καλαφιύγσαν ἐς τὰ ἐκ ποιητικῆς ὀνόματα, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν κυριωτάτων συγκιμένη ϗ κατὰ φύσιν ἔχσαν, ὁρῶ τὸν ἄνδρα ϗ βραχυλογοῦντα ἱκανῶς ϗ διυῶς, καθαπλόμνον ἀπολογίας ἤθει, ἀτλικίζοηλά τι ὐκ ἀκραλῶς, ὐδὲ ἀκφαύλως. *Genus vero orationis Critiæ fuit ſententiarum gravitate & judicio ornatum. Idem in gravi dicendi genere exercitatiſſimus fuit, quam quidem gravitatem non dithyrambis intonabat, neque ad poetica verba confugiebat, ſed vocabulis maxime propriis concinnabat & ut natura poſtulabat. Video namque hominem decenti brevitate loquentem, & in defenſione alios ſubtiliter carpentem; item neque male neque immoderate Attica lingua differentem* (18). I omit the remaining part of his character given by Philoſtratus: he took delight in paradoxes, and to repreſent the ſame idea by ſeveral looſe ſtrokes (19). The wind of his eloquence often abated, but it was always ſofter and more agreeable than the zephyrs (20). We learn from a Letter of Philoſtratus, that Critias and Thucydides took Gorgias for their model, and that they were obliged to him for the elevation of their eloquence, accompanied by eaſe in the one, and ſtrength in the other. Κριτίας δὲ ϗ Θυκυδίδης ὐκ ἀγνοῦνλαι τὸ μιγαλόγνωμον ϗ τὴν ὀφρῦν παρ' αὐτῷ κικλημένοι· μεταποιῦνλις δὲ αὐτὸ ἐς τὸ οἰκεῖον, ὁ μὲν ὑπ' ἐνγλωττίας, ὁ δ' αὖ ὑπὸ ῥώμης. *Critiam vero & Thucydidem non clam eſt magnitudinem animi & ſupercilium ab eo* (Gorgia) *accepiſſe. Tranſtulerunt autem ad propria, alter ad linguæ promptitudinem alter ad robur* (21).

(18) Philoſtratus, *in Vitis Sophiſtar.* pag. 505.

(19) Καὶ τὸ ἀσυνδέτως δὲ χαρίεν προσβαλεῖν Κριτίου ἦρα. *Critiæ quoque decor eſt ſcopis diſſolutis uni loco inhærere.* Idem, ibid. *This is exactly what may be ſaid of* Seneca.

(20) Ibid.

(21) Philoſtrat. *in Epiſt. ad Juliam Auguſtam*, pag. 887.

[*F*] . . . *and his Verſes.*] Plutarch quotes a paſſage of Critias's Elegies, wherein the Author reminded Alcibiades that it was he who had cauſed him to be recalled, I mean, who propoſed the Law which recalled him to the Athenian people. It cannot be pretended that the Author of thoſe Elegies was another Critias, ſince Plutarch calls him the ſon of Callæſchrus (22), and citing the ſame work in another place, he attributes it to Critias, one of the thirty Tyrants (23). A fault has crept into Amiot's Tranſlation of the Life of Alcibiades: inſtead of *Critias the ſon of Callæſchrus*, we there read *Callias the ſon of Callæſchrus*. The ſame fault appears in Serranus's Plato, in the Dialogue intitled *Protagoras*. Κριτίας is in the Greek, and *Callias* in the Tranſlation. Plutarch is not the only Author who has quoted Critias's Elegies, of which you may find ſeveral fragments in Athenæus: look in Book X, page 432, and Book XV, page 666. This laſt paſſage informs us that what is quoted in the firſt Book, page 28, is taken from the ſame work of Critias. I doubt not but he compoſed other poetical pieces. It was not certainly known whether he was the Author of a Poem intitled *Pirithoüs*: ſome aſcribe it to him, and others to Euripides (54). We ſhall ſee below whether he ought to be diſtinguiſhed from the Author of the Book *De Politia Lacedæmoniorum*.

(22) Κριτίου τοῦ Καλλαίσχρου γράψαντος ὡς αὐτὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐλεγείαις σπουδάσας. *Ex Critiæ Callæſchri filii rogatione, ut ipſe hiſce Elegiis cecinit.* Plut. *in Alcibiade*, pag. 209. E.

(23) Κριτίας δὲ τῶν τριάκοντα γενόμενος ἐν ταῖς ἐλεγείαις εὔχεται. *Critias ex triginta tyrannis optat in Elegiis.* Idem, *in Cimone*, pag. 484, E.

[*G*] *He has been praiſed more by Plato than by Proclus.*] "No body in this city is ignorant that Critias is "maſter of all thoſe things which we are ſpeaking of." Κριτίαν δὲ που πάνλις οἱ τῇδε ἴσμεν ὐδενὸς ἰδιώτην ὄνλα ὧν λέγομεν. *Critiam vero omnes utique hac in urbe, nullius eorum, quæ dicimus, eſſe imperitum ſcimus* (25). This is the Elogy which Plato beſtows on him; having juſt before ſpoken of the advantages which are reaped from an excellent genius, and the ſtudy of true Philoſophy. Let us ſee what Monſr. Petit has obſerved on this paſſage. *Proclus in commentario ad hunc locum:* Ὁ Κριτίας ἦν μὲν γενναίας ϗ αὐθαδοῦς φύσως, ἤπτλο δὲ ϗ φιλοσόφων συνυσιῶν, ϗ ἐκαλεῖτο ἰδιώτης μὲν ἐν φιλοσόφοις, φιλόσοφ⊙ ϗ ἐν ἰδιώταις, ὡς ἡ ἱσωρία φησίν. Erat quidem Critias generoſa & vehementi indole, nec philoſophicarum expers diſceptationum; ſed ita tamen ut idiota inter philoſophos, philoſophus inter idiotas vocaretur; ut quidem hiſtoria teſtatur. *Quod ſignificat hunc quidem non fuiſſe perfectum in philoſophia, ſed tamen ingenio aptum, & multæ eruditionis* (26). i. e. "Proclus in his commentary on this place writes "thus: *Critias indeed was of a noble and ſtrong genius; he had alſo frequented the aſſemblies of Philoſophers, yet ſo as to be reckoned a novice among Philoſophers, and a Philoſopher among novices; as is recorded in hiſtory.* Which ſignifies that he was not "a perfect Philoſopher, but yet of an apt genius, and "great learning." Obſerve on theſe laſt words of Mr. Petit, that the expreſſions of Proclus do not ſeem to ſignify that Critias had much learning. A man may without that paſs for a Philoſopher among the ignorant. *Inter cæcos regnat ſtrabus.*

(24) Athen. lib. 11. pag. 496.

(25) Plato. *in Timæo*, pag. m. 1041, E.

(26) Petrus Petitus, *Miſcellan. Obſervat.* pag. 6.

[*H*] *He has been reckoned in the number of thoſe who dogmatized againſt the exiſtence of God.*] Sextus Empiricus expreſſes himſelf in very plain terms on this head. Θεὸς γάρ, ſays he (27), οἱ μὲν πολλοί φασιν εἶναι. τινὲς δ' ὐκ εἶναι· ὥσπερ οἱ περὶ Διαγόραν τὸν Μήλιον, ϗ Θεόδωρον, ϗ Κριτίαν τὸν Ἀθηναῖον. *Moſt people believe there are Gods; but ſome, as Diagoras, Theodorus, and* CRITIAS *the Athenian, ſay there are none.* He is more explicit in repreſenting this perſon's thoughts in another Book. Critias, one of the thirty Tyrants of Athens, ſays he (28), ſeems to have been in the number of Atheiſts. He pretends that the old Legiſlators, in order to prevent a man from doing an injury to his neighbour in private, feigned that there is a Providence, which takes notice whether men live well or ill, and puniſhes thoſe who do evil. According to this ſyſtem, there had been a time when mankind, living as diſorderly as brute beaſts, and neither rewarding good actions, nor puniſhing crimes, followed no other rule than the law of ſuperior ſtrength. Afterwards there were men who appointed puniſhments, and then juſtice exerciſed her authority over injuſtice, as a maſter does over his ſlave; and thoſe who did any evil were puniſhed. In proceſs of time, it being perceived that the Laws indeed reſtrained men from committing crimes in public, but not from doing an ill action in ſecret, a man of ſenſe aroſe who knew he ſhould render a very great ſervice to mankind if he could contrive it ſo that the wicked ſhould be afraid of being puniſhed, even when they ſhould ſin in private, or ſhould only have evil intentions. Wherefore he invented a God, that is to ſay, an immortal Nature who ſees and knows all things: he attributed to him the government of the world, the motion of the heavens, lightning, and thunder, and all things in general which mankind are afraid of: thus, concluded he, did an able man make the others believe the exiſtence of a Deity. Sextus Empiricus ſets down Critias's own words, without quoting the work from whence he takes them. We only know that he borrowed them from a Poem; for he cites ſome Iambic verſes. But what perplexes one is, that Plutarch aſcribes the ſame verſes to Euripides, and ſuppoſes that Poet, dreading the Areopagus, and for that reaſon not daring to publiſh his Atheiſm directly, put this wicked ſyſtem into the mouth of a perſon repreſented on the ſtage (29): Εὐριπίδης ὁ τραγῳδοποιὸς ἀποκαλύψαλ μὲν ὐκ ἠθέλησε, διδοικὼς τὸν Ἄρειον πάγον· ἐνέφηνε δὲ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον· τὸν γὰρ Σίσυφον εἰσήγαγε προφάτην ταύτης τῆς δόξης, ϗ συνηγόρευσεν αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ τῇ γνώμῃ, Ἦν γὰρ χρόν⊙ (φησὶν) ὅτ' ἄτακλ⊙ ἦν ἀνθρώπων βί⊙, Καὶ θηριώδης, ἰσχύ⊙ θ' ὑπηρέτις. ἔπειλα φησὶ τὴν ἀνομίαν λυθῆναι νόμων εἰσαγωγῇ. ἐπεὶ γὰρ ὁ νόμ⊙ τὰ φανερὰ τῶν ἀδικημάτων εἴργειν ἐδύναλο, κρύφα τε ἠδίκει πολλοί, τότε τὶς σοφὸς ἀνὴρ ἐπέστησεν ὡς δεῖ ἀεὶ ψευδεῖ λόγῳ τυφλῶσαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ϗ πεῖσαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, Ὡς ἔστι δαίμων ἀφθίτῳ θάλλων βίῳ, Ὃς ταῦτ' ἀκούει ϗ βλέπει φρονεῖ τ' ἄγαν. *Euripides tragicus poeta aperte quidem profiteri hanc ſententiam non eſt auſus, metuens Areopagiticum judicium: indicavit tamen hac ratione: Siſyphum introduxit, qui eam proferret, ipſeque ei patrocinatus eſt,*

(27) Sext. Empir. *Pyrrhon. Hypotypoſ.* lib. 3. pag. 155.

(28) Idem, *adverſus Mathematicos*, pag. 318.

Incondita olim vita fuit mortalium,
Et belluina, viribuſque ſerviens.

Legibus deinde poſitis ait injuſtitiam fuiſſe repreſſam. Sed cum hæ aperta poſſent flagitia prohibere, multi autem occulte ſcelera perpetrarent, tum quendam callidum virum prodiiſſe, qui docuerit veritati tenebras mendacio offundendas, hominibuſque perſuadendum eſſe,

(29) Plutarch. *de Placitis Philoſophor.* lib. 1. Quæſt. 7. pag. 880, E.

Quod

ſurprize to me, that Authors meanly verſed in the Ancients ſhould be ignorant of this certain

Quod ſit perenni vita aliquis vigens Deus,
Qui cernat iſta, & audiat, atque intelligat.

i. e. "Euripides the tragic Poet durſt not openly profeſs this opinion, being afraid of the Tribunal of the Areopagus; however he publiſhed it in this manner: he introduced Siſyphus, as the broacher of this doctrine, and then patronized the opinion himſelf; ſaying,

"*There was a time when mankind knew no order,*
"*But liv'd like ſavage beaſts, the ſlaves of power.*

"Afterwards he ſays injuſtice was repreſſed by the introducing of Laws: but when theſe could only prevent open crimes, and many committed unjuſt actions in ſecret, a ſubtle man aroſe, who taught that truth ought always to be blinded by falſe reaſoning, and that men muſt be perſuaded

"*That there's a God enjoying endleſs life,*
"*Who hears, and ſees, and knows thoſe ſecrets well.*"

It is evident that the Syſtem given by Sextus Empiricus, and that mentioned by Plutarch, are the very ſame. They differ only in that Plutarch does not cite ſo many verſes as Sextus Empiricus, and that he aſcribes to Euripides what the other attributes to Critias; but the verſes which Plutarch cites are exactly the ſame with ſome of thoſe which are quoted by Sextus Empiricus. Hereupon it might be aſked whether by a ſlip of memory too frequent among Authors both great and ſmall, what belongs to Euripides has not been aſcribed to Critias, or what belongs to the latter to Euripides; or whether there be any other way to ſolve the difficulty? Methinks a Phyſician of Paris has been pretty happy in conjectures.

He is of opinion there is an omiſſion in Sextus Empiricus, that is, that the tranſcribers have ſkipped ſome periods which contained what had been quoted from Critias, and the notice which had been taken that Euripides, being poſſeſſed by the ſame opinion, had explained it at length in a Tragedy. *Mihi probabilius videtur mutilum eſſe* Empirici *librum quam* Plutarchi, *nec ea modo quæ ex Critia citabat ævo ſubſtracta, ſed etiam ipſius verba illa quibus Euripidem eorum verſuum auctorem laudabat antequam verſus ipſos poneret. Quo ſane factum putandum eſt ut iis qui lacunam non adverterent, iidem verſus Critiæ adſcribi, ac nomine ejus citari ab* Empirico *viderentur* (30). Thoſe who know that ſome very ancient and tolerably good manuſcripts do not contain all that is to be found in others, and that notwithſtanding there is no blank ſpace left in them, will allow that it is very poſſible that the manuſcripts of Empiricus are mutilated in this paſſage, tho' the writing be continued. But tho' I acquieſce in Monſr. Petit's conjecture, I do not admit all his reaſons; and ſhall point out thoſe which I take to be falſe.

(30) Petrus Petitus, *Obſervat. Miſcellan.* lib. 1. cap. 1. pag. 7.

MONSIEUR PETIT's Reaſons examined.

I. He ſays that, according to Plutarch, the reaſon which obliged Euripides to vent his Syſtem under the perſon of Siſyphus, was his fear of the Areopagus; now, adds he, that fear is not likely in ſuch a man as Critias, a cruel and violent Tyrant, who laughed at all Laws both human and divine (31). This reaſon is of no force; for the tyranny of Critias did not begin till after the taking of Athens: before that, he was conſiderable only in proportion to his intrigues, and was as anſwerable for his conduct as another; ſo that if he had deſigned to write a Play, he would have been obliged to uſe caution as well as Euripides, in a greater or leſs degree. The people of Athens and the Courts of Juſtice could have brought him to reaſon, as eaſily as they did Alcibiades, under the pretence of impiety (32). It is very probable that if Critias had written Tragedies, it was not after he became one of the thirty Tyrants, but while he enjoyed more leiſure. At the worſt, it is very poſſible that he wrote them before he was a Tyrant; and this is ſufficient to refute the reaſon I am here arguing againſt.

(31) *Non videtur is metus in tyrannum cadere qualis fuiſſe Critias dicitur, impotens, ſævus, juris humani oblitus, & Deorum contemptor.* Petit. ibid. pag. 5.

(32) *See* Cornelius Nepos, *in Vita Alcibiadis.*

II. Here is another which is full as weak. Critias was not Poet good enough to have ſuch fine verſes attributed to him as thoſe which are cited by Empiricus. How is this to be reconciled with Athenæus, who quotes ſo many good verſes of Critias, and even compliments him with the epithet of excellent (33), and who moreover cites a piece which paſſed for a work either of Critias, or of Euripides? When the public doubts whether a Poem be the production of one of the firſt-rate Authors, whom they know, or of another, they muſt neceſſarily be perſuaded that that other is an excellent Poet.

(33) Ὁ χρήστος Κριτίας. *Optimus Critias.* Athen. lib. 13. pag. 600.

III. What Monſr. Petit adds, that ſince Plato (34) has reproached Euripides with flattering Tyrants too much and praiſing Tyranny, the dread of the Areopagus ſuits much better with that Poet than Critias (35), ſeems to me a bad argument. For, generally ſpeaking, there is no manner of connection between preferring Monarchy to a Republican government, and not daring directly to ſpeak one's thoughts concerning Religion. The praiſes of Tyranny, for which Euripides has been reproached, are only certain paſſages in his Tragedies, wherein he deſcribes the advantages of Monarchical government: and it is not at all ſtrange that in a city like Athens, where the Republican government was an inexhauſtible ſource of revolutions and confuſions, a man of ſenſe ſhould be ſtruck with maxims which favour Monarchy. But let us quit this point, it not being our buſineſs to defend the taſte of Euripides; the queſtion is, whether becauſe he has ſometimes ſpoken in commendation of Kingly government, it was neceſſary for him to have recourſe to the artifice which Plutarch aſcribes to him; which is, that not daring to expoſe himſelf to the Judges of the Areopagus, he would not broach his impious opinions himſelf, but put them in the mouth of Siſyphus in one of his Tragedies. It is not eaſy to perceive that one of theſe two things may be the conſequence of the other: but it is very evident that if he had declared againſt Monarchy, and in favour of a Commonwealth, prudence would nevertheleſs have dictated to him, that he ought to ſtand in fear of the Areopagus, and make uſe of an artifice in publiſhing an impious doctrine. I acknowledge that, after a certain effort of meditation, a man diſcovers that Euripides, by commending Kingly Government, might become diſagreeable to the Athenian Magiſtrates, and that he ought for the future to have thought himſelf obliged to be more wary than another, and not furniſh an occaſion for a proſecution. But at the bottom, the conjecture of Mr. Petit would be diſputable (36); at leaſt it cannot be denied but that his argument would be involved in too much obſcurity. See the margin (37).

(34) Lib. 8. *de Republica.*

(35) *Magis profecto Euripidi convenit, quod ait Plutarchus, non auſum metu Areopagi aperire mentem ſuam de Diis; propterea Siſyphi perſonam ab eo inductum.* NAM & Plato *Euripidi objicit in octavo* de Republica, *quod tyrannis impenſius faveret, & tyrannidem laudaret.* Petit. lib. 1. pag. 6 and 7.

(36) *I ſpeak thus, becauſe it is certain that Monſieur* Petit *did not think of this.*

IV. If Plato's reproach of Euripides had been alledged only as a principle of the concluſion which I am going to examine, I ſhould not have attacked Mr. Petit's Logic in the manner I have done: I ſhould eaſily have perceived ſome connection between the two things which he has concluded from one another. He argues thus (38): ſince Euripides has made an encomium on Tyranny, and has warmly maintained the cauſe of Tyrants, it is probable that he publiſhed on the Stage the Maxims which are imputed to him; for thoſe Maxims are greatly to the taſte of Tyrants. So far all goes well; that is to ſay, whoever admits the principle, will be forced to admit the conſequence; but, as ill luck will have it, there is a falſe propoſition in this argument. It is not true that it is doing a thing acceptable to Tyrants to teach Maxims which tend to raze the impreſſions of Religion out of men's minds. They who are ſo ignorant and unreaſonable as not to attribute the origin of Religion to the impreſſions which God himſelf has communicated to the mind of man, find no ſuppoſition more plauſible than to ſay that thoſe who are deſirous of ruling over others invented

(37) *To know the reaſon of the difference here between the 1ſt and the 2d Edition conſult page* 1356 *of the 1ſt Volume of the 1ſt Edition, of this* Dictionary.

To ſpare the Readers that trouble, it may not be amiſs to ſet down the paſſage to which this Citation refers: and it is as follows. The perſon who made the Table to this Dictionary has juſt now informed me, that my Cenſure of Mr. Petit may be very falſe in this particular: for Euripides, by beſtowing commendations on Regal Government, might become diſagreeable to the Magiſtrates of Athens, and from thenceforwards he ought to have thought himſelf obliged to be more wary than another, and not furniſh an occaſion for a proſecution. This thought, I own, is ſolid; and I place it here as a corrective to my own: but at the bottom I am ſtill of opinion that Mr. Petit advances a very ſlight Conjecture; and at leaſt it cannot be denied but that his argument would be involved in too much obſcurity.

(38) *Quidni igitur Euripides tyrannis amicus, & Archelao Macedonum regi haud ſane admodum laudato, in amoribus, hanc ſententiam in ea tragœdia tyrannorum moribus conſentaneam protulerit: utpote quibus religio nihil aliud ſit, niſi machina theatralis, qualem poëtæ habent in promptu, ad expediendum fabulæ quampiam nodum?* Petit. *Obſerv. Miſcell.* lib. 1. pag. 7.

certain fact; but I think it a little ſtrange that the learned Mr. le Fevre did not know it [I]. The paſſage wherein Sextus Empiricus ſpeaks of it has given ſome exerciſe to one of our modern Critics (g). Moreri has had very little light with regard to this Article [K], and Voſſius could not ſerve him for a ſufficient guide [L].

(g) Mr. *Petit*, a Phyſician of Paris. See the Remark [H].

CRITO

invented Religion, in order the more eaſily to keep the people under the yoke. Hiſtory affords us a thouſand and a thouſand inſtances of the advantage which Princes have made of the ſuperſtitions of the people, whether the point was to encourage, or to intimidate them: an Oracle of Delphi, an anſwer of the Augurs, the explication of a prodigy, have been of ſingular uſe on a thouſand occaſions for the intereſt of the Sovereigns. Therefore, though by the very ſame machines the people may be induced to revolt (39), it is probable however that, as all the inconveniencies which may ariſe from an invention are not foreſeen, intelligent and able Sovereigns would have got a Religion forged, if they had not found one eſtabliſhed to their hands. What, therefore, does Mr. Petit mean by ſuppoſing that Euripides, to make his court to Tyrants, and in particular to Archelaüs King of Macedon, cauſed a long part to be ſpoken on the Stage with a view of deſtroying Religion? Is there any thing more likely to ruin it, than to make the people believe that it was only invented for a ſcarecrow, and that in reality it is a chimæra to imagine that lightening, hail, and ſtorms, are the chaſtiſements which God inflicts for wicked actions? Mr. Petit has ſo plainly refuted himſelf, that one cannot help being amazed at it: Tyrants, ſays he (40), laugh at Religion, and have no manner of regard for it; but yet they make uſe of all imaginable means to oblige their ſubjects to pay an exact obedience to Religious inſtitutions: and conſequently, ſhould he be anſwered, Euripides would have made his court to Tyrants very ill, had he publiſhed on the Stage ſo impious a Syſtem as that which Sextus Empiricus and Plutarch mention.

(39) See above the Remark [B] of the Article ABDAS.

(40) *Cum enim neque religionis reſpectum habeant, id tamen modis omnibus ſtudent, ut quibus imperant populi, religioni maxime pareant.* Petit. *Obſervat. Miſcell.* lib. 1. pag. 7.

Monſieur Petit has forgotten, methinks, one of the beſt reaſons which prove that it was Euripides, and not Critias, who dogmatized in that manner. He ought to have alledged that it is frequently the cuſtom of Euripides to bring perſons on the Stage who utter impieties. His Bellerophon inveighs in the boldeſt manner imaginable againſt Divine Providence, and concludes by denying it, by reaſon of the diſorders which are ſeen in the World, and the univerſal oppreſſion of innocence (41). I end this Remark by obſerving that Mr. Petit has cited a long paſſage of Seneca, which ſhews that Philoſopher looked on what the Ancients have ſaid concerning Jupiter's thunder as no other than a pious fraud. *Quid tam imperitum eſt, quam credere fulmina è nubibus Jovem mittere... ut impunitis ſacrilegis, percuſſis ovibus, incenſis aris, pecudes innoxias feriat... Si quæris à me quid ſentiam, non exiſtimo tam hebetes fuiſſe, ut crederent Jovem, aut non æquæ voluntatis, aut certe minus paratum eſſe. Utrum enim cum emiſit ignes, quibus innoxia capita percuteret, ſcelerata tranſiret, aut noluit juſtius mittere, aut non ſucceſſit? Quid ergo ſecuti ſunt, cum hoc dicerent? ad coërcendos animos imperitorum ſapientiſſimi viri judicaverunt, inevitabilem metum, ut ſupra nos aliquid timeremus. Utile erat in tanta audacia ſcelerum, aliquid eſſe adverſum quod nemo ſibi ſatis potens videretur. Ad conterrendos itaque eos, quibus innocentia niſi metu non placet, poſuere ſuper caput vindicem & quidem armatum* (42). i. e. "What can be more filly than to "believe that Jupiter hurls thunderbolts out of the "clouds,.. to ſtrike harmleſs cattle, kill ſheep, and "burn altars, letting ſacrilegious villains eſcape un-"puniſhed..... If you ask my opinion, I do not "imagine they were ſo ſtupid, as to believe that Ju-"piter was either not inclined to do juſtice, or unable "to execute it. For when he ſends forth his lighten-"ing, which ſtrikes the innocent, and paſſes over the "guilty, is he unwilling to direct it better, or does "he miſs his aim? What was their deſign therefore "in aſſerting this? To reſtrain the minds of the ig-"norant, the wiſeſt judged it neceſſary to introduce "a fear of inevitable puniſhment, and a dread of "ſomething above us. It was of uſe in an age when "wickedneſs was daring, that ſome power ſhould be "ſet up which none might think himſelf able to "withſtand. Wherefore to deter thoſe who are in-"nocent out of fear only, they placed over their "heads an armed avenger." Obſerve that Seneca denies not that Jupiter darts the thunder, if by Jupiter be underſtood the ſoul of the world, which has produced all things, which directs and governs all things, which may be called fate, providence, nature, world, and which properly ſpeaking is no other than the Univerſe itſelf. *Ipſe enim eſt totum quod vides, totus ſuis partibus inditus, & ſe ſuſtinens vi ſua* (43). This thought would eaſily go down with the Spinoziſts. When Seneca is aſked, why Jupiter ſtrikes what he ought to ſpare, and ſpares what he ought to ſtrike, he demands time to prepare an anſwer. *At quare Jupiter aut ferienda tranſit, aut innoxia ferit? In majorem me quæſtionem vocas, cui ſuus locus, ſuus dies dandus eſt* (44).

(41) See the Remark [AA] of the Article EURIPIDES. *See alſo* La Mothe le Vayer, tom. 12. Letter 135. pag. 220, *and* Athenagoras, *in Legat. pro Chriſtian.* pag. m. 28, & Clem. Alexandr. *in Admonit. ad Gentes*, pag. 50.

(42) Seneca, *Natur. Quæſt.* lib. 2. cap. 42.

(43) Idem, ibid. cap. 45.

(44) Idem, ibid. cap. 46.

[I] *Monſieur le Fevre did not know it.*] He has plainly ſhewn it in his Note on theſe words of Plutarch: *How much better ſtill would it have been for thoſe of Carthage, to have had for their firſt Lawgivers a Critias and a Diagoras, who believed neither God nor Spirit, than to offer ſuch ſacrifices as they did to Saturn* (45). Here follows his Note: "I know very well that Cri-"tias was a violent, furious, and unjuſt man, in a "word the moſt ſavage of the XXX Tyrants. But "the queſtion here is concerning a Philoſopher, and "not a Tyrant. For which reaſon I am of opinion "that inſtead of Critias we ſhould read Theodorus, "who was formerly one of the moſt famous Atheiſts "of Greece. I may be told that there is ſcarce any "reſemblance at all between theſe two words Κριτίας "and Θεόδωρος with regard to the Letters which com-"poſe them; but it muſt be conſidered that the Greek "Tranſcribers uſually abbreviate the words which "begin with θεο, ſo that they write Θδωρος with a "ſmall ſtroke over the Θ. However it be, *Critias* is "an error." Here is a deciſive ſentence, which would not have ſlipped from this Critic, if he had known what is to be found in Sextus Empiricus concerning Critias. One of the Fathers (46) has placed our Critias among the Atheiſts.

(45) *I follow his Tranſlation.* Here is the Greek: Τί δὲ Καρχηδονίοις οὐκ ἐλυσιτέλει Κριτίαν λαβοῦσιν ἢ Διαγόραν νομοθέτην ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, μήτε τινὰ θεῶν μήτε δαίμονα νομίζειν; ἢ τοιαῦτα θύειν οἷα τῷ Κρόνῳ ἔθυον. *Nonne utilius erat Carthaginenſibus jam inde ab initio Critia vel Diagoræ ad condendas leges adhibito decernere nullum eſſe Deum, nullum genium: quam talia ſacra facere, qualibus illi Saturno operabantur?* Plutarch. *de Superſtit. ſub fin.* pag. 171.

(46) Theophilus ad Autolycum, lib. 2. pag. m. 121.

[K] *Moreri has had little light as to this Article.*] I. He ought not to have ſpoken in the ſingular *of an Elegy of Critias*, ſince Plutarch and Athenæus have made uſe of the plural. II. He would not have ſaid that *Sextus the Philoſopher quotes an excellent fragment of his*, if he had known that that fragment contains an abominable doctrine, down-right Atheiſm. III. *Critias the ſon of Callæſchrus* ſhould not have made a ſeparate Article; he is the ſame Critias who was one of the XXX Tyrants. IV. There are no good reaſons to give us one Critias, a Greek Hiſtorian, different from the ſon of Callæſchrus; as will be ſeen in the ſubſequent Remark. V. The teſtimony produced by Clemens Alexandrinus is not *very advantageous to this Author*; for that Father only quotes (47) ſome words of Critias, to convict him of being a plagiary with reſpect to Euripides. What deceived Moreri was, that he did not underſtand the full force of theſe Latin words of Voſſius, *Illuſtre hujus Scriptoris teſtimonium adducit Clemens* (48). This ſignifies no more, than that Clemens Alexandrinus quotes Critias touching a remarkable ſubject: but this does not import that he praiſes or eſteems Critias. VI. No doubt ſhould have been made but that he who is cited by Plutarch in the Life of Lycurgus is the ſame perſon who wrote concerning the Republic of Sparta, and who is *twice quoted by Athenæus*. We ſhall ſee preſently that this is a certain truth.

(47) Stromat. lib. 6. pag. 620, D.

(48) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græcis*, pag. 348.

[L]..... *and Voſſius could not ſerve him for a ſufficient guide.*] He believed, without any foundation, that Critias the ſon of Callæſchrus was not the ſame perſon who compoſed Elegies, and was one of the XXX Tyrants (49). It is evident that we have here but one and the ſame Critias, and I am ſurprized that Voſſius did not perceive it: he has ſaid expreſly that Critias the Tyrant had addreſſed an Elegy to Alcibiades (50): now Plutarch quotes an Elegy of Critias the ſon of Callæſchrus, wherein the Author addreſſes himſelf to Alcibiades (51): is it not manifeſt there-

(49) Idem, *de Poetis Græcis*, pag. 44.

(50) Ibid.

(51) Plutarch. *in Alcibiade*, pag. 209, E.

CRITO. There have been ſeveral ancient Authors of that name; I ſhall not repeat what Moreri has ſaid of them; I ſhall only correct ſome of his blunders [*A*].

CRITON

fore that Critias the Tyrant, and the Elegiac Poet, and the ſon of Callæſchrus, are one and the ſame perſon? Voſſius was not always ignorant of this; for in his Greek Hiſtorians he is ſatisfied that the Critias from whom Plutarch quotes ſome verſes in the Life of Alcibiades is the ſon of Callæſchrus (52). We read alſo in Athenæus that Critias the ſon of Callæſchrus wrote ſome Elegies. As to Critias the Author of a Treatiſe concerning the Republic of Lacedæmon, Voſſius ought not to have thought (53), but known, that it is he whom Plutarch quotes in the Life of Lycurgus (54). To prove it, it is ſufficient to ſay that Athenæus, relating the ſame thing which Plutarch mentions, produces for his Voucher Critias, Author of the Treatiſe of the Republic of Lacedæmon. Voſſius aſſerts that this Critias is not the ſon of Callæſchrus; but gives no reaſons for it: wherefore as I would not be poſitive that he is in the wrong, neither would I warrant what he ſays to be true. It may be the ſame Critias, who was the Scholar of Socrates, and one of the XXX Tyrants, had a mind to demonſtrate to the public that he was at once a Poet, an Orator, and an Hiſtorian. He had left ſome Orations behind him, which Cicero and Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus had read; he had alſo left ſome Poems, which are cited by Plutarch and Athenæus (55): why may he not be the ſame perſon who compoſed a Treatiſe on the Republic of Lacedæmon? I obſerve that Athenæus quotes a paſſage of the Elegies of Critias, wherein he ſpeaks of the different ways of drinking at entertainments. Critias expatiates on the praiſes of the cuſtom obſerved at Lacedæmon in that reſpect. They drank no healths, neither did they drink round; they were guilty of no exceſs, but kept a certain medium which revived the warlike humour, and the gaiety of converſation, and which, in one word, was beneficial both to the body and the mind, rendring a man very fit for the functions of love, and provoking a ſound ſleep.

Οἱ Λακεδαιμονίων δὲ κόροι πίνωσι τοσοῦτον,
Ὥστε φρὴν εἰς ἱλαρὰν ἀσπίδα πᾶσ' ἀπάγειν,
Εἰς τε φιλοφροσύνην γλῶτταν μέτριόν τε γέλωτα.
Τοιαύτη δὲ πόσις σώματί τ' ἀφέλιμος,
Γνάμῃ τε, κλάσει τε καλᾶς εἰς ἔργ' Ἀφροδίτης,
Πρὸς θ' ὕπνον ἥρμοσαι, τὸν καμάτων λιμένα.

Lacedæmonii juvenes eouſque bibunt,
Ut ad capiendum ſcutum alacres totum animum vertant;
Linguam verò ad hilaritatem, modeſtumque riſum:
Ea nimirum potatio corpori utilis eſt,
Ac menti: juvatque multum ad Veneris opus,
Nec parum ad ſomnum confert, qui laborum portus eſt (56).

I obſerve alſo that the ſame Author cites Critias's Work concerning the Republic of Lacedæmon (57), to ſhew the different ways of drinking: and it happens that this Critias makes the ſame obſervation which I have already mentioned; that the Lacedæmonians drank no healths. This rather proves that here is but one Critias than that here are two. Take notice that Julius Pollux, who has cited Critias very frequently without ſpecifying any Book, has once named the Atalanta (58), and once the Treatiſe of the Republics (59).

[*A*] *I ſhall only correct ſome of Moreri's blunders*] I. Crito the Athenian lived indeed in the 94th Olympiad, but not in the year 150 ſince the building of Rome; it ſhould have been in the year 350. II. He was, I own, one of Socrates's diſciples, but it is not true, that Diogenes Laertius acquaints us with this; and yet he is the only author to whom Moreri refers. He ought to have quoted Xenophon (1). I ſhall clear this up in the cloſe of this Remark. III. Crito had not a ſon called *Cheſippus*; he ſhould have ſaid *Cteſippus*. IV. Crito the Phyſician *did* not *teach an art of politeneſs, which Galen ſays muſt be excuſed, becauſe Crito practiſed Phyſick at court, and had Kings and Ladies for his patients.* Would not this make one believe, that this Phyſician wrote Books, not upon the politeneſs, which becomes children, but upon that, which becomes full grown men, upon a politeneſs much more exalted than that of *Monſignor* della Caſa's *Galatea*? Would not one think, that he was the Chevalier de Meré of the Age; and that he publiſhed Treatiſes upon Delicacy, which deſerved the title much better than Father Bouheur's Defence againſt Cleanthe? And yet he did nothing of all this, and only taught that part of Phyſic, which is called *Coſmetica*. It is the art to cure uglineſs and other defects in the body, which are capable of creating in married people a diſguſt againſt one another. This is not the part of Phyſick, which is the moſt cultivated, but it is pretended, that it may be very uſeful, even with regard to the ſoul's ſalvation, ſince it may prevent adulteries. *Ad medicinam etiam pertinet Coſmetice, quæ ars non debet reprehendi, ſi quis recte utatur. Nam & mariti quandoque levibus uxorum vitiis offenſi, amorem ad concubinas, vel etiam meretrices, imo & alienas uxores applicant. Quandoque & homines bene natos, inque honore conſtitutos pudet cum ejuſmodi vitiis in publicum prodire. Itaque nec Galenus dubitavit in Arte ſua tradere complura, quæ ad Artem κοσμητικὴν pertinent; ut de iis, quæ pulchrum vultus colorem concilient; quæ maculas, ſcabritiem, aut rugas tollant; quæ capillis colorem mutent; quæ dentes albos reddant* (2). i. e. "The Art of beautifying is alſo a "part of Phyſic, which ought not to be condemned, "if it be properly applied. For huſbands, being "ſometimes diſpleaſed with ſome ſmall defects in their "wives, turn their affections to concubines, or lewd "women, or even to other men's wives. It happens "alſo ſometimes, that perſons of diſtinction, and who "enjoy ſome honourable poſt, are aſhamed to appear "in public with ſuch defects. Therefore Galen him-"ſelf did not ſcruple to give ſeveral directions con-"cerning that Art of *beautifying*; as, for inſtance, "what receipts are proper to give the face a beautiful "colour; or to take away freckles, pimples, or "wrinkles; or to alter the colour of the hair, or "to whiten the teeth." The Phyſicians uſe to diſtinguiſh this Art, from the ſhameful artifice, which teaches how to paint, and how to employ all the fine drugs, which Ovid had diſplayed in his Poem *de Medicamine faciei* (5) i. e. "of mending the face." They have endeavoured to correct this blunder in the edition of Moreri printed in Holland, but they did not ſucceed, becauſe they could not believe the blunder is ſo enormous as it really is. *He taught his Art with politeneſs, which Galen ſays, muſt be excuſed, &c.* Thus have they corrected the paſſage in Moreri; but it is certain the correction is ſtill wrong, but this is very pardonable; for ſince it is obſerved three lines lower, that Crito invented the *Coſmetica* or *Art of beautifying*, who would have imagined, that the *Politeneſs* and the *Coſmetica* are the ſame thing, and muſt not be diſtinguiſhed? Moreri's miſtake does not appear in its full light, but when one examines the Author, whom he tranſcribes. It is Voſſius: Now Voſſius's words are, *Hic Crito docuit artem κοσμητικὴν ſive* comptoriam *vel* exornatoriam: *qua in re, ut Galenus ait, veniam meretur, quia apud Reges & Reginas medicinam faceret* (4). That is, "This Crito taught the Art of beautifying or adorn-"ing, for which, Galen ſays, he deſerves to be ex-"cuſed, becauſe he practiſed Phyſick amongſt Kings "and Queens." It is evident from theſe words, that the pretended Art of Politeneſs, which Galen would have us excuſe, is nothing elſe but the *Coſmetica* or *Art of beautifying*. Moreri, no doubt, had read in ſome book, that Crito taught *Artem poliendi cutem*, the Art of making the ſkin ſmooth, to take away the freckles, &c. He did not take notice of the word *cutem*, the ſkin, and made of the reſt the pretended *Art of Politeneſs*. But could not Voſſius, whom he tranſcribed continually, and who was his perpetual Oracle, ſet him right here very eaſily? To aſſert, that *Galen gave a liſt of Crito's works* is not a good tranſlation of Voſſius (5): it would have been better to ſay, that he gave a ſummary of them. VI. To pretend, that theſe words of Voſſius, *docuit artem κοσμητικὴν* ſignify, that Crito was the firſt inventor of the *Coſmetica*, is a very ill-grounded pretenſion; there is a vaſt

(52) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* pag. 348.

(53) *Puto & eundem Critiam eſſe cujus Plutarchus mentionem fecit in Lycurgo.* Idem, ibid.

(54) Pag. 45.

(55) Athen. lib. 11. pag. 463.

(56) Idem, lib. 10. cap. 9. pag. 432.

(57) Idem, lib. 11. cap. 3. pag. 463. *Voſſius* thought that *Athenæus* quotes this Book no more than twice. I find it quoted thrice. *Harpocration* quotes it under the word Ἀνακυργεῖς.

(58) Κριτίας δὲ ἐν Ἀταλάντῃ. Jul. Pollux, lib. 7. cap. 10.

(59) Παρὰ Κριτίᾳ ἐστὶν ἐν ταῖς πολιτείαις. Idem, ibid. cap. 13.

(1) Xenophon, *de Fact. & Dict. Socratis*, lib. 1. pag. m. 418. *See alſo* Suidas *in* Κρίτων.

(2) Voſſius, *de Philoſophia*, cap. 9, pag. 74.

(3) If he was really the Author of that Poem.

(4) Voſſius, *de Philoſophia*, cap. 11. pag. 86, 87.

(5) Ἀναχεφαλαίωσιν *Librorum ejus exhibet Galenus*, lib. 1. τῶν κατὰ τόπους. Voſſius, *de Philoſoph.* cap. 11. pag. 87.

CRITON (GEORGE) (*a*) a Scotſman, has been Profeſſor of the Greek Tongue in the Royal College at Paris. He was a very good Papiſt [*A*]. He had married the daughter of a Scotſman, who was Counſellor in the Preſidial of Poitiers: ſhe was afterwards married to Francis de la Mothe le Vayer [*B*], after ſhe had refuſed a brother of the Conſtable De Luines [*C*]. Criton died April the 11th, 1611 (*b*).

(*a*) Thus he is called in Father Du Breul's *Antiquitez de Paris*, pag. m. 564. F. Labbe, *Bibliotheca Bibliothec.* pag. m. 71. calls him *William*, He is named *James* in the *Sorberiana*. I think we ought to keep to F. Du Breul's opinion.

(*b*) Du Breul, pag. 564.

a vaſt difference between a Phyſician, who makes a particular part of Phyſick his chief ſtudy, and a Phyſician, who firſt invented that part. Crito being a Phyſician at Court, and finding that the Princes and Princeſſes do as much deſire to get rid of a pimple or freckle, and in general any deformity in the face, as they do, to be cured of a ſickneſs, applied himſelf entirely to the *Coſmetick Art*: but it does not follow, that it had never been treated of by any Phyſician before him. VII. Laſtly, Moreri gives a very bad definition of the *Coſmetick Art*. *It is*, ſays he, *the Art of beautifying and adorning the body*. According to this definition, the *Coſmetica* ſhould alſo teach how to dreſs the head, to chooſe a ſuit of cloaths, to ſort jewels right, and in general the whole induſtry and ſkill of thoſe women, who dreſs a Bride on her wedding-day.

Let us ſee now, whether I was right in my ſecond criticiſm. It has been objected to me (6), that Diogenes Laertius *mentioning Crito's love for Socrates, and placing him in the number of Socrates's followers, hints thereby clearly enough*, what Moreri aſcribes to him. I anſwer to this, that a Philoſopher's diſciples are not the only perſons, who can ſhew a great love for him: ſo that what Diogenes Laertius ſays of Crito's *love for Socrates* is no proof of Moreri's aſſertion. I add, that he places between Socrates and Crito ſome Philoſophers, who were neither Socrates's diſciples, nor his followers; conſequently, it cannot be inferred from the place he gives Crito in his ſecond Book, that *he was a follower of Socrates*. Farther, he obſerves expreſly, that Crito's ſons were Socrates's diſciples, οἱ παῖδες δὲ αὐτῦ ἐπήκουσαν Σωκράτες (7). And as he ſaid nothing like this concerning Crito, it is natural to think he did not pretend to tell us the circumſtance, for which he is quoted in Moreri. It muſt even be obſerved (8), that Plato makes Socrates ſay, that Crito was as old as he, and father of Critobulus, Socrates's diſciple. It had been very proper in that place, that the Philoſopher ſhould put the father as well as the ſon in the number of his diſciples, and yet he gives that title to the ſon only. Yet I own, that Plato hints clearly enough in other places (9), that Crito muſt be reckoned amongſt Socrates's diſciples.

(6) See the *Moreri* printed in Holland, tom. 2. pag. 293. edit. of 1698.

(7) Diog. Laert. lib. 2. num. 121.

(8) Plato, *in Apologia Socratis*, pag. m. 27.

(9) It is not in the Dialogue intitled *Phædrus*; it is chiefly in the Dialogue intitled *Phædon*.

[*A*] *He was a very good Papiſt.*] Here follows what Sieur Gillot wrote to Scaliger (1). "You muſt "know, that ſome days ago, Criton, Profeſſor of "polite Learning, intended to take his Degrees of "Doctor of Civil and Canon Law, and propoſed "Theſes upon both Laws to be held publickly. "Theſe having been ſeen by the King's Counſel *, "they found one amongſt them, which is very much "contrary to the ancient and ſound doctrine of France "and of the Sorbonne, as well as to truth. It was "this: *Nec Hierarcha Romanus (ad quem ſolum αὐ-*"*θεντία τῆς ἀποστολικῆς διαδοχῆς Juriſdictio ſpiritualis*"*in Chriſtianos omnes, in patrimonio Eccleſiæ temporalis*,"*etiam poteſtas pertinet) nec Princeps ſolutus eſt legibus*"*tametſi uterque alios his ſolvere poſſit, & hic comitiis*,"*ille conciliis ſit ſuperior*. i. e. "The Biſhop of "Rome (to whom alone belongs the power, by ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles, a ſpiritual juriſdiction over "all the Chriſtians, and an authority even over the "temporal eſtate of the Church) and the Prince are "both ſubject to the Laws, tho' they can both exempt "others from them, and tho' the latter be above the "Aſſembly of the State, and the former above the "Councils. And in another Theſis, ſpeaking of ex"communication, he ſays, *quod nuda cogitatione non*"*nunquam incurritur, & ob unius noxam familiam omnem*"*& civitatem plerumque ferit*, that thought alone may "make us fall under an excommunication, and that "for the fault of one perſon a whole family, and even "a whole city generally incurs it. The King's Coun"ſel complained of this to our Grand-Chambre; "their complaint was very well received, and it was "ordered, that Criton ſhould come immediately to "ſpeak to the Attorney General, and that the diſpu"tation ſhould be put off. After he had been heard "the next day, and the opinion of the Doctors of "Canon-Law had been taken, it was ordered, that "the parties ſhould have a hearing very ſoon, and "in the mean time Criton was forbidden to hold, "or to diſpute upon the ſaid Theſes. This was done "on the XVIIth and XVIIIth of this inſtant Janua"ry. We are in hopes to proceed further, and to "make a Decree, which will be read in the Sorbonne, "and by which all Doctors will be ſtrictly charged, "not to maintain ſuch propoſitions, which are con"trary to the doctrine of the Gallican Church."

(1) *Lettres Françoiſes eſcrites à Scaliger*, pag. 256.

* The Attorney and Sollicitor General.

[*B*] *His widow married Francis de la Mothe le Vayer.*] I confeſs, that I had not been acquainted with this, but by reading the *Sorberiana*, where I met with the following paſſage. "Franciſcus Motha Vahyerius, "of Mans (2), married the daughter of Adam Bla"cuodæus, Counſellor at Poitiers, and a learned "man: She was the widow of Jacobus Critonius, "Profeſſor of polite Learning at Paris. Le Vayer "got all his collections, of which he knew how to "make a very good uſe."

(2) He ſhould have ſaid of Paris; his father was of Mans.

[*C*] . . . . *After ſhe had refuſed a brother of the Conſtable de Luines.*] Do not think that ſhe was ſo nice, at the time when Mr. de Luines was in favour at Court, and High-Conſtable of France, if it be true that ſhe refuſed Monſieur Cadenet, it was before Mr. de Luines was raiſed at Court. I mention this with an *if*, becauſe I have no other authority, but a collection of pieces written againſt the Family of the Luines's. Now the Writers of ſuch kinds of Satyrs are not much to be depended upon. At all adventures, I ſhall tranſcribe, what I read in that Collection. *Cadenet's arrogance was not leſs preſuming, when in the year* 1618 *he pretended to marry the Princeſs of Orange, ſiſter to the firſt Prince of the Blood, and the widow of a ſovereign Prince; Cadenet, I ſay, to whom the King's nurſe had refuſed her daughter, and whom the widow of Criton, Profeſſor of the Greek Tongue at Paris, would not marry; and ſoon after we ſee him ſo bold as to pretend to match into the Royal Family* (3).

(3) This is taken from a Satyr or Libel intitled, *Le Comtadin Provençal*; it is inſerted in pag. 79, &c. of the *Recueil des Piéces les plus curieuſes, qui ont été faites pendant le Regne du Connétable de Luynes*, printed in the year 1625, 8vo. The paſſage which I have quoted is in pag. 103.

CRITON (JAMES) was born in Scotland in the ſixteenth Century; he was one of the moſt extraordinary prodigies for wit, that have ever been ſeen (*a*). There is a long Article of him in Moreri.

(*a*) *See* Aldus Manucius, *ſon of Paul, in the Dedication of his* Notes upon Tully's Paradoxes. *dedicated to James Criton, in the year* 1581.

Thus he ſhould have been quoted, and not as Moreri does, Ald. Manucius, in Præfat. Cicer. *This Commentary of* Aldus Manucius *was*

CRITON (*a*) (WILLIAM) was born in Scotland in the ſixteenth Century, and turned Jeſuit in France, in the *Seminary of Rheims* (*b*). He was Rector of the College of the Jeſuits at Lyons (*c*). He made himſelf very famous, not indeed by his works, for I do not believe he publiſhed any, but by conſpiracies, which if they had ſucceeded, had been infinitely more advantageous both to his Order, and to the whole Roman Catholic party, than an hundred volumes. He paſſed and repaſſed the Sea and the Alps very often with

(*a*) His Scots name was *Chreighton*.

(*b*) De Larrey, *Hiſt. d'Anglet.* tom. 2. pag. 385.

(*c*) Paſquier, *Catechiſme des Jeſuites*, liv. 3. chap. 2. pag. m. 385.

with his head full of intrigues and plots, deſigned to reſtore the Roman Catholic Religion in Great Britain. Yet, if we may give credit to a letter which he wrote to Walſingham, he did not approve of wicked means to eſtabliſh the Kingdom of God [*A*], and he ſtrongly condemned the deſign of murthering of Queen Elizabeth, upon which William Parr aſked his advice. The privateers of Oſtend took him in the year 1585, on his return into Scotland to execute a great undertaking [*B*]. He was *conducted by order of the Admiral of the States, to Queen Elizabeth, who was ſo well pleaſed with this preſent, that ſhe gave the Admiral in return, amongſt other rewards, a golden chain* (*d*). He was impriſoned in the Tower of London, where he was kept a pretty while, but at laſt the Queen ſet him at liberty, after he had promiſed that he would never undertake any more the leaſt thing againſt England (*e*). Yet ſhe heard in 1593, that he had made ſeveral journies into the Low-Countries, and into Spain, to forward the deſign which the Catholics of Scotland had formed of calling in the Spaniards, in order to change the Religion, and to attack England (*f*). He attended the Biſhop of Dublin into Scotland, whither that Prelate was ſent by Pope Sixtus V, to offer the Infanta of Spain to the King (*g*). The conditions of this match were, that the King ſhould turn Papiſt, and join with the Pope and

(*d*) Richeome, *Plainte Apologetique*, chap. 43. pag. 166.

(*e*) Camden, *Annal.* pag. m. 604. *ad ann.* 1592.

(*f*) Idem, ibid.

(*g*) Paſquier, *Catechiſme des Jeſuites*, liv. 3. chap. 2. pag. 335.

[*A*] *If we may give credit to a Letter, he wrote to Walſingham, he did not approve of wicked means to eſtabliſh the Kingdom of God.*] Here follows a paſſage from Monſieur de Larrey's account of William Parr's confeſſion. " Morgan told him, that the whole Ca- " tholick Church expected a great and bold action " from his courage; and this wicked wretch aſſured " him, that he was ready to ſtick a dagger into the " heart of the firſt Lord of the Kingdom. Why do " you not ſay, into the Queen's, replied Morgan? " And into the Queen's alſo, anſwered he, if it were " proved to me, that it is lawful: but the Jeſuit " Vattes (1) is not of that opinion. He added, that " Criton, a Scots Jeſuit, was not of that opinion, " and that in order to diſſuade him from it, he had " alledged this fundamental principle, that the law of " Nature, as well as the law of God, teaches all men, " that they ought not to commit a crime with a deſign " of ſerving God: That he had ſtrongly inſiſted upon " this doctrine, laying great ſtreſs upon a ſentence, of " which he made a kind of demonſtration, namely, " that God loved *adverbs better than nouns*, that is to " ſay, that he is better pleaſed with what is rightly and " lawfully done, than with what is good and lawful " (2)." This William Parr, being found guilty of the execrable deſign of murthering the Queen, was executed March the 2d, 1585 (3). His Trial was immediately printed at London in Engliſh. There is a French Tranſlation of it in the firſt volume of the *Memoires de la Ligue*. I have juſt now examined it; but I have not found in it, that Parr ever mentioned our Criton, either by word of mouth, or in writing; and I obſerve, that Camden giving an account of Parr's confeſſion, inſerts into it, by way of parentheſis (4), what relates to this Jeſuit's opinion. Thuanus alſo mentioned it, but not a thing contained in Parr's confeſſion, but as an incidental circumſtance, which came ſome other way to be known. It is nevertheleſs true, that the printed Trial acquaints us with the Jeſuit Criton's ſentiments; for it contains a Letter, which he wrote to Walſingham (5), in which he has very clearly explained them. He was a priſoner in the Tower of London, when Parr was tried, and having been aſked by Walſingham, whether Parr had ſaid ſomething to him, *either in France or elſewhere, concerning the queſtion, whether it be lawful to murther her Majeſty*, he anſwered that he did not remember it. *But having thought of it afterwards, he wrote of his own accord to the Secretary* (6) *concerning this fact, all in his own hand, in the following manner.* His Letter is inſerted after theſe words, in the *Mémoires de la Ligue*, Tom. I. page 42.

I wiſh his Trial had acquainted us, whether this Letter was ſhewed to William Parr. It ſhould indeed have been done; for it was not very ſafe to truſt to a Declaration made in the Tower of London. Criton would never have owned in ſuch a place, that he had approved Parr's deſign. In order therefore to know, whether he ſpoke the truth, his Letter ought to have been communicated to the criminal, or the latter ſhould have been aſked, what converſations they had had together upon that attempt. If Parr had owned, that the Jeſuit loudly condemned the deſign of killing the Queen, we ſhould have a certain proof of Criton's Orthodoxy in this reſpect; but the Trial affords us no other argument upon this ſubject, but the teſtimony, which Criton being a priſoner would give of himſelf. I believe however that William Parr was interrogated upon this, tho' it be not mentioned in the account of his Tryal; and that therefore Monſieur de Larrey's aſſertion is well grounded: for here follows a circumſtance, which Richeome relates. *Parr was aſked, by the Queen's order, whether he did not know William Criton a Scots Jeſuit; he anſwered, yes, and that this Jeſuit diſſuaded him formerly from this attempt, when he aſked him his advice at Lyons. The Queen was ſurprized at this anſwer, which cleared the Jeſuit; and that ſhe might be better informed, ſhe commanded Francis Walſingham her Secretary, to aſk Criton, whether Parr communicated any thing of his deſign to him either in France or elſewhere. Walſingham went immediately to Criton, and aſked him, &c* (7). Richeome adds, what has been related above (8), and gives us Criton's whole Letter, tranſcribed from the *Mémoires de la Ligue*, then he continues after this manner. " The Queen having heard " the contents of this Letter; How, ſaid ſhe? they " publiſh that the Jeſuits deſign to murther me in Eng- " land, and this man protects me in France? She gave " orders afterwards to ſet Criton at liberty, and to " publiſh his Letter, not ſo much for his ſake, as to " let the people know, that the Jeſuits did not teach " it was lawful to kill her (9)." There was more policy than ſincerity in theſe words of the Queen; for ſhe knew perfectly well, that Criton's innocence could not clear the two Jeſuits, whom Parr had charged with approving his attempt (10). Let us ſay therefore that Richeome drew too general a conſequence from Criton's Letter, when he ſaid, *The members of our Society are ſo far from being the authors of that attempt* (of Parr), *that on the contrary, they have prevented it as much as lay in their power, according to the teſtimony even of our enemies. For the whole ſtory and the Letter have been inſerted in the collection of the memorable events, which happened during the League, publiſhed by thoſe of the pretended Reformed Religion, in the year* 1588 (11). His Remark would have had more weight ſtill, had he obſerved, that that part of the collection was only a French Tranſlation of an account publiſhed in Engliſh at London.

[*B*] *The Privateers of Oſtend took him in the year* 1585, *on his return into Scotland to execute a great undertaking.*] " He had been ſo cautious as to throw all " his papers into the ſea, after he had torn them " into ſeveral pieces: but the wind ſupported them, " and blew them again into the ſhip, ſo that not " one bit was either loſt or ſpoiled; which Criton " could not look upon but as a miracle in favour " of Elizabeth. They were taken up, and carried to " Vaad, who joined them together ſo dexterouſly, " that one might read in them the whole account of " the undertaking, of which the Scots Jeſuit was car- " rying the project to the accomplices. They found " there that the Pope, the King of Spain and the Guiſes " prepared an Army and a Fleet to invade England, " and that their deſign would ſoon be executed. This " writing having been publiſhed, put the whole King- " dom in an uproar (12)." Thuanus was not rightly informed, when he ſaid, that whilſt Parr was in priſon, ſome perſons gave notice, that Criton was gone over into England in a diſguiſed habit, for which reaſon he was ſeized (13).

(1) Thuanus alſo ſtyles him a Jeſuit, lib. 79. towards the end. But in Parr's Tryal he is only called a Prieſt. *See alſo* Camden, *Annal.* pag. m. 393, *ad ann.* 1585.

(2) De Larrey, *Hiſt. d'Angleterre*, tom. 2. pag. 392.

(3) Thuanus, lib. 74. towards the end, ſays, 1584: but he did not remember, that the Engliſh, in all public deeds begin the year with the 25th of March.

(4) It is printed in a different letter, from what precedes and follows.

(5) See the *Memoires de la Ligue*, tom. 1. pag. m. 42, &c.

(6) That is to ſay, to *Francis Walſingham.*

(7) Richeome, *Plainte Apologetique*, pag. 166.

(8) Quotation (6).

(9) Richeome, *Plainte Apologetique*, pag. 168, 169.

(10) One was *Beneditto Palmio* (Parr had conſulted him at Venice): the other was *Annibal a Codreto*, to whom he had confeſſed at Paris.

(11) Richeome, *Plainte Apologetique*, pag. 169. *See alſo* Eudæmon Joannes, in the *Apology for Garnet*, pag. 154.

(12) Le Larrey, *Hiſt. d'Anglet.* tom. 2. pag. 385, 386. *See alſo* Camden, pag. m. 384. *ad ann.* 1584.

(13) Thuanus, lib. 79. *circa finem.*

and the Spaniards againſt the Engliſh. It was ſome time ſince the King of Scotland's mother had been beheaded. Sixtus V's Envoy miſcarried in this negotiation, and on his return he left Crito in Scotland, to favour the deſigns of Robert Bruce, whom the Duke of Parma had ſent thither, by the King of Spain's command. It is ſaid, that this Jeſuit endeavoured to perſuade Robert Bruce to kill John de Metelan, Chancellor of Scotland, who had made the Biſhop of Dublin's whole negotiation miſcarry, but that not being able to prevail upon him, he accuſed him before the Governor of the Low-Countries (*b*). All this is fully related in a work of Stephen Paſquier. I do not know what the Jeſuits anſwered to it. Criton was ſtill living in the year 1615, as I am informed from a book, in which it is aſſerted, that he had reaſons to complain of the Jeſuits [*C*].

(*b*) Ibid.

[*C*] *He had reaſons to complain of the Jeſuits.*] Father *John Fourrier Rector of the Jeſuits at Avignon*, (thus they ſpeak in the Collection of the Articles, propoſed by Theophilus Eugene to his Moſt Chriſtian Majeſty, for the Reformation of the Jeſuits in France (14), *will not admit into his College Father Creton a Scotſman, that venerable old man, whom Queen Elizabeth of England delivered from priſon, becauſe he diſſuaded the parricide Parr from the attempt, upon which he was reſolved againſt her Royal Perſon. This ſincere Monk, who cannot mention F. Perſonius a Jeſuit, that reſtleſs ſpirit, who is always raiſing commotions in England, but he ſtiles him factious, enemy to his King, now King of Great Britain, becauſe he ſlandered him, and neglected to bring him over to the Church, to the great detriment of the two Kingdoms of England and Scotland. That old man, who laboured a great while in Spain to procure the peaceful converſion of his Prince, and who, tho' old and grey as he is, would rejoice to die in his own country. This good Father cannot be admitted into the College of Avignon; they fear leſt he ſhould procure alms for the poor Scots, who are baniſhed from their home for the ſake of the holy Catholick, Apoſtolick and Roman Faith. F. Fourrier cannot ſuffer to ſee at the gate of the College theſe poor Chriſtians reduced to want, for the quarrel of God. F. Creton, the Father of theſe perſecuted perſons, of theſe Confeſſors of our holy Faith, is ſent to Carpentras as being a charge too heavy for the covetouſneſs of F. Fourrier, the Rector. He is committed to F. Luce, an Italian, Rector of Carpentras, who is reſolved to make his life grievous to him, and to nouriſh him with anguiſh; he dies there daily under the unreaſonable government of F. Luce. F. Luce being exaſperated againſt F. Creton, who reproved him for his diſobliging behaviour towards the Lord Coponio his Biſhop, and towards the inhabitants of the city, will not be ſatisfied, till he drives this ſincere and bold old man out of his College; F. Luce's ill-treatment and ſurly pride force the good old man, decrepit as he is, to beg for admittance in another College; the charitable Rectors deſire to be excuſed. He can hardly meet with one Rector, who will admit him.*

(14) Printed in the year 1614, in 8vo. See there pag. 64, 65.

CROI (JOHN DE) in Latin *Croius*, was one of the moſt learned Miniſters in France in the ſeventeenth Century. He was born at Uſez (*a*), and the ſon of a Miniſter [*A*]. He performed his paſtoral functions in the Church of Beziers, and afterwards in that of Uſez. He publiſhed ſeveral books of Controverſy in French [*B*], but his Latin Works gained him a much greater reputation [*C*], becauſe it appeared by them that

(*a*) Colomies, *Gall. Orient.* pag. 184.

[*A*] *He was the ſon of a Miniſter.*] Whoſe name was Francis (1) de Croï. He had made himſelf known by ſome Books, according to Colomies (2). The only one I know, is that which he intitled, *Les trois Conformitez, ſavoir l'Harmonie & Convenance de l'Egliſe Romaine avec le Paganiſme, Judaïſme, & les anciennes Hereſies*, 1605, 8vo. i. e. "The three Conformities, namely, the Harmony and Reſemblance there "is between the Church of Rome, Paganiſm, Judaiſm, and the ancient Hereſies." I have been told, that he was deſcended from the ancient and illuſtrious Family of the De Croï's, but by a baſtard. The perſon who told me this, could not well ſay, whether Francis de Croï had been a Monk, he only aſſerted, that the Miniſter of Beziers was deſcended from a Monk, who turned Proteſtant, and who was a baſtard, or deſcended from a baſtard of the family of Croï. In the title of his Book of the three Conformities, he ſtyles himſelf, G. Arth. that is, *Gentilhomme Artheſien*, a Gentleman of the Province of Artois. He was Miniſter at Uſez.

(1) Colomies, *Gall. Orient.* pag. 184. calls him *John.*

(2) *Joannis Scriptis quibuſdam clari filius.* Ibid.

Obſerve, that a very honeſt man of that country let me know, that he wrote from Amſterdam to the ſon of our John de Croï (3), what I have here related upon an hear-ſay; and that he was anſwered, that the preſent De Croï's are deſcended from the Family of the De Croï's by lawful marriages, and that it could be proved in due form. I replied, that I would with all my heart inſert into my Dictionary the account that ſhould be communicated to me, as well of this ſubject, as of the life and writings of that able Miniſter, either printed, or to be printed. But I have not received any thing yet.

(3) He is a Lawyer at Uſez.

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſeveral Books of controverſy in French.*] He wrote one to prove the Truth of the Geneva Confeſſion of Faith * by the Scriptures, and dedicated it to our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. This Book was printed at Geneva in the year 1645, 8vo (4). The ſecond Edition of it was publiſhed in 1650, and contains ſeveral additions. The Author promiſed two other Treatiſes, the one, to confirm the ſame Confeſſion by the authority of the Fathers, and the other, to confirm it by the teſtimony of the adverſaries (5). In 1655, he publiſhed at Geneva a work intitled, *Auguſtin ſuppoſé, ou Raiſons qui font voir que les quatre livres du Symbole, que l'on a mis dans le 9 tome des Oeuvres d'Auguſtin ne ſont pas de lui, mais de pluſieurs auteurs, qui en on pris le Nom, contre le P. Bernard Meynier Jeſuite.* i. e. "Auguſtin ſuppoſititious; or, Arguments "to prove that the four Books on the Creed, which "are inſerted in the 9th Volume of Auguſtin's works, "were not written by him, but by ſeveral Authors, "who put them under his name, againſt F. Bernard "Meynier a Jeſuit." Colomiés obſerves, that *there is alſo a work of Mr. de Croï, intitled*, Semei convaincu (Shimæi convicted) *printed at Geneva in ſeveral volumes, in 8vo* (6). I do not believe that there are ſeveral volumes of this work, it is an Anſwer to a very captious Book, intitled, *La Sainte Liberté des Enfans de Dieu*; i. e. "The holy Liberty of the Children of "God." The Jeſuit Meynier, who is the Author of it (7), ſpeaks of it like a Reformed Miniſter, for which reaſon Monſieur Drelincourt intitled his Anſwer to that Book *Le Faux Paſtor convaincu*, (the Mock-Paſtor convicted,) it was printed in the year 1656. Here follows Monſieur Drelincourt's Obſervation at the end of his Preface to that Book. I hear that Monſieur de Croï, Paſtor of the Church of Uſez, anſwers or has already anſwered fully and exactly to all that our Mock-Paſtor has put in the laſt edition of his Libel. Therefore I leave the taſk to him with all my heart; for I know how great his learning and merit are, and that he does not *want my aſſiſtance.* I have heard of a Book, in which Monſr. De Croï pretends to prove, that St. Peter never was at Rome. See Monſieur Sarrau's CXXVIth Letter, p. 130 of the Utrecht Edition.

(5) Idem, ibid.

(6) Idem, ibid. pag. 184.

(7) *See* Nathaniel Southwell, *in Biblioth. Script. Societat. Jeſu*, pag. 122. where he ſays, that this book had been printed twenty times, and that the laſt edition was that of Nimes, in 1660.

* The Articles of belief.

(4) Colomiés, *Gall. Orient.* pag. 184.

[*C*] *. . . His Latin Works gained him a much greater reputation.*] In the year 1632 he publiſhed *Specimen Conjecturarum & Obſervationum in quædam Origenis Irenæi & Tertulliani Loca.* i. e. "An Eſſay of "Conjectures and Obſervations upon ſome paſſages in "Origen, Irenæus, and Tertullian." Twelve years after he publiſhed his *Obſervationes Sacræ & Hiſtoricæ*

that he perfectly well underſtood the Languages, Criticks, Hebrew Learning, Eccleſiaſtical Antiquity, and all that is meant by the words *Philology* and *Polymathy* or extenſive learning. He pretended in ſome manner to be an univerſal man, and even undertook to cenſure Monſieur Balzac upon his mother-tongue [*D*]. When the controverſy concerning univerſal Grace was carried on with the greateſt heat, each party endeavoured to get him on their ſide. The aſſerters of particular grace were the moſt diligent, and prepoſſeſſed him againſt univerſal grace to ſuch a degree, that he went to the general Synod of Alençon in a terrible paſſion, and full of threatnings (*b*). Mr. Amyraut boaſted that he had appeaſed him in a converſation, which laſted ſome hours. Others pretend, that Croï, having perceived afterwards, that Amyraut had impoſed upon him, was very angry at it (*c*). He died Auguſt the 31ſt 1659.

(*b*) See the Preface of Mr. Amyraut's *Specimen Animadverſionum.*

(*c*) *See* And. Rivet. *Ep. Apol.* and Du Moulin, *Præf. Judic. de Amyr. Libro contra Spanh.*

in Novum Teſtamentum. i. e. "Sacred and Hiſtorical "Obſervations upon the New Teſtament:" in which Heinſius is terribly cenſured. In divers paſſages of theſe two works he promiſes ſeveral others, which in all likelihood will never be printed. It is a pity; for we might learn an infinite number of things in them. He did not abuſe Daniel Heinſius only, he alſo extended his proud and biting criticiſm upon Father Petavius, who had examined and cenſured (8) the *Specimen Conjecturarum*. This Jeſuit would not reply, becauſe, ſaid he, when we write againſt the Miniſters, it occaſions the raiſing of their ſalary (9).

(8) *In Fine* Syneſii Operum, *Græcè & Latine editorum*, 1640.

(9) *Is reſponſurum ſe negat, ideo quod norit annua augeri Miniſtris contra quos ſcribitur.* Grotius, *apud* Colomeſium, *Gal. Orient.* pag. 185.

His *Obſervationes Sacræ* appeared very learned to Monſieur Sarrau, and very proper to deſtroy Heinſius's reputation (10). He wrote to Salmaſius, that the Author had twenty five Books like that ready for the preſs (11). He alſo wrote to him, that Heinſius had endeavoured to prevent the printing of his adverſary's Book (12), and had even deſired him in a very civil Letter to uſe him handſomely (13).

(10) Sarrau, *Epiſt.* 102. pag. 103, 104.

(11) Idem, Epiſt. 103. pag. 105.

(12) Idem, Epiſt. 102. pag. 103. *See alſo* Epiſt. 94. pag. 94.

(13) Idem, Epiſt. 81. pag. 81.

[*D*] *He undertook to cenſure Monſr. Balzac upon his mother-tongue.*] This was not the real ſubject of his criticiſm, he made ſome obſervations upon the language only by the by, and occaſionally; his chief deſign was to anſwer the cenſure of the *Herodes infanticida* (14), which cenſure had been publiſhed by Balzac. This Anſwer was printed at Geneva in the year 1642, and contains 189 pages in 8vo. It was an anonymous piece, but the Author declares at the end, that it was not out of fear that he concealed his name. *If Balzac will anſwer this*, ſays he, *I deſire him not to make uſe of any other name of his own, and not to hide himſelf under a borrowed one, that he might ſpeak of himſelf more freely. I have courage enough to diſcover mine when he ſhall deſire it, and ſtrength enough to enter the liſt, which he will open to me.* What is moſt ſurprizing, is that he is as zealous for the intereſt and glory of Heinſius, as his beſt friend could be, and beſtows exorbitant praiſes upon him, and yet he was at that time preparing a volume of mortifying and diſdainful obſervations againſt Heinſius. They were publiſhed in the year 1644, as I have already obſerved. Monſieur Sarrau was amazed at this conduct, and expreſſes his wonder and conjectures in the following manner. *Vidi tua indicina Croïi Reſponſionem ad Balſacium pro Heinſio. Plurima certe ſapiunt eruditionem altiſſimam; ſed linguam Gallicam & ſtylum quod attinet, fluit incultus, diſſipatus, inelaboratus, habebitque non pauca politiſſimi ingenii & vibrantis orationis adverſarius, etiam in ipſo argumento quæ regerat. Opus itaque laudo, non opificem, idem aliquando de Gariſſolii tui poemate dicturus. Sed an Croius ipſe autor eſt edendi? Vix credam. Scio enim & certò ſcio, habere eum præ manibus ſatis amplum volumen notarum in Exercitationes ſacras τῆς Φοινιξιδὸς Leydenſis. Ergo quum Gallicè, hoc eſt, quaſi intra privatas parietes opus hoc muſteum laudaverit, Latinè, id eſt per totum orbem terrarum in re non nauci, ſuggillabit. Explica quæſo mihi iſtud quicquid eſt ænigmatis. Niſi forſan Gronovius, quem iſtam Diatribam ad vos detuliſſe audio, voluit Heinſium, ad quem abituriebat, hac ſive arte, ſive officio demereri* (15). i. e. "I have ſeen De Croï's anſwer to Balzac in behalf of "Heinſius. There are indeed a great many things in "it, which ſhew the deepeſt learning. But as to the "French language and the ſtyle, it is unpoliſhed, looſe, "and rough: ſo that his adverſary, who has the moſt "polite wit, and a lively ſtyle, will find a great many "things to object to, even in the ſubject itſelf. I "therefore commend the work and not the work-"man, and I ſhall ſay the ſame one day of your friend "Garriſolles's Poem. But did De Croï himſelf pub-"liſh that work? I can hardly believe it; for I know "poſitively, that he has by him a volume of Obſer-"vations upon the *Exercitationes Sacræ* of that little "Phœnix of Leiden. When therefore he wrote in "French, that is, as it were in a private houſe, he "commended that new work, the reputation of which "he will ſink in Latin, that is, before the whole "world, in a conſiderable book. Pray unfold that "riddle to me, whatever it be. Unleſs perhaps Gro-"novius, who I hear brought that Diſſertation to you, "would by this artifice or kindneſs, gain Heinſius's "good will, to whom he was ſoon to go."

(14) It is the Title of one of Heinſius's Tragedies.

(15) Sarravius, *in Epiſtola ad Alex. Morum, Scripta Lutetiæ.* Idem, Januar. 1642, pag. 39, 40. edit. Ultraj. 1697.

☞ CROMWELL (OLIVER) was born in the pariſh of St. John at Huntingdon April the 24th (*a*) or 25th (*b*) 1599, and deſcended of an antient and conſiderable family in that county [*A*]. His father Mr. Robert Cromwell, ſecond ſon of Sir Henry Cromwell, and younger brother of Sir Oliver, who at his houſe at Hinchingbrook made the nobleſt entertainment for King James I at his acceſſion to the Engliſh Crown, that had ever been offered by a private ſubject, had not above three hundred pounds *per annum* (*c*). He married Elizabeth ſiſter to Sir Thomas, ſon of Sir Richard Steward Knights (*d*). He took great care of his ſon's education, and ſent him to Sidney-College in Cambridge [*B*], where he was admitted April the 23d 1616, under the tuition of Mr. Richard

(*a*) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 88. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*b*) *Life of Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland. Impartially collected from the beſt Hiſtorians, and ſeveral original Manuſcripts*, pag. 1. 2d edit. London 1725, in 8vo.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 1, 2.

(*d*) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

[*A*] *Deſcended of an ancient and conſiderable Family in Huntingdonſhire.*] The name of the family, from whence he was deſcended, was not originally *Cromwell*, but *Williams*. *Morgan Williams*, ſon and heir of *William*, of a very ancient family in Wales, married the ſiſter of Thomas Lord Cromwell, and Earl of Eſſex in the reign of Henry VIII. By her he had *Richard*, who was knighted by that King, and took the name of his uncle *Cromwell*, tho' he kept the arms of *Williams*. He married *Frances*, daughter and co-heir of Sir *Thomas Murſyn*; and upon the diſſolution of the Monaſteries, obtained all thoſe lands in Huntingtonſhire, which belonged to any of them in that County, and which amounted to a prodigious value. And this was the firſt ſettling of that Family in that County. He had a ſon, Sir *Henry Cromwell*, who was knighted by Queen Elizabeth in the 6th year of her reign, and married Joan daughter and heir of Sir Ralph Warren, and made his chief ſeat upon the ruins of an houſe of Nuns at Hinchingbrook. He had ſix ſons, *Oliver*, afterwards Sir *Oliver*; *Robert*, *Henry*, *Richard*, *Philip*, and *Ralph*. The ſecond ſon *Robert*, was father of *Oliver* the *Protector* (1).

(1) *See* Carrington's *Hiſtory of the Life and Death of his moſt ſerene Highneſs*, Oliver, *late Lord Protector*, pag. 3. edit. London 1659 in 12mo. and *Appendix* to the *Life of Oliver Cromwell*, pag. 409, 410. 2d edit. London 1725 in 8vo.

[*B*] *Sent him to Sidney-College in Cambridge.*] Carrington (2) tells us, that while he was a Student in this Univerſity, *a public repreſentation being to be performed, he that was to repreſent the King's part falling ſick, this our* Cromwell *was ſaid to have taken the part upon*

(2) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 3, 4.

Richard Howlet (*e*), who then obſerved, that he was not *ſo much addicted to ſpeculation, as to action* (*f*). Whilſt he was there his father died, upon which he returned home, and led an extravagant kind of life (*g*), ſo that his mother was adviſed to ſend him up to Lincoln's-Inn, where he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the Law. But not liking that ſedentary employment he ſoon returned to the country, and followed his former vicious courſes, to the waſting of a great part of his paternal eſtate. At laſt he became greatly reformed and religious [*C*]; and having an eſtate of four or five hundred pounds a year left him by Sir Robert Steward, his uncle by his mother's ſide, he married Elizabeth, daughter of Sir James Bouchier of Eſſex (*h*). In 1628 he was one of the Committee of Religion in King Charles the Iſt's third Parliament; and in 1637 the Puritans, to whom Mr. Cromwell adhered, being ſeverely treated by Archbiſhop Laud, he reſolved with ſeveral other Gentlemen to remove to New-England, but was prevented by a Proclamation forbidding the diſorderly tranſporting his Majeſty's ſubjects to the Plantations in America without a Royal Licence. In 1638 he oppoſed the draining of the Fens in Lincolnſhire and the Iſle of Ely, which gained him ſuch an intereſt, that he was elected Burgeſs for the Town of Cambridge in 1640 [*D*], to ſerve in the Long Parliament, in which he vigorouſly promoted the grand Remonſtrance (*i*). At the breaking out of the war, he was made Captain of a Troop of Horſe, and ſecured the Town of Cambridge, and took Sir Thomas Conneſby (*k*) High-Sheriff of Hertfordſhire, priſoner, at St. Albans. In 1643 he was made a Colonel, and by his own management raiſed a Regiment of a thouſand Horſe, with which he was very active for the Parliament. He was ſoon after appointed Lieutenant General to the Earl of Mancheſter, and routed the King's forces near Grantham, relieved Gainſborough, and in 1644 advanced to the ſiege of York, and gained the battle of Marſton-Moor [*E*]. The Earl of Eſſex, and the Scots Commiſſioners

(*e*) *Deſiderata Curioſa. By Francis Peck, M. A.* vol. 2. lib. 7. num. 21. B. 66. edit. London 1735 in fol.

(*f*) *The Perfect Politician: Or a full View of the Life and Actions (Military and Civil) of O. Cromwell. Whereunto is added his Character, &c.* pag. 2. edit. London 1660, in 24°.

(*g*) Wood, *ubi ſupra*; and *Life of Cromwell*, pag. 2.

(*b*) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, and *Life of Cromwell*, pag. 2.

(*i*) *Life of Cromwell.* pag. 4, 5.

(*k*) *The Perfect Politician*, pag. 3. S. Carrington in his *Hiſtory of the Life and Death of his moſt ſerene Highneſs, Oliver late Lord Protector*, pag. 6. edit. London 1659 in 12mo, calls him *Sir Thomas Comet.*

on himſelf, and ſo well employed the little time he had to get it by heart, as it ſeemed that it was infuſed into him, and whereby he repreſented a King with ſo much grace and majeſty, as if that eſtate had been natural unto him. The Author in the margin obſerves that this public Repreſentation was intitled, Lingua, *the Combat of the Senſes.* And Winſtanley (3) informs us, that this piece was written by Anthony Brewer, and "being once acted at Combridge, the late Uſurper "Cromwell had therein the part of *Tactus*, the ſub"ſtance of the Play being a contention among the "ſenſes for a Crown, which *Lingua*, who would "have made up a ſixth ſenſe, had laid for them to find, "having this Inſcription,

(3) *Lives of the moſt famous Engliſh Poets*, pag. 114, 115. edit. London 1687.

"*Which of the five that doth deſerve it beſt,*
"*Shall have his temples with this coronet bleſt.*

"This mock-contention for a Crown is ſaid to ſwell "his ambition ſo high, that afterwards he contended "for it in earneſt, heading ſuch a notable Rebellion, "as had almoſt ruined three flouriſhing Kingdoms." Gerard Langbaine (4) mentions this Play, and obſerves, that Winſtanley is miſtaken in aſcribing it to Brewer; and that it was printed at London in 4to. We have in our hands an Edition of it printed in 24to at London 1657, under the following title: Lingua: *or the Combat of the Tongue and the Five Senſes for Superiority. A ſerious Comedy. Firſt acted at Trinity-College in Cambridge: after at the Free-School at Huntington.* We ſhall give the reader a Soliloquy of *Tactus*, which part was acted by Cromwell, in the 6th Scene of the firſt Act.

(4) *Account of the Engliſh Dramatick Poets*, pag. 538. edit. Oxford 1691.

Tactus *ſolus.*

TACT. Tactus, *thy ſneezing ſomewhat did portend.*
Was ever man ſo fortunate as I?
To break his ſhinnes at ſuch a ſtumbling-block.
Roſes and baies pack hence. This crown and robe
My brows and body circles and inveſts.
How gallantly it fits me? ſure the ſlave
Meaſur'd my head, that wrought this coronet.
They lie, that ſay complexions cannot change:
My blood's ennobled, and I am transformed
Unto the ſacred temper of a King.
Methink I heare my noble paraſites
Styling me Cæſar, *or great* Alexander,
Licking my feet, and wond'ring where I got
This pretious oyntment. How my pace is mended,
How princely do I ſpeak, how ſharp I threaten!
Peaſants, I'll curb your head-ſtrong impudence,
And make you tremble when the Lion roars,
Ye earth-bred worms. O for a Loking-glaſſe:
Poets will write whole volumes of this change.
Where's my attendants? Come hither, Sirrah, quickly,
Or by the wings of Hermes. ——

[*C*] *At laſt he became greatly reformed and religious.*] After his reformation, he adhered for ſome time to the Church of England, very devoutly attending on the public ſervice; but at length he became a zealous friend to the Puritans, frequently entertaining their Miniſters at his houſe. At this time he is ſaid to have been ſo ſcrupulouſly juſt, that having ſome years before won thirty pounds of one Mr. Calton at play, he now paid it him back again, telling him that he had got it by indirect and unlawful means, and that it would be a ſin in him to keep it any longer (5). Mr. Wood (6) tells us, that he *pretended to Saintſhip* upon his removal to the Iſle of Ely, *and more frequently and publicly owned himſelf a Teacher.*

(5) *Life of Oliver Cromwell*, pag. 2, 3.

(6) *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 88, 89. 2d edit. London 1721.

[*D*] *Elected Burgeſs for the Town of Cambridge in* 1640.] Mr. Wood (7) writes as follows: "In 1640 "he, by the endeavours of one Richard Tyms (after"wards Alderman of Cambridge) who had ſeveral "times heard him preach at Ely, was firſt made free "of the Corporation of Cambridge, then a Burgeſs "thereof to ſit in that unhappy Parliament, which "began at Weſtminſter 3d Nov. 1640."

(7) Ibid. col. 89.

[*E*] *Gained the battle of Marſton-Moor.*] Denzil Lord Holles (8) denies Cromwell to have had any ſhare in this victory, and affirms, that he acted a very cowardly part on this as well as other occaſions. His words are as follow: *And however Lieutenant-General Cromwell had the impudence and boldneſs to aſſume much of the honour of it to himſelf, or rather, Herod-like, to ſuffer others to magnify him and adore him for it (for I can ſcarce believe he ſhould be ſo impudent to give it to himſelf, ſo conſcious as he muſt be of his own baſe cowardlineſs) thoſe who did the principal ſervice that day, were Major General* Lesley, *who commanded the Scots Horſe, Major General* Crawford, *who was Major General to the Earl of* Mancheſter's *Brigade, and Sir* Thomas Fairfax, *who under his father commanded the Northern Brigade. But my friend* Cromwell *had neither part nor lot in the buſineſs; for I have ſeveral times heard it from Crawford's own mouth (and I think I ſhall not be miſtaken if I ſay* Cromwell *himſelf has heard it from him, for he once ſaid it aloud in Weſtminſter-Hall, when Cromwell paſt by him, with a deſign he might hear him) that when the whole Army at* Marſton-Moor *was in a fair poſſibility to be utterly routed, and a great part of it running, he ſaw the Body of Horſe of that Brigade ſtanding ſtill, and to his ſeeming doubtful which way to charge, backward or forward, when he came up to them in a great paſſion, reviling them with the name of poltroons and cowards, and aſked them,* if they would ſtand ſtill and ſee the day loſt? *Whereupon Cromwell ſhewed himſelf, and in a pitiful voice ſaid,* Major General, what ſhall I do? *He (begging pardon for what he had ſaid, not knowing he was there, towards whom he knew his diſtance as to his ſuperiour Officer)*

(8) *Memoirs of Denzil Lord Holles, Baron of Ifield in Suſſex, from the year* 1641 *to* 1648, pag. 15, *&ſeqq.* edit. London 1699, in 8vo.

sioners began now to grow jealous of him, and he grew very formidable to the King (*l*). In the second battle at Newbury he endangered his Majesty's person, if the Earl of Cleaveland had not interposed, and bore off the pursuit (*m*). But this battle occasioned an irreconcileable breach between Cromwell and the Earl of Manchester, whom he accused of cowardly betraying the Parliament (*n*). He promoted the Self-denying Ordinance, and in 1645 the Army being modelled, prosecuted the war with vast success, and being made Lieutenant-General of Horse, notwithstanding the Self-denying Ordinance, gained the battle at Naseby. This with his other successes soon put an end to the war; and the King being delivered up by the Scots into the hands of the Parliament's Commissioners, was conducted to Holmby-House in Northamptonshire; differences immediately arising between the Parliament and Army, the former grew jealous of Cromwell, and he of them (*o*); so that he promoted the Army's jealousies of the Parliament (*p*). After the King was seized by the Army's order at Holmby, Cromwell appears to have had a design of restoring him by means of the Independents (*q*); but the Agitators in the Army being jealous of his treating with the King, he was forced for his own safety to make his peace with them by abandoning the King's interest (*r*). For a few days after the King's departure from Hampton-Court to the Isle of Wight, he was present at a meeting of the General Officers of the Army at Windsor, in which it was resolved, that the *King should be prosecuted for his life as a criminal person*, which was at last done, and Cromwell had a considerable hand in the whole affair [*F*]. We shall give the reader several original papers and letters to him for some years subsequent to the King's death in the note [*G*]. A Commonwealth

(*l*) *Life of Cromwell*, pag. 13, 14, 15, 16.

(*m*) Wood, col. 89.

(*n*) *Life of Cromwell*, pag. 16.

(*o*) Ibid. pag. 37.

(*p*) Ibid. pag. 38.

(*q*) Ibid. pag. 48.

(*r*) See *Memoirs of Sir John Berkeley, containing an Account of his Negotiation with Lieutenant General Cromwell &c. for restoring K. Charles the First to the Government of England*, 2d edit. London 1702, in 8vo.

ficer) told him, Sir, if you charge not, all is lost. *Cromwell answered*, he was wounded, and was not able to charge, *(his great wound being a little burn in the neck by the accidental going off behind him of one of his soldier's pistols.) Then* Crawford *desired him to go off the field, and sending one away with him (who very readily followed wholesome advice) led them on himself, which was the duty of his place, and as little for Cromwell's honour, as it proved to be much for the advancement of his and his party's pernicious designs.* "This I "have but by relation, yet I easily believe it upon the "credit of the Reporter, who was a man of honour, "that was not afraid to publish it in all places. Be- "sides I have heard a parallel story of his valour "from another person (Colonel *Dalbier*) not inferiour, "neither in quality nor reputation to Major General "*Crawford*, who told me, that when Basing-House "was stormed, Cromwell instead of leading on his "men, stood a good distance off, out of gun-shot be- "hind a hedge. And something I can deliver of him "upon my own knowledge, which makes passage for "the easier belief of both these relations, and assures "me, that that man is as errant a coward, as he is noto- "riously perfidious, ambitious, and hypocritical. This "was his base keeping out of the field at Keinton Bat- "tle, where he with his Troop of Horse came not in, "impudently and ridiculously affirming the day after, "that he had been all that day seeking the army and "place of fight, tho' his quarters were but at a vil- "lage near hand, whence he could not find his way, "nor be directed by his ear, when the ordnance was "heard, as I have been credibly informed, twenty or "thirty miles off, so that certainly he is far from the "man he is taken for."

[*F*] *Cromwell had a considerable hand in the whole affair.*] The Author of the *Life of Cromwell* (9) is of opinion, that Ireton, his-son-in-law, was the person, who chiefly influenced in these proceedings, being a zealous Republican: which party was always averse to any Treaty with the King. And tho' he with Cromwell was in such a Treaty, yet Ludlow thinks, that he never really intended to close with the King, but only to lay his party asleep, whilst they were contesting with the Presbyterian interest in Parliament. But he says no such thing of Cromwell, whom he seems all along to be angry with for his design of making an agreement with the King, being himself utterly averse to it, and supposing Cromwell's main end was to gratify his own ambition; which is not unlikely, and yet he might have been in earnest in the Treaty, and also have designed the public good. Cromwell was certainly no Commonwealth's-man, tho' he was forced to humour, and in many things actually to comply with the party; and as the agitators and their offspring the levellers, who were no other than the Commonwealth's-men in the army, and whom it is likely Cromwell at first made use of to bring about some of of his designs, were the original contrivers and chief actors in the King's death; *so whatever hand* Cromwell *had in it*, says the Author of his Life (10), *seems to be chiefly owing to their fury, and desperate resolutions, which made him apprehensive of the greatest danger, if he did not comply with their designs; tho' at the same time the contradictions, that appeared in the King's conduct, might the more easily incline him to join purposes with them. In short, what with the danger that threatned his person, if he had persisted to oppose the designs of the Levellers; what with the enthusiasm, that was so habitual to him; and what with the consideration of the King's past misgovernment, which had been the original cause of all the evils the Nation had suffered, and the fear of the like happening for the future, if he should be restored, he having discovered himself to be of a very inconstant and wavering, not to say equivocating temper; Cromwell was at length so wrought upon, as to think it necessary, and so lawful to take off the King; in which towards the last he seemed to be pretty active, tho' always in some doubt about it.* Bishop Burnet likewise tells us (11), that *Ireton* was the person who drove on the King's trial and death, and that Cromwell was all the while in some suspence about it. "*Ireton*, says he, had "the principles and the temper of a Cassius in him. "He stuck at nothing, that might have turned Eng- "land to a Commonwealth; and he found out *Cook* "and *Bradshaw*, two bold Lawyers, as proper instru- "ments for managing it." And we are informed by others, that it was *Ireton* who wrought upon General *Fairfax*, and managed the affair of the Army's Remonstrance, and purging the Parliament, and brought it about.

(9) Pag. 109.

(10) Pag. 110.

(11) *History of his own Time*, vol. 1.

[*G*] *We shall give the reader several original Papers and Letters to him for some years subsequent to the King's Death in the Note.*] We have selected these out of a great number of original Papers relating to Cromwell's affairs, which formerly belonged to Milton, who was *Latin* Secretary to the Commonwealth and to the Protector, and were communicated to us by a very ingenious Gentleman (12). The first Paper is indorsed thus: *Intelligence from Edinborough, received July 30th* 1649: and is as follows,

(12) Mr. John Nickolls.

Edin. July 24. 1649.

"The 18th instant a Letter sent by an Expres to "the Governor of Newcastle, desireing, acording to "his promise and Lieut. Generall *Cromwell's*, the "Cannon to be restored, which weare taken, uppon "surrender of the English Garrisons to Lieut. Generall "*Crumwell* immediately after the last engagament. "The same daye passed an Act of Parliament prohi- "biting any to goe into Ireland, except such as had "Passes from the Committees of the Countyes, from "whence they come. Letters from France saye the "King's servants baggage are gon for Ireland. The "Duke *Longevyle* hath 20000 gallant men ready for "service, which 'tis conceived may bee at the King's "command. The peace between the King and the "Parrisians said to bee of noe long contynuance: no- "thing less than liefe or banishment of the Cardinall, "who is suspected to be too familiar with the Queene "Regient

Commonwealth being ſet up, Cromwell in July 1649 (s) was ſent over to Ireland as Lord Governor both as to the civil and military affairs of that Kingdom for three years, and reduced almoſt the whole country in about nine months, and returned triumphant to England in May 1650 (t). The ſame year the Scots having raiſed an army for the ſupport

(s) He ſet out from London the 10th of that month. Whitelocke, pag. 413.

(t) He came to London on the 31ſt of that month. Idem pag. 457.

" Regient of France, will ſerve the Pariſians. Duke " *Hamilton* and Earle of *Loutherdale* have left the " Kinge, being much deſcontented that the Counſels " of Montroſs take to much with his Majeſtie. The " 19th the Lord *Oglebey* appeared before the Generall " Aſſembly, and it's thought his peace will bee made " between them and the Parliament. Mr. Robert " Bayly preacht before the Parliament on Sunday laſt, " where ſpeaking of the Kinge, he ſaid, that though " hee weare not affected to the Covenant, yet hee " was a man of maney ſweete and gracious endow- " ments. By an Expreſſion of a Petition to the Ge- " neral Aſſembly preſented by the Lord Provoſt, Lord " Warreſton, and others of the City, it would ſeeme " the King is expected, tho' noe preparation bee made " for him. It was right deſiring a Myniſter from " the Countrey, that he maye bee healpfull at the de- " ſired and expected arrival of his Majeſtie. An Act " or Declaration for receaving the late engagers toge- " ther with the oath to bee ſubſcribed by every one of " them or of thoſe, who weare in the buyſineſs of the " North, is omitted by the Aſſembly, and now prynt- " ing, declaring the unlawfullneſs of the engagement " and proceedings, and ſweare for the future to ad- " heare nor joyne in any courſe againſt the ſollemne " Leage and Covenant. The Parliament ſitt ſtill; the " Earles of *Eglenton*, *Buckclugh*, and *Kyrkoodbright* " keepe their former diſtance. Our hopes in the " Kinge is not altogether deſperate. Wee are aſſured " he will give all poſſible ſatisfaction, which is dayely " expected by Sir Will. Fleming. Yeaſterday our " news was, that *Cromwell* was gone towards Briſtoll " for Ireland; and this day, that he is come to Che- " ſter, intending, as ſome fear, for this Kingdom. " Wee are in a good poſture; 14000 on all occaſi- " ons, with thoſe already on foote will near compleate " 20000. Our horſe have orders to be in an hour's " readyneſs, and are to quarter hereabouts, or rather " ſouthwards."

The next is a Letter from Edinborough, addreſs'd *For my very loving and much recepted Friend, Mr.* William Crydan *at the Horſe Showe in the Oyld Balla.* It was intercepted, as appears from the Indorſement, *February 25th*, and is as follows:

" Deare Sir,

" Yours of the 12th with the pamphlets came ſafe. " Never more eagerneſſe to have our King among " us, and mighty workings in order to the treaty. " Thow all who are not malignant will acknow- " ledge great danger to be in his coming, if not " heart-changed, yet on the other ſide they ſay we " ſhall never be well till we have a King among us; " and the ill opinion we have of the Sectaryes and " their wayes, makes us the more vehemently de- " ſirous thereof; and we thinke if we had him out " of the hands of his evil Counſaylours, we could " modell him to our mind, and purpoſe. The dif- " ficulty is how to gett him out; and to receive him " with them, were fondly to betray ourſelves. The " Subcommittee have had ſeveral meetings and de- " bates, and laſt night late agreed to the propoſitions, " which are this afternoon to be preſented to the " Committee of Eſtates. As they are drawne up by " them, they are higher and ſtricter then thoſe which " were ſent by *Libburton*. The King is abſolutely " required to ſigne the Covenant. The Parliament " ſitts downe the week after the next. All will be " in readyneſſe ere that time. The Committee of " the Army make round work with the Malignants. " There hath been alſo this week much nibling at " ſome ſuſpected to be Sectaryes. Lieutenant *Gif- " fith* was accuſed; three Articles put in againſt him, " viz. that he left Dowſees Regiment in the Scots " Army, and went to the Sectary Army; that he is " not of the judgment of the Kirk of Scotland; that " he is a penſioner to the Sectaryes, and holds cor- " reſpondence with them, and is acceſſary to the " late King's death. One of them ſtood up, and " ſaid; *Thow I could be willing to ſee him hanged; " yet I'le cleare him of the firſt Article, that his leavi- " ing the Regiment was in regard of its profaneneſs.* " We heare nothing of *Montroſſe*, nor of the North of " Scotland farther than in my laſt of the landing of " ſome men there. From the North of Ireland it's " written to *Argyle*, that *Ireton* is dead, and *Inche- " queene* ſubmitted, and Limbricke ſurrender'd. Some " would have twelve, but moſt probable but ſix " Commiſſioners will go for the State; of which will " be *Caſſiles*, and thoſe who went laſt; and the Earle " of *Lothian* it's thought for the Lords will be added " to them. Mr. John Leviſton alſo and George " Huchiſon, and one Durham of Glaſgow are in no- " mination for the miniſters. The King muſt alſo " bring noan with him, that are under cenſures, if " he come. The Committee ſitting ſo extreame late, " I cannot give you the particulars ſo fully, as I " would. By the next (God willing) at large. I am

" Edin. Feb. 19th 49. Thyne humbly, endearedly, faithfully.

" The gratifying the Poſtmaſter (as I hinted " in my laſt) the 40 *s. per annum*, indeed " would do good; and it's but what his " Predeceſſour had."

The next is a Letter to Cromwell from Col. Thomas Harriſon, one of the King's Judges, who was executed at the Reſtoration. It is as follows:

" My Deare Lord,

" To ſpare your trouble I forbeare to give you my " excuſe for not waiting on you to Ware. I know " you love me; therefore are not apt to except, " though in this particular I had not failed, but that " orders from the Councell ſuperſeded mee. Conſi- " dering under how many and greate Burdens you " labour, I am afraid to ſaie anie more, that I maie " not add to them; but love and dutie makes me " preſume. The buſineſs yow goe upon is weightie, " as ever yett you undertooke; the iſſue plainly and " deeply concernes the life or death of the Lord's " people, his own name, and his ſon's. Nevertheles " maie you rejoyce in God, (whoſe affaire itt is) " who having heretofore given you numberleſſe ſig- " nall Teſtimonies to other parts of the Work will " in mercie proſper this, that he maie perfect what " he hath begun. And to omitt other arguments, " that in Deut. xxxii. 27. hath much force in my " hearte, eſpecially the laſt words, *And the Lord hath " not done all this.* I believe if the preſent enemy " ſhould prevaile, he would as certainly reproach " God and all that hitherto hath been done as afore- " ſaid, even as I now write. But the jealouſie of the " Lord of Hoſts for his greate Name will not admit " itt. My Lord, *be careful for nothing, but praie " with thanksgiving*, (to witt in faith) *Phil.* iv. 6, 7. " I doubt not your ſucceſſe, but I thinke faith and " praier muſt bee the cheife engines, as heretofore " the antient worthies through faith ſubdued King- " doms, out of weaknes were made ſtrong, waxed " valiant in fight, and turned to flight the armies of " the Aliens. Oh that a ſpirit of faith and ſuppli- " cation maie bee poured forth on you and your ar- " mie! There is more to bee had in this poore ſim- " ple waie then even moſt ſaints expect. My Lord, " let waiting upon Jehovah bee the greateſt and moſt " conſiderable buſineſs you have every daie; reckon " it ſo more than to eate, ſleep, or councell toge- " ther. Run aſide ſometimes from your companie, " and gett a word with the Lord. Why ſhould you " not have three or four pretious ſoules allwaies " ſtanding att your ellbow, with whom you might " now and then turne into a corner? I have found " refreſhment and mercie in ſuch a waie. Ah! the " Lord of compaſſion owne, pittie your burdens, care " for you, ſtand by and refreſh your hearte each mo- " ment. I would I could in any kind do yow good.

port of King Charles II, Cromwell adviſed to invade that Nation; and Fairfax laying down his Commiſſion, the former was made General in his room, and ſet out June the 29th for Scotland, where having routed the enemy at Dunbar September the 3d (*t*), he took Edinburgh, Leith, and other places, and purſued the King's army to England, and

(*t*) Idem, pag. 470.

" My hearte is with yow, and my praiers to my " God for you. The almightie Father carry you in " his very boſome, and deliver you (if itt be his " will) from touching a very haire of anie, for whom " Jeſus hath bledd. I expect a very gracious retorne " in this particular. But I am ſorry to be thus tedi- " ous; pardon mee. Here is little newes; only " *Charles Vane* retorned from Portugall, who left our " Fleet indifferently, and that they had ſeiſed 9 of " the Portugals ſhippes. The Father of Mercies vi- " ſitt and keepe your ſoule cloſe to him continually, " protect, preſerve, and proſper yow, is the praier of, " my Lord,

" Whitehall 3d July 1650. Your Excellency's loving, ſervant whilſt I breath T. Harriſon.

We ſhall now preſent the reader with ſome letters from Sir Henry Vane, Peter Chamberlen, Serjeant Bradſhaw, and Walter Strickland.

" My Lord,

" I have receaved your Lordſhip's directed to the " Lord Chief Juſtice and Pickering; which laſt is " now in Northamptonſhire. We are all moſt truly " ſenſible of the wonted favour and loving kindneſs " of our good God and Father to the honeſt and diſ- " piſed Army, and in them to this whole Common- " wealth. I never knew any thing make a deeper " and more kindly impreſſion upon the Parliament, " who in the generall have good aymes, and are ca- " pable of improvement upon ſuch wonderfull deli- " verances as theſe vouchſafed to them. You may " be ſure we will not be wanting, through God's " goodneſs and aſſiſtance, to make the beſt uſe we can " for the good of thoſe that feare God in the land, " and in proſecution of theſe deſires recommended " by your Lordſhip we have ordered 5000 horſe and " foote to goe into Scotland, beſides the recruits to " make up compleate your firſt number you carried " into Scotland; and doe deſire to know whether you " approve of this number for to proſecute the warr " in Scotland, and what proviſions you doe expect " when once you ſhall be maſter of the country be- " tween Sterling and Barwecke. I am now in very " much haſte, and intend to write againe by the " meſſenger, that brings the Parliament's letter of " thankes to your Lordſhip, which is the cauſe I " ſhall only now adde, that never were your friends, " to whom you directed your Letter, more enlarged in " heart with thankfullneſs to God, and in love to " you and your army, then from the ſenſe of this " late inexpreſſible deliverance. I am moſt con- " ſtantly,

" Sept. the 10th 1650. Your moſt faithfull brother and ſervant, " H. Vane."

" My Lord,

" Were there the ſame integritie with us at home, " as with you abroad, ſurely the Lord would bleſs " us. But a ſecret envie divides us into jealouſies, " and nothing but a mutual guilt keepes us toge- " ther. Your counſels at this diſtance are ſoon for- " gotten. Every man ſeekes his own. And no won- " der; for what good without faith? And how can " men beleeve, who receive honour one of another, " and ſeek not (through obedience) the honour that " cometh from above? (*Jo.* v. 14.) What will the " end of theſe things bee? Ships taken, Trade de- " cay'd, Taxes increas'd, ſouldiers unpay'd, hated " abroad, not lov'd at home, truſting of enemies, " diſtruſting of friends. It will ſhortly bee a bad " choice, if extremities afford no other Councils but " either where it is not to bee had, or not to pay the " ſoldier the price of his blood. Might it not bee " accepted now if one poor deſpiſed man could ſave " the citye (*Eccleſ.* ix. 15.) Oh! (my Lord) there " are yet terrible things decreed againſt this Nation, " if we turne not unto them by unfained repentance " and a more entire obedience. Truly (my Lord) " the helps, which I (unworthy I) have offered, will " riſe up in judgement. This opportunity I have " now taken to ſee whether the many ſuggeſtions " againſt mee have not at laſt blotted me out of " your Excellencie's favour, and to find you at ſo " much leiſure in abſence to read theſe few lines, " whom I deſpair ever to ſpeak withal here, by rea- " ſon of the multitude of viſits and intruſions, that " will and did oppreſſe you. This meſſenger, who " hath once had the ſweet influence of an attendance " nigh your Lordſhip, hopes to bee reinſtated again " into the like favours. I am ſtill

" Your Excellencie's moſt humble " and moſt faithful ſervant, " Peter Chamberlein."

" Sir,

" The litle tyme allotted me for particular tranſ- " myſſion to any, I willingly confine to you, whoſe " Letter of the 16th inſtant was gladly received here, " the newes being good and acceptable of the corne's " ſevering from the chaffe in that hitherto undiſtin- " guiſhing ſoyle, the now acknowledged cauſe by moſt " of any worth amongſt them of this Nation's myſe- " rie. We are buſied here (*inter alia*) with preparing " the reception for Embaſſadors, one from Portugal " being upon his way from Southampton hither to this " place; the Parliament according to his deſire have " given him their ſafe-conduct; and Don. Alonzo " having now received his Credentials a la mode, and " his audience being appointed to be upon Thurſday " next. By a freſher Vote this night the returne of " Mr. Str. as Reſident into Holland is at preſent for- " borne. The incloſed will tell you the Votes upon " the account of that, and proceedings of the High " Court for triall of the King. The new High Court " of Juſtice, ſitting in Norwich began upon Friday, tried " and condemned upon Saturday, who were executed " in the market-place; and are proceeding vigorouſly " to the triall of the reſt that had a hand in that " miſtymed inſurrection of Norfolk. The terror of " the example may happily do good; and help to " prevent numerous miſchiefs ſtill plotting of that " kind, whereof we meete with ſome advertiſments, " and are dayly making uſe of as we may. Captain " Biſhop intends to give you ſome account hereof. " Buſy we ſeem to be about many things here; but " truth is, God's bleſſing upon the wiſe and faithfull " conduct of affaires where you are gives lyfe and " repute to all other actions and attempts on the Com- " monwealth's behalf. The Spaniard in his Creden- " tials ſayes, his Embaſſador ſhall give us a ſatisfacto- " rie account of the buſineſs of Aſcham. It might " happilie have done well, if this account had been " firſt given before any audience granted. But that is " now paſt. Some thought alſo, it would have been " fit to have known of the Portugall Miniſter whether " he had been furniſhed with power to have treated " touching ſatisfaction for damages and injuries done " to this Nation, and to have ſeene a copy of his " Credentialls before a ſafe conduct granted; and ſuch " opinion from hence was repreſented to the Houſe. " But they ordered him a ſafe-conduct without anie " ſuch previous demands. Verie hott manie are for " ownings and applications from foreign States *plus* " *quam ſatis*. God grant we may depend upon him, " and ſeek aright for his owning of us, and that we " may be independent enough as to all others. Onelie " doe all perſons and Nations juſtice, and cauſleſlie " provoke none, which would be the beſt way for " furtherence and eſtabliſhment, and teach other Na- " tions in tyme to value us aright, and to doe as they " would be done to. I fear our impotent haſte to in- " gratiate with neighbour Nations hath done us neither " honour nor profit; and it ſeems to me by the mur- " der and diſgrace of our Miniſters ſent abroad, that " God thought fit to give our forwardneſs that way a

(x) Idem, pag. 507.
(y) He came thither on the 12th of September. Idem, pag. 509.

and defeated it at Worceſter September the 3d 1651 (x), and returned to London (y), where the Parliament ſettled upon him four thouſand pounds a year out of the eſtates of the Duke of Buckingham and the Marquis of Worceſter, beſides two thouſand five hundred pounds *per annum*, formerly granted (z). Soon after this he held a conference with ſeveral

(z) *Life of Cromwell*, Part 2. ch. 5. pag. 219.

" check, and teach us where our ſtrength was, and " our applications ſhould be. But in theſe things I " have many diſſenting brethren, and I write to one " much abler to judge, and therefore forbeare. Our " ſecond year is drawing on apace to a concluſion. " God give us a good exit; and much good may it " doe them, that court to be our ſucceſſors; *modo* " *ſalva ſit Reſpublica.* Some of us ſhall intertaine our " diſmiſſions with much contentedneſs. Much talk " there is of things and perſons relating to the ſuc- " ceeding choice, wherein I may not be particular. " Hugh Peters hath arbitrated between me and Lieu- " tenant General Hammond, making me pay ſound- " lie for my coming into Hanworth at Annunciation " next. But I am well contented, becauſe if I live " ſo long, I hope thereby to atteine to ſome freſh " ayre, to recover health ſomewhat impaired, and " and prevent more waſts and ſpoils. Excuſe this " miſcellanie, and preſent my humble ſervice to " my Lord General, and my reſpects to our other " good friends, and eſteeme me what you ſhall ever " find me, viz. Your true and faithful Friend " 24th 10ber 1650." J. B.

" My Lord, I returne you my humble and heartie " thanks for your late noble and friendlie Letter, " whereby I have the comfort and aſſurance of your " Lordſhip's faire interpretation of my paſt, and (if I " dare call them) well-meant actions, which I ſhall not " deſyre to account for, or to juſtify to any man liv- " ing ſo ſoone as to yourſelf, of whom I ſhall ever " have that eſteem as becomes me to have of one, " who daylie approves himſelf religious and his Coun- " trey's beſt Friende, and who may juſtly challenge " a tribute of obſervance from all that ſincerely wiſh " them well, in which number I ſhall hope ever to be " found. My Lord, I have ('tis true) taken the bold- " neſs to wryte ſome few Letters to you ſince your late " departure hence, and I have ſatisfaction enough, " that they were received, and are not diſpleaſing to " you. Your application to the Gentleman named in " yours, who is of ſo knowne fytneſs and abylytie to " procure you effectual returnes, was an act in my o- " pinion ſavouring of your uſuall prudence, and tend- " ing to the advantage of the publick affaires commit- " ted to your truſt and care; neither can any wyſe " man juſtifie any charge of ſeeming neglect of others " in that reſpect. I am very ſorry, that your Lord- " ſhip hath been put to any expence of your pretyous " tyme for removing any ſuch doubts; but thoſe my " overcarefull Fryends, who have created your Lord- " ſhip this trouble, have I muſt confeſſe occaſyonally " contrybuted to my deſyred contentment, which is " and ever hath been ſynce I had the honour to be " knowne unto you, to underſtand myſelf to be re- " teyned and preſerved in your good opynion. And " if my faithfull endeavours for the publick and " reſpects unto your Lordſhip in every thing, where- " in I may ſerve you, may deſerve a contynuance " thereof, I may not doubt ſtill to find that hap- " pineſs. And this is all the trouble I ſhall give your " Lordſhip as to that matter. We are now beginning " with a new Councell another yeare. I might have " hoped, either for love or ſomething elſe, to have been " ſpared from the Chayre. But I could not obtaine " that favour, and I dare not but ſubmyt where it is " cleer to me, that God gives the call. He alſo will " I hope give his poore creature ſome power to act " according to his mynde, and to ſerve him in all up- " ryghtnes and ſinceritye in the way wherein he hath " placed me to walke. My Lord, I have no more but " to recommend you and all your great affaires to the " guydance, mercy, and goodneſs of our good God, " and to ſubſcrybe myſelf in all truth of affection, " Your Lordſhip's ever to be dyſpoſed of " Whytehall 18 Febr. 1650 Jo. Bradſhawe."

" The cuſtomer, who wronged Sir James L**** " is ordered to reſtore and ſatisfie, and to " come up to anſwer his charge, which pro- " bably will fall heavy upon him."

The following is a Letter from Mr. Walter Strickland, with an account of ſome of the papers of Montreul, the French Reſident in Scotland. Indors'd by Serjeant Bradſhaw.

" May it pleaſe your Excellency,

" I was commanded to reade over certaine copies of " Letters written by Montreul the French Reſident in " Scotland, and to give your Excellency ſome account " of it. I knew not how to doe it better than by ex- " tracting ſome of the principall paſſages, by which " your Lordſhip may gueſſe at the reſt. I am bould " to ſay more unworthyneſs hath not yet bene offered, " to my underſtanding; thoſe, upon whom you look'd " as more exelent then thire fellows, will appeare to " be as baſe and meane as the worſt. In the bundle " of looſe papers are many Letters of the Cardinal " Mazarin's owne writing; but in none of them any " thinge of moment; and the greateſt part of the " Booke is ſpent in giving an account of two or three " regiments of Scots, which were to be raiſed and " ſent into France. The levying thoſe men and ſhip- " ping them occaſioned more diſpatches than your " Lordſhip would imagine. But in moſt of the Let- " ters to the Cardinal Mazarin and the Count de Bri- " enne was ſomthing about the affaires of the late " King: the principal paſſages I have gleaned out, " and doe referr it to your Lordſhip's judgment what " further uſe you will make of the reſt. Your Lord- " ſhip will ſee the French thire beſt friendes judgeth " them the worſt and meaneſt of men, if not much " leſs than what becomes men as men to be. Your " Lordſhip will give me leave to tel you, that though " it appears that theſe Letters were written when the " King was at Newcaſtell, Homby, and, I thinke, " Richmond, and at his being in the Iſle of Wight; " yet are there not above two Letters in all the greate " Booke dated, and they were both in Auguſt 1647. " The States Generall are now willing to receive any " from this Commonwealth in the ſame condition they " did thoſe ſent from the King, be they Embaſſadors, " Agents, or other; and now the great Aſſembly is " compleate. My Lord, all our ould friendes thire " wiſh ſome were ſent from hence whilſt theſe great " affaires are in agitation; for, my Lord, it will be " our intereſt to be faſt friendes with them; thires to " be ſoe with us; and that being, noe forraign enne- " mys could doe you harme. Noething ſeems to op- " poſe this but thire ſending firſt to you; which it " may be they will, but then the extraordinary meet- " ing of the Stats will be paſſed, which is the harveſt " for us to gather in our friendes, which will ne- " be ſo much conveniently done againe, and the " French will ſow tares, whilſt we ſleep. My " thoughts are that Jochimy's ſending away, and " thire declaring to acknowledge the Commonwealth " for the ſupreme Power, is a reparation in honor for " the delay received when I was thire. I am ſure it " is honorable to doe our buſineſs, and ſhut the doore " of the Scots Kingdom for all forraign hoopes; which " I am aſſured by as good handes as any in thoſe " parts may now be done. They have ſent to require " 28 ſhips taken from them at the Iſle of Sillie of the " Scots King. If it be refuſed, their Admiral Tromp " is to follow with eight more to compell them. My " Lord, I have noe endes but thoſe of God and this " Commonwealth; which makes me deſir to ſee thoſe " men you now have to doe with ſhut out of all hopes. " I am confident by the Grace of God we may doe it. " Your Excellency will pardon the boldneſs of him, " who is, my Lord, your Excellency's humble Ser- " vant, Walter Strickland. " London Jan. 14. 1650.

" He writes to the Cardinal *Mazarin*, that the En- " gliſh Preſbyterians ſhould give *Arguyle* forty five " thouſand pounds ſterling. *P.* 145.

" He writes to the Card. *Maz.* that he ſaw two Let- " ters written from London by *Lawtherdell*, by which " he writes that he who commandes the Parliament's " Fleet

(a) This conference was held in December 1651. *See* Whitelocke, pag. 516, 517.

ſeveral Members of Parliament and ſome of the principal Officers of the Army at the Speaker's houſe, to conſider of a ſettlement (*aa*). In 1652 his Commiſſion of Lord Lieutenant

" Fleet had ſent to him to offer him to declare for the " Scots and Engliſh Preſbyterians with 22 ſhipps, if " the Scots would victuall them; which he ſaith the " Scots cannot doe, but France may. *P.* 183.

" He writes to Card. *Maz.* that ſome of the Scots " tould him, that the Independents did then ſtrive to " gaine the Scots, and that young *Vane* on the behalfe " of the Independents ſaid to *Lawtherdell*, that Scot- " land might have all it would demande of them, " provided that they would conſent to ruine the King " of G. B. But, ſaith he, they did not ſhew me the " Letters, and thought it very likely upon thoſe " conditions the Bargaine would have bene made. " *P.* 201.

" He writs to the Card. *Maz.* that he knowes from " very good handes, that *Waller* and *Maſſie*, who have " bene Generall Officers in the Parliament's army, " who have bene put out of the Parliament by the In- " dependents, have written two Letters within a few " days to the Marquiſſe of Arguyle to preſs him to " com into England with an Army, and to aſſure him, " that all the Weſt of England will joyne with them " as ſoone as they ſhould heare from him. The Mar- " quiſſe anſwered only in generall termes, that he did " diſpoſe the affaires as they deſired, and that the Scots " Army would com into England as ſoone as conve- " niently they could. *P.* 237.

" He writs to Cardinall *Maz.* that he found Scot- " land in thre factions; *Arguyle's* faction, which would " diſtroy the King and Monarchie, and make open " profeſſion of it; *Hamilton's* party, who make pro- " feſſion to maintaine both, but underhand ſtrongly " endeavour to deſtroy both. The third ſorte are " ſuch as would keep up both King and Monarchie, " but dare not appeare. *P.* 242.

" He writs to the Cardinall *Maz.* that the Scots " Commiſſioners had received ſome mony at London; " and that the Engliſh Commiſſioners then in Scotland " had authority to offer them a greater ſome in Scotland. " The knowledge that I have, ſaith he, that the Scots, " though otherwiſe valiant men, have great difficulty to " defend themſelves from armes of this nature, when " they are aſſaulted, makes me confident they will " agree with the Engliſh to the prejudice of thire " Prince, what declaration or reſolutions ſoever they " take to the contrary. *P.* 299.

" *Lawtherdell* ſaid, thire were fower thinges the " Engliſh loved not; the *Covenant*, *Preſbyterie*, *Mo-* " *narchie*, and the *Name of a Scot*.

" He writes to Card. *Maz.* that the Scots thought " with faire promiſes to draw the Prince of Wales to " them; that they may, as they find it moſt for thire " profit, either ſell him, as they did his father, or " keep him, that they might oppoſe him to the In- " dependents; for he ſaith, they love mony better than " thire Religion. *P.* 312, 313.

" He writs another Letter to the Card. *Maz.* that " the Scots deſir to have the Prince of Wales with " them, hopeing by him to eſtabliſh thire affaires, and " by him to git ammunition and armes from France; " and when they had deceived him, then to make an " agreement with the Engliſh more to thire owne ad- " vantage and contentment. *P.* 316.

" The greater French Booke, which was ſent from " Scotland, was copies of the Letters, which Mon- " treul Reſident to the French King writ to the Car- " dinal Mazarin, the Compt de Brienne Secretary of " State in France, and Monſr. Tellier and Bellieure " then Ambaſſadors for the French King in England. " A great part of the Booke is ſpent in giving an ac- " count of the Scots in order to the Kinge's Reſtitution, " he being then in thire handes at Nucaſtle. It ap- " pears throughout that he had an ill opinion of all " the Scots except *Montroſe*, that they never carried " themſelves ſincerely, but doublely with the King, " and the King with them. He makes *Hamilton* and " *Arguyle* the two leading men, which had both de- " ſignes to work thire owne endes; nither the King's. " Arguyle's intereſt was in the Army and Kirke; Ha- " milton's to ſuppreſs both, and ſet up another, as he " did. They were all ennimeys to the Independents, " under which they comprehende the Parliament of " England's Army, becauſe it was contrary to the " Scots Intereſt in England. The King was for ni- " ther Preſbyterian nor Independent, but was for either, " as he hoped to make them inſtrumentall to him to " deſtroy both, as will appeare by theſe particulars " following.

" Bellieure Ambaſſador in England writs to *Mon-* " *treul* to know whither the King were willing the " Independents ſhould know what had paſſed betwixt " him and the Scots or not. He anſwers the King " was once ſoe deſirus all ſhould be made publicke, " that he had much adoe to perſuade him not to put " all that had paſſed betwixt him and the Scots in " writing, and to content himſelfe that it remained " onely by worde of mouth til he had time to writ " into France to knowe the minde of the Queen of " G. B. and the Court of France. And of this mind " he continewed ſome dayes; but whither it were " that the Scots feared the publiſhing it would give " thire ennemys ſome advantage, and diſorder thire " affaires; or whither the Murrayes feared ſome harme " to thire particulars; or els that the King thought he " ought not to break with the Scots before he were " aſſured of the Independents; or whither it were his " fate to be carried to doe all to his moſt prejudice, " he tould me, I ſhould diſcover nothinge of all that " which had paſſed, nor reveale a word of it to any " perſonne, being of opinion nevertheleſs, that what " he had done blindly, and, it may be, to his preju- " dice, might be done by you at London to his great " advantage, and aſſured me what you did with the " Independents, he would approve. You may ſee by " what I have written, that the King will be very " glad, that you diſcover what he hath done with the " Scots, upon condition, that by doeing ſoe you can " gaine him the Independents. *To Bellieure P.* 7.

" My Lord of Lothian had promiſed to conveigh " Letters to the King at Homby, but afterward ex- " cuſeth it to *Dunferling*. *Dunferling* procures to be " ſent to London by the Parliament of Scotland, and " to be ſent by both Parliaments to wait on the King " at Homby; he is employed to conveigh Letters to the " King. *Lawtherdell* promiſeth the like, *p.* 34, 41. " *p.* 53, 54, 58, 64.

" Men ſay publickly, that *Hamilton* aſpires to Mo- " narchie. *To the Card. Maz. p.* 40.

" Traquire aſſures the Reſident, that if the King " will but ſigne that Covenant, that the Parliament " of England ſhall reſt ſatisfied as to the reſt with " what the King offered by *Will. Morray*. He writes " to the Ambaſſador *Bellieure*, that *Dumferling* was " ſent to ſerve the King by *Argyle*, and to diſpoſe the " King to ſigne the Covenant by making him afraid, " that he was to be poyſoned or aſſaſſinated within a " few dayes. He tould me likewiſe, that the Prince " of Wales was deſirous to returne into England, and " that Piercie and ould Goreing perſwaded him to it. " He tould me, if that ſhould be, the loſs of the King " was inevitable. I am ſure he will ſay the ſame thinges " to the King to increaſe his apprehenſion. All that " I will ſay of him (meaning *Dumferling*) is, that he " is a Scot, and a friend to *Arguyle*. 30. *May*. 1647.

" He writs to the Card. *Maz.* that Arguyle tould " him England and Scotland would becom but one " Kingdome; and that Arguyle toulde him the de- " ſigne of the Engliſhe was never to receive any of the " Royall Race for King; and that the Earle of " Northumberland had given him this reaſon for it, " that if new troubles ſhould ariſe in the Kingdom, " the cauſe, which now was publicke, would becum " particular, and ſoe they ſhould fight onely to change " thire maſter, not to preſerve their libertyes. *Pag.* " 68; 78.

" *Hamilton* is a ſuitor to have a penſion of the King " of France. His opinion is whither Hamilton make " himſelfe ſoveraign, or remain as he is, it will be " good to oblige him; though he ſaith Hamilton will " doe noething, neither for the King of G. B. nor " France, but for his own endes. His Councell " is, that the Card. *Maz.* ſhould gaine both him and " Lanaricke. *P.* 76, 77.

" He writs, the Scots deſire the Engliſh may thinke

" they

Lieutenant of Ireland expiring, he was made General of the Forces there; and in November that year had a remarkable converſation with Mr. Whitelocke, in which he diſcovered his thoughts of aſſuming the Government himſelf (*bb*). He began now with his

(*bb*) Idem, pag. 584, 549, 550.

" they are conſiderable to the French, that they may " ſell that eſteem to the Engliſh. *P.* 95.

" He writs to the Card. *Maz.* that the Scots were " minded to give him a preſent when he went away, " not ſoe much to oblige him, as that they, who " ſhould be ſent from the Parliament of Scotland, " might receive againe what they ſhould give me, " with uſury. *P.* 96.

" He writs to the *Compt de Brienne*, Secretary of " State, how he had acquainted Lanaricke with the " gift the French King ſent him; which he takes very " well. *P.* 105.

" He writs to the Card. *Maz.* that the Committee " of State were inclined to ſend a new Army into " England, becauſe they fared well in thire laſt jour- " ney, and becauſe the Preſbyterians would blindly " oppoſe the Independents, and ſoe raiſe a new warr, " and hinder the King from accommodating; which " if he did, the Independents would keep thire autho- " rity; which if they doe, the Scots ſee the ruin of " thire Religion and of thire eſtates, which the Scots " eſteem more by farr than thire Religion, *P.* 116.

" *Hamilton* and *Argyle* agree well enough when the " ruine of the King is in queſtion. *To Card. Maz.* " *Lawtherdell* offered the Preſbyterians at London great " aſſiſtance. *P.* 122.

" He writs to Card. *Maz.* that it contents him much " when he heares the Scots deplore the great fault " they committed, when they ſould thire King to the " Engliſh. *P.* 130.

" He writs to Card. *Maz.* that Morray preſſeth " much that the Prince ſhould cum into Scotland; " but your Emminence will judge, ſaith he, how un- " likly a thing it is to give the ſonne to them, who " uſed the father ſo ill. *P.* 134.

" *Argyle's* Faction doe principally endeavour to git " from the King a Declaration againſt the Procedinges " of the Independents, to the ende that they may " have a pretext to make warr againſt them, and a " meanes to hinder that Prince from agreeing with " them. *P.* 134.

" *Argyle* and his party have ever tould me, they " could not be ſafe in Scotland, if thire Religion were " not abſolutely ſetled in England. *P.* 144."

The following Letter of Sir Henry Vane is written without a date; but it appears from the Indorſement to be in the year 1651, and from the Letter itſelf to be written not long before Mr. Chriſtopher Love, the Preſbyterian Miniſter, was beheaded, which was on the 22d of Auguſt that year.

" My Lord,

" My laſt troubled you with a ſhort account of " Mr. *Love*, and our debates concerning him. I ſhall " only adde thus much, that I am dayly confirmed " in my opinion, that he and his brethren doe ſtill " retaine their old leaven, and are [not] ingenuous att " all towards us whatever they pretend; but have " dexterity enough to take us on our weake ſide, " thinking thereby to ſave themſelves entire in their " principles, and gaine ſome, while this diciſive " worke in Scotland be over; for it is plaine unto " me, that they doe not judge us a lawful Magiſtracy, " or eſteeme any thing treaſon, that is acted by them " to deſtroy us, in order to bring the King of Scots " as head of the Covenant. Yet whileſt ſuch, they " help up their party in the face of us, and for their " better encouragement meete with clemency and " favour from us; unto which you are much depend- " ed upon to caſt in alſo your influence, to ballance " your brother Heron, who is taken for a back-friend " to the *Black Coates*. I was exceeding glad to re- " ceive your Letter of the 11th inſtant from Glaſcoe, " whereby I perceive your Lordſhip's health conti- " nues and ability to diſcharge the place you are in " this criticall. The Lord make us thankfull for " this ſoe ſeaſonable mercy. We are much revived " to underſtand alſo of your affaires, and doe wayte " upon God to ſee him appeare in the midſt of you " againſt this numerous prophane generation of men, " that we judge God is ripening for their deſtructi- " on. Your thoughts in cipher I have conſidered, " and doe finde them very ſuitable to what Lieute- " nant Generall and my ſelf were not long ſince " propounding to our ſelves here. We thinke the " guarriſon of Newark which you have taken in, to " be of very great importance; and have had our " thoughts of ſupplyes from Ireland allready, and " have writt about them as my former hath acquaint- " ed you. Care will be taken in the proviſions you " deſire from Cheſter, Liver-Poole, Briſtoll &c. and " about a ſmall veſſel from Cheſter, if any be to be " had from that coaſt. Alſo concerning the traces " you write for, which will be ſpeeded unto you. " The Lord goe before you in this greate worke, and " ſanctify all his wondrous ſalvations unto us; for " we are like the children of Iſrael in former times, " rather hardned, and made worſe, for the moſt of " us, by God's appearances and deliverances, then " brought neerer to him; which if it continue with " us will be bitternes in the latter end. It is only " in God's hand to ſhorten the buſines you are up- " on; yet through God's bleſſing the way you pitch " upon is likely to put the ennemy to it, and ſatisfy " all the world that you have done your parts before " the winter come upon your backe, whatever they " doe to avoyd engaging. From Ireland we had " nothing ſince my laſt, but expect to hear that " worke to ſhorten apace. France ſeems to be much " out of frame, and Prince Condé is ſecuring himſelf " as well as he can there againſt the Maſariniſts and " the majority of the young King. Portugall 'tis " thought will be neceſſitated to comply with us. " 'Tis reported he hath refuſed *Rupert* his Ports, be- " ing lately att anchor before the mouth of the river " of Liſbone, and that an Ambaſſador of Portugall " will ſhortly be ſent to us. But theſe are only " Merchants thoughts, as farre as I can yet learne. " The Low-countrys are very uneaſy att this time, " whether conſidered in reference to their own inbred " diviſions, or as a new fire is kindling under " their noſe betweene the Elector of Brandeburg and " Duke of Newburge; which 'tis thought hath and " will have at laſt ſome ſcurvey aſpect towards them. " All your family are in good health. I am

" Your Lordſhip's moſt faythful
" brother and ſervant
" H. Vane."

" My wife expects not any returne of " letters till you are more att leiſure."

To this letter we ſhall ſubjoin one of Col. Robert Hammond in favour of Mr. Love.

" My deare Lord,

" I came to London [with full reſolution to have " waited on your Lordſhip, having taken leave of all " my friends and affaires in the countrie. And the " rather choſe this tyme, that if there weare anie " inclination in your Lordſhip to doe a merciful deed " for poor Mr. *Love* in his ſadd condition by inter- " ceding for him to the Parliament, I might accord- " ing to my weake meaſure adde ſome reaſones to " incite thoſe charitable affections, that I know have " ever beene in your Lordſhip to everie good man, " however failing, as this poore man hath miſerablie " beene even to the juſt deſerving of the ſadd ſen- " tence under which he now lies. My Lord, I be- " ſeech your Lordſhip to give me boldneſſe to offer " one or too of the chieſeſt to you. If the providence " of God ſoe diſpoſe your Lordſhip's hart, that you " ſhould become a mediator for the ſparing his life " (for probablie there ſeemes noe other way to effect " it) according to the frame and temper of men, who " have beene exceedingly averſe, are now in, it may " ſoe gaine upon them, that the victorie may bee " greater than winning a field. For certainly the " gaining of harts is the beſt, the ſureſt victorie; and " truly, my dear Lord, in my poore opinion, this is " more

his Officers to complain of the Long Parliament, which on the 20th of April 1653 (cc) he

(cc) Idem, pag. 554.

" more then probable at this tyme. Beſides, my " Lord, when I had the honour to know you well, it " was your Lordſhip's way in your affaires, and " ſure it was the good way, the way of God, to " give a full ſummones before blood was ſhed. I " cannot ſay but this poore man might have avoyded " his offence from what was to bee knowne; but " ſuch an eminent warning as this, if not received, " will leave like offenders for ever altogether inex- " cuſable. But moſt of all the harts of manie, if " not, the moſt of good men here, of all parties, " are exceedingly ſett to ſave his life from this ground, " that it may bee a meanes to unite the hartes of all " good men, the bent of whoſe ſpiritts are ſett to " walke in the wayes of the Lord. For certainly " though ſome of them are under ſeverer bondage, " and doe not only want themſelves ſpirituall libertie, " but are at emmitie with thoſe that have it, from " their owne darke formes and principles, yet they " are to bee preferred farre before a generation, that " does much increaſe, who are turned aſide out of " the good way, and turne the grace of God into " wantonneſſe, and purſue iniquitie with greedineſs, " following the luſtes of their owne corrupted hartes " till they are caried to that exceſſe of wickedneſſe, " that is hardly to bee named amongſt Chriſtians. " Such as theſe and the irreconſilable generation of " Cavalleres doe eſpecially boſt and pleaſe themſelves " in their hopes of the deſtruction of this poore man. " My Lord, I know you have better reaſon than I " can offer, from thoſe, who are better able to give " it you; and that your Lordſhip is a better judge of " your owne affaires then either. I humblie ſubmitte " the matter to the will of God in what your Lord- " ſhip ſhall determine, and ſhall ſay no more in it, " than this, that as there is none ſoe highly concern- " ed in the conſequences of his crime as your Excel- " lencie and your Armie, ſo greater will bee your ho- " nour and goodneſs to paſſe by his offence; and " then moſt humblie begge your pardon, that I have " preſumed ſoe farre to trouble you. My Lord, I " was boald formerly to acquaint you with my wife's " condition; and truly, my Lord, I find by the " triall I have now made of taking my leave of her, " that it would not only bee exceeding prejuditiall, " but dangerouſe to her for me to leave her, which " makes mee, I dare not doe it; for truly weare it " not for this only cauſe, ſuch is my obligation and " affection to your Lordſhip, I ſhould not have turn- " ed backe now I am come as farre on my journey " as this place, to have waited on you. My deare " Lord, my hart is unfainedly with you, my prayers " are for you; if ever there be occaſion, I ſhall ſerve " you faithfully heare, or weare it not for the reaſon " I have given you, in anie other place in the world; " for I have cauſe not only to ſtile my ſelf, but to bee " ever moſt really,

" Your Excellencie's moſt
" London July obligded, moſt affectionate,
" 22, 1651. and moſt faithful ſervant,
" Ro. Hammond."

" My Lord,

" Your Lordſhip's letters to the counſell by this " laſt poſt have been conſidered, and the things you " write for will bee ſpeedily diſpatched unto you, " and ſome things you have not yet mentioned. For " conſidering the ſmall body of foote that is remain- " ing with your Excellency ſince you have divided " your army into two bodyes, it did ſeeme to all " unto us for to doe our utmoſt to ſupply you in that " particular, and becauſe we ourſelves were not able " to put any foote into the field upon any emergency, " either to ſupply you, or be of uſe to ourſelves as " we were, we have propounded it to the Parlia- " ment, and they have conſented to the ſame, to " give the Counſell liberty to take into pay for three " months 4000 foote beſides officers, the charge of " which will come to about 18 or 19000 l. and by " the meanes hereof we ſhall be able to ſend you by " ſea, and ſhip them as we hope next weeke, a thou- " ſand foote under Lieutenant Colonel *Cobbet* out of " Baxter's regiment, whom we ſupply again by o- " ther new companys for the preſent, and *Gibbons* his " whole regiment (all but one troope that went up " with Ingolſby) conſiſting of 1100 men, which we " have ordered to Leith, and we truſt will be ſpee- " dily with you, if the Lord favour them with wind " and weather; and have a third regiment of foote " for you to march out of Cheſhire, if your want of " them ſhall be found greater than ours. We deſi- " ring to have a foundation of a force in the mid- " land parts as well of foote as of horſe againſt all " events, att leaſt to diſpute paſſes in caſe of the " Scots army marching into England, and of your " following them with a body on this ſide the water; " for which purpoſe we could bring 4000 foote into " the field, and ſpare you a third thouſand to Cob- " bet's and Gibbons; but 2000 under Haynes are " deſigned another way as your Lordſhip well knowes, " and the Counſell unwilling to divert that deſigne, " wherein a great progreſs in preparations is allready " made, without a more viſible neceſſity then yet ap- " pears to them. So that if this 2000 be imployed " on that deſign, we ſhall then have but 2000 foote " beſides horſe for the midland parts, unleſs we de- " taine the third thouſand we intended you. For the " mony you write for, we had it in preparation be- " fore your letter came, and have this morning ſet- " tled it, which is two months pay more for your " army, whereof in cleare mony there will come " unto you four ſcoure thouſand pounds, and the re- " mainder imployed in proviſions; and the 80000 is " appointed to be ready to be ſhipt the 17th of this " inſtant Auguſt. There is likewiſe comming to you " two hundred tuns of cheeſe to be with you towards " the latter end of this month, beſides 100 tuns of " old Cheſhire cheeſe now upon the ſeas. And for " all the proviſions you write for from the office of " the Ordnance, this morning they were ordered " forthwith to be ſhipped for you, and the tents and " ſome of thoſe materialls went to you in the laſt " ſhips; all which being alone, and the pay and pro- " viſion for the army ſett in an orderly way till " Michaelmas, and the Houſe doing little but private " concernment, I could not thinke of a fitter ſeaſon " to goe downe for ſome time to my wife in Lincoln- " ſhire, than this vacation time; and when I truſt in " God affaires with you are growing into ſoe good " a poſture, that there will not require the conſtant " attendance, which hitherto I have not given way " to any relaxation in, though to the manifeſt preju- " dice of my health and family concernments. And " indeed, my Lord, it is not only neceſſary for my " own ſake, but concernment for others, who will " thereby have the more roome to carry on buſineſſes " in their owne way, and who without continual " conteſtation and brabling (which of all things is " moſt grievous to mee) will not ſuffer things to be " done, that are ſoe plaine as that they ought to doe " themſelves, Brother *Fountaine* can gueſs at his bro- " ther's meaning; which is not worth the trouble of " putting into cipher, noe more then many other " things, which are reſerved for your knowledge, " whenever it pleaſes God we meete; and till then " let me deſire you upon the ſcore of antient friend- " ſhip, that hath been between us, not to give ear " to the miſtakes, ſurmiſes, or jealouſyes of others " from what hand ſoever concerning your brother " *Heron*, but to be aſſured he anſwers your heart's de- " ſire in all things, except he be eſteemed even by " you in principles too high to fathom, which one " day I am perſuaded will not be ſoe thought by " you, when, by increaſing with the increaſings of " God, you ſhall be brought to that ſight and enjoy- " ment of God in Chriſt, which paſſes all know- " ledge, and into which the wonderful appearances of " God in theſe times doth directly lead and tend, as " to the end of all thoſe ſhakings and removalls of " things, that are made, which theſe late yeares have " produced. I have only one thing more to adde in " reference to the publike, which I had allmoſt " forgotten, and it is concerning Ireland; where by " reaſon of the late frowning of God's Providence on " a party of our forces that attempted the Iſland be- " fore Limbricke (the narrative whereof at large will

he diſſolved by force [*H*], and two days after publiſhed a Declaration of his reaſons, ſigned by himſelf and his Council of Officers. July the 4th he called a Parliament, and by an Inſtrument conſtituted them the ſupreme Authority (*dd*). December the 13th following they reſigned their powers to him (*ee*), who conſulting with his Council of Officers, an *Inſtrument of Government* was drawn up, by which he was declared *Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland*; and December the 16th was inſtalled (*ff*). Upon this advancement he applied himſelf with great dexterity to manage the ſeveral parties, and made choice of the moſt active and leading men into his Council, by whoſe influence he had the guiding of all the reſt of each party. In April 1654 he concluded a peace with the Dutch (*gg*). He ſupplied the Benches of the Courts of Weſtminſter with the ableſt Lawyers, whom he had invited to the public ſervice (*hh*). He began likewiſe to be feared and courted by foreign Powers, and April the 12th 1654 makes an union of the three Nations (*ii*). September the third following his ſecond Parliament met, to whom he made a long ſpeech (*kk*); but they debating upon the *Inſtrument of Government* he was highly diſpleaſed, and made a ſecond ſpeech, and appointed a Teſt, which was ſubſcribed by ſeveral Members (*ll*). However this Parliament not being for his purpoſe, he diſſolved them on January the 31ſt 165$\frac{4}{5}$ (*mm*). This, as it increaſed the indignation of the Republicans, ſo it gave great encouragement to the Royaliſts to purſue the deſigns, which they had now on foot; ſo that both parties were in rage, and plots, and arms againſt him. But they were both ſuppreſſed; and the Protector dividing England, as it were, into ſo many Cantons, over each of them placed one Officer, called by the name of *Major-General*; which Major-Generals were in the nature

(*dd*) Idem, pag. 559.

(*ee*) Idem, pag. 570.

(*ff*) Idem, pag. 571-577.

(*gg*) Idem, pag. 584.

(*hh*) *Life of Cromwell*, pag. 274.

(*ii*) Ibid.

(*kk*) Whitelocke, pag. 599.

(*ll*) Idem, pag. 604, 605.

(*mm*) Idem, pag. 610.

" come to you by this poſte) I doubt the ſupplyes once " thought on from thence will not be ready ſoe ſoone " as elſe might have beene expected. Your family " are gone into Hampſhire, whether I ſent unto them " by an expreſſe the laſt good newes your Lordſhip " made knowne to the Parliament, that God gave " to your forces on Fife ſide, and underſtood by the " ſame meſſenger of their healths. My prayers are " with you, and my truſt in God is very great as to " the perfecting that worke his name is ſo highly in- " gaged in, againſt the ennemy you have to deal " with; but when that is over, I expect greater try- " alls and difficultys than ever, about the right way " of ſetling that which by ſuch a conſtant ſeries of " ſucceſſes hath been obtained; for which changes the " Lord fitt us, and continue your Lordſhip an inſtru- " ment in his hand to ſerve him in your generation " to the prayſe of his grace, and the good of his " people. I am,

" Your Lordſhip's moſt faithfull
" Auguſt 2. brother and ſervant,
" 1651. H. Vane.

[*H*] *Which on the 20th of April* 1653 *he diſſolved by force.*] April the 19th he held a conſultation with the chief of his friends in the Parliament and Army at his lodgings at Whitehall, to conſider of ſome expedient for the preſent carrying on of the government of the Commonwealth, and putting a period to the Parliament. The General and moſt of his Officers with ſeveral Members of the Houſe, delivered their opinion, that it was neceſſary to take ſome new meaſures, and that it was not fit the preſent Aſſembly of Parliament ſhould be permitted to prolong their own power. The conference laſted till late at night, when without coming to any concluſion, the meeting was adjourned to the next morning. Moſt of them being then again met, the point in debate was, " Whether " forty perſons or about that number of Parliament " Men and Officers of the Army ſhould be nomi- " nated for managing the affairs of the Common- " wealth, till a new Parliament ſhould meet, and ſo " the preſent Parliament be forthwith diſſolved." The Lord General being informed during this debate, that the Parliament was ſitting, and that it was hoped they would put a period to themſelves, which would be the moſt honourable diſſolution for them; he thereupon broke off the meeting, and the Members of Parliament that were with him, left him at his lodgings, and went to the Houſe, where, contrary to their expectation, inſtead of coming to any reſolution of diſſolving, they found them in debate of an Act, which would occaſion other meetings of them again, and prolong their ſitting. Colonel Ingoldſby came back to the General, and informed him what the Houſe was upon; at which Cromwell was ſo enraged, that he immediately commanded ſome of the Officers to fetch a party of ſoldiers, with which marching directly to Weſtminſter, he placed ſome of them at the door, ſome in the lobby, and others on the ſtairs. Himſelf going into the Houſe, firſt addreſſed himſelf to his friend Oliver St. John, the Chief Juſtice, and told him, that *he then came to do that which grieved him to the very ſoul, and what he had earneſtly with tears prayed to God againſt. Nay that he had rather be torn in pieces than do it. But that there was a neceſſity laid upon him therein, in order to the glory of God, and the good of the Nation.* Then he ſat down and heard the debates for ſome time; after which calling to Major General Harriſon, who was on the other ſide of the Houſe, to come to him, he told him, *That he judged the Parliament ripe for a diſſolution, and this to be the time of doing it.* Harriſon anſwered, as he afterwards told General Ludlow, *Sir, the work is very great and dangerous, therefore I deſire you ſeriouſly to conſider of it before you engage in it.* " You ſay " well," replied the General; and thereupon ſat ſtill for about a quarter of an hour; and then ſaid again to Harriſon, *This is the time, I muſt do it.* And ſo ſtanding up on a ſudden, he made a ſpeech, wherein he bade the Speaker leave the Chair, and told the Houſe, *That they had ſat long enough, unleſs they had done more good; that ſome of them were Whoremaſters* (looking then towards *Harry Martin* and Sir *Peter Wentworth*) *that others of them were drunkards, and ſome corrupt and unjuſt men, and ſcandalous to the profeſſion of the Goſpel; and that it was not fit they ſhould ſit as a Parliament any longer; and therefore he muſt deſire them to go away.* He charged them with " not having an heart to do " any thing for the public good, and eſpouſing the " intereſt of Preſbytery and the Lawyers, who were " the ſupporters of tyranny and oppreſſion;" and accuſed them of *an intention to perpetuate themſelves in power.* When ſome of the Members began to ſpeak he ſtepped into the midſt of the Houſe, and ſaid, *Come, come, I will put an end to your prating.* Then walking up and down the Houſe, he cried out, *You are no Parliment, I ſay you are no Parliament*; and ſtamping with his feet, he bad them *for ſhame be gone, and give place to honeſter men.* Upon this ſignal the ſoldiers entered the Houſe, and he bad one of them, *Take away that fool's bauble, the mace*; and Harriſon taking the Speaker by the arm, he came down. Then Cromwell addreſſing himſelf again to the Members of the Houſe, who were in number about eighty or an hundred, ſaid, *'Tis you that have forced me to this; for I have ſought the Lord night and day, that he would rather ſlay me, than put me upon the doing of this work.* And then ſeizing on all their papers, he turned them all out of the Houſe, and having cauſed the doors to be locked up, went away to Whitehall.

nature of Prefects or Governors of Provinces, and acted with prodigious rigour (*nn*) [*I*]. About this time the Protector having laid ſome extraordinary tax upon the City of London, he met with oppoſition from Mr. George Cony, a Merchant, who refuſed to pay it [*K*]. In Nov. 1655 he appointed a Committee of Trade (*oo*), and join'd with France in oppoſition to Spain; and the year following ſhewed his power and zeal in the protection of the Proteſtants abroad [*L*]. September the 17th his third Parliament met (*pp*), to whom he made a ſpeech; but none were ſuffered to ſit in the Houſe, but ſuch as had a certificate from him [*M*], by which means near an hundred Members were excluded (*qq*). The Parliament had not ſat two months, when the exorbitant power of the Major-Generals came under conſideration, and accordingly was ſuppreſſed (*rr*). About four months after a debate came on in the Houſe about changing Cromwell's Title of *Protector* into that of *King*, and the Parliament voted him that title, and offered it him (*ss*); but upon a petition from ſeveral Officers of the Army he thought proper to refuſe it [*N*], on the 8th of May 1657. However he was immediately confirmed in his former title and authority

(*nn*) Ludlow's *Memoirs*, vol. 2. pag. 519. Whitelocke, pag. 634, 635. and *Life of Cromwell*, pag. 325, 326.

(*oo*) Whitelocke, pag. 630.

(*pp*) Idem, pag. 650.

(*qq*) *Life of Cromwell*, pag. 343.

(*rr*) Ludlow, vol. 2. pag. 580, 581, 582.

(*ss*) Idem, ibid. pag. 584; and Whitelocke, pag. 655, 656.

[*I*] *Which* Major-Generals *were in the nature of the Prefects or Governors of Provinces, and acted with prodigious rigour.*] They had the inſpection and government of the inferior Commiſſions in every County, to commit to priſon all ſuch perſons as they ſuſpected, to levy all monies, which were ordered by the Protector and his Council to be collected for the Public, to ſequeſter all who did not pay their Decimation, and to put in execution ſuch farther directions as they ſhould receive; and there was no appeal from any of their Acts, but to the Protector himſelf. They carried things with a very high hand, decimating to extremity whom they pleaſed, interrupting the proceedings at Law upon petitions of thoſe, who thought themſelves aggrieved, and threatning ſuch as would not readily ſubmit to their orders with tranſportation to the Weſt-Indies.

[*K*] *About this time the Protector having laid ſome extraordinary Tax upon the City of London, he met with oppoſition from Mr. George Cony, a Merchant, who refuſed to pay it.*] Mr. Cony likewiſe diſſuaded others from complying with it. Upon this the Protector ſent for him, and put him in mind of the old friendſhip, which had been between them, telling him, *That of all men he did not expect this oppoſition from him in a matter, that was ſo neceſſary for the good of the Commonwealth.* Mr. Cony in return remembered him, how great an enemy he had expreſſed himſelf to ſuch grievances, and how he had declared, *That all who ſubmitted to pay illegal Taxes, were greater enemies to their country than they who impoſed them; and that the tyranny of Princes could never be grievous, but by the tameneſs and ſtupidity of the people.* When the Protector ſaw he could not bring him over, he told him, "That he had a will as ſtubborn as "his, and he would try which of them two ſhould be "maſter;" and thereupon committed him to priſon. As ſoon as the Term came on, the priſoner brought his *Habeas Corpus* in the King's Bench, then called the *Upper Bench*. Serjeant Maynard, Serjeant Twiſden, and Mr. Wadham Windham being of Council for him, demanded his liberty, both upon the Illegality of the Commitment, and of the Impoſition. The Judges could not defend either; and it appeared plainly what their ſentence would be; ſo that the Protector's Attorney required a farther day to anſwer what had been urged. But before that time the three, who were his Council, were committed to the Tower, and the Judges were ſent for and ſeverely reprimanded for ſuffering the liberty they had taken. And when they humbly alledged the Law and *Magna Charta*, the Protector told them *Their* Magna F—— *ſhould not controle his actions, which he knew were for the ſafety of the Commonwealth*; and aſked them, *Who made them Judges? And whether they had any authority to ſit there but what he gave them?* and therefore he adviſed them *to be more tender of that, which only could preſerve them*; and ſent them away with this caution, *That they ſhould not ſuffer the Lawyers to prate what it would not become them to hear* (14).

(14) Ludlow, vol. 2. pag. 527, 528. *Life of Cromwell*, pag. 327, 328.

[*L*] *Shewed his power and zeal in the protection of the Proteſtants abroad.*] The Duke of Savoy raiſed a new perſecution of the Vaudois, cruelly murdering and maſſacring many of them, and driving the reſt from their dwellings into the mountains. Upon this the Protector ſent to Cardinal Mazarine, deſiring him to put a ſtop to theſe proceedings, adding, *that he knew well they had the Duke in their power, and could reſtrain him as they pleaſed; and if they did not he muſt preſently break with them.* The Cardinal objected to this as unreaſonable; he promiſed to do good offices, but ſaid, he could not anſwer for the effects. However, nothing would ſatisfy the Protector, till they obliged the Duke of Savoy to reſtore all that he had unjuſtly taken from his Proteſtant Subjects, and to renew all their former privileges. The Protector likewiſe raiſed a great ſum of money for them, and ſent over Mr. Moreland, afterwards Sir Samuel Moreland, to ſettle all their affairs, and ſupply all their loſſes. Another inſtance of his care of the Proteſtants abroad was this: There happened a tumult at Niſmes, in which the Huguenots had committed ſome diſorder; who being apprehenſive of very ſevere proceedings upon it, ſent one over with great expedition to the Lord Protector, to deſire his interpoſition and protection. This Expreſs found ſo good a reception the firſt hour he came, that the Protector having received the whole account, bad him *refreſh himſelf after ſo long a journey, and he would take ſuch care of his buſineſs, that by the time he came to Paris, he ſhould find it diſpatched.* Accordingly, that night he ſent away another meſſenger with a very effectual Letter to his Embaſſador Lockhart, requiring him either to prevail that the matter might be paſſed over, or *to come away immediately.* The Cardinal complained of this way of proceeding; but the neceſſity of the affairs of France made him comply. Theſe things raiſed the Protector's character abroad, and cauſed him to be much depended on (15).

(15) *Life of Cromwell*, pag. 337, 338.

[*M*] *None were ſuffered to ſit in the Houſe but ſuch as had a Certificate from him.*] The Certificate was in this form: *Theſe are to certify, that* A. B. *is returned by Indenture one of the Members to ſerve in this preſent Parliament for* —— *and approved by his Highneſs's Council.*

[*N*] *The Parliament voted him the title of King, and offered it to him; but upon a petition from ſeveral officers of the Army, he thought proper to refuſe it.*] When the title was offered, and the Committee endeavoured to perſuade him to accept it, he gratefully acknowledged their kindneſs, but would not give a preſent anſwer, acquainting the Committee, *that he would conſider of all they had ſaid, and* ſeek to God *for counſel; and then he would ſend for them, and declare his reſolution.* He continued ſeveral days under great difficulties and diſtraction of mind without coming to a reſolution. Whilſt this buſineſs was in agitation, the Lord Broghill coming one day to him, and telling him he had been in the city, the Protector inquired of him, what news he heard there. The Lord Broghill told him, "that he had heard he was in treaty with the "King, who was to be reſtored, and to marry his "daughter." Cromwell ſhewing no diſpleaſure at this, Broghill ſaid, *That in the State to which things were reduced, he could ſee no better expedient. They might bring him in on what terms they pleaſed; and his Highneſs might retain the ſame authority he then had, with leſs trouble.* To this Cromwell anſwered, *The King can never forgive his Father's Blood.* The Lord Broghill replied, *He was one of the many that were concerned in that, but he would be alone in the merit of reſtoring him.* Upon this the Protector ſaid, *He is ſo damnably debauched, he would undo us all*; and ſo went off to other diſcourſe without any emotion, which made his Lordſhip conclude, that he had often thought of that expedient. The Protector in the mean time kept himſelf on ſuch a reſerve, that no man knew what anſwer he would give to the Parliament's offer; tho'

thority by *the Humble Petition and Advice* of the Parliament, and was ſolemnly inaugurated on June the 26th following (*tt*). This year his arms had great ſucceſs both at land and ſea; and King Charles II is ſaid to have made a private offer to him, which he rejected [*O*]. A general inſurrection of the King's friends was likewiſe deſigned, and promoted by a bold paper, intitled, *Killing no Murder* [*P*]; but by his management prevented. He now ſent his writs of ſummons under the Great Seal to divers perſons to ſit as Members in the *other Houſe*; the form of which writs was the ſame with that which had been uſed to ſummon the Peers in Parliament; and the two Houſes met January the 20th $165\frac{7}{8}$, when he made a ſpeech to them (*uu*). But a diſcord ariſing between the two Houſes, the Protector diſſolved them on February the 4th (*xx*). Soon after there broke out a plot of the Fifth-Monarchy Men againſt him, and another of the Royaliſts, for which Sir Henry Slingſby and Dr. Hewet were beheaded on June the 8th 1658 (*yy*). Upon the ſurrender of Dunkirk on the 25th of that month, it was delivered up into the hands of the Engliſh by the French King and Cardinal Mazarine in perſon, purſuant to the treaty between that King and the Lord Protector [*Q*]. Towards the latter part of his life he grew much more apprehenſive of danger to his perſon than he uſed to be; and Biſhop Burnet tells us (*zz*), that it was generally believed, that his life and his arts were exhauſted at once, and that if he had lived much longer, he could not have held things together. He died September the 3d 1658 in the ſixtieth year of his age; and his funeral was magnificently ſolemnized on the 23d of November. But the real place of his burial is uncertain; and it is moſt probable that his body was buried in Naſeby-Field (*aaa*). Ludlow in his *Memoirs* treats him every where as a tyrant, an uſurper, and an hypocrite; and Colonel Algernoon Sidney ſtiles him a *tyrant, and a violent one*, and obſerves (*bbb*), that he *called him ſo every day in Cromwell's life, and acted againſt him too*. Mr. Waller the Poet who was related to him, and frequently waited on him, obſerved him to be very well read in the Greek and Roman Story; and often took notice, that in the midſt of their diſcourſe a ſervant has come in to tell him, that ſuch and ſuch attended; upon which

(*tt*) Whitelocke, pag. 657-662.

(*uu*) Idem, pag. 666, & *ſeqq.*

(*xx*) Idem, pag. 673.

(*yy*) Idem, pag. 673.

(*zz*) *Hiſtory of his own Time*, vol. 1.

(*aaa*) See the *Life of Cromwell*, pag. 403, 404.

(*bbb*) See his *Arraingment, Tryal, and Condemnation at the King's-Bench at Weſtminſter on the 7th, 21ſt, and 27th of November* 1683, pag. 33. London 1684, in fol.

it was thought moſt probable, that he would accept of it. Ludlow informs us (16), that he endeavoured by all poſſible means to prevail with the Officers of the Army to approve his deſign; but ſeveral of them preſenting a Petition to the Houſe againſt making him King, he made a Speech to the Parliament, in which he declared, *that he could not undertake this government with the title of King*,

(16) Vol. 2. pag. 586.

[*O*] *King Charles II is ſaid to have made a private offer to him which he rejected.*] This we are informed of by Mr. Echard (17), who tells us, that the ſtory came from the mouth of the Ducheſs of Lauderdale, who told the ſame to a perſon, of whoſe credit he would make no queſtion. The ſtory is this: that this Lady, afterwards Ducheſs of Lauderdale, being a particular friend and acquaintance of Cromwell's, was employed to make a private offer and propoſal to him, in ſubſtance as follows: *That if he would reſtore, or permit the King to return to his Throne, he would ſend him a blank paper, for him to write his own terms and limitations, and ſettle what power and riches he pleaſed upon himſelf, family, and friends.* This propoſal was firſt communicated to the Protector's Lady, who liked it very well, believing that beſides other advantages, it would bring abſolute indemnity and ſecurity to her huſband and the whole family. She therefore took an opportunity, when ſhe was in bed with him, to mention the offer to him, and endeavoured to perſuade him to accept of it, it being of the higheſt moment to the happineſs of himſelf and relations. But he, without minding her arguments and perſuaſions preſently told her, *She was a fool*; adding this ſhrewd ſentence, *If* Charles Stuart *can forgive me all that I have done againſt him and his family, he does not deſerve to wear the Crown of England.*

(17) *Hiſtory of England*, vol. 1.

[*B*] *A bold Paper, intitled,* Killing no Murder.] It was printed ſecretly in 1657 in 4to under the name of *William Allen*, tho' written by Mr. Silas Titus, afterwards Colonel of a Regiment, one of the Grooms of the Bedchamber to King Charles II, of the Privy Council to King James II, and Member of Parliament for Ludlow in Shropſhire in the reign of King William III. The ſecond Edition of this Pamphlet was printed at London in 1659 in two ſheets in 4to under the following title: *Killing no Murder: with ſome Additions; briefly diſcourſed in three Queſtions; fit for the publick view; to deter ſingle perſons and Councils from uſurping ſupreme Powers.* It was anſwered by Michael Hawke of the Middle Temple Gent. in a Pamphlet, intitled, *Killing is Murder and no Murder: or an Exercitation concerning a ſcurrilous Pamphlet of one* William Allen, *a Jeſuitical Impoſtor, entitled,* Killing no Murder, &c. London 1657 in eight ſheets in 4to.

[*Q*] *Deliver'd up into the hands of the Engliſh by the French King and Cardinal Mazarine in perſon, purſuant to the Treaty between them and the Lord Protector.*] Dr. James Welwood tells us (18), that when the French army being joined with the Engliſh auxiliaries was on its march to inveſt the town, Cromwell ſent one morning to the French Embaſſador to Whitehall, and upbraided him publicly for his Maſter's deſigned breach of promiſe, in giving ſecret orders to the French General to keep poſſeſſion of Dunkirk, in caſe it was taken, contrary to the Treaty between them. The Embaſſador proteſted he knew nothing of the matter, as indeed he did not, and begged leave to aſſure him, that there was no ſuch thing thought of. Upon which Cromwell pulling a paper out of his pocket, *Here*, ſays he, *is a copy of the Cardinal's order: and I deſire you to diſpatch immediately an Expreſs to let him know, that I am not to be impoſed upon; and that if he deliver not up the keys of the town of Dunkirk to Lockhart within an hour after it ſhall be taken, I'll come in perſon, and demand them at the gates of Paris.* There were but four perſons ſaid to be privy to this order, the Queen-Mother, the Cardinal, the Marſhal de Turenne, and a Secretary. The Cardinal for a long time blamed the Queen, as if ſhe might poſſibly have blabbed it out to ſome of her women. Whereas it was found after the Secretary's death, that he had kept a ſecret correſpondence with Cromwell for ſeveral years; and therefore it was not doubted but he had ſent him the copy of the order abovementioned. The meſſage had its effect; for Dunkirk was put in the poſſeſſion of the Engliſh; and to palliate the matter, the Duke and Marſhal of Crequi was diſpatched into England Embaſſador extraordinary to compliment Cromwell, attended with a numerous and ſplendid train of perſons of quality; among whom was a Prince of the Blood, and Mancini, Mazarine's nephew, who brought a Letter from his uncle to the Protector, full of the higheſt expreſſions of reſpect, and aſſuring his Highneſs, *That being within view of the Engliſh ſhore, nothing but the King's indiſpoſition* (who lay then ill of the ſmall-pox at Calais) *could have hindered him from coming over to England, that he might enjoy the honour of waiting upon one of the greateſt men that ever was, and whom, next to his Maſter, his greateſt ambition was to ſerve. But being deprived of ſo great a happineſs, he had ſent the perſon that was neareſt to him in blood, to aſſure him of the profound veneration he had for his perſon, and how much he was reſolved to the utmoſt of his power, to cultivate a perpetual amity and friendſhip betwixt his maſter and him.*

(18) *Memoirs.*

T

which Cromwell would riſe, and ſtop them, talking at the door, where Mr. Waller could overhear him ſay, *The Lord will reveal, The Lord will help*, and ſeveral ſuch expreſſions, which when he returned to Mr. *Waller*, he excuſed, ſaying, *Couſin* Waller, *I muſt talk to theſe men after their own way*; and would then go on where they left off. This created in Mr. *Waller* an opinion, that he ſecretly deſpiſed thoſe, whom he ſeemed to court (*ccc*).

(*ccc*) See *An Account of the Life and Writings of* Edmund Waller *Eſq*; pag. 34. prefixed to his *Poems*, 9th edit. London 1712.

☞CUDWORTH (RALPH), a very learned Divine in the ſeventeenth Century, was ſon of Dr. Ralph Cudworth, at firſt Fellow of Emanuel College in the Univerſity of Cambridge, and afterwards Miniſter of St. Andrew's Church in that town, and at laſt Rector of Aller in Somerſetſhire, and Chaplain to King James I (*a*). He died in Auguſt or September 1624 (*b*). Though he was a man of genius and learning, he publiſhed only a *Supplement* to Mr. William Perkins's *Commentary upon St. Paul's Epiſtle to the Galatians*, of which, as well as ſeveral other works of that Divine, he was Editor. Our Author's mother was of the family of Machell, and had been nurſe to Prince Henry, eldeſt ſon of King James I, and after her huſband's death married Dr. Stoughton (*c*). Our Author was born at Aller in the year 1617 (*d*), and educated with great care by his father-in-law Dr. Stoughton, and at thirteen years of age was admitted a Penſioner in Emanuel-College, the Doctor declaring, that he was as well grounded in ſchool-learning as any boy of his age that went to the Univerſity. July the 5th 1632 he was matriculated as a Student in the Univerſity, and applied himſelf to all parts of polite Literature and Philoſophy with ſuch vigour, that in 1639 he was created Maſter of Arts with great applauſe. Soon after he was choſen Fellow of his College, and became an eminent Tutor there, and had at one time eight and twenty pupils, an inſtance never known before even in the largeſt Colleges of the Univerſity. Among theſe was Mr. William Temple, afterwards famous for his Embaſſies and Writings. Not long after he was preſented to the Rectory of North-Cadbury in Somerſetſhire, worth three hundred pounds *per ann.* In 1642 he publiſhed a *Diſcourſe concerning the true Notion of the Lord's-Supper* [*A*], and a Treatiſe intitled, *Chriſt and his Church in a Shadow* [*B*]. He took the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity, probably about the year 1644 [*C*]; and the ſame year was choſen Maſter of Clare-Hall in Cambridge in the room of Dr. Paſke, who had been ejected. In 1645 Dr. Metcalf having reſigned the Regius Profeſſorſhip of the Hebrew Language, Mr. Cudworth was unanimouſly nominated on October the 15th by the ſeven Electors to ſucceed him. From this time he abandoned all the functions of a Miniſter, and applied himſelf only to his Academical employment and ſtudies, and eſpecially that of the Jewiſh Antiquities. He began his public Lectures, which he read every Wedneſday, explaining the ſtructure and plan of the Temple of Jeruſalem. When his affairs required his abſence from the Univerſity, he ſubſtituted in his room his learned friend Mr. John Worthington, afterwards Maſter of Jeſus College. In 1647 he publiſhed at Cambridge in 4to a Sermon upon 1 *John* ii. 3, 4. [*D*]. In 1651 he took the Degree of Doctor of Divinity. Though

(*a*) *Bibliotheque Raiſonnée des Ouvrages des Savans de l'Europe*, tom. 13. Part 1. pag. 7. edit. Amſterdam 1734, in 12mo.

(*b*) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 187. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*c*) *Bibliotheque Raiſonnée*, pag. 8.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 7.

[*A*] *In* 1642 *he publiſhed* a Diſcourſe concerning the true Notion of the Lord's Supper.] It was printed at London in 4to with only the initial Letters of his name. It was reprinted ſeveral times in 12mo, and the third Edition was publiſhed at London 1676 in fol. to which are added two Sermons, the former on 1 John chap. ii. ver. 3, 4. and the latter on 1 Corinth. xv. 57. In this *Diſcourſe* he endeavours to prove, that *the Lord's Supper is not a ſacrifice, but a feaſt upon a ſacrifice*. Bochart, Spencer, Selden, and other eminent Writers quote this Treatiſe with great commendations.

[*B*] *A Treatiſe, intitled*, Chriſt and his Church in a Shadow.] It was printed at London 1642 in 4to. The Authors of the *Bibliotheque raiſonnée* (1) obſerve, that this Treatiſe is generally joined with the *Diſcourſe concerning the true Notion of the Lord's Supper*; and that Dr. Moſheim, who tranſlated our Author's *Intellectual Syſtem* into Latin, was informed by ſome Engliſh Gentlemen, that it conſiſted of two Sermons, which Mr. Cudworth had preached at his Church.

(1) Tom. 13. Part 1. Art. 1. pag. 17.

[*C*] *He took the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity, probably about the year* 1644.] We find, that at the Commencement that year, he maintained the two following Theſes; "That the *Rationes* of good and evil are "eternal and indiſpenſable; and that there are incor-"poreal ſubſtances immortal by their own nature." Hence it appears, that our Author even at that time was examining and revolving in his mind thoſe important ſubjects, which he ſo long afterwards cleared up with ſuch uncommon penetration in his *Intellectual Syſtem*, and other works ſtill preſerved in manuſcript (2).

(2) *Bibliotheque Raiſonnée des Ouvrages des Savans de l'Europe*, tom. 13. Part 1. pag. 10.

[*D*] *March* 31*ſt* 1647 *he preached before the Houſe of Commons at Weſtminſter a Sermon upon* 1 John ii. 3, 4.] This Sermon was printed at Cambridge 1647 in 4to pagg. 82, and reprinted at the end of his *Intellectual Syſtem* in 1676; but in this latter Edition the Dedication of it to the Houſe of Commons is omitted. Since the firſt Edition therefore is very difficult to be met with, we ſhall give ſome paſſages from that Dedication. He obſerves there, that the ſcope of this *Sermon* was not to contend for this or that opinion, but only to perſuade men to the *Life of Chriſt*, as the pith and kernel of all Religion; *without which all the ſeveral* Forms of Religion *in the world, though we pleaſe our ſelves never ſo much in them, are but ſo many ſeveral dreams. And thoſe many opinions about Religion, that are every where ſo eagerly contended for on all ſides, where this doth not lie at the bottom, are but ſo many ſhadows fighting with one another. So that I may well ſay of the true Chriſtian, that is indeed poſſeſſed of the life of Chriſtianity, in oppoſition to all thoſe that are but lightly tinctured with the opinions of it, in the language of the Poet,*

Οἷσι πέπνυται, τοὶ δ' ὡς σκιαὶ ἀἴσσουσι.

Wherefore I could not think any thing elſe either more neceſſary for Chriſtians in generall, or ſeaſonable at this time, than to ſtirre them up to the reall eſtabliſhment of the Righteouſneſſe of God *in their hearts, and that* Participation of the divine Nature, *which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of; that ſo they might not content themſelves with mere phancies and conceits of Chriſt, without the Spirit of Chriſt really dwelling in them, and Chriſt himſelf inwardly formed in their hearts, nor ſatisfie themſelves with the mere holding of right and orthodox opinions, as they conceive, whileſt they are utterly devoid within of that* Divine Life, *which Chriſt came to kindle in men's ſouls, and therefore are ſo apt to ſpend all their zeal upon a violent obtruding of their own opinions and apprehenſions upon others, which cannot give entertainment to them.* "Which, beſides its repugnancy to the doctrine "and example of Chriſt himſelf, is like to be the "bellows, that will blow a perpetual fire of diſcord "and contention in Chriſtian Commonwealths; whileſt "in the mean time thoſe hungry and ſtarved *opinions*

Though the places which he held in the Univerſity were very honourable, yet he found the revenue of them not ſufficient to ſupport him; for which reaſon he had thoughts of leaving Cambridge entirely, and he actually retired from it, though but for a ſhort time. For upon the deceaſe of Dr. Samuel Bolton, Maſter of Chriſt's College, in 1654, he was choſen to ſucceed him; and married the ſame year. In this ſtation he ſpent the reſt of his life, proving highly ſerviceable to the Univerſity and the whole Church of England. In January $165\frac{6}{7}$ he was one of the perſons nominated by a Committee of the Parliament, to be conſulted about the Engliſh Tranſlation of the Bible [*E*]. Irreligion began now to lift up its head; but the progreſs of it was oppoſed by no perſon with greater force and learning than by our Author. For this purpoſe in 1678 he publiſhed his *True Intellectual Syſtem of the Univerſe* [*F*]; which admirable work met with great oppoſition from ſome of

" devoure all the life and ſubſtance of Religion, as " the *lean Kine in Pharaoh's Dream* did eat up the " *fat*. Nor laſtly, pleaſe themſelves onely in the " violent oppoſing of other men's *Superſtitions*, accord- " ing to the genius of the preſent times, without ſub- " ſtituting in the room of them an inward *Principle* " *of Spirit* and *Life* in their own ſouls. For I fear " many of us that pull down *idols* in churches, may " ſet them up in our hearts; and whilſt we quarrel " with *painted glaſſe*, make no ſcruple at all of enter- " taining many foul *luſts* in our ſouls, and commit- " ting continual idolatry with them." He afterwards deſires the Houſe of Commons, that after their care for the advancement of Religion and the public good of the Commonwealth, they would think it worthy of them to promote *ingenuous learning*, and caſt a favour- able influence upon it. *I mean not*, ſays he, *that onely, which furniſheth the pulpit, which you ſeem to be very regardfull of; but that, which is remote from ſuch po- pular uſe, in the ſeveral kinds of it, which yet are all of them both very ſubſervient to Religion, and uſefull to the Commonwealth. There is indeed a* Ψευδωνυμία, *as the* Philoſopher *tells us*, a baſtardly kind of Literature, *and a* Ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις, *as the* Apoſtle *inſtructeth us*, a Knowledge falſely ſo called, *which deſerves not to be pleaded for. But the noble and generous improvement of our underſtanding faculty in the true contemplation of the Wiſdome, Goodneſſe, and other Attributes of God, in that great fabrick of the univerſe, cannot eaſily be diſparaged without a blemiſh caſt upon the Maker of it. Doubtleſſe we may as well enjoy that which God hath communicated of himſelf to the creatures by this larger faculty of our* underſtandings, *as by thoſe narrow and low faculties of our* ſenſes; *and yet no body counts it to be unlawfull* to hear a leſſon plaied upon the lute, *or to* ſmell a roſe. *And theſe raiſed improvements of our* natural underſtand- ings *may be as well ſubſervient and ſubordinate to a divine Light in our minds, as the natural uſe of thoſe outward creatures here below to the life of God in our hearts. Nay all true knowledge doth of itſelf naturally tend to God, who is the Fountain of it; and would ever be raiſing of our ſouls up upon its wings thither, did not we* κατέχειν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ, detain it, *and hold it down* in un- righteouſneſſe, *as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh.* " All *Philo-* " *ſophy* to a wiſe man, to a truly ſanctified mind, as " he in *Plutarch* ſpeaketh, is but ὕλη τῆς Θεολογίας, " *matter for Divinity to work upon.* Religion is the " Queen of all thoſe inward endowments of the ſoul, " and all pure *naturall knowledge*, all virgin and un- " deflowred *arts* and *ſciences* are her handmaids, that " *riſe up and call her bleſſed.* I need not tell you how " much the ſkill of tongues and languages, beſides " the excellent uſe of all *Philology* in generall, con- " duceth to the right underſtanding of the letter of " ſacred Writings, on which the ſpirituall notions muſt " be built; for can thoſe poſſibly be ignorant of that, " which have but once heard of a *Tranſlation of the* " *Bible?* The Apoſtle exhorteth private Chriſtians " to *whatſoever things are lovely, whatſoever things* " *are of good report, if there be any virtue, if there be* " *any praiſe, to think on thoſe things*; and therefore it " may well become you, (*noble Gentlemen*) in your pub- " lick ſphere, to encourage ſo noble a thing as *know-* " *ledge* is, which will reflect ſo much luſtre and ho- " nour back again upon your ſelves."

[*E*] *One of the perſons nominated by a Committee of the Parliament, to be conſulted about the Engliſh Tranſ- lation of the Bible.*] Whitelocke (3) tells us, that at the Grand Committee for Religion, January 16th $165\frac{6}{7}$, it was " ordered, that it be referred to a Sub- " Committee to ſend and adviſe with Dr. Walton, Mr. " Hughes, Mr. Caſtle, Mr. Clark, Mr. Poulk, Dr. " Cudworth, and ſuch others as they ſhall think fit, " and to conſider of the Tranſlations and Impreſſions " of the Bible, and to offer their opinions therein to " this Committee; and that it be eſpecially com- " mended to the Lord Commiſſioner Whitelocke to " take care of this buſineſs." *This Committee*, ſays that Writer, *often met at my houſe, and had the moſt learned Men in the Oriental Tongues to conſult with in this great buſineſs, and divers excellent and learned Obſervations of ſome miſtakes in the Tranſlations of the Bible in Engliſh; which yet was agreed to be the beſt of any Tranſlation in the world. I took pains in it; but it became fruitleſs by the Parliament's diſſolution.*

(3) *Memorials of the Engliſh Affairs*, pag. 654. edit. London 1732, in fol.

[*F*] *In* 1678 *he publiſhed his* True Intellectual Syſ- tem of the Univerſe.] It was printed at London 1678 in fol. under the following title: *The true Intellectual Syſtem of the Univerſe. The firſt part; wherein all the Reaſon and Philoſophy of Atheiſm is confuted, and its Impoſſibility demonſtrated. By* R. Cudworth D. D. It is dedicated to Heneage Lord Finch, Lord High Chan- cellor of England. The *Imprimatur* by Dr. Samuel Parker, Chaplain to Archbiſhop Sheldon, is dated May 29th 1671, ſeven years before the publication of this work. In the Preface Dr. Cudworth tells us, that when he engaged the Preſs, he intended only a diſ- courſe concerning *Liberty* and *Neceſſity*, or, to ſpeak out more plainly, againſt the *fatal Neceſſity of all ac- tions and events*; which, upon whatever grounds main- tained, will ſerve the deſign of Atheiſm, and under- mine Chriſtianity and all Religion, as taking away all guilt and blame, puniſhments and rewards. But afterwards he conſidered, that this, which is indeed a controverſy concerning the *True and Intellectual Syſtem of the Univerſe*, does in the full extent of it take in other things; the Neceſſity of all actions and events being maintained by ſeveral perſons upon very different grounds, according to the *tripartite Fataliſm* men- tioned in the beginning of the firſt chapter; the firſt of which, *ſuppoſing the material Neceſſity of all things without a God*, he tells us, is *abſolute Atheiſm*; the ſecond, *Immoral Theiſm*, or *Religion without* any *Na- tural Juſtice* and *Morality*, all juſt and unjuſt, according to this hypotheſis, being factitious, made by arbitrary will and command only; and the third, ſuch a Theiſm as acknowledges not only a God or omnipotent under- ſtanding Being, but alſo Natural Juſtice and Morality, founded in him, and derived from him; nevertheleſs no Liberty from Neceſſity any where, and therefore no diſtributive or retributive Juſtice in the world. " Where- " as theſe three things are the fundamentals or eſſen- " tials of true Religion. Firſt, that all things in the " world do not float without a Head or Governor; " but that there is a God, an omnipotent underſtand- " ing Being, preſiding over all. Secondly, that this " God being eſſentially good and juſt, there is φύσει " καλὸν καὶ δίκαιον, ſomething in its own nature im- " mutably and eternally juſt and unjuſt, and not by " arbitrary will, law, and command only. And laſtly, " that there is ſomething ἐφ' ἡμῖν, or, that we are " ſo far forth the principles or maſters of our own ac- " tions, as to be accountable to juſtice for them, or " to make us guilty and blame-worthy for what we " do amiſs, and to deſerve puniſhment accordingly." Theſe three things, as the Doctor obſerves, taken all together, make up the wholeneſs and entireneſs of that, which he calls, *The True Intellectual Syſtem of the Uni- verſe*, in ſuch a ſenſe as *Atheiſm* may be called *a falſe Syſtem* thereof; the word *Intellectual* being added to diſtinguiſh it from the other, vulgarly ſo called, *Sy- ſtems of the World* (that is, the *viſible* and *corporeal World*) the *Ptolomaic*, *Tychonic*, and *Copernican*; the two former of which are now commonly accounted *falſe*

of the Courtiers of King Charles II, who endeavoured to deſtroy the reputation of it, when it was firſt publiſhed (e); nor has it eſcaped the reproaches of others ſince that time [G]. In 1678, he was inſtalled Prebendary of Glouceſter (f). He had ſeveral ſons, who

(e) *Joannis Clerici Vita & Opera ad ann.* 1711. pag. 129. edit. Amſtelod. 1711 in 8vo.

(f) *Survey of the Cathedral of York &c. By Browne Willis Eſq;* pag. 743. edit. London 1727 in 4to.

falſe, the latter *true*. And thus our Author's proſpect being now enlarged into a *threefold Fataliſm*, or *ſpurious* and *falſe Hypotheſis* of the *Intellectual Syſtem*, making all things neceſſary upon ſeveral grounds, he accordingly deſigned the confutation of them all in three ſeveral Books. The *firſt* againſt *Atheiſm*, (which is the *Democritic* fate) wherein all the Reaſon and Philoſophy thereof is refelled, and the Exiſtence of a God demonſtrated, and ſo that ὑλικὴ ἀνάγκη or material Neceſſity of all things is overthrown. The *ſecond*, for ſuch a God as is not mere *arbitrary Will omnipotent*, decreeing, doing, and neceſſitating all actions, bad as well as good; but eſſentially *moral, good, and juſt*; and for a natural *Diſcrimen honeſtorum & turpium*, whereby another ground of the Neceſſity of all human actions will be removed. And the *third* and laſt, againſt *Neceſſity intrinſecal and eſſential to all actions*, and for ſuch a Liberty and *Sui-Poteſtas* in rational creatures, as may render them accountable, capable of rewards and puniſhments, and ſo objects of diſtributive or retributive Juſtice, by which the now only remaining ground of the fatal Neceſſity of all actions and events will be taken away. And all theſe three under that one general title of the *True Intellectual Syſtem of the Univerſe*; each Book having beſides, its own particular title. But the firſt of theſe Books only appeared under the title abovementioned; our Author informing the reader in his *Preface*, that tho' the other two Books *were and ſtill are really intended by us, yet the compleat finiſhing and publication of them will notwithſtanding depend upon many contingencies, not only of our life and health, the latter of which, as well as the former, is to us very uncertain; but alſo of our leiſure or vacancy from other neceſſary employments*. At the cloſe of the *Preface* he obſerves, that tho' ſome may think his work ſuperfluous, upon pretence, that an Atheiſt is a chimera, no where to be found in the world, yet ſuch perſons are both unſkilled in the monuments of antiquity, and unacquainted with the preſent age they live in, others having found too great an aſſurance from their own perſonal converſe of the reality of them. "Nevertheleſs, *continues he*, this labour of ours is not intended only for the converſion of downright and profeſſed Atheiſts (of which there is but little hope, they being ſunk into ſo great a degree of ſottiſhneſs,) but for the confirmation of weak, ſtaggering, and ſceptical Theiſts. And unleſs thoſe exploders of Atheiſts will affirm alſo, that all men have conſtantly an unſhaken faith and belief of the Exiſtence of God without the leaſt mixture of doubtful diſtruſt or heſitancy, (which if it were ſo, the world could not poſſibly be ſo bad as now it is,) they muſt needs grant, ſuch endeavours as theſe for the confirming and eſtabliſhing of men's minds in the belief of a God by philoſophic reaſons, in an age ſo philoſophical, not to be ſuperfluous and uſeleſs." In 1706 there was publiſhed an Abridgment of this work under the following title: *A Confutation of the Reaſon and Philoſophy of Atheiſm: being in a great meaſure either an Abridgment or an Improvement of what Dr. Cudworth offered to that purpoſe in his* True Intellectual Syſtem of the Univerſe. *Together with an Introduction, in which, among accounts of other matters relating to this Treatiſe, there is an impartial examination of what that learned perſon advanced touching the Chriſtian Doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, and the Reſurrection of the Body. In two volumes. By* Tho. Wiſe, *B. D. Fellow of Exeter-College in Oxford, and Chaplain to his Grace the D. of Ormond*. London 1706 in 4to. in 2 vol. Mr. Wiſe in his *Introduction* remarks, that Dr. Cudworth's Book, which is the vaſteſt magazine of reaſoning and learning, that ever ſingly appeared againſt Atheiſm, is ſwelled with frequent repetitions, circumlocutions, and digreſſions, and the ſeries and thread of it much interrupted by Greek and Latin quotations, ſo that hardly any writing will better admit of an Abridgment; upon which account Mr. Wiſe undertook his work. He then proceeds to obſerve, that Dr. Cudworth, having laid down a general propoſition, that the Heathens univerſally held but one unmade independent God, comes to ſhew that the Platoniſts in particular maintained an Unity of the Godhead in their three divine Hypoſtaſes, viz. *Monad* or *Good*, *Mind*, and *Soul*; notwithſtanding that they owned theſe three Hypoſtaſes to be numerically diſtinct, or to have diſtinct ſingular Eſſences of their own. To vindicate the Platoniſts in this point, he tells us, that the *ancient orthodox Fathers of the Chriſtian Church were generally of no other perſuaſion than this, that that Eſſence or Subſtance of the Godhead, which all the three Perſons* or Hypoſtaſes *agree in, as each of them is God, was not ſingular or individual, but only one common or univerſal Eſſence or Subſtance*. This and other aſſertions of the like nature in Dr. Cudworth's *Intellectual Syſtem*, have made ſo much noiſe in the world, that there was ſcarce a Pamphlet or Book written for many years concerning the Trinity, eſpecially in England, and in the heterodox way, which did not bring in the Doctor's authority; while on the other hand the orthodox treat his notion with the utmoſt ſeverity. Mr. Wiſe therefore endeavours, as much as poſſible, to clear up and juſtify our Author's doctrine. He afterwards proceeds to conſider Dr. Cudworth's opinion about the Reſurrection, who, as appears from ſeveral paſſages of his *Intellectual Syſtem* thought, that the Reſurrection-Body will not conſiſt of the ſame ſubſtance with that, which was buried; and that it will not be a body of fleſh, but an ætherial one; and that the preſent body is only a ſeed of the Reſurrection. However Mr. Wiſe ſhews from ſome other paſſages in his works, that he has plainly aſſerted the Reſurrection of the ſame numerical Body, as in ſome places he denied it. In the year 1703 &c. Mr. Le Clerc gave long Extracts of the *Intellectual Syſtem* in his *Bibliothoque Choiſie* (4); which engaged him in a diſpute with Mr. Bayle (5). Mr. le Clerc expreſſed his wiſhes, that ſome man of learning would tranſlate this work into Latin; but this deſign, though reſolved upon and attempted by ſeveral perſons in Germany (6) was never executed till the year 1733, when Dr. Moſheim publiſhed his Tranſlation of it under the following title: RADULPHI CUDWORTH *Theologiæ Doctoris, & in Academiâ Cantabrigienſi Profeſſoris*, Syſtema Intellectuale *hujus Univerſi, ſeu de veris Naturæ rerum originibus Commentarii; quibus omnis eorum Philoſophia, qui Deum eſſe negant, funditus evertitur. Accedunt reliqua ejus opuſcula.* Joannes Laurentius Moſhemius, *Theolog. Doctor, Sereniſſimi Ducis Brunſvicenſis a Conſiliis rerum ſanctiorum, Abbas Cœnobiorum Vallis S. Mariæ & Lapidis S. Michaelis, omnia ex Anglico Latinè vertit, recenſuit, variiſque Obſervationibus & Diſſertationibus illuſtravit & auxit.* Jena, 2 voll. fol. 1733. Dr. Moſheim in his Preface repreſents the difficulties of tranſlating this work to be very great; and obſerves ſome miſtakes, which Mr. le Clerc has committed with regard to the ſenſe of our Author in his *Extracts* in the *Bibliotheque Choiſie*.

(4) Tom. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9.

(5) See the Article of LE CLERC (John), Note [M].

(6) See *Biblitetheque Raiſonnée*, pag. 23, 24. *ubi ſupra*.

[G] *Nor has it eſcaped the reproaches of others, ſince that time.*] The Reverend Mr. John Turner in the *Dedication* (7) of his *Diſcourſe of the Meſſiah* treats our Author with great ſeverity on account of his *Intellectual Syſtem*, and tells us (8), that *we muſt conclude him to be himſelf a* Tritheiſtick, *a Sect, for which, I believe, he may have a kindneſs, becauſe he loves hard words; or ſomething elſe without either* ſtick *or* trick, *which I will not name, becauſe his Book pretends to be written againſt it*. And in another place he ſays (9), that *the moſt that charity itſelf can allow the Doctor, if it were to ſtep forth, and ſpeak his moſt favourable character to the world, is, that he is an* Arian, *a* Socinian, *or a* Deiſt. Mr. Dryden (10) tells us, that our Author "has raiſed ſuch ſtrong objections againſt the Being "of a God and Providence, that many think he has "not anſwered them." The Earl of Shaftſbury in his *Moraliſts, a Rhapſody* (11) has the following paſſage with relation to our Author. "You know the com"mon fate of thoſe, who dare to appear fair Authors. "What was that pious and learned man's caſe, who "wrote the *Intellectual Syſtem of the Univerſe?* I con"feſs it was pleaſant enough to conſider, that though "the whole world were no leſs ſatisfied with his ca"pacity and learning, than with his ſincerity in the "cauſe of the Deity; yet was he accuſed of giving "the upper hand to the Atheiſts for having only ſtat"ed their reaſons, and thoſe of their adverſaries, "fairly together."

(7) Pag. 16, 17, 19, 162. edit. London 1685 in 8vo.

(8) Ibid. pag. 17.

(9) Ibid. pag. 19.

(10) *Dedication* of his *Tranſlation of Virgil's Æneid. Works of Virgil tranſlated into Engliſh Verſe by Mr. Dryden*, vol. 2. pag. 378. London 1730, in 12mo.

(11) Part 2. Sect. 3. *Characteriſtics*, vol. 2. pag. 262. edit. 1714 in 8vo.

who probably died young; but he left a daughter *Damaris*, who was diſtinguiſhed for her uncommon learning and piety [*H*], and was ſecond wife to Sir Francis Maſham Bart. by whom ſhe had a ſon, the late Francis Cudworth Maſham Eſq; one of the Maſters in Chancery, and Accountant-General of the ſame Court. Our author died at Cambridge [*I*] June 26, 1688, in the 71ſt year of his age, and was interred at Chriſt's College there [*K*]. Beſides the works abovementioned he publiſhed a Sermon on 1 *Cor.* xv. 57. [*L*], and a Treatiſe intitled, *Deus Juſtificatus* [*M*]. He left ſeveral poſthumous Works [*N*]. He was a man of very extenſive Learning, excellently ſkilled in the learned

[*H*] *Left a daughter* Damaris, *who was diſtinguiſhed for her uncommon learning and piety.*] This Lady had a great friendſhip with Mr. Locke, who died at her houſe at Oates in Eſſex, where he had reſided for ſeveral years before. In 1696 ſhe publiſhed at London in 12mo, without her name, a *Diſcourſe concerning the Love of God* (12). She begins with obſerving, that "whatever reproaches have been made by the Romaniſts on the one hand of the want of books of "devotion in the Church of England; or by the Diſſenters on the other, of a dead and lifeleſs way of "preaching; it may be affirmed, that there cannot "any where be found ſo good a collection of diſcourſes "upon Moral Subjects, as might be made of Engliſh "Sermons and other Treatiſes of that nature written "by the Divines of our Church; which Books are "certainly in themſelves of the greateſt and moſt ge-"neral uſe of any, and do moſt conduce to that, "which is the chief aim of Chriſtianity, a good "life." She then animadverts upon thoſe, who undervalue Morality (13), and others, who ſtrain the duties of it to an impracticable pitch, and pretend to aſcend by it to ſomething beyond or above it (14); and afterwards proceeds to conſider the conduct of thoſe, who *build their practical and devotional Diſcourſes upon principles, which not only will not bear the teſt, but which oblige them to lay down ſuch aſſertions of Morality, as ſober and well diſpoſed Chriſtians cannot underſtand to be practicable* (15). And here ſhe applies herſelf to the Examination of Mr. John Norris's (16) Scheme in his *Practical Diſcourſes* and other Treatiſes, wherein he maintains, that "mankind are obliged "ſtrictly, as their duty, to love with deſire nothing "but God only, every degree of deſire of any crea-"ture whatſoever, being ſinful." Which aſſertion Mr. Norris defends upon this ground, that *God, not the Creature, is the immediate efficient cauſe of our ſenſations; for whatſoever gives us pleaſure has a right to our love; but God only gives us pleaſure; therefore he only has a right to our love.* This Hypotheſis is conſidered with great accuracy and ingenuity by Lady Maſham, and the bad conſequences of it repreſented in a ſtrong light. This *Diſcourſe* was tranſlated into French by Mr. Coſte in 1705.

(12) It contains 126 pages beſides the Preface.

(13) Pag. 2, 3.

(14) Pag. 3, 4, 5, 6.

(15) Pag. 7.

(16) This Divine borrowed his *Hypotheſis* from Father Mallebranche.

[*I*] *Our Author died at Cambridge.*] The Writer of *the Preſent State of the Republick of Letters for January* 1736 (17) having obſerved, that *it has been inſinuated by ſome, who perhaps only envied the luſtre of ſo great a name, as if Dr. Cudworth's* Intellectual Syſtem *was a diſguiſed plea for Atheiſm, inſtead of being a confutation of it*; proceeds thus: "And a certain "Baronet of this Kingdom, whoſe veracity I can ſafe-"ly depend on, and who has not, I believe, the leaſt "prejudice againſt the Doctor's reputation, told me a "few days ago, that he was aſſured by a Clergyman of "great piety and worth, (who expreſſed himſelf there-"upon with the utmoſt ſorrow and concern) that viſiting "the Doctor upon his death-bed, he heard him declare, "*he believed not any thing at all of Deiſm*; from whence "he inferred that he died a very infidel. But for my "part, I am apt to conclude juſt the contrary, ſuppoſ-"ing a miſtake to ariſe from ſome inadvertency of this "reverend Gentleman, who might imperfectly hear "Dr. Cudworth profeſſing his ſtedfaſt attachment to "Chriſtianity in oppoſition to Deiſm in the uſually re-"ceived ſenſe of it. And this the rather, becauſe, "as the Doctor could not but know that he had been "ſuſpected and calumniated on this ſcore by ſeveral, "who impeached him as a Deiſt in maſquerade; ſo "nothing could be properer to clear his character of "that aſperſion, and juſtify his unfeigned regard for "Revelation, than ſuch a declaration as I am ſuppoſ-"ing, when he was upon the very brink of eternity. "However the fact may indeed be, this at leaſt muſt "be owned, that what I am here imagining can be "charged with no great improbability; whereas the "Clergyman's report is undeniably inconſiſtent with "the moſt ſpecious appearances."

(17) Vol. 17. Artic. 2. pag. 29. edit. London 1736, in 8vo.

[*K*] *Interred at Chriſt's-College there.*] His Epitaph there is as follows (18): *Here lyeth the Body of Dr.* Ralph Cudworth, *late Maſter of Chriſt-College, about* 34 *years* Hebrew *Profeſſor, and Prebendary of Glouceſter. He died June the* 26*th* 1688, *in the* 71*ſt year of his age.*

(18) See *The Survey of the Cathedrals of York &c. By Browne Willis Eſq*; pag. 743. edit. London 1727 in 4to.

[*L*] *He publiſhed a Sermon on* 1 Cor. xv. 57.] The third edition of it was printed at London 1676 in fol. and ſubjoined to his *Intellectual Syſtem.* Dr. Moſheim never ſaw this or the other Sermon upon 1 *John* ii. 3, 4.

[*M*] *A Treatiſe intitled,* Deus Juſtificatus.] This Treatiſe is mentioned by Mr. Fancourt (19) under the title of *Deus Juſtificatus: Or the Divine Goodneſs vindicated and cleared againſt the Aſſertions of abſolute and inconditionate Reprobation.* Mr. Fancourt cites a long paſſage out of this Treatiſe, wherein that *great man,* as Mr. Fancourt ſtiles him (20), maintains, that the *Liberty of man's will* is taken away by aſſerting of *inconditionate decrees,* and that *both the predeſtinations of the good to life, and of reprobates to deſtruction neceſſarily pervades and caſts a fatal influence upon their whole lives. I mean,* ſays the Doctor, *that that decree invincibly orders and diſpoſes the actions of men to their reſpective ends; ſo that he who is pre-ordained to happineſs ſhall certainly and neceſſarily be good, and the other, who is deſtined to perdition, ſhall enevitably be wicked and vitious. A caſt of which doctrine we have delivered to us by* Zanchy *in theſe words:* Non dubitamus itaque confiteri ex immutabili Reprobatione neceſſitatem peccandi & quidem ſine reſipiſcentia ad mortem uſque peccandi, eoque & æternas pœnas dandi, reprobis incumbere. (*Vide* De Nat. Dei, *cap.* 2. in Reſponſ. ad Sophiſm.) i. e. "We doubt not to pro-"feſs, that from the immutable decree of Reproba-"tion there lies upon reprobates a neceſſity of ſinning, "and that without repentance even unto death, and "conſequently of ſuffering eternal puniſhment." Piſcator *likewiſe will aver the ſame, and more if you deſire it:* In ſumma ſe tueri fatetur, Deum abſolute decreviſſe ab æterno & efficaciter, ne quiſpiam hominum plus boni faciat, quam reipſa facit, aut plus mali omittat quam reipſa omittit. i. e. "That he "defends this concluſion, that God hath efficaciouſly "from all eternity, ſo predetermined the will of man to "every individual action, that none can do any more "good than he really doth, or omit any more evil "than *ipſo facto* he omitteth." (*Vid. Ad amic. dupl. Vorſt.* pag. 175.) *To theſe I ſhall add* Szydlovius *as the worſt of the three.* Fateor & ipſe ad communem ſentiendi conſuetudinem crudum nimis hoc videri, Deum poſſe Blaſphemiam, Perjurium, Mendacium, &c. imperare: .... quod tamen veriſſimum eſt in ſe, &c. i. e. "I confeſs that according to common ſenſe it "ſeems very crude to aſſert, that God can command "Blaſphemy, Perjury, Lying, &c. which yet is moſt "true in itſelf." *Now following theſe principles,* continues Dr. Cudworth, *it is impoſſible there ſhould be any ſuch thing as virtue and vice exiſting in the world; for all our actions, whether good or evil, are the neceſſary effects of an eternal principle acting and over-ruling our wills, and we are but the inſtruments, which that invincible power makes uſe of for the doing ſuch and ſuch actions, and can no more withſtand it, than the Sun ceaſe to make day and night &c.* (21).

(19) *Preface* to his *Free Agency of Accountable Creatures examined with Candour and defended in ſeveral Letters &c.* pag. 16, 17, edit. London 1733, in 8vo.

(20) Ibid. pag. 14.

(21) *See* Dr. Cudworth's *Deus Juſtificatus*, pag. 184-188.

[*N*] *He left ſeveral poſthumous works.*] I. *A Treatiſe concerning* Moral Good *and* Evil; in ſeveral volumes in fol. containing above a thouſand pages. It conſiſts of two books. The Author begins with repreſenting the ſentiments of thoſe amongſt the Anti-

learned Languages and Antiquity, a good Mathematician, a ſubtle Philoſopher, and a profound Metaphyſician. He embraced the Mechanical or Corpuſcular Philoſophy; but with regard to the Deity, Intelligences, Genii, Ideas, and in ſhort, the Principles of Human Knowledge, he followed Plato and even the later Platoniſts (*g*). A great number of Writers commend his piety and modeſty; and Biſhop Burnet tells us (*h*), that "he was a man of great conduct and prudence; upon which his enemies did very falſly "accuſe him of craft and diſſimulation." The late Earl of Shafteſbury (*i*) ſtiles him *an excellent and learned Divine, of higheſt authority at home, and fame abroad.*

(*g*) *Biblioth. Raiſonn.* pag. 13, 14.

(*h*) *Hiſtory of his own Time*, vol. 1. pag. 187.

(*i*) *Characteriſticks*, vol. 3. chap. 2. pag. 64. edit. 1714, in 8vo.

ents, who denied *Natural Juſtice*. He anſwers their objections one after another; and ſhews that this opinion is directly contrary to the good of ſociety. He proves, that *juſt* and *right* is not eſtabliſhed by the arbitrary will of the Deity. He examines whether the *ſovereign Good* conſiſts in *pleaſure*; and after having at large refuted the Philoſophy of Epicurus, he gives us the true idea of *Happineſs*, which he places in *a divine life*. The queſtion concerning human liberty is diſcuſſed here, and the objections againſt it anſwered. From thence he proceeds to the moral and political Philoſophy of Hobbes; and it appears that Dr. Cudworth had applied himſelf to the entire deſtruction of that ſcheme. II. *A Treatiſe of* Liberty *and* Neceſſity, *in which the Philoſophical foundations of Atheiſm are deſtroyed, and the certainty of Morality defended, and the Nature of it explained.* This work contains a thouſand pages in folio. He refutes here the notion of the neceſſity of human actions, by anſwering the objections not only of the Stoics, and the antient Atheiſts, but likewiſe the modern Chriſtians, who maintain that opinion. III. *A Commentary upon the Prophecy of* Daniel *concerning the* Seventy Weeks; *in which all the explications of the Jews, as well as of ſome learned Chriſtians, are examined and confuted.* In two volumes in folio. IV. *Of the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion againſt the Jews.* The Author mentions this work among his Manuſcripts; but it cannot yet be found. V. Δίκαιον φυσικὸν ἢ ἀϊδιον: Or *A Treatiſe concerning Eternal and Immutable Morality.* This was printed at London 1731 in 8vo, with a Preface by Dr. Edward Chandler Lord Biſhop of Durham, who obſerves (21), that in this book our Author "proves the falſeneſs of the conſequences with reſpect "to *natural juſtice and morality in God*, which are "deducible from the principles of thoſe that maintain the ſecond ſort of fate, denominated by him "*Theologick*. And thus it may be reckoned to be a "ſequel in part of his firſt book againſt *Material* "*Fate*. Had it come abroad as early as it was written, it had ſerved for a proper antidote to the poiſon in ſome of Mr. Hobbes's and others Writings, "who revived in that age the exploded opinions of "Protagoras, and other antient Greeks, and took away the *eſſential and eternal diſcriminations of moral* "*good and evil, of juſt and unjuſt*, and made them "*all arbitrary productions of divine or human will.*" Againſt the antient and modern patrons of this "doctrine no one hath writ better than Dr. Cudworth. "His book is indeed a demonſtration of the truth of "the contrary opinion, and is drawn up with that "beauty, clearneſs, and ſtrength, as muſt delight as "well as convince the reader, if I may judge of the "affection of others, from the effect it had on me. "It will certainly give a juſt idea of the Writer's "good ſenſe, as well as vaſt learning. We are not "certain that this Treatiſe is quoted ſo perfect as the "Author deſigned it; but it appears from the MS. "that he tranſcribed the beſt part of it with his own "hand, as if it was ſpeedily to have been ſent to the "preſs." VI. *A Treatiſe of the* Creation *of the World, and the* Immortality *of the* Soul. A volume in 8vo. VII. *Of the Learning of the Hebrews.* VIII. *An Explication of the Notion of Hobbes concerning the Nature of God, and the Extenſion of Spirits.* T

(21) Preface, pag. 9, 10, 11.

☞CUMBERLAND (RICHARD), a very learned Engliſh Divine and Biſhop in the latter end of the ſeventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth Century, was ſon of a Citizen of London (*a*). He was born in that City July the 15th 1632 *. His education was firſt in St. Paul's School in London, and afterwards in Magdalen College in Cambridge, where he contracted an intimate friendſhip with Dr. Hezekiah Burton, Dr. Hollings, Sir Samuel Moreland, Mr. Pepys, afterwards Secretary to the Admiralty, and Sir Orlando Bridgman, afterwards Lord Keeper of the Great Seal (*b*). He diſtinguiſhed himſelf while he was Fellow of the College by the performance of his Academical Exerciſes. July the 14th 1657 he was incorporated Maſter of Arts in the Univerſity of Oxford (*c*). He went out Bachelor of Divinity at a public commencement; and though it was hardly known that the ſame perſon performed thoſe great exerciſes twice, yet ſuch was the expectation he had raiſed, that he was afterwards ſollicited to keep the Act at another public Commencement for his Doctor's Degree (*d*). His firſt preferment, for which he quitted an Univerſity life, was the Rectory of Brampton in Northamptonſhire, given him by Sir John Norwich. In this rural retirement he minded little elſe than the duties of his function and his ſtudies; and his relaxations from thoſe were very few beſides his journies to Cambridge, which he made frequently to preſerve a correſpondence with his learned acquaintance in that place (*e*). His friend Sir Orlando Bridgman being made Lord Keeper in 1667, appointed him his Chaplain, and beſtowed on him the Living of All-hallows in Stamford (*f*), where he performed the duties of his function in the moſt exemplary manner [*A*]. In 1672 he publiſhed his excellent Treatiſe of the *Laws of Nature* [*B*]; and in 1680 at the ſollicitation of the Univerſity, he took upon him the weighty

(*a*) *Life of Biſhop Cumberland, by S. Payne, A. M.* pag. 3. prefixed to *Sanchoniatho's Phœnician Hiſtory, tranſlated from the firſt Book of Euſebius* de Præparatione Evangelica *&c. By the Right Reverend R. Cumberland, D. D. late Biſhop of Peterborough*, edit. London 1720, in 8vo.

* *Survey of the Cathedrals of Lincoln, Ely, Oxford, and Peterborough. By Browne Willis Eſq*; pag. 510. edit. London 1730 in 4to. This Gentleman tells us, that our Author was born in the Pariſh of *St. Anne Aldgate:* but Mr. Payne, *ubi ſupra*, writes that he was born in Fleet-ſtreet.

(*b*) *Life of Cumberland*, pag. 4, 5, 6.

(*c*) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 118. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*d*) *Life of Biſhop Cumberland*, p. 6.

(*e*) Ibid. pag. 7, 8.

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 8.

[*A*] *Performed the duties of his function in the moſt exemplary manner.*] Beſides the duty incumbent on him as Miniſter, he accepted of the weekly Lecture; and by this means was obliged to preach three times every week in the ſame Church. This difficult province he went through conſtantly and aſſiduouſly. This, which alone would have been a burthen too heavy for an ordinary man, he diſcharged with ſo much eaſe, that he carried on at the ſame time great deſigns in his Philoſophical, Mathematical, and Philological Studies (1).

(1) *Life of Biſhop Cumberland, by S. Payne, A. M.* pag. 9. prefixed to *Sanchoniatho's Phœnician Hiſtory, &c.*

[*B*] *In* 1672 *he publiſhed his excellent Treatiſe of the* Laws of Nature.] It was printed at London in 4to, under the following title; *De Legibus Naturæ Diſquiſitio Philoſophica, in quâ earum forma, ſumma Capita, Ordo, Promulgatio, & Obligatio è rerum naturâ inveſtigantur; quinetiam Elementa Philoſophiæ Hobbianæ, tum moralis tum civilis, conſiderantur & refutantur.* Mr. Payne tells us (2), that it is in one of the firſt Diſquiſitions "written in the demonſtrative way "upon a moral ſubject: I may add too, *ſays he*, the "perfecteſt; for I believe all good judges allow it to "be a demonſtration. He was not near the preſs "while it was working off: by this means it came "into

(2) Ibid. pag. 26.

weighty exerciſe of reſponding at the public commencement [C]. The melancholy proſpect of affairs in the reign of King James II, as it made deep impreſſions on every one who wiſhed well to our Conſtitution in Church and State, ſo it made a deeper than ordinary on Dr. Cumberland, and contributed to the bringing on him a dangerous fit of ſickneſs, one of the ſevereſt fevers, from which ever man recovered (*g*). In 1686 he publiſhed *An Eſſay toward the Jewiſh Weights and Meaſures* [D]. After the Revolution he was nominated by King William III to the Biſhoprick of Peterborough, without the leaſt ſollicitation on his part; and the firſt account he had of his promotion was from the public Newspaper, which he was reading at the Coffee-houſe in Stamford (*h*). He was conſecrated to that See in the room of Dr. Thomas White, (who had been deprived for refuſing the oaths,) July the 5th 1691 (*i*). He was very diligent and careful in his Dioceſe, and on all occaſions treated his Clergy with ſingular regard and indulgence. He was remarkable for humility of mind, benevolence of temper, and innocence of life. He purſued his ſtudies to the very laſt; and the world is obliged to him for clearing up ſeveral difficulties in Philoſophy, Hiſtory, and Chronology (*k*). After the age of eighty three he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the Coptic Language, which he made himſelf Maſter of (*l*). He died of the Palſy at Peterborough in the eighty ſeventh year of his age October the 9th 1718, and was interred in his Cathedral there (*m*). He left ſeveral works behind him, two of which have been publiſhed [E].

(*g*) Ibid. pag. 11.

(*h*) Ibid. pag. 12, 13.

(*i*) Willis, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 510.

(*k*) *Life of Dr. John Colet, Dean of St. Paul's. By Samuel Knight, D. D.* pag. 426. edit. London 1726 in 8vo.

(*l*) *Life of Biſhop Cumberland*, pag. 25.

(*m*) Willis, *ubi ſupra*.

CURIO

" into the world very incorrectly printed. This may " have been ſome diſcouragement to the reading of " it, though the difficulty of the ſubject and the " cloſeneſs of the reaſoning has been a greater. " Hardly any men hitherto have made themſelves " acquainted with the argument of it, but ſuch as " are in the uppermoſt form of learning. I have " ſometimes wiſhed that his Lordſhip would have been " pleaſed to have reviſed it, and tried to make it more ea- " ſy and intelligible; but it had lain ſo long out of his " hands, that he did not care to take it up again. " He gave me leave to attempt any thing of that " kind, if I would; and as a help he gave me his " own interleaved book, which has here and there a " little addition. I read his book over and over di- " ligently with this view, but never found where I " could well alter any thing, where I could leave " out, or where I could add. All I can think on to " give a little advantage to common readers, is to print " the book correctly, to give an analyſis of the ar- " gumentation, to add contents to each paragraph, " and to divide them oftner. This I may perhaps " find leiſure to do." In 1692 James Tyrrel Eſq; grandſon of Archbiſhop Uſher, publiſhed at London in 8vo, *A brief Diſquiſition of the Law of Nature, according to the Principles and Method laid down in the Reverend Dr.* Cumberland's *(now Lord Biſhop of* Peterborough) *Latin Treatiſe on that ſubject; as alſo his Confutations of Mr. Hobbes's Principles, put into another method, with the Author's approbation.*

[C] *In* 1680 *at the ſollicitation of the Univerſity, he took upon him the weighty exerciſe of reſponding at the public Commencement.*] The Theſes maintained by him were, I. *Sancto Petro nulla data eſt juriſdictio in cæteros Apoſtolos*; i. e. " St. Peter had no juriſdiction granted " him over the reſt of the Apoſtles." II. *Separatio ab Eccleſiâ Anglicanâ eſt ſchiſmatica*; i. e. " The Se- " paration from the Church of England is ſchiſmati- " cal." The fame of Dr. Cumberland's performance was many years after freſh among the Members of the Univerſity (3).

(3) Idem, ibid. pag. 9, 10.

[D] *In* 1686 *he publiſhed an* Eſſay toward the Jewiſh Meaſures and Weights.] It was printed at London in 8vo under the following title; *An Eſſay toward the Recovery of the Jewiſh Meaſures and Weights, comprehending their moneys, by help of an ancient ſtandard compared with ours of England, uſeful alſo to ſtate many of thoſe of the Greeks, and Romans, and Eaſtern Nations.* The Author of the *Animadverſions on the Reflections upon Dr. Burnet's Travels* (4) ſtiles this *a moſt learned and ingenious Diſcourſe.* There is a long Extract of this Eſſay in Mr. Le Clerc's *Bibliotheque Univerſelle* (5). Dr. Bernard in his Book *de Menſuris & Ponderibus antiquis* (6) thought fit to contradict ſome of our Author's aſſertions without quoting him; upon which Dr. Cumberland wrote ſome ſheets to juſtify his calculations: but his averſeneſs to any thing like wrangling made him lay them by, and leave his Book to ſhift for itſelf (7).

(4) Pag. 27. edit. 1688.

(5) Tom. 5.

(6) Printed at Oxford 1688 in 8vo.

(7) *Life of Cumberland*, pag. 27.

[E] *He left ſeveral works behind him, two of which have been publiſhed.*] The Reverend Mr. Squire Payne, M. A. his ſon-in-law and domeſtic Chaplain, publiſhed at London 1720 in 8vo the following poſthumous work of the Biſhop: *Sanchoniatho's Phœnician Hiſtory, tranſlated from the firſt Book of Euſebius* de Præparatione Evangelicâ. *With a Continuation of Sanchoniatho's Hiſtory by Eratoſthenes Cyrenæus's Canon, which Dicæarchus connects with the firſt Olympiad. Theſe Authors are illuſtrated with many hiſtorical and chronological Remarks, proving them to contain a Series of Phœnician and Egyptian Chronology, from the firſt Man to the firſt Olympiad, agreeable to the Scripture Accounts. By the Right Reverend* R. Cumberland, *D. D. late Biſhop of Peterborough. With a Preface giving a brief Account of the Life, Character and Writings of the Author. By* S. Payne *A. M. Rector of Barnack in Northamptonſhire, his Lordſhip's domeſtick Chaplain.* Mr. Payne obſerves (8), that our Author had a quicker ſenſe than many other men of the advances Popery was making upon us; and was affected with the apprehenſions of it to the laſt degree. This made him turn his thoughts to the enquiry by what ſteps and methods idolatry got ground in the world. The oldeſt account of this he believed he found in *Sanchoniatho's Fragment.* This he ſaw was a profeſſed apology for idolatry, and owned openly, what other Heathens would have made a ſecret of, that the Gods of the Gentile World had been all mortal men. He ſtudied this *Fragment* with no other view than as it led to the diſcovery of the original of Idolatry. He ſpent ſome time upon it before ever he had a thought of extracting from it Footſteps of the Hiſtory of the World preceding the Flood. While other Divines of the Church of England were engaged in the controverſy with the Papiſts, in which they gained over them ſo complete a victory, our Author was endeavouring to ſtrike at the root of their idolatrous Religion. His firſt deſign he finiſhed about the time of the Revolution, and would then have printed it, but his Bookſeller was ſo cautious, that he did not care to undertake it. Upon this diſcouragement he laid aſide the thoughts of making it public; but he was enter'd on a ſubject, which he did not know how to leave. Having made what he thought a great diſcovery, theſe ſearches into the oldeſt times became more engaging to him; and he went on with them rather for his own entertainment, than with any deſign to make the world acquainted with them. We ſhall give an account of his Scheme, as it is repreſented by Mr. Payne (9); who obſerves, that the firſt hint given our Author was from this paſſage:

(8) Ibid. pag. 27, 28, 33, 34. The pages in this Preface are miſnumbered after pag. 32.

(9) Pag. 28, & ſeqq.

Ἶσιρις ἀδελφὸς Χνᾶ τῦ πρώτυ Φοίνικος.

" Iſiris the brother of Chnaa the firſt Phœnician."

The firſt Phœnician was indiſputably *Canaan*, whoſe poſterity peopled that country. His name in the Hebrew is often written *Chanaan*. That the Egyptian King called by the Greeks *Iſiris*, was brother to him, was ſomething new. The next ſtep was to find that *Miſor* in *Sanchoniatho* was *Mizraim* in *Moſes*. *Mizraim* was

CURIO (COELIUS SECUNDUS) a learned man of Piedmont, retired into Switzerland, after he had ſuffered a very heavy perſecution in Italy, becauſe he was ſuſpected to be a Proteſtant. He was very kindly received in the Canton of Bern, and was made Maſter of the College of Lauſanne (a); he went afterwards to Baſil, where they gave him the chair of Profeſſor of Eloquence: he filled that Poſt with great reputation. He publiſhed

(a) See the Dedication of his *Paſquillus Extaticus*, printed at Geneva, in 1544.

was the name of a people, like *Ludim*, *Philiſtim*, *Caphtorim*, &c. The ſingular number, and the proper name of the man was *Miſor*. In this there is not much difficulty, nor that *Miſor* (from whence comes *Miſraim*) was the brother of Canaan. It is a greater difficulty to make *Miſor* the ſame man with *Iſiris*, tho' it is done without much force. *M* in Hebrew is a ſervile letter often omitted: leave it out, the name is *Iſor*; add to this a Greek termination, which Greek authors always do to Eaſtern Names, it is *Iſoris*, and by the ſmall change of a vowel, *Iſiris*. The next obſervation was, that *Miſor* or *Iſiris* is placed by *Sanchoniatho* about the diſtance of twelve generations from *Protogonus*, the firſt produced man, and *Mizraim* is undoubtedly in the twelfth generation from Adam. Our Author then proceeded to collect, that *Protogonus* was *Adam*. What name *Sanchoniatho* called him by, we know not; it was probably by ſome Eaſtern Name, ſignifying the firſt created Man, which Philo Biblius tranſlates *Protogonus* by a Greek word of the ſame import. *Æon* and *Protogonus* are the two firſt mortals. *Æon* our Author conjectures to have ſome affinity to the name *Eve*. *Æon*, adds Sanchoniatho, *firſt gathered food from trees*. What can this be but an alluſion to *Eve's* eating the forbidden fruit? From *Protogonus* and *Æon*, ſays Sanchoniatho, deſcended *Genus*. You cannot well make any other Greek name of the Hebrew *Cain* than Γένος. Hence our Author concludes, that Sanchoniatho preſerved the Hiſtory of the idolatrous line of *Cain*, as *Moſes* did that of *Seth*, who were the worſhippers of the true God. Who the men were, whoſe names are preſerved by Sanchoniatho in the ſucceeding generations, we know not; their memory periſhed with the Flood. But in the twelfth generation from Æon and Protogonus, we find *Miſor*; and *Mizraim* is in the ſame diſtance from *Adam* and *Eve*. Here again we are got within our knowledge. But we have not in *Sanchoniatho* one word about the Deluge. What wonder is it we ſhould not? Sanchoniatho was an idolater; he writes avowedly a Defence or Apology for Idolatry. The deluge was a judgment on the idolatrous world, and ſwept it away. The worſhippers of the true God gloried in this, and reproached the Heathens with it: no wonder then that they were deſirous to conceal ſuch a matter of ſhame to themſelves. *Cronus*, who makes the great figure in this Hiſtory, our Author ſuppoſes to be *Ham*, and brings good vouchers for his opinion from antiquity. Conſequently therefore *Ouranus*, the father of *Cronus*, muſt be Noah. *Ham*, among the ſons of Noah, was the man of ambition, and the reſtorer of idolatry after the flood. How long he lived we know not. We are aſſured by Moſes, that his brother *Shem* lived 502 years after the Flood. *Ham* in all probability lived long, tho' perhaps not ſo long as that religious and peaceable man *Shem*. He deſired to make his ſons great; therefore beſides *Canaan*, who peopled *Syria*, two other of his ſons, *Cuſh* and *Mizraim*, were the founders of two great Empires, the Aſſyrian and the Egyptian. Sanchoniatho repreſents him as a ſort of univerſal Monarch travelling over the world to plant Colonies. He intimates that he outlived *Miſor* [*Mizraim*], and ſettled the ſon of *Miſor*, *Thoth*, the great Hermes of the Egyptians, in the Kingdom of Egypt. From the Records left by this *Thoth*, *Sanchoniatho* collected his Hiſtory, and with him this Fragment ends. Where *Sanchoniatho* ends *Eratoſthenes* begins. The two firſt Kings in his Catalogue are *Menes* and *Athothes*. That *Menes* was the firſt King in Egypt, and the ſame man with *Mizraim*, is allowed on all hands. *Athothes* is plainly the ſame name with *Thoth*. *A* is arbitrarily prefixed, or omitted. He is called indifferently *Thoth* or *Athoth*. *Es* is only the Greek termination. *Eratoſthenes* was the moſt learned man of his time, a native of Cyrene bordering upon Egypt, Librarian to Ptolomæus Euergetes, had greater opportunities and helps for ſearching the Egyptian Records than any other man. The Prieſts of Egypt had ever been in a combination to relate extravagant and incredible accounts of their Kings, thinking thereby to aggrandize their Monarchy. *Eratoſthenes* went with a deſire to find out the truth. The names of the firſt thirty eight of his Catalogue of the Kings of Thebes in Egypt are preſerved; they are a ſucceſſion for the ſpace of 1055 years. *Nilus*, the laſt King but one in this liſt, is ſuppoſed to have lived about the time of the Siege of Troy. *Dicæarchus*, a learned Hiſtorian, contemporary with Ariſtotle, ſays, that from this *Nilus* to the beginning of the Olympiads were 436 years. This account has an air of probability; it places *Menes* about 1400 years before the *Olympiads*, near 2000 years after the Flood, and it agrees well with the Moſaic Hiſtory. We have by this means a ſeries of profane Hiſtory from the firſt Man to the firſt Olympiad, agreeing with the Scripture. *Sanchoniatho* begins his Hiſtory with *Protogonus* [*Adam*], and brings it down to *Thoth*, the ſecond King of Egypt. *Eratoſthenes* begins his Catalogue with *Menes* [*Miſor*], as *Athothes* [*Thoth*], which is connected with the Olympiads. The Authors of the *Univerſal Hiſtory* (9) have made Animadverſions upon this Scheme of Biſhop Cumberland; and Monſr. Fourmont in his *Reflexions Critiques ſur les Hiſtoires des anciens Peuples, Chaldéens, Hébreux, Phéniciens, Egyptiens, Grecs, &c. juſqu' au tems de Cyrus; en trois Livres* (10) ſpeaks of this work of our Author with great approbation, tho' he diſſents from him in ſeveral particulars. In 1724 Mr. Payne publiſhed at London in 8vo another poſthumous Treatiſe of the Biſhop, intitled, Origines Gentium antiquiſſimæ: *Or, Attempts for diſcovering the Times of the firſt planting of Nations. In ſeveral Tracts. By the Right Reverend* R. Cumberland, *D. D. late Biſhop of Peterborough. Publiſhed from his Lordſhip's Manuſcript by* S. Payne, *A. M. Rector of Barnack in Northamptonſhire.* This work conſiſts of the following Tracts. I. *A Diſcourſe on Gen.* xxxvi. *concerning the Settlement of* Eſau's *Family, from Mount* Seir *to* Elparan, *the antient ſeat of the* Horites: *and of the Government of that Land before and after their ſettlement: with an Enquiry about the times thereof.* II. *A Diſcourſe on Deut.* ii. 23. *The* Avim *which dwelt in* Hazarim, *even unto* Azzah; *the* Caphtorim, *which came forth out of* Caphtor, *deſtroyed them, and dwelt in their ſtead.* III. *Notes on the Synchroniſms of* Canaan *and* Egypt. IV. *Concerning the Poſſibility of a ſufficient Increaſe of Men from the three ſons of Noah, to a number large enough to found all the Nations mentioned in the oldeſt credible Hiſtories; and that in the times aſſigned to their foundation, agreeably with the Hebrew accounts. With ſome ſuggeſtions about the Diſperſion of Men to plant in ſeveral parts of the earth; particularly the building of* Nineveh, *the Metropolis of the Aſſyrian Monarchy.* V. *An Appendix to the preceding chapter, in an Eſſay towards the better ſtating of the interval between the founding of* Niniveh, *and the fall of* Sardanapalus, *which broke from the ancient* Aſſyrian *Empire two Monarchies:* 1. *that of the* Babylonians, *beginning with* Nabonaſſar: 2. *that of the* Medes, *begun in* Dejoces, *yet left to* Tighlath-Pilezer *and his ſucceſſors, an* Aſſyrian *Empire, which recovered good ſtrength, ſo as to conquer Syria, and to captivate the ten Tribes of* Iſrael. VI. *Proofs from Scripture and from Heathens of the* Aſſyrian *Empire before* Nabonaſſar. VII. *A Diſcourſe endeavouring to connect the Greek and Roman Antiquities with thoſe of the eldeſt Eaſtern Monarchies in Aſia and Egypt, and conſequently with the diſperſion from Babel, which came near the great Flood. In two chapters,* 1. *Concerning* Greece, *eſpecially the* Pelaſgi. 2. *Concerning* Italy, *particularly the* Tyrrheni, *or as the elder Greeks call them, the* Tyrſeni; *theſe, beſides the* Egyptians, *being Colonies from the* Aſſyrian *Empire, and the beginning of the Greek and Roman Empires.* VIII. *Appendix de Cabiris, addenda Diſquiſitioni de Pelaſgis.* IX. *Appendicula de Legibus, quibus tenebantur Patriarchæ, tam ante quam poſt diluvium, uſque ad tempus quo ſolemniter ſancitum eſt Fœdus Moſaicum: quod leges continet præcipuas, quibus tenebatur populus Judaicus poſt Exodum ex Ægypto.* H.

(9) Vol. 1. B. 1. cap. 2. edit. London 1730, in fol.

(10) Printed at Paris 1735, in two volumes in 4to.

publiſhed ſome books [*A*], and one, amongſt others, in which he endeavours to prove, that the number of the Elect exceeds that of the Reprobates [*B*]. He died in the year 1569, aged ſixty ſeven years (*b*). He had buried not long before a very illuſtrious ſon, named AUGUSTINUS SECUNDUS CURIO [*C*]. Their Library, which was very fine, was bought by the Duke of Lunenburg (*c*), and is now part of that of Wolfenbuttel. You will find in Hoffman's Lexicon, and in Monſieur Teiſſier's Additions to Thuanus's Elogies, ſeveral things relating to our Curio.

(*b*) Hoffman, *in Lexico*, tom. 1. pag. 509.

(*c*) See Coringius in his *Treatiſe of Libraries*.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] You will find a Catalogue of them in Monſieur Teiſſier's Elogies taken from Thuanus (1). But obſerve, that the *Hiſtoria Sarracenica*; i. e. "The Hiſtory of the Sarracens," was not written by Cœlius, but by his ſon Auguſtin Curio. As to the War of Maltha, printed with this Hiſtory of the Sarracens, Konig (2) ſhould not have aſcribed it to Auguſtin; it is a work of Cœlius.

(1) Tom. 1. pag. 358.

(2) *Biblioth. Vet. & Nov.* pag. 228.

[*B*] . . . *And one amongſt others, in which he endeavours to prove, that the number of the Elect exceeds that of the Reprobates.*] We may wonder, that he dared to aſſert ſuch a doctrine amongſt the Swiſs, for it is very ſuſpicious to the true Reformed, and I do not believe, that any Profeſſor could maintain it at preſent in Holland with impunity. However it be, his book was intitled, *De Amplitudine beati Regni Dei*; i. e. "Of the extent of God's happy Kingdom." He dedicated it to Sigiſmund Auguſtus, King of Poland. He ſays, in pag. 131 (3), that he never better underſtood, how extenſive God's mercy is, than when his ſon Horace (4) tranſlated out of Italian a Diſcourſe upon that ſubject, written by Maſile Andreaſi, a native of Mantua. See the *Sorberiana* (5), where this book of Curio is mentioned with great contempt, whilſt the Author's intention is commended.

(3) Of the edition of Gouda 1614. The firſt edition was of Baſil 1554.

(4) Ramus, *Oratione de Baſilea*, pag. 57. ſays, that *Cœlius Horace Curio* publiſhed at Baſil at the age of 15 a book *de Amplitudine divinæ Miſericordiæ*, and ſome *Declamations*.

(5) Pag. 56.

[*C*] *He had . . . a very illuſtrious ſon named* AUGUSTINUS SECUNDUS CURIO.] He had been Profeſſor of Eloquence in the Univerſity of Baſil, and though he lived but twenty eight years, yet he has given public proofs of his learning; he publiſhed three Books of the Hiſtory of the Saracens, one of the Kingdom of Morocco, and one upon the life and death of his four ſiſters (6). One of them was a learned maid. *Cujus Sororem Angelam præter cætera virginis ornamenta, non ſolum Germanicè, Italicè, Gallicè, ſed & Latinè locutam (quod ipſius manuſcriptæ declarant Epiſtolæ) equidem etiam ad Patris eximias laudes aggrego.* i. e. "I muſt alſo obſerve, in commendation of the "Father, that Auguſtinus's ſiſter Angela, beſides the "other ornaments of a maiden, underſtood, not only "German, Italian, and French, but even Latin, as "it appears from her manuſcript letters." Theſe are Peter Ramus's words (7).

(6) Taken from Petrus Ramus in *Oratione de Baſilea*, pag. m. 53.

(7) Ibid. pag. 57

CURTIUS (QUINTUS), the Writer of Alexander's Hiſtory. See QUINTUS CURTIUS.

CYRIL, Deacon of the Church of Heliopolis near Mount Libanus, was a great Iconoclaſt, or Image-breaker, under the Empire of Conſtantine; for finding himſelf enflamed with the ardours of divine love (*a*), he demoliſhed ſeveral ſtatues worſhipped by the Heathens. Theſe remembered it when their Religion got the upper hand under the Empire of Julian; and they revenged themſelves with great fury; ſince they not only killed him, but tore his bowels out, and eat his liver. All who ſhared in this crime were puniſhed in a moſt aſtoniſhing manner; they firſt loſing all their teeth, afterwards their tongues, and at laſt their eyes (*b*). Alcyonius aſſures us that Cyril, before he had exerted himſelf in this manner againſt idols, had been baniſhed to the iſland of Naxos; and that Julian himſelf gave orders for his being put to death [*A*], and for his courtiers to eat the bowels of that holy man. But I have not found theſe particulars in Theodoret.

(*a*) Ζῆλῳ πυρπολούμενος θείῳ. Theodoretus, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 3. cap. 7.

(*b*) Extracted from Theodoret, ibid.

[*A*] *Alcyonius aſſures us that Cyril . . . had been baniſhed . . . and that Julian himſelf gave orders for his being put to death.*] Here follows his words: *Cyrillus quoque ſempiterna laude videtur decorandus qui leviſſime ſuum in Naxo inſula exſilium toleravit, idque principatu Magni Conſtantini, apud quem poſtea tanta gratia & auctoritate valuit, ut cum bona ejus venia complura veterum Deorum ſimulacra ſubverterit, quo defuncto cum poteſtas rerum omnium penes Julianum eſſet, illius juſſu diſſectus eſt, mandavitque inſuper crudeliſſimus tyrannus, ut Purpurati ſui viſcera ſanctiſſimi & innocentiſſimi hominis epularentur* (1). i. e. "Cyril alſo ſeems worthy of "everlaſting honour, who bore his baniſhment to the "iſland of Naxos with the utmoſt patience and reſignation, and that too, under the reign of Conſtantine the Great, who afterwards indulged him "ſo great a ſhare of his favour, and gave him ſuch "authority, that, by this Prince's leave, he demoliſhed many ſtatues of the antient Gods. Conſtantine dying, and Julian ſucceeding to his throne, "Cyril was butchered by his command; but this not "ſatisfying the barbarous tyrant, he ordered his Courtiers to eat the entrails of this moſt holy and "moſt innocent man." It is probable that ſome flouriſhes were added on this occaſion; but if his intent was to defame expreſly this apoſtate Prince, and to add, for that purpoſe, certain probable particulars, why were not ſome alſo ſuppreſſed? for this the laws of Rhetoric allowed; why was notice taken of the ſtatues of the Gods demoliſhed by Cyril? This circumſtance leſſens prodigiouſly the cruelty of the Heathens. The Roman Catholics may judge of this from themſelves. No circumſtance removed more effectually the Duke of Alba's ſcruples, when he put to death ſuch multitudes of Proteſtants in the Low Countries, than his calling to mind, that they had been Image-breakers. It muſt be owned, that Martyrs win a brighter crown, when they cannot be reproached with having demoliſhed ſtatues devoted to a religious uſe &c.

(1) Petrus Alcyonius, *in Medice Legato priore*, folio c. iiij.

CYRUS, ſon of Darius Nothus King of Perſia, became illuſtrious by his noble qualities; but nothing has made him ſo much ſpoken of as the War which he undertook againſt his brother Artaxerxes. Darius, their common father, finding himſelf extremely ill and his end approaching, recalled him from the Province of which he had given him the government. Cyrus brought with him Tiſſaphernes, in whom he placed entire confidence; but that man deceived him; for he perſuaded Artaxerxes, who had ſucceeded Darius, that Cyrus was plotting ſomething againſt him. This falſe information ſo highly provoked the King of Perſia that he would have put Cyrus to death, if Paryſatis their mother had not prevented the blow. She not only ſaved his life, but got him continued in the government of the Province which he had obtained of King Darius. As ſoon as Cyrus was returned thither, he employed his whole thoughts in forming ſchemes of ambition and revenge; and made all neceſſary preparations to revenge the ill treatment he had received from his brother, and to get poſſeſſion of the Crown.

He

He made ſure of ſome good Greek Captains, who had fled from their native country: he gave them orders to raiſe troops; and concealed his real deſign under divers pretexts during his march. His money ſoon fell ſhort; however he was not diſcouraged, but was fortunate enough to meet with a Queen, who was not contented to bring him money [*A*]: nevertheleſs he had a hundred difficulties to rub through with thoſe mercenary troops, which hindred not his paſſing the Euphrates, and promiſing himſelf a deciſive victory. Artaxerxes, in the mean while, having received timely information from Tiſſaphernes of Cyrus's preparations, had neglected nothing to put himſelf in a condition to oppoſe him, and marched to meet him with a fine army. The battle was fought near Babylon; and there is no doubt but Cyrus would have gained it, if he had not been killed, fighting with too much eagerneſs and too little caution (*a*) [*B*]. ASPASIA, his concubine, fell into the hands of Artaxerxes, and was looked on as one of the moſt conſiderable parts of the booty. We ſhall give an Abridgment of her Hiſtory in the Remark [*C*]. She was a woman who made no ill uſe of Cyrus's complaiſance, and behaved

(*a*) *Extracted from the 1ſt Book of* Xenophon's Hiſtory of the Expedition of Cyrus the younger. *The battle between the two brothers, wherein Cyrus was killed, was fought the 3d year of the 95th Olympiad, which anſwers to the year of Rome* 353, *according to* Calviſius.

[*A*] *He met with a Queen, who was not contented to bring him money.*] Her name was Epyaxa: ſhe was wife to Syenneſis King of Cilicia. She came to Cyrus very opportunely; for he owed his troops almoſt four months pay, and was beſieged every day at his door by a crowd of ſoldiers who demanded their arrears. It was not his cuſtom to ſend them away when he had money: he was therefore in great anxiety; for ſince he uſed to pay well when he was able, he had reaſon to fear they would conclude his treaſures were already exhauſted. Such a notion was enough to fruſtrate all his deſigns. Epyaxa delivered him from theſe diſquiets; for upon her arrival he diſtributed to his army four months pay; and whether it was by way of acknowledgment, or whether the Queen would not beſtow her favours on him by halves, he lay bravely and gallantly with her: at leaſt this was the common opinion (1). To pleaſe her he reviewed his troops in her preſence, and made them perform their exerciſes; and when the Greeks, making a ſhew of charging the barbarians, put them to flight; the Queen took part in the fright, and fled alſo. Cyrus gave her a good convoy when ſhe returned to Cilicia. She arrived at Tarſus five days before Cyrus. That city was the capital of Syenneſis's Kingdom: it was pillaged notwithſtanding the ſervices and civilities of every kind which the Queen had rendred to Cyrus; and what is very ſtrange, Syenneſis would not truſt himſelf with that Prince, tho' he had truſted his wife with him. He was at length perſuaded by her to pay Cyrus a viſit: he received ſome preſents from him, but they coſt him dear; for he was obliged to diſburſe large ſums of money for the ſubſiſtence of Cyrus's troops, and to preſerve his dominions from being plundered (2).

(1) Ἐλέγετο δὲ Κῦρον καὶ συγλέγεσθαι τῇ Κιλίσσῃ. *Vulgo quidem ferebatur cum Cyro eam congreſſam.* Xenophon, *de Cyri Expedit.* lib. 1. pag. m. 146.

(2) Extracted from Xenophon's firſt Book of the *Expedition of Cyrus the Younger*, pag. m. 146, 147.

[*B*] *He was killed, fighting with too much eagerneſs and too little caution.*] The Greeks in his pay had handled the Perſians who were oppoſed to them ſo roughly, that Cyrus tranſported with joy was ſaluted King by thoſe who were about him. However he kept himſelf in reſerve in the midſt of ſix hundred men who ſurrounded him during the action, waiting to ſee what Artaxerxes's main body would do; and he no ſooner ſaw them in motion, than he fell upon them with his Brigade: he broke thro' the firſt ranks, routed ſix thouſand men of the regiment of guards, and killed their leader; then perceiving the King his brother, he ſpurred his horſe up to him, and wounded him with his lance (3). The action was bloody; and Cyrus, attended by a few of his men, was overborne there and ſlain (4).

(3) Cteſias, *who was in the army of Artaxerxes, affirmed in his Hiſtory that he had dreſſed this wound.* Xenophon, *de Cyri Expeditione*, lib. 1. pag. 157.

(4) Extracted from Xenophon, *ibid. See alſo* Plutarch, in the *Life of Artaxerxes.*

[*C*] *We ſhall give . . . an Abridgment of the Hiſtory of* ASPASIA.] This woman was a native of Phocæa (5), and daughter of Hermotimus. According to the deſcription which Ælian has left us of her, ſhe muſt have been a moſt accompliſhed perſon, as well with reſpect to her body as her mind. She was called Milto before ſhe belonged to Cyrus; but that Prince made her change her name, and gave her that of the celebrated Miſtreſs of Pericles (6). Hermotimus, whoſe wife died in child-bed of our Aſpaſia, gave his daughter an education ſuitable to the ſmallneſs of his fortune. This girl had a great affliction during her infancy. She was the moſt beautiful child that could be ſeen, but there aroſe a ſwelling on her chin which diſfigured her horribly. The Phyſician, to whom her father brought her, had the hard-heartedneſs to refuſe to cure her, becauſe Hermotimus was not able to pay him his price. She returned very diſconſolate, and did nothing but entertain her grief by viewing herſelf in the glaſs. Ἀπιλθοῦσα ἔξω ἴκλαιεν ἔχουσα ἐν τοῖς γόνασι κάτοπτρον καὶ ὁρῶσα ἑαυτὴν ἐν αὐτῷ σφόδρα ἤλγει. *A medico digreſſa in acerbiſſimo luctu verſata eſt, & ſpeculum in genibus tenens, ſeſeque in ipſo contemplata vehementer doluit* (7). She learned the remedy which cured her in a dream; after which ſhe became the moſt beautiful woman of her time. Her hair was fair and curling, ſhe had large eyes, a noſe ſomewhat riſing, ſmall ears, a fine ſkin, and a complexion of lilies and roſes; her lips were of an admirable red, her teeth whither than ſnow, her legs and feet ſhaped in perfection, and a voice ſo ſweet that when ſhe ſpoke one would have thought he heard the Sirens. She was indebted to nature alone for the ſuperiority of her beauty; for neither her own humour, nor her father's poverty, allowed her to ſet off her charms by borrowed ornaments. The perſon who commanded in thoſe quarters under Cyrus, the King of Perſia's ſon, took her againſt the will both of her and her father, and brought her with ſome other very beautiful young women to Cyrus. When ſhe was preſented to that Prince, he was juſt riſen from table, and was entertaining himſelf with drinking according to the cuſtom of the country. There were three other Greek girls with her, who were not of her humour: they ſuffered themſelves to be painted and dreſt out without reſiſtance, retaining admirably well the leſſons which their nurſes had taught them with regard to their behaviour when Cyrus ſhould approach them, when he ſhould careſs them, touch them, or take a fancy to kiſs them. Ἦσαν δ' αἱ ὑπὸ τῶν τροφίων διδιδαγμέναι, ὅπως τε ὑποδρομεῖν χρὴ τὸν Κῦρον, καὶ τίνα τρόπον θωπεῦσαι, καὶ προσιόντα μὴ ἀποσοβῆναι, καὶ ἁπτόμενον μὴ δυσχεράναι, καὶ φιλοῦντι ὑπομεῖναι, ἰταμικὰ δὲ μαλακὰ μαθήματα, καὶ διδάγματα γυναικῶν καπηλικῶς τῷ καλλει χρωμένων ἔργα. *Et a nutricibus acceperant documenta, quemadmodum erga Cyrum ſe gerere deberent: quomodo inſinuare ſe illi & adblandiri, & non refugere, ſi accederet, neque ſi tangeret, ægre ferre, & oſculum admittere eas oporteret, omnibus denique præceptis & inſtitutis amatoriis, quibus uti mulieres, quibus ſua venalis eſt forma, ſolent, inſtructæ* (8). They ſtrove who ſhould pleaſe him moſt; but Milto ſhewed ſo much averſion to the uſe for which ſhe was deſtined, that they could not oblige her without blows to ſuffer the cloaths to be put on her, which were given to young women on ſuch occaſions: and while her companions ogled to admiration, and diſcovered by their ſmiles the deſire they had to charm the Prince, ſhe did nothing but weep, and durſt not lift up her eyes, ſo great was the ſhame which her natural modeſty raiſed in her to ſee her ſelf in that condition. When Cyrus bid them come and ſit near him, the others waited not to be bidden twice; but they were obliged to force our Aſpaſia: the others ſuffered Cyrus to touch them as much as he pleaſed; Aſpaſia alone would not allow of thoſe liberties, and threatened Cyrus if he but offered to touch her with his finger's end. However he put his hand into her boſom, which made her riſe up, and endeavour to get away. Cyrus did her juſtice; he declared that of all thoſe who had been brought to him, ſhe alone was really unpractiſed, and he conceived a greater love for her than for all the other women he had ever enjoyed. Ἅμα γὰρ τῇ χειρὶ μόνον τοῦ Κύρου προσαψαμένου, ἐξεβόησέ τε καὶ ἔφατο αὐτὸν αἰκίζεσθαι τοιαῦτα δρῶντα, ὑπερήσθη τούτοις ὁ Κῦρος, ἐπαινεσαμένης τε αὐτῆς καὶ πιφωμένης

(5) Φωκαΐς. Plut. *in Pericle*, pag. 165. Amiot *has ill tranſlated this*, native de la Phocide.

(6) Plutarch. *ibid.* Ælianus, *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 12. cap. 1.

(7) Ælianus, *ibid.*

(8) Ælianus, *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 12. cap. 1. pag. m. 543, 544.

haved her ſelf ſo prudently that ſhe gained the love of Paryſatis [*D*]. As ſhe believed his favour was a preſent from heaven, ſhe gave many public marks of her gratitude to the Goddeſs Venus [*E*]. If all that has been ſaid of her be true, her beauty muſt have laſted a prodigious while [*F*]. Cyrus's Letter to the Lacedæmonians ought by no means to

μένης φεύγειν, ἐπεὶ κ᾽ τῶν μαζῶν προσήψαλο, ἀλλ᾽ ἐνλαῦθα μὲν ὑπεφηγάσθη τὴν εὐγένειαν οὐ Περσικῶς ὁ τῦ Δαρείν, ἀλλὰ κ᾽ ἀποβλέψας πρὸς τὸν ἀγοραςήν· ταύτην μόνην ἴφη, ἐλευθέραν κ᾽ ἀδιάφθορον ἤγαγες. αἱ δὲ λοιπαὶ καπηλικῶς ἔχυσι κ᾽ τῦ εἴδυς ἔτι, κ᾽ τῦ τρόπυ μᾶλλον, ἐκ δὲ τούτων ὁ Κῦρ@· πλέον ταύτην ἠγάπησεν, αἷς ὠμίλησέ ποτε ἀνθρώποις. *Si enim extrema manu ſaltem Cyrus attingeret, exclamabat, dicebatque eum non impune laturum, quod talia feciſſet. Ea re ſupra modum delectatus eſt Cyrus, & quum attrectante mamillas, illa ſurgeret, & ſe in pedes conjiceret, contra Perſarum conſuetudinem ardente amore Cyrus erga ingenuitatem ejus flagrare cœpit, reſpicienſque ad emptorem: Hanc, inquit, ſolam ingenuam & incorruptam adduxiſti: reliquæ vero tum facie tum magis etiam moribus fucatæ ſunt. Quamobrem Cyrus eam plus amavit omnibus cum quibus unquam conſuetudinem habuiſſet* (9). Plutarch ſays almoſt the ſame thing. It is true he does not ſay that Aſpaſia threatned Cyrus, but thoſe only who would oblige her to approach near him. Βελομένων δὲ προσάγειν τῶν καλλιναικῶν, οἰμώξεται μέντοι τύτων (εἶπεν) ὃς ἂν ἐμοὶ προσαγάγῃ τὰς χεῖρας. *Parantibus adducere ipſam cubiculariis, væ ei, inquit, mihi qui admoverit manus* (10).

(9) Idem, ibid. pag. 545.

(10) Plutarchus, *in Artaxerxe*, pag. 1024, 1025.

She was of uſe to Cyrus, not only for the pleaſures of love, but alſo for counſel. He conſulted her in his moſt difficult affairs, and never repented following her advice. It may be ſaid, therefore, that ſhe had no leſs capacity than beauty, With theſe qualifications a Prince's miſtreſs uſually goes a great way; and if ſhe enjoys not the ſubſtantial part of the government, and ſovereign power, it wants but little of it. Cyrus treated Aſpaſia with reſpect to rank and dignity almoſt as a lawful wife; and it is even thought that after he knew her, he had no more to do with other women. We need not therefore be aſtoniſhed if ſo great an elevation of the daughter of an ordinary Greek made ſome noiſe even at the Court of the great King (11). This reputation was of great ſervice to Aſpaſia; for after Cyrus was ſlain, ſhe was carefully ſought for by order of Artaxerxes. They found her in great affliction: however in ſpite of her reſiſtance they put on her the cloaths which the King ſent her; and he found her ſo beautiful in that dreſs, that he became deſperately in love with her, and it was a point of honour with him to make her forget his brother; but it was a conſiderable time before he could ſucceed. She alone was able to comfort him for the loſs of Teridates, the moſt beautiful of his Eunuchs (12).

(11) *This was the Title which they gave the King of Perſia. See above the Remark* [*A*] *of the Article* ARTABANUS IV.

(12) Extracted from Ælian, lib. 12. cap. 1.

Xenophon relates a thing which is not very conſiſtent with what has been ſaid above, that Cyrus contented himſelf with Aſpaſia. He mentions two of that Prince's concubines, one of whom was of Phocæa, and the other of Miletus. The latter was younger than the other, and eſcaped the hands of the Perſians on the day that Cyrus loſt his life. The Phocæan fell into the enemy's power; and the Hiſtorian ſays ſhe paſſed for a woman of beauty and ſenſe (13). This was our Aſpaſia. There is no likelihood that Cyrus brought two concubines with him, to leave the youngeſt without employment. If he had brought a regiment of them, we might ſay the greater part ſerved only for ſhew; but we ought to think the contrary ſeeing them reduced to two. Beſides, does not Xenophon ſay it was believed that Cyrus lay with the Queen of Cilicia? This confutes the tradition of Ælian; for Aſpaſia had at that time been long with Cyrus. Obſerve that Xenophon has made uſe of the term σοφὴν *wiſe* in a different manner from Plutarch: the latter has uſed it in a way which does more honour to Aſpaſia; he does not ſay, as Xenophon does, that it was reported Aſpaſia was wiſe, but that Cyrus ſurnamed her *the wiſe* (14).

(13) Βασιλεὺς δὲ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ τά τε ἄλλα πολλὰ διαρπάζουσι καὶ τὴν φοκαίδα τὴν Κύρυ παλλακίδα τὴν σοφὴν καὶ καλὴν λεγομένην εἶναι, λαμβάνει· ἡ δὲ Μιλησία ἡ νεωτέρα λειφθεῖσα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀμφὶ Βασιλέα ἐκρεύγει γυμνὴ πρὸς τῶν Ἑλλήνων. *Rex interim cum ſuis caſtra diripit ac Cyri ipſius pallacam Phocaicam eximia ſpecie ac prudentia etiam (uti fama ferebatur) mulierem abducit. Namque altera natu minor Mileſia à regia coborte capta nuda effugit.* Xenophon, lib. 1. Exped. Cyri, *ſub fin.*

(14) Plutarchus, *in Artaxerxe*, pag. 1025.

[*D*] *She gained the love of Paryſatis.*] A very fine necklace being one day ſent to Cyrus, he ſhewed it to Aſpaſia; and told her it was fit either for the daughter or the mother of a King. She was of the ſame opinion, whereupon he bid her take it and wear it; but ſhe artfully excuſed her ſelf from accepting it for this reaſon, becauſe it was a preſent fitter for the Queen mother, and adviſed him to ſend it to her; for, added ſhe, you ſhall think my neck beautiful enough without this ornament. Cyrus ſent his mother the necklace, and wrote her an account of the whole converſation. Paryſatis was as much rejoiced at the contents of the Letter as at the preſent; being exceedingly pleaſed to ſee that Aſpaſia deſired not to have a greater ſhare in the affection of Cyrus than herſelf. She ſent her very magnificent preſents; but Aſpaſia gave them to Cyrus, telling him he had more occaſion for them than ſhe. This conduct is very commendable, few women uſing their good fortune with ſuch moderation. Ἀσπασία μὲν οὖν μεγαλοφρονῶς, κ᾽ ὑπὲρ τὰς γυναῖκας βασιλικῶς τὰ ἐναντία ἔδρασεν ἢπερ εἰώθασι γυναῖκες ὁρᾶν. φιλόκοσμοι γάρ εἰσι θεινῶς. *Aſpaſia itaque animi magnitudine præſtans, contrarium reliquis regum uxoribus faciens, eas longe ſuperavit. Sunt enim illæ rerum ad ornatum mundumque pertinentium plus æquo ſtudioſæ* (15). i. e. "Aſpaſia therefore, acting with a greatneſs of mind "ſuperior to her ſex, did the contrary of what other "women are accuſtomed to do: for they are too fond "of dreſs and ornament." Aſpaſia contented herſelf with the heart of Cyrus, and made no other uſe of his favour than to enrich her father Hermotimus (16), which required no great ſums, and to teſtify her gratitude to Venus, as we ſhall ſee immediately.

(15) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 12. cap. 1. pag. 548.

(16) Idem, pag. 547.

[*E*] *She gave many public marks of her gratitude to the Goddeſs Venus.*] She often dreamed during her childhood that ſhe ſhould one day enjoy an exalted fortune (17). After the Phyſician had refuſed to cure her, ſhe dreamed ſhe ſaw a pigeon which, changing herſelf into a woman, acquainted her that the true remedy for her complaint was to take noſegays of roſes conſecrated to Venus, and to lay them to the ſwelling when dry. She did ſo, and diſſipated the humour (18). Seeing herſelf all-powerful with Cyrus, ſhe believed that Venus had for a long time honoured her with her protection. For which reaſon ſhe offered ſacrifices to that Goddeſs, ſhe conſecrated a ſtatue of fine gold to her, and placed near it a pigeon glittering with precious ſtones; and to this idol ſhe recommended herſelf every day by oblations and prayers (19).

(17) Idem, pag. 540.

(18) Idem, pag. 541.

(19) Idem, pag. 547.

[*F*] *If all that has been ſaid of her be true, her beauty muſt have laſted a prodigious while.*] Artaxerxes lived fourſcore and fourteen years, and reigned ſixty two (20). A few years before his death he had made choice of his ſon Darius for his ſucceſſor (21). Darius was then fifty years old. There was a Law among the Perſians, that he who was deſigned King ſhould aſk a preſent, and that he who had nominated him King, ſhould grant it him, if poſſible. Darius aſked Aſpaſia: the King his father was very much troubled at this demand, tho' beſides his wife he had 360 very beautiful concubines. He anſwered that Aſpaſia was free, and if ſhe would give herſelf to Darius, ſhe might; but that he would not have any violence offered her. Aſpaſia was ſent for to know her reſolution, and declared that ſhe was contented to be Darius's: ſhe was therefore delivered to him; but Artaxerxes, when he had granted his ſon this preſent, deprived him of it by a ſtratagem. He appointed Aſpaſia Prieſteſs of Diana, which neceſſarily engaged her to continence and celibacy. Darius was ſo exaſperated at it, that he conſpired againſt his father and ruined himſelf irreparably. This is what Plutarch acquaints us with (22). Juſtin relates the ſame thing in ſubſtance; only he does not ſay, as Plutarch does, that Aſpaſia was made Prieſteſs of Diana Anitis, who was worſhipped at Ecbatana; he ſays that ſhe was created Prieſteſs of the Sun, and that for that reaſon ſhe was injoined continence (23). This is very ſurprizing; for Aſpaſia, as Plutarch obſerves, had been the favourite concubine of Cyrus, before ſhe was entertained in the ſame ſtation by Artaxerxes. All the Hiſtorians agree that Cyrus's expedition falls on the firſt years of the reign of Artaxerxes. Let us ſuppoſe, with Calviſius, that the battle in which Cyrus loſt his life was fought the third year of his reign; let us ſuppoſe

(20) Plutarchus, *in* Artaxerxe, *ſub fin.*

(21) Idem, ibid. pag. 1024.

(22) Ibid. pag. 1024, & *ſeq.*

(23) *Hanc patrem cedere ſibi ſicuti regnum Darius poſtulaverat: qui pro indulgentia ſua in liberos primo facturum ſe dixerat: mox pœnitentia ductus, ut honeſte negaret quod temere promiſerat, ſolis eam ſacerdotio præfecit, quo perpetua illi ab omnibus viris pudicitia imperabatur.* Juſt. lib. 10. cap. 2.

to perſuade us that he omitted to make the uſual proteſtations when occaſion required [G].

poſe that Artaxerxes made choice of Darius for his ſucceſſor the 58th year of his reign: it does not appear by Plutarch's account, that that Prince lived above two or three years after the Election of Darius to the throne. It was then fifty five years that Aſpaſia had been the Concubine of Artaxerxes; and we cannot allow her to be leſs than twenty years old at the death of Cyrus: conſequently ſhe muſt be ſeventy five when a new King demanded her as a particular favour, and when a King to whom ſhe had belonged five and fifty years could not prevail on himſelf to part with her; it follows therefore that at that age ſhe muſt ſtill have had a great many charms. Is not this extraordinary? Can one imagine, without laughing, that a woman near fourſcore ſhould be made a Prieſteſs on purpoſe that no man might enjoy her? Has a woman need at that age to be obliged to continence by a religious vow? Is not ſuch an age a ſhelter and a rampart of much greater efficacy againſt the deſires and ſollicitations of men, than the venerable quality of Prieſteſs? I do not remember to have read that any Critic propoſes theſe difficulties againſt Plutarch, or that he ſays this Lady muſt have preſerved her beauty a long time; but I meet with this remark in a Book written by a Courtier. *Il ſe lit*, ſays he (24), *qu' Artaxerxes entre toutes les femmes qu'il eut, celle qu'il aima le plus fut Aſpaſia, qui eſtoit fort âgée, & toutesfois très-belle, qui avoit eſté putain de ſon feu frere. Darius ſon fils en devint ſi fort amoureux, tant elle eſtoit belle, nonobſtant l'âge, qu'il la demanda à ſon pere en partage, auſſi bien que la part du Royaume. Le pere, pour la jalouſie qu'il en eut, & qu'il participât avec lui de ce bon boucon, la fit Prêtreſſe du Soleil; d'autant qu'en Perſe celles qui ont tel eſtat, ſe vouënt du tout a la chaſteté.* i. e. "We "read that of all the women which Artaxerxes had, "he loved Aſpaſia the beſt, who was very much ad- "vanced in years, and yet very handſome, and had "been his late brother's concubine. Darius his ſon "became ſo deeply in love with her by reaſon of her "great beauty, notwithſtanding her age, that he de- "manded her to be aſſigned him by his father, as "well as part of the Kingdom. The father, out "of jealouſy thereat, and that Darius might not partake "with him of ſo delicious a morſel, made her Prieſteſs "of the Sun; becauſe in Perſia thoſe who are inveſted "with that dignity dedicate themſelves wholly to cha- "ſtity." It was not Brantome's intereſt to criticize Plutarch, on the contrary it was of advantage to him to find in that Author the Chronology which I have ſet out. You muſt know Brantome names ſeveral Ladies who had been very handſome in their autumn, and even in the midſt of their winter, till the age of threeſcore and ten. This is what he ſays of the Dutcheſs de Valentinois, We have ſeen above (25) that he names one more. However, the admirable wiſdom for which Aſpaſia has been celebrated does not appear in the choice which ſhe deſigned to make of Darius. She likes the ſon better than the father, preferring the riſing ſun to the ſetting, and forgetting the conſtant friendſhip which Artaxerxes had had for her during ſo great a number of years. This makes one think the Spaniſh maxim was verified in her, *Que ningunas damas lindas, o à lo menos pocas, ſe hazen viejas de la cinta haſta à baxo*, that is, *that no beautiful Ladies, or at leaſt very few, are old from the girdle downwards.* Brantome ſays (26) that having heard this maxim laid down by a Lady, he aſked her "how ſhe underſtood it, whether the meaning "was that the beauty of the body from the girdle "downwards was not diminiſhed by old age, or that "the carnal deſire and appetite was never extinguiſh- "ed or cooled in the lower parts? She anſwered, ſhe "underſtood it of both; for as to the luſt of the fleſh, "ſaid ſhe, we muſt not think it wholly cured till "death, tho' age does it beſt to reſiſt it." Brantome's French is as follows. *Je lui demandai comment elle l'entendoit, ſi c'étoit au regard de la beauté du corps depuis cette ceinture juſques en bas, qu'elle n'en diminuât par la vieilleſſe, ou pour l'envie & l'appetit de la concupiſcence, qui ne vinſſent à ne s'éteindre, ni à ſe refroidir aucunement par le bas? Elle répondit, qu'elle l'entendoit & pour l'un & pour l'autre; car, pour ce qui eſt de la piqueure de la chair, diſoit-elle, ne faut pas penſer qu'on s'en guériſſe juſques à la mort, quoi que l'âge y vueille repugner.*

(24) Brantome, *Dames Galantes*, tom. 2. pag. 227.

(26) *Dames Galantes*, tom. 2. pag. 198, 199.

[G] *Cyrus's Letter to the Lacedæmonians ought by no means to perſuade us that he omitted to make the uſual proteſtations when occaſion required.*] He wrote to them to demand ſome troops. His Letter promiſed ſo many advantages to all who ſhould come and join him, that every one had reaſon to flatter himſelf with having his fortune made by entring into that Prince's ſervice. The pay ſhall not be counted, ſaid Cyrus, it ſhall be meaſured (27). He made no ſecret of his deſign, but boaſted he was more worthy of the throne than his brother: *I have more courage than he*, ſays he (28), *I am a better Philoſopher, and underſtand the Magian Religion better; I can drink more wine and bear it better than he* (29). *He is an effeminate, cowardly fellow, who never gets on horſeback even when he hunts, and dares not ſo much as ſit on the throne in time of danger.* Cyrus's frankneſs is very ſingular: he conceals not from the Lacedæmonians his deſign of dethroning Artaxerxes; he does not tell them, as is the method in all civil wars, that he has no deſign upon the crown, that his intention is only to remove from about the Prince the evil Counſellors who abuſe his name to oppreſs the ſubjects and to aboliſh the laws. He knew very well that thoſe of Lacedæmon would be highly pleaſed to ſee the Crown of Perſia on the head of a Prince who would have great obligations to them. This was the reaſon why he did not conceal his deſign from them. There is no doubt but he made the uſual proteſtations, where and when his intereſt required it: and I believe that at this day no ſcruple would be made of truſting a ſecret of the ſame kind with the neighbouring Princes who might expect ſome advantage by the change.

(27) Μισθοῦ τοὺς στρατευομένους οὐκ ἀριθμὸν ἀλλὰ μέτρον ἔσεσθαι. *Stipendium militibus non annumeraturum ſed admenſurum.* Plutarchus, *in Artaxerxe*, pag. 1013, F.

(28) Idem, ibid.

(29) Οἶνον δὲ πλείονα πίνειν καὶ φέρειν. *Vinum potare & ferre largius.* Idem, pag. 1014, *A.*

(25) In the Article of Joan of ARAGON, Remark [G].

DACIER

D.

DACIER (ANDREW) was born at Caſtres in Upper Languedoc April the 6th 1651. His father, who was an Advocate in the Chamber of the Edict, and profeſſed the Proteſtant Religion, in which he had been educated, took all poſſible care to bring him up in the ſame Religion, and ſent him to the College of Caſtres; but when by a decree of the Council Nov. the 17th 1664 the direction of that College was given to the Jeſuits alone, he ſent him to the Univerſity of Puylaurens, and afterwards to that of Saumur, in order that he might perfect himſelf in the ſtudy of polite Literature under *Tannegui le Fevre*. Monſieur Dacier, who had a great genius and inclination for learning, fully anſwered the pains of ſo excellent a maſter; and Monſieur le Fevre was ſo highly pleaſed with the progreſs which he made, that having diſmiſſed all his pupils above a year before his death, he kept Monſieur Dacier alone in his houſe. That learned man was then entirely engaged in the inſtruction of his daughter, who proved afterwards the honour of her ſex. Monſieur Dacier could not ſee the riſing merit of that amiable Lady without being ſeized with an affection for her; and ſhe contracted no leſs a regard for her fellow-ſtudent; and this was the riſe of that mutual tenderneſs, which a marriage of almoſt forty years could never weaken in them. The death of Monſieur le Fevre on Sept. 12, 1672 obliged Monſ. Dacier to return to his father; and having ſtaid ſome time with him he went to Paris with a view to procure ſome ſettlement there ſuitable to him, and to form a perſonal acquaintance with thoſe who were then moſt eminent in the Republic of Letters. One of theſe advantages was much eaſier attainable than the other, and the knowledge in polite Literature, which he had made himſelf maſter of in the famous ſchool of Saumur, ſoon gained him the eſteem of the men of learning. But as the road of fortune is not very acceſſible to men of letters, and as he ſaw no probability of ſettling there to his advantage, he returned to his father's houſe. However this ill ſucceſs did not deter him from taking a ſecond journey to Paris, which proved more fortunate to him. His friends repreſented his merit and abilities to the Duke of Montauſier, who being highly pleaſed to find a perſon, whom he could employ, put him in the liſts of the Commentators for the uſe of the Dauphin, and engaged him in an edition of *Pompeius Feſtus*, which he publiſhed in 1681 [*A*]. In 1683 he married Madamoiſelle le Fevre, and in September 1685 with his Lady publickly abjured the Proteſtant Religion. His edition of Horace with a French Tranſlation printed at Paris in ten volumes in 12° [*B*], and

[*A*] *An edition of* Pompeius Feſtus, *which he publiſhed in* 1681.] The title is as follows: *Sexti Pompeii Feſti & Marci Verrii Flacci de Verborum ſignificatione Libri XX, cum Notis & Emendationibus in uſum Delphini:* i. e. "Twenty Books of Pompeius Feſtus "and Marcus Verrius Flaccus concerning the ſignifi- "cation of words, with Notes and Emendations for "the uſe of the Dauphin." Paris 1681 in 4to. Amſterdam 1699 in 4to. There are few works, which have paſſed through ſo many and ſo learned hands as this. M. Verrius Flaccus, who lived under the Emperor Auguſtus, was the firſt Author. Sextus Pompeius Feſtus made an Abridgment of it under the Chriſtian Emperors. Paulus Diaconus endeavoured to do the ſame with regard to Feſtus in the time of Charlemagne, but diſfigured it in ſuch a manner, that the labours of Aldus Manutius, Anthony Auguſtinus, Fulvius Urſinus, Joſeph Scaliger, and ſeveral others could never reſtore it to its original beauty. Monſieur Dacier after the example of thoſe great men applied himſelf to give as correct an edition of it as poſſible, and added ſeveral good emendations and conſiderable ſupplements. The Notes are fully to the purpoſe without a vain ſhew of uſeleſs learning, and written with a noble ſimplicity. The edition of Amſterdam is preferable to that of Paris, becauſe there are added to it the entire Notes of Joſeph Scaliger, Fulvius Urſinus, and Anthony Auguſtinus, and the new Fragments of Feſtus.

[*B*] *His edition of Horace with a French Tranſlation printed at Paris in ten volumes.*] It is intitled, *Oeuvres d'Horace en Latin & en François avec des Remarques Critiques & Hiſtoriques:* i. e. "The works of Ho- "race in Latin and French, with Notes critical and "hiſtorical." Paris 1681, 1689. ten volumes in 12°. This edition was at firſt reprinted at Lyons, and afterwards in ſeveral other places; but that which Monſieur Dacier publiſhed himſelf at Paris 1709 in ten volumes in 12° is preferable to all the former, on account of the corrections and additions, which he has given in it; but has been eclipſed by that of Amſterdam 1726 in ten volumes in 12°. This laſt edition contains a great number of important additions and corrections, communicated by Monſieur Dacier to Wetſteins the Bookſellers, who printed it. There are different judgments paſſed upon this work of our Author. Some perſons extol the accuracy and elegance of the Tranſlation, and the learned diſquiſitions and judicious vein of criticiſm exhibited in the Notes. Others on the contrary repreſent Monſieur Dacier as a mere Compiler without judgment, who has preferred the ridiculous vanity of diſplaying a great deal of dry Literature, to the ſolid pleaſure of ſaying nothing but what was neceſſary for the explication of the obſcure paſſages of the Author, whom he had undertaken to interpret. Others embrace a middle opinion between theſe two; and affirm, that Monſieur Dacier has explained a great many paſſages of Horace, but that in general he has not been ſucceſsful in clearing the ſenſe of the Poet. The Authors of the *Bibliotheque Françoiſe* (1) obſerve, that it is a point univerſally agreed upon, that it were to be wiſhed he had quoted with more exactneſs than he has done the Authors, from whence he has taken ſome ſtories, of which we ſee no trace any where except in his writings. We ſhould particularly be very curious to know what antient Writer has ſupplied him with the names of the Members of the Academy at Rome under Auguſtus, which he ſpeaks of with as much confidence, as if he had had the Regiſters of it in his hands (2). Mr. John Maſſon made ſeveral Animadverſions upon Monſieur Dacier's Notes on Horace in his *Life* of that Poet printed at Leyden 1708 in 8vo, pagg. 374. under the following title; *Q. Horatii Flacci Vita, ordine Chronologico ſic delineata, ut vice ſit Commentarii Hiſtorico-Critici in plurima Poetæ Carmina, quæ veris reddantur*

(1) Tom. 1. Part. 1. Art. 1. pag. 20, 21.

(2) *See* tom. 10. in the *Notes* upon *Horace's Art of Poetry.*

and his other works, of which we ſhall give a Catalogue in the Note [C], raiſed him a very great reputation. In 1695 he ſucceeded Monſieur Felibien in the Academy of Inſcriptions, and Monſieur Francis de Harlay, Archbiſhop of Paris, in the French Academy. The Academy of Inſcriptions being new modelled in 1701, Monſieur Dacier loſt nothing by the alteration, but was continued a Penſionary. When the impreſſion of the Hiſtory of Lewis XIV by Medals was finiſhed, he was choſen to preſent it to his Majeſty, who being informed of the pains which Monſieur Dacier had taken in it, and of the ſhare which he had in the hiſtorical explications which accompanied the Medals, ſettled upon him a penſion of two thouſand livres; and about the ſame time appointed him Keeper of the Books of the King's Cloſet in the Louvre, which place had been vacant ever ſince the year 1694 by the death of the Abbé Lavau. His conſtant attendance upon the

duntur Annis, novâ donata Luce, à pravâ vendicantur interpretatione celeberrimorum Commentatorum, imprimis Tanaquilli Fabri, Andreæ Dacerii, &c. Studio Joannis Maſſon. This occaſioned Monſieur Dacier to publiſh *Nouveaux Eclairciſſemens ſur les Oeuvres d'Horace; avec la Réponſe à la Critique de M. Maſſon, Miniſtre refugié en Angleterre:* i. e. "New Explications of the works "of Horace, with an Anſwer to the Criticiſms of "Monſieur Maſſon, a Refugee Miniſter in England." Paris 1708 in 12mo pagg. 169. He treats Mr. Maſſon's book with great contempt; and ſpeaking of Criticiſm, ſtiles it after a great Rhetorician, *the laſt effort of reflection and judgment.* He both defends himſelf, and attacks his antagoniſt. He aſſerts, that what is true and ſound in Mr. Maſſon's book, is taken from his Commentaries on Horace; and that the method, of which Mr. Maſſon boaſts ſo much, as if he had been the firſt, who ſhewed the uſe of Chronology in Criticiſm, is exactly the ſame with that, which Monſieur le Fevre and himſelf had followed long before Mr. Maſſon ſet up for a Critic; and in which they both laboured with ſucceſs to place the Poems of Horace according to the order of time in which they were written. And it is ſufficiently known what light is given by this method to the works of the Antients in order to exhibit their full ſenſe, and diſcover all their beauties. In this piece Monſieur Dacier has too much imitated the haughty and contemptuous manner in which his antagoniſt had treated him, which drew upon him a reply written with all the ſeverity of ſtyle imaginable.

[C] *His other works, of which we ſhall give a catalogue in the Note.*] I. *S. Anaſtaſii Sinaitæ Anagogicarum Contemplationum in Hexaemeron Liber XII hactenus deſideratum. Cum Notis & Interpretatione Latinâ.* i. e. "The twelfth book of the Anagogical "Contemplations of St. Anaſtaſius Monk of Mount "Sinai upon the creation of the world, now firſt publiſhed, together with Notes and a Latin Tranſlation." London 1682 in 4to. II. *Reflexions Morales de l'Empereur Marc-Antonin avec des Remarques:* i. e. "The Moral Reflections of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus, with Notes." Paris 1691, 2 vol. in 12mo. Madam Dacier had a ſhare in this work. III. *La Poetique d'Ariſtote contenant les Regles les plus exactes pour juger du Poëme Heroique & des pieces de Théatre, la Tragedie, & la Comedie, traduite en François avec Remarques Critiques ſur tout l'Ouvrage.* i. e. "Ariſtotle's Poetics, containing the moſt exact rules "of judging of an Heroic Poem, and Theatrical "Writings, as Tragedy and Comedy, tranſlated into "French with critical Notes upon the whole work." Paris 1692 in 4to and 12°. It was reprinted in Holland in 12°. Several learned men have aſſerted that this work was Monſr. Dacier's maſter-piece; and it is true, that it is difficult to enter into his Author's ſenſe with more ſucceſs than he has done. However it was not this, that procured him all the applauſes which he met with; but the Notes, in which he has explained the text of Ariſtotle, which tho' faithfully tranſlated, is obſcure in many places; and this was not ſo much occaſioned by the conciſeneſs, with which he affected to expreſs himſelf, as by the difficulty of the ſubject, of which he treated. Monſr. Dacier's Preface is likewiſe excellent. IV. *L'Oedipe & l'Electre de Sophocle, Tragedies Greques traduites en François avec des Remarques.* i. e. "The Oedipus and Electra, Tragedies of "Sophocles, tranſlated from the Greek into French, "with Notes." Paris 1693 in 12mo. Monſr. Dacier having laid down the principles, which thoſe, who deſign to apply themſelves to Poetry, ought to follow, was willing to ſupply them with proper models for their imitation; and this engaged him in a Tranſlation of theſe two Tragedies of Sophocles. But it is more difficult to tranſlate into proſe ſublime images, and ſuch as owe a great part of their beauty to the poetical turn of them, than a Syſtem of Rules, which it is ſufficient to deliver with propriety and perſpicuity. It was this undoubtedly, which was the occaſion of the ſucceſs of Monſr. Dacier's Tranſlations of Works in Proſe, a ſucceſs, which did not attend his Verſions of the ancient Poets. V. *Vies des Hommes Illuſtres de Plutarque traduites en François avec des Remarques.* i. e. "Plutarch's Lives of illuſtrious Men "tranſlated into French, with Notes." Tom. I. Paris 1694 in 8vo. This Eſſay, which contains only five Lives, is the beginning of a work, which he afterwards finiſhed. VI. *Les Oeuvres d'Hippocrate traduites en François avec des remarques, & conferées ſur les Manuſcrits de la Bibliotheque du Roi.* That is, "The Works of Hippocrates tranſlated into French, "with Notes, and compared with the Manuſcripts "in the King's Library." Paris 1697, two volumes, in 12mo. Monſr. Dacier has tranſlated the text in a very accurate manner, and equalled the brevity of his Author, without falling into obſcurity. This is the judgment of the *Journal des Savans* upon that verſion. VII. *Les Oeuvres de Platon traduites en François avec des Remarques, & la Vie de ce Philoſophe avec l'Expoſition des principaux Dogmes de la Philoſophie.* That is, "The works of Plato tranſlated into French with "Notes, and the Life of that Philoſopher, with an "Account of the principal doctrines of his Philoſophy." Paris 1699 two volumes in 12. Tho' the title of this Book ſeems to promiſe an entire verſion of the works of Plato, yet we have here only ſome of his Dialogues. VIII. *La Vie de Pythagore, ſes Symboles, ſes Vers dorez, la Vie d'Hierocles & ſon Commentaire ſur les Vers dorez.* i. e. "The Life of Pythagoras, his Symbols, and golden Verſes, the Life "of Hierocles, and his Commentary upon the golden "Verſes." Paris 1706 two volumes in 12°. The Public owes this new work to the new regulation made in 1701 in the Academy of Inſcriptions, by which every member was obliged to undertake ſome uſeful work ſuitable to his genius and courſe of ſtudies. Monſr. Dacier in conformity to this regulation made this Tranſlation and that of Epictetus, which followed ſoon after. We find in this Book an exact and clear account of the Opinions and Life of Pythagoras. IX. *Le Manuel d'Epictete, avec cinque Traitez de Simplicius ſur des Sujets importans pour les Mœurs & la Religion traduits en François avec des Remarques.* i. e. "The Manual of "Epictetus, with five Treatiſes of Simplicius upon "important ſubjects with relation to Morality and Religion tranſlated into French with Notes." Paris 1715 two volumes in 12mo. To this Tranſlation are prefixed a Life of Epictetus very well written, and a Preface, which is excellent, as every piece of Monſr. Dacier in that kind is. There is a long digreſſion in it to confute what the Abbe Terraſſon has ſaid in favour of Opera's in his Diſſertation upon Homer. X. *Réponſe de M. Dacier aux Critiques que l'on a inſerees dans l'Europe Savante ſur la Traduction des Vies de Plutarque.* i. e. "Monſr. Dacier's Anſwer to the "Criticiſms upon the Tranſlation of Plutarch's Lives, "inſerted in the *Europe Savante.*" This Anſwer is printed in the *Journal des Savans* of the 25th of June and the 11th of July 1718. The Authors of the *Europe Savante* of January 1718, giving an account of the Plan of the new Edition of *Plutarch's Lives of illuſtrious Men* tranſlated by Monſr. Dacier, pretended

the French Academy procured him the place of perpetual Secretary upon the death of the Abbé Regnier des Marais in 1713. He obtained about the end of the year 1717 a grant in reverſion of ten thouſand crowns upon his place of Keeper of the Books of the King's Cloſet; and when by an *Arret* of Auguſt 1720 that poſt was united to that of Library-Keeper to the King, he was not only continued in the privileges of his place during life, but the ſurvivance of it was granted to his wife; a favour, of which there never had been an inſtance before. But the death of Madam Dacier on Auguſt the 17th 1720 rendered this grant, which was ſo honourable to her, ineffectual. It is eaſy to conceive how great a regret he was ſenſible of upon the loſs of that Lady, in whom he found an amiable perſon, whom her cloſe ſtudies did not divert from the proper care of her domeſtic affairs, and a faithful friend, whom he conſulted in all his doubts, and never in vain. However he was about marrying a ſecond time, when he was prevented by death. He died September the 18th 1722, of an ulcer in the throat, which he did not think at all dangerous, ſince that very evening he was preſent at the Academy. He was ſeventy one years of age. He was ſhort of ſtature, and his viſage was long and meagre. His converſation was dry and languid, eſpecially in the latter part of his life; and he never ſhewed any ſpirit or vivacity, except when he had occaſion to defend the Antients, and inſpire the youth with the love of virtue and learning; for he was inexhauſtible upon thoſe ſubjects. He was a man of great humanity and modeſty, a zealous friend, patient of labour, and ſupplying by his application what he wanted in readineſs. In ſhort his manners, his ſentiments, and his whole conduct exhibited a compleat model of that antient Philoſophy, which he was ſo extremely fond of, and which he improved by the rules and principles of Chriſtianity (*a*). Some perſons have accuſed him, as well as his illuſtrious Lady, of too great a prepoſſeſſion in favour of the Antients [*D*]. But Monſieur

(*a*) See *Journal des Savans* 1722, and *Bibliotheque Françoiſe*, tom. 1. Part. 1. Art. 1.

that there were ſome perſons, who were not ſatisfied with the ſpecimen, which he had given of his Tranſlation in that Plan, and who found ſeveral things to object to in the ſtyle and notes. In anſwer to this Criticiſm Monſr. Dacier publiſhed the piece abovementioned in the *Journal des Savans*; but it did not ſatisfy the Authors of the *Europe Savante*, who printed in that Journal of Auguſt 1718 a Reply, in juſtification of what they had advanced againſt his Tranſlation. XI. *Vies des Hommes Illuſtres de Plutarque revûës ſur les Manuſcrits, & traduites en François avec des Remarques Hiſtoriques & Critiques & le Supplement des Comparaiſons, qui ont éte perduës. On y a joint les têtes, que l'on a pû trouver, & une table generale des Matieres.* i. e. "Plutarch's Lives of illuſtrious Men "reviſed by the Manuſcripts, and tranſlated into "French, with Notes Hiſtorical and Critical, and the "Supplement of thoſe Compariſons, which are loſt. "To which are added thoſe heads, which could be "found, and a general Index of the matters con"tained in the work." Paris 1721, eight volumes in 4to. Amſterdam 1723, nine volumes in 8vo. This work was received by the Public with applauſe, as well on account of the elegance and accuracy of the Tranſlation, as of the Notes, and the Compariſons, which Monſr. Dacier has ſupplied. Theſe Compariſons gave occaſion to the Writers of *the Journal des Savans* to ſay, that *Monſr. Dacier had ſo well entered into the genius and character of his Author, and had ſo ſucceſsfully imitated his arrangement, turn, and expreſſions, that Plutarch would have done himſelf an honour in adopting ſuch Supplements.* However the Authors of the *Bibliotheque Francoiſe* tells us, "that notwithſtanding "theſe elogiums it is doubtful whether Monſr. Dacier's "Tranſlation will make the world ſo ſoon forget that "of Amiot: whether it is juſtice, or prejudice, yet "we find in the latter, however antique it is, and a"mongſt a great number of errors and obſolete ex"preſſions, a certain turn like an original, a nume"rouſneſs of periods, and a ſprightly air, which we in "vain ſeek for in moſt modern Books." XII. *Diſcours prononcé à l'Academie Françoiſe, lorſqu'il y fut reçû à la place de M. Harlay.* i. e. "A Speech made in the "French Academie, when he was admitted into it in "the room of Monſr. Harlay." Printed at Paris 1695 in 4to in the Collections of the French Academy. XII. *Anſwers*, which he made as Director of the Academy to the Speech of Monſr. Couſin in 1697, and to that of Monſr. de Boze in 1715. Inſerted in the Collections of the French Academy. XIV. *Diſſertation ſur l'Origine de la Satyre*; i. e. "A Diſſertation "upon the Origin of Satyr." Inſerted in the ſecond volume of the *Memoirs of the Academy of* Belles Lettres in 1717. XV. *Notes ſur Longin.* i. e. "Notes upon "Longinus." Boileau in the Preface to his Tranſlation of Longinus ſtiles theſe *Notes very learned*, and ſays that *the Author of them is not only a man of very extenſive learning and an excellent Critic, but likewiſe a Gentleman of ſingular politeneſs, which is ſo much the more valuable as it ſeldom attends great learning.* Boileau has added them to his own Notes upon Longinus, and they are printed in all the Editions of his works. XVI. He had a ſhare in the Hiſtorical Explications, which are publiſhed in the *Hiſtory of Lewis XIV* by medals. He wrote alſo a *Commentary upon Theocritus*, which he mentions in his Notes upon Horace *Ode* 29. *L. III.* and a ſhort Treatiſe upon Religion, which contained the ſubſtance of his reflections upon that ſubject, and which ſerved to bring him over to the Church of Rome. But theſe two works were never printed.

[*D*] *Some perſons have accuſed him, as well as his illuſtrious Lady, of too great a prepoſſeſſion in favour of the Antients.*] The Author of the *Mélanges d'Hiſtoire & de Literature*, publiſhed under the name of *M. De Vigneul-Marville* tells us †, that they had both ſo great a zeal for the honour of the Antients, and eſpecially thoſe, whoſe works they had tranſlated or written Notes upon, that they could not bear the leaſt reproach caſt upon them; and that they were highly exaſperated againſt any perſon, who did not eſteem them as much as themſelves. That Author is perſuaded, that they would have born with more patience any reflections upon themſelves than upon Homer, Socrates, or Plato. We find in ſeveral of his works to what exceſs of reſentment they were carried by Monſr. de *** and the Abbé ***. But what paſſed at their houſe on occaſion of the *Satyr againſt Equivocation*, which Monſr. Boileau came to read to them, is one of thoſe ſingular facts, which prove what has been ſaid above concerning the force of their prejudice in favour of the Antients, much more than all the vehemence, which they have ſhewn againſt the Partiſans of the Moderns. The beginning of that Satyr was applauded; the two auditors ſeemed charmed with it; but when Monſr. Boileau came to that line, which relates to Socrates;

† Vol. 3. pag. 289, 290. edit. de Paris 1725.

Très-équivoque Ami du jeune Alcibiade;

Monſr. and Madam Dacier began to object. They thought it very wrong, that the Author ſhould have given the world the leaſt ſuſpicion concerning the virtue of that Philoſopher; they made an Apology for him, and defended him by all the arguments, which Plato had made uſe of to ſhew, that the friendſhip of that great man for the young Athenian was founded upon his virtue; and they were very importunate with Monſr. Boileau to alter that verſe; but as he would not agree to this, nor make them any promiſe upon that ſubject, the converſation ended, and the reading of the Satyr ſtop'd there. T.

ſieur Dacier always deſpiſed the railleries which he was expoſed to upon that account, and never receded from his firſt ſentiments. If he cannot be entirely approved, with regard to that point, and if ſeveral excellent Divines have declared againſt that Conformity, which his prejudice for Antiquity made him diſcover between the Platonic Philoſophy and the Doctrine of the primitive Fathers of the Church, and between the Heathen Morality and that of the Goſpel; yet he is to be excuſed, becauſe he had made a particular ſtudy of thoſe writers among the Pagans, who had applied themſelves with moſt ſucceſs to the knowledge and regulation of the human mind; in which reſpect our Author cannot be too highly eſteemed. He choſe none but uſeful ſubjects; he conſecrated his pen to works only of importance; he enriched the French Language with thoſe remains of wiſe Antiquity, which are of the greateſt advantage to the morals of mankind. And we ſhall find, if we will do him juſtice, that when he meets in the Authors, whom he tranſlates, any maxims not entirely conformable to the genuine precepts of our Religion, he corrects them, and ſhews the defect of them in inſtructive remarks (*b*).

(*b*) *Bibl. Franç.* pag. 25, 26.

☞DACIER (ANNE) was daughter of Tanneguy le Fevre Profeſſor of Greek at Saumur in France, by Mary Olivier, and born in that City about the latter end of the year 1651. The great reputation which ſhe afterwards raiſed to herſelf by her learning, is ſaid to have been then foretold by a friend of her father, who calculated her nativity [*A*]. She was about eleven years of age when her father formed a deſign of giving her a learned education upon this occaſion. While he was teaching one of his ſons the Rudiments of Grammar in the ſame room, where Madamoiſelle le Fevre was employed at her needle, ſhe, as a perſon wholly unconcerned, now and then ſupplied her brother with proper anſwers to the moſt intricate grammatical queſtions propoſed to him by the father, when ſhe found that he could not help himſelf. The father took the hint, and reſolved to make her a ſcholar. She was extremely ſorry that ſhe had ſpoken ſo much, ſince from that moment ſhe was obliged to a regular courſe of leſſons. However in a ſhort time ſhe made ſo great a progreſs, that her father charm'd with the force and vivacity of her genius, applied himſelf entirely to the cultivation of it [*B*]. He dying in 1672 ſhe went the year following to Paris, whither her reputation had reached before. She was then engaged in preparing an edition of *Callimachus*, which ſhe publiſhed in 1674 [*C*]. Having ſhewn ſome ſheets of that work to Monſieur Huet Preceptor to the Dauphin, and to ſeveral other men of learning at the Court, the work was ſo highly admired, that the Duke of Montauſier made a propoſal to her of publiſhing ſeveral Latin Authors for the uſe of the Dauphin. She rejected this propoſal at firſt as a taſk to which ſhe was not equal. But the Duke having made her a viſit, and being charmed with her converſation, inſiſted upon it ſo vigorouſly, that at laſt he gained her conſent; upon which ſhe undertook an edition of Florus, which was publiſhed in 1674 [*D*]. Her reputation being now ſpread over all Europe, Chriſtina Queen of Sweden ordered Count Conigſmark to make her a compliment in her name; upon which Madamoiſelle le Fevre ſent

[*A*] *The great reputation, which ſhe afterwards raiſed to herſelf by her learning, is ſaid to have been then foretold by a friend of her father, who calculated her nativity.*] This Gentleman, who was eminent for his ſkill in Aſtronomy, was likewiſe poſſeſſed with a ſtrong belief in judiciary Aſtrology, which he conſidered as a ſcience, which was eſtabliſhed upon very ſolid foundations. He had erected ſeveral horoſcopes, in which he ſometimes happened to ſucceed. On the day when Anne le Fevre was born, her father deſired this friend of his to calculate her nativity, and gave him the exact time of her birth. The Aſtrologer having conſidered the ſcheme a long while, told Monſr. le Fevre, that he had deceived him in his information with regard to the hour of the child's birth, ſince he diſcovered in the ſcheme ſuch a turn of fortune, and ſo great an *Eclat*, as were by no means ſuitable to one of her ſex. Madam Dacier always made uſe of this ſtory to ſhew the vanity and uncertainty of that art, which had found ſuch great things in the horoſcope of a woman, who had no fortune, and who had lived a kind of recluſe life. But others on the contrary took advantage of this prediction to confirm and authorize that art, by referring thoſe great promiſes of fortune and *Eclat*, to the reputation, which ſhe had gained by her works.

[*B*] *Her father charm'd with the force and vivacity of her genius applied himſelf entirely to the cultivation of it.*] When ſhe had learned Latin enough to read Phædrus and Terence, he began to inſtruct her in the Greek Tongue, which ſhe was ſo prodigiouſly pleaſed with, that in a ſhort time ſhe was capable of reading Anacreon, Callimachus, Homer, and the Greek Tragic Poets. As ſhe read them, ſhe ſhewed ſo exquiſite a taſte of the beauties of thoſe admirable Writers, that all the fatigue of her father in his Profeſſorſhip was ſoftened by the pleaſure, which he found in teaching her. To divert her in her more ſerious ſtudies he taught her the Italian Language, and read over with her ſeveral Poets of that Nation, and particularly Taſſo, in the peruſal of whom ſhe admirably well remarked the difference between that Poet and Virgil and Homer. She often took the liberty of diſputing with her Father. One of their moſt remarkable diſputes was with relation to Monſr. de Vaugelas's Tranſlation of Quintus Curtius. Her father ordered it to be read, and was charmed with that Tranſlation, which in reality has its beauties, conſidering the time when it was made. But Madamoiſelle le Fevre ventured to point out to him ſome things, which did not pleaſe her, as inſtances of negligence of ſtyle, errors in language, and paſſages ill tranſlated; and he was frequently obliged to own himſelf of the ſame opinion with her. Theſe little conteſts gave him the greateſt ſatisfaction imaginable, and he was extremely ſurprized to find ſo delicate a taſte, and ſo uncommon a penetration in ſo young a perſon.

[*C*] *An Edition of* Callimachus, *which ſhe publiſhed in* 1674.] It was printed at Paris in 4to under the following title: *Callimachi Hymni, Epigrammata, & Fragmenta, Græcè & Latinè, necnon ejuſdem Poematium de Comâ Berenices à Catullo verſum: edente cum notis & indice Anna Tanaquilli Fabri filia*, i. e. "The Hymns, "Epigrams, and Fragments of Callimachus, in Greek "and Latin, with his Poem upon Berenice's Hair "tranſlated by Catullus; publiſhed with Notes and "an Index by Anne the daughter of Tanaquil Faber."

[*D*] *An Edition of* Florus, *which was publiſhed in* 1674.] It was printed at Paris in 4to. There was another edition of it at Oxford 1692 in 8vo, and another at Venice 1714 in 4to.

ſent the Queen a Latin Letter with her edition of Florus, and her Majeſty wrote a very obliging anſwer; and not long after ſent her another Letter to perſuade her to abandon the Proteſtant Religion, and made her conſiderable offers to ſettle at her Court. In the beginning of the year 1683 ſhe married Monſieur Dacier [*E*], with whom ſhe had been brought up from her earlieſt years; and ſoon after her marriage declared to the Duke of Montauſier, who had always zealouſly eſpouſed her intereſts [*F*], and the Biſhop of Meaux her deſign of reconciling her ſelf to the Church of Rome, which ſhe had entertained for ſome time; but as Monſieur Dacier was not yet convinced of the reaſonableneſs of ſuch a change, they thought proper to retire to Caſtres [*G*] in the beginning of the year 1684, where they had a ſmall eſtate, in order to examine the points of controverſy between

[*E*] *In the beginning of the year* 1683 *ſhe married Monſr. Dacier.*] Some Writers aſſure us, that ſhe had been married before; and we are informed in the *Bibliotheque Germanique* †, that her firſt huſband was a Bookſeller of Saumur, whoſe name was *John Leſnier*, who for about twelve years had been engaged in printing ſeveral of the works of Tanneguy le Fevre, her father. The ill treatment, which ſhe met with from this huſband, is ſaid to have obliged her to return home to her father, at whoſe houſe ſhe reſumed her ſtudies in polite Literature, which ſhe had abandoned during her marriage. A certain Writer alludes to this ſtory in his *Dialogues of the Dead in the Elyſian Fields* (1), where he has the following paſſage. "Are you acquainted with the Greek Poets? ſays *Charon* to the Shade, who ſpoke to him (Monſr. *Dacier*). I know them, anſwers the learned Shade; they have almoſt all of them been at my houſe to learn the French Language; my wife and I have ſpent our whole life, in introducing them to the acquaintance of our Nation. How! replies the Ferry-man; was that your wife, whom I carried over ſome time ago? She had no ſooner ſet her foot aſhore, but Homer gave her his hand to conduct her to Pluto. A certain Bookſeller would have challenged her, declaring, that ſhe was his wife; that ſhe had left him in the other world; and ſince he had found her now, he would claim her again. Homer caſting a terrible look upon him, bid him retire, not without firſt giving him the epithet of Dog's Face. . . . The learned Shade was raviſhed to find, that his wife was ſo kindly received by Homer; and flattered himſelf that Horace, Plato, and Plutarch would come to meet him in the ſame manner. But his hopes were vain; no perſon waited for him, &c." But there has been inſerted in the firſt volume of the *Bibliotheque Françoiſe* (2) a *Memoire*, which aſſigns a much leſs honourable cauſe of her abandoning her huſband. The Writer of that Paper obſerves, that the Author of the Elogium upon her printed in the *Journal des Sçavans* (3), who aſſerts that ſhe was married in the year 1683 to Monſr. Dacier, would perhaps find it very difficult to juſtify that date; at leaſt that it is certain, that he has made a conſiderable omiſſion in the Life of that learned Lady, by making her quit the name of *le Fevre* for that of *Dacier*, without taking any notice of *John Leſnier*, the Bookſeller, her firſt huſband. *It is true*, ſays the Writer of the *Memoire*, *the latter would have made but a bad figure in an elogium, ſince he could not have been introduced there without the mention of a very ſcandalous circumſtance in the conduct of his wife, who had abandoned him to follow Monſr. Dacier, in whom ſcandal ſaid ſhe found a certain merit, which ſhe loved, and accuſed the other of wanting. This occaſioned ſome perſons, who were acquainted with the fact, of which we are ſpeaking, to ſay, that Madam Dacier was not ſo zealous in the juſtification of the conduct of Helena without reaſon, ſince by that apology ſhe formed a palliative remedy to be applied to herſelf.*

† Tom. 3. pag. 155, 156.

(1) See *Entretiens des Ombres aux Champs Elyſées.* Oct. 1722, pag. 307, 308.

(2) Artic. 2. pag. 31, &c.

(3) For January 1721, pag. 29. edit. d'Amſterdam.

[*F*] *The Duke of Montauſier, who had always zealouſly eſpouſed her intereſts.*] We are informed (4), that in 1682 this Lady having dedicated a Book to the King of France, ſhe could not find any perſon at Court, who would venture to introduce her to his Majeſty, in order to preſent her Book, becauſe ſhe was at that time a Proteſtant. The Duke of Montauſier, Governor to the Dauphin, being informed of this, offered his ſervice to introduce her to the King, and taking her in his coach, preſented her and her Book to his Majeſty; who told him with an air of reſentment, that he acted wrong in ſupporting perſons of that Lady's Religion; and that for his part he would forbid his name to be prefixed to any Book written by Huguenots; for which purpoſe he would give orders to ſeize all the copies of Madamoiſelle le Fevre's Book. The Duke anſwered with that freedom, with which he always ſpoke to the King, and which no perſon elſe would preſume to follow him in, *Is it thus, Sir, that you favour polite Literature? I declare to you frankly, a King ought not to be a bigot.* He added then, that he would thank the Lady in his Majeſty's name, and make her a preſent of an hundred piſtoles; and that he would leave it to the King to pay him, or not pay him; and he did as he had ſaid.

(4) See the *Hiſtory of the Times during the Reigns of Charles II and James II, Kings of England*, printed firſt at London, and afterwards at Amſterdam 1691 in 12mo.

[*G*] *They thought proper to retire to Caſtres . . . in order to examine the points of controverſy between the Proteſtants and Roman Catholics.*] Their friends endeavoured to diſſuade them from that journey, and Monſr. de Charleval, a Gentleman diſtinguiſhed for the delicacy of his genius, imagining, that it was the preſſure of their circumſtances, which obliged them to leave Paris, brought them ten thouſand livres in gold inſiſting upon their acceptance of them. They ſaw with pleaſure this inſtance of uncommon generoſity, but abſolutely refuſed to receive it. The pretence, which they made uſe of to conceal the true motive of their journey was, that Madam Dacier was deſirous of being acquainted with her huſband's family. During their ſtay at Caſtres, they applied themſelves entirely to the reading of the Scriptures and Fathers with relation to the points in diſpute, and at laſt determined on the ſide of the Church of Rome †. Mr. Bayle in his *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (5) obſerves, that they did not defer the inſtructing themſelves in the doctrine of that Church till the Miſſionaries and Dragoons put them upon it; but abjured the Proteſtant Religion without waiting for the troops, and without making any difficulty about it, and even exhorted every body about them at Caſtres to return to the boſom of the Church. *Thoſe*, continues he, *who are lovers of polite Learning in both the Popiſh and Proteſtant Churches, were very apprehenſive, leſt Monſr. and Madam Dacier ſhould ſuffer themſelves to be prevailed upon by the advice of their Confeſſor, and the Gentlemen of the Miſſion, to write ſome controverſial Tracts. It would, ſay they, be a great loſs to the Public, if they ſhould amuſe themſelves with ſuch a taſk; there are but too many already, who have engaged in it; and it would be much better, that an Author, who can write well upon other ſubjects, ſhould not invade the province of the Miſſionaries, but leave it entirely to thoſe, who are capable of nothing elſe. But when people argue thus, they do not conſider that every one has his particular reaſon, and that Monſr. Peliſſon, who has apologized ſo well for thoſe, who write nothing but Madrigals, has juſtified beforehand thoſe, who quit every other ſubject upon certain occaſions, to write tracts upon Religion.* The writer of the *Memoire* cited in the Note [*E*], aſſigns the following reaſon of their converſion to the Church of Rome. He tells us (6), that in January 1682 the Court of France publiſhed a Declaration, importing, that all children, which were illegitimate, ſhould be educated in the Romiſh Religion, and be conſidered as born Roman Catholics, though their fathers or mothers were Proteſtants. The Proteſtants were likewiſe prohibited to admit into their Churches any perſon who had changed his Religion, or even their children, or any Roman Catholic of whatever age, ſex, or condition, under the penalty of being deprived of the exerciſe of their Religion, and their Miniſters to ſuffer the *amende honorable*, with baniſhment and confiſcation of their goods, &c. Monſieur and Madam Dacier had a little daughter, whom they carried with them to Church; but the Conſiſtory at Caſtres having ſome well-grounded ſuſpicions that

† *Bibl. Franç.* tom. 1. Part. 1. Art. 1. pag. 8, 9.

(5) For March 1686. Article 1.

(6) *Biblioth. Françoiſe, ubi ſupra*, pag. 33.

between the Proteſtants and Roman Catholics; and at laſt determined in favour of the latter, and made their public abjuration in September 1685. They laboured likewiſe to draw over other Proteſtants to the Church of Rome, who had been touched by their example. The Biſhop of Meaux and the Duke of Montauſier repreſented her merit and her huſband's in ſuch a light to the King, who waited only for their converſion to ſhew them marks of his generoſity, that he gave Monſieur Dacier a penſion of fifteen hundred livres, and another of five hundred livres to his Lady. The patent was expedited in November, and upon the advice, which they received of it, they returned to Paris, where they were received by his Majeſty with a peculiar civility, and afterwards both of them reſumed their ſtudies, and Madam Dacier in particular obliged the world with ſeveral valuable works [*H*]. Upon the death of Monſieur Dacier's Father in 1692, ſhe went to Caſtres alone, in order to ſettle their private affairs there; and upon her return in 1693, ſhe had been only what is called a marriage of conſcience between them, deputed ſome of their Members to repreſent to Monſieur Dacier, that as he knew the King's orders, they deſired him for their ſatisfaction to ſhew them a certificate of his marriage with Madam Liſnier, or elſe not to bring their daughter to Church. Monſieur Dacier refuſed to ſatisfy them in either of theſe reſpects; upon which one of the Deputies of the Conſiſtory told him, that if he had Religion at heart, he would make no difficulty of ſatisfying their Church in the firſt point; but that if he was in the contrary diſpoſition, their Church would have no loſs of him; that they might diſpenſe with coming again to the Church, ſince they would both be refuſed admittance till they had given the proofs required of them. This is what occaſioned *thoſe moſt ſerious Reflections*, which the Abbé *Raguet* ſpeaks of in the *Journal des Savans*. Some perſons doubt upon good grounds, whether there had been a marriage in form between them, and ſuſpect that this occaſioned their refuſal to give the proper proofs of it. Others think on the contrary, that there had been a lawful marriage between them, but that it was ſolemnized privately in the Romiſh Church, for the ſake of the penſions, which were then given to thoſe who changed their Religion. "However the "caſe may be, *ſays the Writer above quoted*, with re- "gard to theſe two opinions, upon which we do not "determine for want of proofs, it is eaſy to conclude "that with regard to their ſincerity, the Church, "which loſt them, was no great ſufferer by it; and on "the other hand, that which gained them, had no "mighty occaſion to boaſt of its acquiſition. We "may add to this that the Journaliſts of *Trevoux*, in "their *Elogium* upon Madam *Dacier* in January "1721, do not ſet down the time of her marriage with "Monſieur *Dacier*. They were too prudent to do "this. But the Journaliſts of Paris fix it, as we "have ſeen before, in the year 1683. Let us ſup- "poſe this date to be right, and ſee what follows. "*Madam Dacier*, ſay the Jeſuits of *Trevoux*, pag. "101. *thought the moſt important and neceſſary employ- "ment for her, was to proceed, as ſhe had begun, in the "education of the daughter and ſon, whom God had given "them.* To follow this order, that daughter muſt "have been the elder, and in fact ſhe was ſo. The "Journaliſts took care not to mention her age; but "that of the ſon, who was younger, has eſcaped theſe "good Fathers. *He died*, ſay they, *in* 1694, *aged "ten years.* We ſee there was no time loſt, if he was "born in lawful marriage; and even for this it is "neceſſary to ſuppoſe, that Monſieur and Madam "*Dacier* were married in the beginning of 1683; "that their ſon was born in the very beginning of "1684; and that he died at the end of 1694, to "make up the age of ten years, in which he was "when he died. But when was the daughter born, "who ſome years after became a Nun in the Abbey "of Longchamps? The Conſiſtory of Caſtres had "therefore good grounds to ſuſpect her legitimacy." But Father Niceron (7) mentioning this *Memoire*, obſerves, that *it is very common, when a perſon abandons any party, to be expoſed to the diſadvantageous judgments and even calumnies of thoſe whom they have quitted; and that we ought to regard this* Memoire *in that light*..

(7) *Mémoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire des Hommes Illuſtres*, tom. 3. pag. 132 edit. Paris 1727.

[*H*] *Obliged the world with ſeveral valuable works.*] Beſides thoſe abovementioned ſhe publiſhed the following: I. *Dictys Cretenſis & Dares Phrygius, ad uſum Delphini.* Paris 1684 in 4to. It. *Editio auctior notis Variorum &c.* Amſterdam 1702 8vo. II. *Sexti Aurelii Victoris Hiſtoriæ Romanæ Compendium cum Interpretatione & Notis, ad uſum Delphini.* Paris 1681 in 4to. We find in her Notes upon this Author a great many points of Antiquity explained with prodigious perſpicuity and learning. III. *Les Poeſies d'Anacreon & de Sapho traduites du Grec en François avec des Remarques:* i. e. "The Poems of Anacreon and "Sappho tranſlated into French with Remarks." Paris 1681 in 8vo; another edition at Amſterdam 1699 in 12mo, which has been ſeveral times reprinted; and another *with the Latin Notes of Tanaquil Faber, and Monſieur de la Foſſe's Tranſlation into French*, printed at Amſterdam 1716 in 8vo. This work had great ſucceſs. Madamoiſelle le Fevre's Tranſlation was highly eſteemed on account of its noble ſimplicity and great purity and elegance of ſtyle. Monſieur Boileau gave it this compliment, that it ought to deter any perſon from attempting to tranſlate thoſe Poems into verſe. But Monſ. Tourmont tells us, that ſhe has only tranſlated into French her Father's Latin Verſion of that Author. IV. *Eutropii Hiſtoriæ Romanæ Breviarium ab urbe conditâ uſquè ad Valentinianum & Valentem, Auguſtos, cum Notis & Emendationibus, ad uſum Delphini.* Paris 1683 in 4to. Oxford 1696 in 8vo. V. *L'Amphytrion, l'Epidicus, & le Rudens, Comédies de Plaute traduites en François, avec des Remarques & un examen ſelon les Regles du Théatre*; i. e. "The Amphytrio, Epidicus, and Ru- "dens, Comedies of Plautus, tranſlated into French, "with Notes, and an examen of them according to "the Rules of the Theatre." Paris 1683 in 12mo, 3 volumes; and in the edition which Mr. de Limiers has publiſhed of Plautus at Amſterdam in 1718. VI. *Le Plutus & les Nuées d'Ariſtophane, Comédies Greques traduites en François avec des Remarques & un Examen de chaque piece ſelon les Regles du Théatre.* i. e. "The Plutus and Clouds of Ariſtophanes, Greek "Comedies tranſlated into French, with Notes, and "an Examen of each play according to the Rules of "the Theatre." Paris 1684 in 12mo. Madam Dacier was ſo highly charmed with the *Clouds* of Ariſtophanes; that ſhe aſſures us, that ſhe had read over that Comedy with pleaſure two hundred times. But perhaps ſome perſons will conſider this rather as an inſtance of her prejudice in favour of the works of the Antients, than as a proof of the excellence of that Play. VII. *Les Comédies de Terence traduites en François avec des Remarques*: i. e. "Terence's Comedies "tranſlated into French with Notes." Paris 1688, 3 vol. in 12mo. Amſterdam 1691, 3 vol. in 12mo. Zittaw 1705 in 12mo. Amſterdam 1706, 3 vol. in 12mo. Rotterdam 1717, 3 vol. in 8vo, *avec des figures à chaque Acte, tirées des anciens Manuſcrits, où l'on voit les Maſques & l'Action des perſonnages de chaque Comédie.* When Madam Dacier firſt undertook this Verſion of Terence, ſeveral of her friends endeavoured to diſſuade her from the deſign by repreſenting to her, that the Terence of Port-Royal was ſo highly eſteemed, that though her Tranſlation ſhould prove better, the prejudice founded upon the reputation of thoſe Gentlemen would be a diſadvantage to her, and that ſhe would have the diſſatisfaction of failing in her deſign. But this oppoſition was ſo far from deterring her, that it raiſed an emulation in her, and ſhe took an incredible deal of pains in order to ſurmount that prejudice. She roſe at five a clock in the morning, during a very ſharp winter, and diſpatched four Comedies. But ſome months after when he had read over her work again, and compared it with the original, ſhe found, that her great elaborateneſs had injured it,

ſhe applied herſelf to the education of her ſon and daughter, who made a prodigious progreſs under her care. The ſon died in 1694, and the daughter became a Nun in the Abbey of Longchamp. She had afterwards another daughter, whom ſhe educated with the utmoſt care, and who had united in her all the virtues and accompliſhments which can adorn the ſex, but died at eighteen years of age, and her mother has immortaliſed her memory in the preface to her Tranſlation of the *Iliad*. Madam Dacier was in a very infirm ſtate of health the two laſt years of her life, and died after a very painful ſickneſs Auguſt the 17th 1720, being ſixty nine years of age. The accompliſhments of her genius, how conſpicuous ſoever, were inferior to the virtues of her mind. She was remarkable for her firmneſs, generoſity, equality of temper, and piety. Her modeſty was ſo great, that ſhe never ſpoke of ſubjects of Literature, or her own performances, nor affected to ſhew her ſuperiority in that reſpect over thoſe with whom ſhe converſed. Even her moſt intimate friends could ſcarce engage her to diſcourſe upon points of learning. She always put herſelf upon a level with thoſe about her, and thoſe who did not know her, ſaw nothing in her above the ordinary turn of her ſex, and diſcovered only a Lady, who knew how to preſerve the decorum of it [*I*]. She was often ſollicited to publiſh a Tranſlation of ſome of the books of Scripture, with remarks upon them; but ſhe always anſwered

it, ſince it ſmelt of the lamp, and was very far from having reached thoſe graces and that noble ſimplicity, which diſtinguiſh the Author himſelf. Being extremely afflicted at the ill ſucceſs of this attempt, and diſpleaſed with her performance ſhe had the courage to throw thoſe four Comedies into the fire, and to begin the Tranſlation again. As ſhe proceeded in it with more moderation, ſhe ſucceeded much better, and at laſt brought her work to ſuch a degree of perfection, that it was admired even by thoſe who had moſt oppoſed her deſign. It was a circumſtance which was very remarkable and greatly to her honour, that having taken the liberty to change the Scenes and Acts, her conjectures were afterwards found to be confirmed by an excellent Manuſcript in the Library of the King of France. The edition of 1717 is much preferable to all the former. Madam Dacier has made in it ſeveral alterations in the Tranſlation, which render it better, and more elegant, and ſometimes more literal. The Notes, which are enlarged, are conciſe and well choſen. The figures, which are curious, were engraven under the direction of Monſieur Picart. VIII. *Reflexions Morales de l'Empereur Marc-Antonin, avec des Remarques:* i. e. "The Moral Reflections of Marcus Antoninus the Philoſopher, with "Notes." Paris 1691, 2 volumes in 12mo. Monſieur and Madam Dacier had hitherto wrote ſeparately, and not publiſhed any work in conjunction. The firſt Preſident Harlay propoſed to them this as one, which deſerved their pains; and in order that they might not be interrupted in the execution of it, he let them have the uſe of his houſe of Meſnil-Montant near Paris, whither he went twice a week to ſee how far the work was advanced. It was this that induced them to dedicate their Tranſlation to him, which is as elegant as it is faithful; and the Notes are enriched with an exact and curious vein of Literature. IX. Monſieur Dacier having undertaken a Tranſlation of Plutarch's Lives of Illuſtrious Men, Madam Dacier propoſed to divide it with him, and diſpatched two lives; but the work being interrupted by Monſieur Dacier's other employments, ſhe turned her thoughts another way; and as ſhe had a long time been deſirous of publiſhing a Tranſlation of Homer. She left Monſieur Dacier to finiſh that of Plutarch alone. X. *L'Iliade d'Homere traduite en François avec des Remarques.* i. e. "The Iliad of Homer tranſlated "into French, with Notes." Paris 1711, 3 volumes in 12mo; and 1720 3 volumes in 12mo. This Tranſlation is elegant and faithful; however it had not contributed to change the opinion of thoſe, who were not ſufficiently prejudiced in favour of Homer. XI. *Des Cauſes de la Corruption du Goute:* i. e. "Of "the Cauſes of the Corruption of Taſte." Paris 1714 in 12mo, and Amſterdam 1715 in 8vo. This Treatiſe is written againſt Monſieur de la Mothe, who in the Preface to his Iliad had declared but very little eſteem for that Poem. Madam Dacier being ſhocked with this liberty which he had taken, immediately began a defence of her favourite Author. But it muſt be owned that her love for him has made her forget the regard due to a valuable Writer, and that politeneſs and civility, which ſo well becomes all perſons, and eſpecially thoſe of her ſex. This was the beginning of a Literary War, which produced a great number of books in the courſe of it. XII. *Homere défendu contre l'Apologie du R. P. Hardouin, ou ſuite des Cauſes de la Corruption du Gout:* i. e. "A Defence of Homer againſt the Apology of "Father Hardouin, or a Sequel of the Cauſes of the "Corruption of Taſte." Paris 1716 in 12mo, Amſterdam 1717 in 12mo. Madam Dacier's deſign in this Treatiſe is to ſhew, that Father Hardouin, in endeavouring to apologize for Homer, has done him a greater injury than he ever received from his moſt declared enemies. This injury is reducible to two heads; the firſt of which is, that he is not well ſatisfied with what the defenders of that Poet have written in his favour, and attempts to correct them, which, according to Madam Dacier, is exactly the ſame thing with being diſſatisfied with every thing, which ſhews the beauties of Homer. The ſecond head is, that he has deprived the Poet of all his grand, noble, and real views, in order to give him falſe ones, and ſuch as can only make him contemptible. Beſides the two laſt mentioned pieces Madam Dacier wrote a Reply to Monſieur de la Mothe, but ſuppreſſed it, after Monſieur de Vallincourt had procured a reconciliation between them. XIII. *L'Odyſſée d'Homere traduite en François avec des Remarques.* i. e. "The Odyſſey of "Homer tranſlated into French, with Notes." Paris 1716, 3 volumes in 12mo. This Tranſlation is not at all inferior to that of the Iliad. It has been reprinted at Amſterdam 1717, in 3 volumes in 8vo. In this edition the Notes are placed under the text, whereas in that of Paris they are put at the end.

[*I*] *Diſcovered only a Lady, who knew how to preſerve the decorum of her ſex.*] We have a remarkable inſtance of this. It is the common cuſtom of learned men of the northern parts of Europe, who travel, to viſit in every country thoſe perſons, who are moſt eminent for their learning, and they carry with them a book, in which they deſire ſuch perſons to write their names with ſome ſentence or other. A German Gentleman of great learning paid a viſit to Madam Dacier, and requeſted her to write her name and ſentence in his *Album*. She ſeeing in that book the names of the greateſt ſcholars of Europe, told him, that ſhe ſhould be aſhamed to put her name among thoſe of ſo many illuſtrious perſons, and that ſuch a preſumption would by no means become her. The Gentleman ſtill inſiſted upon it, and the more ſhe refuſed, the more importunate he was, till at laſt overcome by his entreaties ſhe took her pen, and wrote her name together with this verſe of Sophocles,

Γυναιξὶν ἡ σιγὴ φέρει κόσμον.
That is,
"Silence is the ornament of the female ſex.

The German upon reading that ſentence was ſtruck with admiration of ſo much modeſty joined to ſuch extenſive and exquiſite learning. T

(a) See *Memoires de Trevoux*, Janvier 1721, &c. *Journal des Savans*, Janvier 1721.

swered upon theſe occaſions, that a woman ought to read, and meditate upon the Scriptures, and regulate her whole conduct by them, and to keep ſilence, agreeably to the command of St. Paul. The Academy of *Ricovrati* at Padua choſe her one of their Body in 1684 (*a*).

DAILLE' (JOHN) in Latin *Dallæus* [*A*], Miniſter of the Church of Paris, was one of the moſt learned Divines of the ſeventeenth Century [*B*], and was the moſt eſteemed by the Catholics of all the Controverſial Writers among the Proteſtants. He was born at Chatelleraut the ſixth of January 1594. *He began but late to ſtudy Latin, becauſe his father deſigned him for buſineſs, propoſing to leave him his office* (*a*); *but there was a neceſſity of yielding to the great inclination which Nature had given him for Learning*; . . . . *ſo that at eleven years of age he was ſent to S. Maixent in Poitou to learn the firſt rudiments* (*b*). He continued his Studies at Poitiers, Chatelleraut, and Saumur; and having finiſhed his Claſſical learning in the laſt of thoſe Towns, he entred on Logic at Poitiers, at the age of ſixteen, and finiſhed his courſe of Philoſophy at Saumur under the celebrated Duncan. He began his Theological Studies at Saumur in the year 1612; and in the month of October, the ſame year, he went into the family of the illuſtrious Monſieur du Pleſſis Mornai, to be Tutor to two of his grandſons. He had the happineſs to pleaſe him; and he made very great progreſs by enjoying the converſation of that learned man, who frequently did him the honour to read with him, and concealed nothing from him of whatever he knew. Mr. Daillé, having lived ſeven years with ſo excellent a maſter, travelled into Italy with his two pupils (*c*). He ſaw himſelf in a ſtrange perplexity when one of them fell ſick at Mantua: he was obliged to get him conveyed with all ſpeed to Padua, where thoſe of the Proteſtant Religion have a little more liberty; and as he died ſoon after, *great addreſs and intereſt was neceſſary* to avoid the traverſes of the Inquiſitors, and to get him carried to France to the burial place of his anceſtors. The Governor of the deceaſed ſurmounted all theſe difficulties, not without the aſſiſtance of Father Paul, and continued to travel with his other pupil. They ſaw Switzerland, Germany, Flanders, Holland, and England; and returned to France towards the end of the year 1621. Mr. Daillé had ſo ſmall an opinion of the uſefulneſs of travelling, that he regretted all his life long the two years which he had ſpent therein [*C*]; and he would have regretted them more, had he not conſidered the advantage he had enjoyed at Venice of being familiarly acquainted with Father Paul [*D*]. He was received Miniſter in the year 1623, and firſt exerciſed his office in the family of Mr. du Pleſſis Mornai (*d*): but this did not laſt long, for that Lord fell ſick a little after, and died in the month of November, the ſame year, in the arms of the new Paſtor. The Memoirs of that great man employed Mr. Daillé the following year. In 1625 he was appointed Miniſter of the Church of Saumur, and in 1626 he was removed to that of Paris (*e*). He ſpent all the reſt of his life in the ſervice of this laſt Church, and from thence diffuſed great light over the whole Body, as well

(a) It was that of Receiver of the Confignations, which he bore at Poitiers. *Abrégé de la Vie de Mr. Daillé*, pag. 2.

(b) Ibid. pag. 3, 4.

(c) They left Saumur the beginning of Autumn 1619.

(d) At the Caſtle of la Forêt on the Saivre, in lower Poitou.

(e) He ſucceeded Mr. Durant.

[*A*] *Daillé . . . . in Latin* Dallæus.] So long as a man has not publiſhed his name in print, it is excuſable to be ignorant of the true way of writing it; but this ignorance is unpardonable in thoſe who have ſeen the name in print; and therefore great negligence may be imputed to Mr. le Chaumont, who always writes the *Sieur D'Aillé*, in a work wherein he is anſwering a Letter of that Miniſter. This Letter was printed in the year 1634, and has in the title the name Daillé. The Author had already prefixed it to the Apology for the Reformed Churches, which obliged Mr. de Chaumont to publiſh a Writing to which the ſaid Letter ſerved for an Anſwer. Where were Mr. de Chaumont's eyes, when he was reading the works he undertook to refute? I have already animadverted on Father Southwel's latinizing Mr. Daillé's name ill (1). The learned Grotius has not latinized it a whit better by *Dalieus* (2). The Abbot de la Roque would not have written *Dallié* (3), if he had been better acquainted with that Miniſter's Works. Balzac generally writes *Daillé*, as he ſhould do, but I have ſeen *D'Aillé* in the XXXVII Letter of the IX Book (4).

(1) He calls him *D. Allius*. See above the Remark [*I*] of the Article ADAM (John).

(2) Grot. Epiſt. 350. Part. 2. pag. 854.

(3) In the *Journal des Savans* of the 2d of January 1675.

(4) Edition in folio.

[*B*] . . . . *was one of the moſt learned Divines of the XVII Century.*] The Proteſtants uſed to ſay in France, that they had had no better Writer ſince Calvin than Mr. Daillé, "A Gentleman of that Religion told me that "ſince Calvin they never had ſo great a man as Mon"ſieur Daillé; and I know him: the Jews ſaid of "their Rabbi *Moſes Maimonides*, that *a Moſe antiquo* "*ad Moſem noſtrum non ſurrexit major Moſe*, i. e. "*from the ancient Moſes to our Moſes there hath ariſen* "*none greater than Moſes*: I therefore freely grant it "(5)." Patin, from whom I borrow this paſſage, ſpeaks thus in another place. *They are now printing at Geneva a new Book of Monſieur Daillé, Miniſter of Charenton, whom the Huguenots affirm to be the greateſt man they have had ſince Calvin* (6). What he ſays in the CCCCXVIII Letter deſerves to be ſet down. He is ſpeaking to a Huguenot. *As for Law-Books I have no occaſion for them; but I like thoſe which concern your Religion: for there is ſomething to be learned in them, eſpecially when they have the merit of Mr. Daillé's* (7). I have quoted above (8) a paſſage of Monſr. Arnauld to which I refer my reader. Here is a very conſiderable one of Mr. Colomiés: *Going to ſee Mr. de Valois* (Valeſius) *the elder*, ſays he (9), *at Paris, he told me, among other things, that a great many people pretended to write Books, but he knew but few who wrote ſo well as Mr. Daillé.*

(5) It is *Patin* who ſpeaks, *Letter* 405, pag. 202 of the 3d Volume, of the Geneva Edition. See alſo *Letter* 527.

(6) *Letter* 501, pag. 46 of the 3d Volume.

(7) *Lettres de Patin*, tom. 3, pag. 241, 242. See alſo pag. 464 of the ſame Volume.

(8) Citation (10) of the Article AUBERTIN.

[*C*] *He had ſo ſmall an opinion of the uſefulneſs of travelling, that he regretted all his life long the two years which he had ſpent therein.*] "We have often "heard the perſon, whoſe Hiſtory we are writing, re"gret thoſe two years, which he reckoned as it were "loſt, becauſe he could have ſpent them to better pur"poſe in his cloſet." It is his ſon who ſays this in his Abridgment of the Life of Mr. Daillé (10).

(9) Colom. *Opuſcul.* pag. 95.

(10) *Abregé de la Vie de Mr. Daillé*, pag. 8.

[*D*] *He had the advantage of being familiarly acquainted with father Paul.*] Let us continue to hear his ſon: *The only fruit which he ſaid he had reaped* from that journey, *was the acquaintance and converſation of Father Paul. . . . Mr. du Pleſſis, with whom he correſponded by Letters, had recommended to him in a very particular manner both his grandſons and their Governor, ſo that he was immediately admitted into his confidence, and not a day paſſed but he viſited him, and had ſome hours diſcourſe with him. The good Father even conceived ſuch an affection for him, that he uſed his utmoſt endeavours with a French Phyſician of our Religion, and one of his intimate friends, named Aſſelineau, to prevail with him to ſtay at Venice* (11). He employed his favour and intereſt *to procure him the neceſſary ſafe-conduct and paſſports from the Republic* with regard to the corps which was to be ſent to France (12). The Controverſial Writers have perhaps already made uſe of this circumſtance of Mr. Daillé's Life, to prove that Fra Paolo concealed, under the habit of a Monk, a mind wholly devoted to Proteſtantiſm.

(11) Ibid. pag. 9.

(12) Ibid. pag. 8.

well by his Sermons [*E*], as by his Books of Controverſy (*f*). As he lived long, and almoſt always enjoyed very good health, and beſides was not burthened with a large family [*F*], it may eaſily be conceived that a man ſo laborious as he [*G*], and endowed with the qualifications of a Writer in an eminent degree, compoſed ſeveral Works. With ſubmiſſion

(*f*) Extracted from the *Abridgment of Mr. Daillé's Life*, publiſhed in the year 1670.

[*E*] *His Sermons.*] He had publiſhed XIX volumes of them, and a little before his death he ſent *to Geneva the laſt Sermons which he had preached on the 12th chapter of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews.* They make the XX Volume. The learning in theſe Sermons is not profound, as in thoſe of Meſtrezat; but they are more clear, both with regard to the expreſſion, and the diſpoſition of the ſubject. He has been reproached with ſtealing ſeveral things from Dr. Davenant, in his Expoſition of the Epiſtle to the Coloſſians. See what he ſays on this head in anſwer to the Sieur Cottiby (13), who moreover reproached him with a great number of repetitions.

(13) Daillé, *Replique à Adam & à Cottiby*, Part. 3. chap. 5. pag. m. 172.

[*F*] *He was not burthened with a large Family.*] He married in the lower Poitou, in the month of May 1625 (14). His wife died the 31ſt of May 1631 (15), and left him only one ſon, of whom ſhe lay in at the houſe of the Dutch Embaſſador (16) the 31ſt of October 1628 (17). She had taken refuge there, becauſe the Proteſtants were afraid leſt the news of the taking of Rochelle might raiſe popular tumults againſt them. This only ſon, whoſe name was HADRIAN DAILLE, was received a Miniſter in the year 1653. He had continued his Theological Studies with his father for ſeveral years, when the Conſiſtory of Rochelle invited him thither (18). *The father and the ſon were both beholden to the affection and obliging care of Meſſieurs Drelincourt, father and ſon* (19), *for ſo honourable an invitation. They embraced it with joy, and ſet out together in the month of April*, 1654, *the father not being willing to leave his Candidate till he had himſelf inſtalled him in that holy office, to which he had conſecrated him from his moſt tender years. In this journey he renewed his acquaintance with his old friends in Touraine, Anjou, and Poitou; and the Church of Chatelleraut, where he was born, as well as thoſe of Saumur and la Foreſt, which had enjoyed the firſt fruits of his miniſtry, had the ſatisfaction of hearing him edify their Congregations once more. He alſo preached ſeveral times at Rochelle and la Rochefoucault, whither he was obliged to go to preſent his ſon to the Synod which was held there on the utmoſt border of the Province; and the Aſſembly having admitted him after the neceſſary examinations, they returned to Rochelle; where that numerous Flock having heard the new Miniſter's Probation Sermons with ſatisfaction, his father laid hands on him, on Sunday the 6th of July. A fortnight after he took leave of the Church by a farewel Sermon, and a Collection was made of all the Sermons preached by him during this journey, which has born two impreſſions, one at Saumur and the other at Geneva. He then departed from Rochelle, to return to Paris* (20). He had the ſatisfaction five years after to have his ſon for his Collegue. Hadrian Daillé was in the year 1658 choſen a Miniſter of Paris, in the room of Mr. Meſtrezat. Mr. Cottibi relates a pleaſant ſtory about the invitations of Rochelle and Paris ſucceſſively addreſſed to Mr. Daillé's ſon (21): *Your reflecting thus on my prayers* (he ſpeaks to the father) *puts me in mind of yours in a journey I took with you from Paris to Chatelleraut: without lying, they were prayers well cooked up: under pretext of conducting this your dear and only ſon to be Miniſter at Rochelle, did it not mightily become you to compare your ſelf to the Patriarch Abraham, and him to Iſaac, whom you was going to ſacrifice, becauſe you removed him to a diſtance from Paris* (22)? *There wanted no more to make the Allegory compleat, but an Angel to come and ſtay your arm, and prevent the blow, obliging you to return back again, and bring home the young victim ſafe and ſound. But you have provided for this ſince; the Angel being one of the King's Secretaries, whoſe name I have forgot* (23): *he went poſt from Paris to ſurprize the Rochellers; and in ſpite of all the proteſtations which you had made to thoſe poor people, to conſecrate your ſon to them without reſerve, and never to demand him back; and this in oppoſition to Mr. Drelincourt, who, it is ſaid, ſeemed to have a mind to recall his own ſon; againſt all thoſe vows by which you had deſtined his Miniſtry to thoſe Gentlemen, and which being more ſolemn than thoſe which, by your relation, had engaged mine to the Proteſtants of Poitiers, ought conſequently to have been more inviolable; notwithſtanding all theſe engagements, I ſay, the aforeſaid Angel, whom one would have taken for a very intereſted man, addreſſes himſelf to the Miniſters of the Synod of Xaintonge, already prepoſſeſſed by Letters, and without giving the parties an opportunity of defending their right, he takes away this Iſaac from them, giving them ample foundation for eternally complaining both of the fidelity of the father, and of the loſs of the ſon, if he deſerved ſuch laſting regret.* Monſr. Daillé calls this a Romance, and a fabulous Narration (24).

(14) *Abrégé de ſa Vie*, pag. 12.

(15) Ibid. pag. 27.

(16) It was the Baron of Languerack.

(17) Ibid. pag. 25.

(18) Ibid. pag. 29.

(19) He was Miniſter of Rochelle.

(20) *Abrégé de la Vie de Mr. Daillé*, pag. 30.

(21) Cottiby, *Replique à Mr. Daillé*, pag. 20.

(22) *Without ſuppoſing this to be true, I obſerve that it is the common diſeaſe of the Pariſians to look on living in the Provinces as a deplorable exile.*

(23) *In the* Life of Mr. Daillé, *pag.* 31, *the Elder of the Conſiſtory of Charenton, who was deputed to Rochelle to demand Mr. Daillé's ſon, is named Monſieur Turpin.*

His ſon was ſtill alive at the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes; but on account of his bodily infirmities he was excuſed from exerciſing the functions of his Miniſtry. He retired to Switzerland, and died at Zurich about the month of May 1690. All his Manuſcripts, among which there were ſeveral Works of his father's, were carried to the public Library. He was an admirable good judge of books; for he not only knew whether they were good or not, but even whether they ſold well; and I have heard that the Bookſellers were not over and above pleaſed with the latter part of his knowledge. Mr. Baillet mentions him in the firſt Volume of his *Anti*, and juſtly cenſures thoſe who pretend he had a ſon who became a convert to the Romiſh Communion. I ſet down his words in the margin: they are taken from a paſſage in his Work, wherein he gives the titles of ſeveral Books which he ſuppoſes were deſigned (25). Take notice that Mr. Daillé the father, becoming a Widower at thirty ſeven, never married again.

(24) *Replique à Adam, & à Cottiby*, Part. 3. chap. 3. pag. m. 152.

(25) A General Conſpiracy of the Proteſtants, *and other Heretics of the North and Weſt, againſt the Catholic Church, concerted in purſuance of the Viſions and Inſpirations of the Prophet of Rotterdam, with the Hiſtory of the Viſionaries of both Sexes, whom the Proteſtants have had hitherto. By the Sieur* John Daillé, R. B. T. *ſon of Hadrian, and grandſon of John. I am miſtaken, ſaid Mr. de Brillat, if this Author's name be not forged. It is true Mr. Daillé, who is now retired to Zurich, is named Hadrian, and his father was named John; but I never heard that he left a ſon in France who was converted.* Baillet, tom. 1. *des Anti*, pag. 294.

Monſr. Pictet, Divinity Profeſſor at Geneva, having read what I have ſaid above, that Mr. Daillé's ſon's Manuſcripts were carried to the public Library of Zurich (26), had the goodneſs to inform me that the Manuſcripts of Mr. Daillé the father were at Geneva, in the hands of a private perſon who had bought them. They are the explication of the IX firſt Chapters of the Epiſtle of S. Paul to the Romans: the Explication of the Iſt Epiſtle of S. Peter: ſeveral other Sermons: the Refutation of the Expoſition of the Biſhop of Condom: and a Treatiſe of the Euchariſt, like that by Aubertin.

(26) *I had read this in a Letter written from Zurich a little after the death of Mr. Daillé the ſon.*

[*G*] *A man ſo laborious as he.*] I aſſure my ſelf the Reader will be glad to find here what I am going to tranſcribe from the Life of Mr. Daillé. "His Books "and his Studies were his chief recreation, and his "greateſt delight. In his cloſet he refreſhed himſelf "after labour, with pleaſure and profit at the ſame "time; and thither he came to reſt after the moſt "painful duties of his office, even thoſe which con"ſiſt in ſtudying. For then he diverted himſelf by "changing the ſubject, and when he found his mind "fatigued with reading or ſtudying matters of high "ſpeculation, or which demanded ſtrong attention, he "took up ſome Author which required leſs applica"tion, and yielded him agreeable entertainment: thus "he intermixed the ſerious and the delightful, that he "might always as it were keep up his appetite by this "variety of diet. I believe alſo we may, without "flattery, give him the praiſe of having been one of "the greateſt readers of his time, and that of the moſt "various kinds of Books, not only of thoſe belong"ing to his own profeſſion, but of thoſe which ſeem "to be the moſt foreign to it. It would be no difficult "matter to be convinced of this, if we conſider that "he lived to a great age, and huſbanded well every "moment of his long life. He was extremely labo"rious, and riſing very early, as was his daily cuſ"tom, he had by that means about five or ſix hours free "from the ordinary hurry of life, which he could aſ"ſuredly ſpend in his cloſet. No wonder therefore if "he had the leiſure to lay up ſuch a ſtock of learning "in ſo many years time; for he was a man who made "his advantage of every thing, and read no Book, "how deſpicable ſoever, without taking Extracts from "it (27), for which he never failed to find ſome place "or other, and he knew very well how to make uſe of "them on proper occaſions (28)."

(27) Pliny did the ſame. *Nihil unquam legit, quod non excerpere, dicere etiam ſolebat nullum eſſe librum tam malum, ut non aliqua ex parte prodeſſet.* Plin. Epiſt. 5. lib. 3.

(28) *Abrégé de la Vie de Daillé* pag. 66, 67.

submiſſion to certain Critics, his firſt eſſay was a Maſter-piece [*H*]; and I do not know whether it ſhould not be ſaid to be his Maſter-piece. I peak of his Book of the *Uſe of the Fathers*, which was printed in the year 1631 (*g*). It is a very ſtrong chain of arguments, which form a moral demonſtration againſt thoſe who would have Religious Diſputes decided by the authority of the Fathers. The Author did not begin with this, becauſe he knew the Fathers of the firſt ages favoured the Roman Catholics; for he has ſhewn in ſeveral Works that he deſired no better than to reduce Controverſies to this point: *Every doctrine which is not conformable to the three firſt Centuries ought to be rejected as a human innovation.* He would not have conteſted with the Biſhop of Meaux the principle of the Hiſtory of the Variations [*I*]. Never was any Miniſter more exactly acquainted than he with the Hiſtory and Doctrine of the Fathers. It is impoſſible at this time of day to write in finer Latin than he has done on the ſubjects which he has treated. As to his French Style, it cannot be ſaid that he was arrived at the height of perfection: but there was no man of his age, among thoſe of his cloth, who ſpoke French ſo well as he; which muſt be attributed to the intimate acquaintance he had, during his long ſtay at Paris, with the celebrated Monſieur Conrart (*b*). He preſided in the laſt National Synod held in France, which was that of Loudun, in the year 1659. He had this advantage, that his mind did not decay with his age; for there is no leſs fire and ſtrength in his Reply to Father Adam (*i*), and in the two Volumes *de Objecto Cultus religioſi* (*k*), than in his

(*g*) The Bookſeller, according to cuſtom, put the following year in the Title page.

(*b*) See the Remark [*N*].

(*i*) See the Remark [*I*] of the Article ADAM (John).

(*k*) He was 70 years old when he publiſhed the firſt.

[*H*] *With ſubmiſſion to certain Critics, his firſt Eſſay was a Maſter-piece.*] Here is what we find in a Book of Mr. Colomiés (29). *Opinions are pretty much divided concerning this Work* de Uſu Patrum. *The Preſbyterians eſteem it highly; but thoſe of the Church of England make no great account of it. Speaking one day of this Book to a learned man (who is now in Epiſcopal Orders) he told me that in his opinion it was the leaſt of Mr. Daillé's Works, and that he wondred that having read the Fathers pretty much, he ſhould make uſe of that reading to darken the merit of the primitive Church. Mr. Scrivener, an Engliſh Divine, is of the ſame ſentiment, in his Apology for the Fathers againſt the ſame Mr. Daillé.* Take particular notice that this Cenſure is principally founded on the wrong which that Work may do Antiquity: this would not be ſaid of an indifferent Book; ſo that thoſe who cenſure this Work are in reality its Panegyriſts. I know very well that the Divine of the Church of England (30), who wrote againſt that Work, pretends Mr. Daillé's arguments are not ſtrong: but he maintains his aſſertion ſo ill, that nothing would be more eaſy than to refute his Criticiſm. But not to enter into the merits of the diſpute, let us only obſerve, that by the confeſſion of that Divine (31), the Book *de Uſu Patrum* has been the admiration of the Preſbyterian party. This was the Work which a learned Miniſter of Picardy eſteemed above any that Mr. Daillé had written. He ſpeaks of it in the following words, addreſſing himſelf to the Author. *Licet quicquid operum hactenus edidiſti, vir Reverende, mihi plurimùm placuerit, tuaque omnia, tùm* Latinè *tum* Gallicè *ſcripta, æquali plauſu ab eruditis, atque adeò à piis omnibus, excepta ſint, diffiteri tamen non poſſum, laborum tuorum primitias, Tractatum nempe tuum de* Patrum *in decidendis de* Religione *Controverſiis* Uſu, *me plurimùm ſemper cepiſſe. Non ſolùm enim Opus iſtud mirâ rerum lectu & ſcitu jucundiſſimarum digniſſimarumque varietate refertum eſt, verùm etiam eloquentia orationiſque nitor cum rebus ipſis certant, tantâque eruditione & facundiâ argumentum illud pertractaſti, ut vix quicquam magis elaboratum erudito hoc ſeculo prodiiſſe videatur* (32). i. e. "Though I have been very much "pleaſed with whatever Works you have hitherto "publiſhed, and all your Writings, as well in *Latin* "as in *French*, have been received with equal applauſe "by the learned, and by all religious men, yet I "cannot but confeſs that the firſt fruits of your labours, "I mean your Treatiſe of the *Uſe of the Fathers* in de"ciding controverſies of *Religion*, always took me the "moſt. For that work is not only ſtored with an "admirable variety of things extremely entertaining "and worthy to be read and known, but the elegance "and purity of the language vie with the matters "themſelves; and you have treated that argument "with ſuch learning and eloquence, that, in my judg"ment, a more elaborate performance has ſcarce ap"peared in this learned age." Theſe are the words of Mr. Mettayer, who was Miniſter of St. Quintin; his Latin Tranſlation of this Work of Mr. Daillé was printed at Geneva in the year 1656. It is aſſerted in the Life of Mr. Daillé (33), that a learned Engliſhman, named Thomas Smith, tranſlated the ſame Book into his mother-tongue: Mr. Mettayer ſays the ſame thing; but Mr. Scrivener affirms (34) that he knows this fact to be falſe from very good hands, and has heard Mr. Smith ſay it was one of Oxford, and not himſelf, who had done that Tranſlation; and that he (Mr. Smith) would have refuted the work, if he had thought it worth his while (35). One thing which cannot be denied is, that there is a Preface, under the name of Mr. Smith, prefixed to the Engliſh Tranſlation printed in the year 1651. Mr. Cottiby (36) made a Remark againſt the Book of the Uſe of the Fathers, which the Author did not vouchſafe to examine. See Mr. Daillé's Reply, in the XI chapter of the III part (37).

Here is more than enough to prove that the firſt Book which Mr. Daillé preſented the Public with was reckoned a very good Book, and one of his beſt Books. And this puts me in mind of a maxim which a grave Author advanced ſome years ago, to prove that the *Avis aux Refugiez*, or *Advice to the Refugees*, was the Work of a Writer who had already compoſed ſeveral good Books. His Proof reduced to a Maxim amounts to this: *Every Book which is well written, and with a good turn, is at leaſt the third or fourth production of its Author.* This Maxim is falſe; but when a man endeavours to convert it into a proof of a Crime of State, he deſerves to be turned to ridicule yet more than the Author, of whom I am ſpeaking, was in the *Cabale chimerique*. Mr. Daillé, and his Book *de Uſu Patrum*, were there cited, among other inſtances, to prove that the firſt Book which a man publiſhes is ſometimes a finiſhed piece.

[*I*] *He would not have conteſted with the Biſhop of Meaux the principle of the Hiſtory of the Variations.*] The principle I am ſpeaking of is this: *The Catholic Truth proceeding from God receives its perfection immediately; but Hereſy, the weak production of human wit, cannot be made up of any other than ill-matched pieces.* The Author of *the Paſtoral Letters* pretends (38) that this is arguing like a Heathen, as *the greateſt enemy of the Chriſtian Religion* would do, *and that it is ſuppoſing of facts which cannot be advanced but by the moſt ignorant of all men:* ſo that one is tempted to believe the Biſhop of Meaux never caſt his eyes on the Writings of the *Fathers of the four firſt Centuries*, ſince it is impoſſible *that a learned man could ſhew ſuch profound ignorance.* There appeared a Writing (39) towards the end of the year 1688, wherein it is obſerved (40) that theſe abuſes fall no leſs on Mr. Daillé than on the Biſhop of Meaux, *who ſeems to have copied his Maxim from the firſt lines of one of the beſt of Mr. Daillé's Works.* And indeed, that Miniſter, in the very beginning of his Reply to Father Adam, lays down the principle of the Biſhop of Meaux. See the *Anſwer of the faithful who are captives in Babylon* to the Paſtoral Letter of the firſt of November 1694: you will find there (41) the words of Mr. Daillé, and the declaration which thoſe faithful make, that they ſtick to that principle, notwithſtanding the invectives of the Author of the Paſtoral Letters. This Anſwer is dated from Orleans the 15th of January 1695.

(29) *Biblioth. Choiſie*, pag. 2.

(30) Matthew Scrivener, *in Apologia pro S. Eccleſiæ Patribus adverſus Jo. Dallæum*, printed at London, 1672.

(31) See his Preface.

(32) Jo. Mettayer, *Epiſt. Dedicat. Tractatus* de Uſu Patrum.

(33) Pag. 14.

(34) Scriven. *in præfat.*

(35) *Sibi aliquando fuiſſe in animo contrario ſcripto Dallæum refellere, ſed re maturius expenſa nihil in Dallæano opere ſua dignum opera repertum.* Idem, ibid.

(36) Cottiby, *Replique à Mr. Daillé*, pag. 245.

(37) Pag. m. 209.

(38) See the *Paſtoral Letter* of the 15th of Nov. 1688.

(39) Intitled, *Réponſe d'un nouveau Converti à la Lettre d'un Refugié pour ſervir d'Addition au Livre de Dom Denys de Ste. Marthe.*

(40) Pag. 9.

(41) Pag. 5.

his other Works. He declared ſtrenuouſly for Univerſal Grace, and wrote againſt a Profeſſor of Leyden, the Antagoniſt of Mr. Amyraut (*l*). He intitled his Book, *An Apology for the Synods of Alençon and Charenton* (*m*). This Work rekindled the War among the Proteſtant Divines. Mr. Daillé endeavoured to clear himſelf, by ſaying that his Writing had been publiſhed without his knowledge; but notwithſtanding he anſwered a Profeſſor of Groningen, who had written againſt him, with all the ſharpneſs imaginable. The Profeſſor (*n*) failed not to reply; and though the conſequences of this quarrel did not laſt long [*K*], yet they produced what conſtantly happens in like caſes, I mean that the public thereby came to the knowledge of ſeveral little adventures which injure Mr. Daillé's memory [*L*], whether they be true or falſe: for there are but too many Readers who, finding how difficult it is to diſtinguiſh truth from falſhood, chuſe rather to believe what they find in the Book of a famous man. It were to be wiſhed that the Diſputes concerning Univerſaliſm and Particulariſm had been looked upon in thoſe days as

(*l*) Frederic Spanheim.

(*m*) It is a Latin Work, and was printed at Amſterdam, in 1655.

(*n*) It was *Samuel des Marêts* (Mareſius).

[*K*] *The conſequence of this quarrel between him and Des Marets did not laſt long.*] "The diſpute between "Mr. Des Marets and the Author of the Apology "was ſoon extinguiſhed. And as they had till that "time lived in good friendſhip, there was no great "difficulty in reconciling them: the agreement was "afterwards confirmed by an interview at the *Hôtel* "*de Turenne*, where they embraced as brothers; and "they viſited each other during Mr. Des Marets ſtay "in Paris, whither his occaſions had called him (42)."

(42) *Vie de Mr. Daillé*, pag. 26.

[*L*] *The Public thereby came to the knowledge of ſeveral little adventures which injury the memory of Mr. Daillé.*] Read the *Prolegomena* of Mr. Des Marets, and you will there find a long ſeries of artifices imployed by Mr. Daillé to excuſe his printing of his Book. The Walloon Synod made a great noiſe againſt that Book, and wrote their complaints concerning it to the Synod of the Iſle of France. They alledged that the title of that Work had been fraudulently ſuppreſſed till after its publication; that that Title was injurious and ſcandalous; that the Walloon Churches had been extremely offended at it; that they thought the Churches of France had yet more reaſon to be offended; and that Mr. Daillé's honour viſibly ſuffered by it, ſince that Title had been put to his Book contrary to his intention. This ſhewed that Mr. Daillé had written, or cauſed ſome other to write, to Holland, that the Title of his Book was none of his, and that he diſapproved it: and yet the anſwer which the Synod of the Iſle of France returned to the Walloon Synod declares, that excepting the name of Mr. Spanheim, the reſt of the Title was that of Mr. Daillé's Original, and that Mr. Daillé had fully ſatisfied the Aſſembly by explaining himſelf to them concerning thoſe matters (43). This was plainly to impoſe both on the Walloon Synod, and on the Synod of the Iſle of France; for the ground of the offence was not the inſerting Mr. Spanheim's name in the Title, but the intitling of the Work, *An Apology for the Synods of Alençon and Charenton*. This very plainly appears from the Walloon Synod's Letter. As Mr. Daillé, therefore, preſided in the Synod of the Iſle of France, and cauſed their Anſwer to be drawn up according to his own fancy (44), it was he who impoſed on the two Synods. *Dallæum hac in parte ſuæ Synodo impoſuiſſe, idque parum & prudenter & pudenter luce meridianâ clarius poſſim demonſtrare; non adoptando priorem partem tituli alteram omnino ſuam facit: qui enim, &c.* If Mr. Daillé, therefore, made uſe of falſe evaſions to clear himſelf with regard to the Title, he made uſe of them in a yet more extraordinary manner to excuſe himſelf with regard to the impreſſion. Mr. Des Marets clearly proves that Mr. Daillé's excuſes, and thoſe of Blondel, and the reſt, compared together, mutually deſtroy one another; and, in a word, that to cover the firſt lie, there was a neceſſity of forging ſeveral others. I aſſert that this does wrong to a great man's memory: for a great number of people, eſpecially in the remote parts of the kingdom, know theſe Gentlemen of Charenton no otherwiſe than by their Books of devotion and controverſy. They imagine them to be the lively images of the Apoſtles, who would not for all the world make uſe of any artifices or diſſimulation. Therefore when they are ſhewed a Monſr. Daillé who deceives two Synods at the ſame time, who gets Letters drawn up as he thinks fit in a Synod of which he is Moderator, who accumulates ſubterfuge on ſubterfuge to elude the complaints brought againſt his conduct, they muſt neceſſarily loſe a great part of the reſpect and veneration which they had conceived for him; and if this is not the conſequence, it is rather becauſe one meets with ſtupid ſouls, than becauſe the thing is in itſelf incapable of producing that effect. It is certain that diſputes wherein a Writer unravels, as Mr. Des Marets does here, the artifices of thoſe who have great credit in Aſſemblies, their artifice, I ſay, in getting what they deſire inſerted in the Letters and Acts of thoſe Aſſemblies, are a ſort of reading which muſt needs give great ſcandal. But this is not all. You will find in the ſame *Prolegomena*, that when Mr. Daillé ſaw the Cenſure of this Work, he fell into a violent paſſion againſt Monſr. Des Marets; that he ſpread his thundering menaces in all places, and entred into a confederacy with Curcellæus, an Arminian Profeſſor, whereby that Profeſſor engaged to fall on Monſr. Des Marets on one ſide, while Monſr. Daillé attacked him on the other. *Dallæus inſtar Tigrorum, qui dicuntur in rabiem agi ad pulſum tympanorum, ita efferbuit ad iſtius Opuſculi conſpectum, ac ſi tres illæ Exercitationes in tres Furias abiiſſent, quæ verbere ſurdo ipſum interdiu noctuque exagitarent; nam illicò cæpit dira quæque mihi minitari, & hinc inde ad amicos ſcriptitando, in me evomere quicquid ipſi ſplendida ſua bilis ſuggerebat, reſponſionem eam minatus quâ me pro merito depecteret . . . . primum ex æſtu politico pactus eſt cum Curcellæo, publico hoſte Eccleſiarum reformatarum, ut arma ſua conjungerent, & me communi impetu adorirentur* (45). i. e. "Daillé, like "Tigers which are ſaid to run mad at the beating of "drums, was as highly enraged at the ſight of this "little piece, as if thoſe three Exercitations had been "converted into three Furies, and had ſecretly laſhed "him day and night: for he immediately began to "threaten me with every thing that was terrible, and "to write circular Letters to his friends, wherein he "loaded me with all the abuſes his malice could in-"vent, menacing me with an Anſwer in which I "ſhould be handled as I deſerved. . . . He firſt politi-"cally leagued himſelf with Curcellæus, the profeſ-"ſed enemy of the Reformed Churches, to join their "forces and attack me at once." This wrath has been attributed to the preſumption which he had entertained, on ſeeing himſelf Miniſter of the capital City; as if a Paſtor of that Church ought to enjoy the privilege of a little Popedom. *Iniquius fert ſibi contradici & pro celebritate Eccleſiæ cui ſervit, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, ut de veteri Roma loquuntur Patres Concilii Chalcedonenſis* Can. penult. *Non ſolum τὰ πρωτεῖα ſibi deberi putat, ſed etiam τὸ πρωτεῖον; ac ſubinde Archiepiſcopaturit vel Papaturit* (46). He cites againſt him a paſſage in a Caſe which the Sieur de Fauquemberge, Miniſter of the Church of Senlis, had publiſhed againſt him; a paſſage which contains a fact full of inſupportable pride (47): it is aſſerted that ſeveral of his brethren complained of his haughtineſs, and in concluſion, that it is common for thoſe who ſee themſelves in a diſtinguiſhed poſt and applauded by flatterers,

(43) *Vos ſcitis, Domini honoratiſſimique fratres, id factum abſque ejus conſenſu ipſoque inſcio, & præter id quod ipſi præſcribitis in veſtra ad nos Epiſtola, ita ſe explicavit in hoc tœtu, ut plene nobis ſatisfactum fuerit*, Mareſ. *Prolegom. Epiciſ. Theolog.* edit. 1658, in 12mo.

(44) *In nuperis literis ſuæ Synodi Provincialis, cui præfuit, quas curavit fabricari pro ſuo lubitu.* Ibid.

(45) Idem, ibid.

(46) Idem, ibid.

(47) *Nolim omnibus iis credere, quæ de ipſo publice ſcripſit unus ex ſuis in eadem Provincia ſymmyſtis, Fauquembergius; aut illum eo feritatis proceſſiſſe, ut cùm ſibi narraretur hunc pro concione liberiùs notaſſe quendam ex Eccleſiæ ſuæ membris, qui dicebatur falſo modo uſus fuiſſe, ſtatim eum inauditum damnaverit, nec ſolum cenſurâ dignum pronunciaverit, ſed etiam in hanc tyrannicam vocem proruperit,* Il lui faut bailler les eſtrivieres, du haut en bas: *quo atrocius & contumelioſius, ut norunt qui Gallicè norunt, (ſic enim agitur demum cum vilſſimis mancipiis,) nihil à Verbi Divino Miniſtro, de ſuo fratre in eadem dignitate conſtituto, dici poteſt.* Idem ibid. i. e. "I would not give credit to all that Fauquemberge, one "of his own fraternity in the ſame Province has publiſhed of him; or believe he ar-"rived at ſuch a pitch of inſolence, that when he was told that the aforeſaid Miniſter "had in his Sermon a little too freely cenſured one of the members of his Church, "who was reported to have uſed falſe meaſures, he ſhould immediately condemn him "unheard, and not only pronounce him worthy of cenſure, but break out into this "tyrannical expreſſion, *He ſhould have the Baſtinado from head to foot*: than which "nothing more barbarous or contumelious could be ſpoken by a Miniſter of God's "Word of a Brother of his own Order; for thus are the vileſt Slaves treated."

as they are at preſent [*M*]. Mr. Daillé had a great ſhare in the eſteem of Balzac [*N*]: he died at Paris the 15th of April 1670, leaving a ſon of whom I ſhall ſpeak in the Remarks (*o*). One cannot ſufficiently admire the knavery of the Miſſionaries, with regard to a paſſage of Mr. Daillé concerning the taking away the Cup from the Laity [*O*].

(*o*) In the Remark [*F*].

terers, to have their heads turned. They cannot bear to be contradicted in ſuch a ſtation. *Ut dudum eſt quod φιλοπρωτεύει, nec priſtinæ ferulæ memoriam penitus depoſuit; ita afflatus typho ſæculi paulatim aſſuevit καταξιοῦν τῶν κλήρων, ut multi ſint ejuſdem ſecum ordinis in Gallia, qui majorem moderationem, & nimis ſublimium ſpirituum aliquam repreſſionem, in ipſo deſiderent. Verùm id ſolet iis evenire qui in loco celſiore conſiſtunt, ut facile tententur vertigine, & aliorum blandimentis delinîti, ſibi quid ſumant de Phariſæorum ſupercilio, quod poſtea tonſoris novaculam non vult admittere* (48). i. e. "As he has for ſome time aſpired to primacy, and "has not yet quite forgotten his having been a pe- "dagogue, he is ſo puffed up with worldly arrogance, "and has accuſtomed himſelf to lord it over the Clergy "in ſuch a manner, that many of his own order in "France wiſh he had more moderation, and that he "would curb his high ſpirit a little. But it frequent- "ly happens to thoſe who are placed in a high ſtati- "on, that they eaſily grow dizzy, and being elated "with the applauſe of others, contract ſomething of "the Phariſaical pride, which will not bear humilia- "tion."

(48) Idem, ibid.

It is certain theſe things are enough to leſſen the eſteem which the people had conceived for Mr. Daillé. In moſt of the provinces of France he was no otherwiſe known than by a great number of Sermons, full of excellent morality, and edifying piety, and by ſome Books of Controverſy, wherein zeal for the truth, moderation, and judgment ſhine no leſs than learning. When people are acquainted only with the bright ſide of a man's character, they have the higheſt veneration for him, becauſe they are prepoſſeſſed by this favourable opinion, that his life does not give the lie to his doctrine; and conſequently great abatements are to be made, if we hear that a perſon who preaches up humility, and the forgiving of injuries to others, is himſelf puffed up with pride, cannot bear to be refuted, and horribly abuſes his Cenſurers. It is doubtleſs a great misfortune for ſuch men as Mr. Daillé, to engage in perſonal diſputes: it ſeems as if their evil Genius laid wait for them there with his moſt dangerous ſnares. They grow hot, and in their paſſion diſcover more of their defects in a month, than they had been able to conceal in twenty years. The worſt is, that their adverſary reveals whatever may tend to diſhonour them, and publiſhes a hundred things which would have otherwiſe remained unknown. Let the reader remember the clauſe which I have inſerted in the Text of this Article, *whether they be true or falſe*. I decide nothing here as to the fact: nor do I advance any thing but what is to be found in a public Work.

[*M*] *It were to be wiſhed that the Diſputes concerning Univerſaliſm and Particulariſm had been looked upon in thoſe days as they are at preſent.*] We have ſeen that the Walloon Synod mightily beſtirred themſelves againſt Mr. Daillé's Book, and made heavy complaints of it to the Synod of the Iſle of France. They found matter of great ſcandal in the very Title; *An Apology for the Synods of Alençon and Charenton*. Whence comes it that the Walloon Synod, who drew up a form of ſubſcription in the year 1686, for the Miniſters who came from France, did not inform themſelves whether they were for univerſal or particular Grace? Had this doctrine changed its nature ſince the printing of Mr. Daillé's Book? This is no very difficult queſtion. There needs no more to ſolve it than to call to mind that all thoſe who had been at the head of parties, either in France, or in Holland, had been dead a long time. If Peter du Moulin, Andrew Rivet, Frederic Spanheim, Samuel Des Marets, or Moſes Amyraut, had been alive in the year 1686, the Diſputes concerning Univerſal Grace would have been reckoned very important; but, as they had been for a long time unable to communicate to others the ſpirit which animated them, the waters which had overflowed were returned into their channel, flowing in a gentle and quiet ſtream, and people then judged better of the nature of things. How many fewer ſins and ſcandals would there have been in the world, if thoſe waters had never overflowed their banks (49)?

(49) See the Remark [*E*] of the Article AMYRAULT.

[*N*] *He had a great ſhare in the eſteem of Balzac.*] It was Monſr. Conrart who procured Mr. Daillé this acquaintance. So early as the year 1639 they wrote Letters to one another. We find among the ſelect Letters of Balzac an Anſwer which he ſent to Mr. Daillé the 24th of December 1639 (50). Mr. Daillé is frequently mentioned in Mr. de Balzac's Letters to Mr. Conrart (51), and almoſt always with ſtudied encomiums. See the X Letter of the III Book, wherein a Sermon of Mr. Daillé's is praiſed to the ſky. In the XVI Letter of the IV Book, Balzac ſpeaks of a viſit he had received from him, and complains in the moſt obliging manner that it had laſted but two hours. This is an encomium on our Miniſter which does him a great deal of honour. Mr. Daillé went to ſee Mr. de Balzac in 1653, during the journey which I have ſpoken of above (52). This appears from the date of the XVI Letter of the IV Book. Here follows ſomething which teſtifies the friendſhip there was between Meſſrs. Daillé and Conrart. "The Friday after this "his laſt Sermon (53), he only went abroad to pay "a viſit in the neighbourhood to the illuſtrious Mr. "Conrart his intimate friend, who was a man per- "fectly after his own heart, whoſe charming conver- "ſation made one of the chief delights of his life, "and in whoſe affection he might juſtly glory; there "never having been a more ſtrict or more indiſſoluble "friendſhip than that which always continued between "them from their firſt acquaintance. He ſeemed to "have a deſire to take leave of this dear friend; and, "as if he had ſome ſore knowledge that this would "be their laſt farewel, his viſit was longer than uſual, "and he did not retire till after a converſation of "two hours, which was the moſt agreeable in the "world (54)."

(50) It is the 13th of the 1ſt Book of the 2d part.

(51) See the 1ſt *Letter* of the 1ſt Book, pag. 26, of the Dutch Edition of 1659; and alſo the 8th *Letter* of the 2d Book, pag. 107. See likewiſe pag. 249.

(52) In the Remark [*F*].

(53) That is, the *Sermon* which he preached on Thurſday the 10th of April 1670. It has been printed with the *Abridgment of his Life*.

(54) *Abrégé de la Vie de Mr. Daillé*, pag. 47.

[*O*] *One cannot ſufficiently admire the knavery of the Miſſionaries, with regard to a paſſage of Mr. Daillé concerning the taking away the Cup from the Laity.*] They have ſaid, and repeated it a hundred times, that Mr. Daillé had acknowledged (55) that the taking away the Cup was of little or no importance: they have repeated it, I ſay, on all occaſions, tho' they have been perpetually anſwered that Mr. Daillé ſpoke not of the taking away the Cup, but of the reaſons which had induced the Church of Rome to take it away. See the Letter (56) which he wrote to Mr. de Langle, Miniſter of Roan, who had very well expoſed this equivocation in a printed Sermon.

(55) In his *Apology for the Reformed Churches*.

(56) It is dated the 1ſt of March 1655, and printed with two *Sermons of Mr. de Langle on the 1ſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, chap. x. ver. 32.*

DALMATIN (GEORGE) a Lutheran Miniſter at Laubech in Carniola in the ſixteenth Century, tranſlated the whole Bible into the Sclavonian tongue, and publiſhed his Verſion at Wittemberg (*a*). This Edition had not been long publiſhed, when the Epiſtle Dedicatory which informs me of this fact was dated; and it bears date the 28th of March 1586. Calviſius (*b*) ſays this Verſion of the Bible was printed in the year 1584 (*c*), and that Adam Bochoritz was concerned in it with Dalmatin. The latter had ſtudied at Tubingen, in the College where the Duke of Wirtembergh maintained a certain number of ſcholars (*d*).

(*a*) Philipp. Hailbrunnerus, *Epiſt. Dedic.* Comment. in Jeremiam.

(*b*) *Ad ann.* 1584.

(*c*) It muſt therefore be diſtinguiſhed from that which, according to the Oxford Catalogue, at the word *Biblia*, was printed *Oſtrobiæ*, in the year 1581.

(*d*) Hailbrunn. *Epiſt. Ded.* Com. in Jerem.

(*a*) This Article was communicated by Mr. DE BRESLER.

DALMATIN (*a*) (GEORGE) Maſter of Arts, a Lutheran Miniſter in upper Carniola, was an able, expeditious, active, and learned man. In the year 1568 he tranſlated Luther's

Luther's German Bible into the Sclavonian or Carniolic tongue: and as that tongue is ſpoken in divers places, as in Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, the States of thoſe Countries concluded that the aforeſaid Bible ſhould be printed in that language. Wherefore a calculation was made of the expence with a Printer of Laybach (b) [A]. But the Archduke Charles of Auſtria, being informed of it, in the year 1580 forbad the ſaid Printer to print the aforementioned Bible. However, the States of the Country, reſolving to get it printed elſewhere, ſent George Dalmatin for that purpoſe to Gratz, there to take upon him the Correction and Reviſal of this Bible. But it was found proper to have it reviſed at Laybach, which was done accordingly [B]. And as it might be eaſily concluded that the Impreſſion of this Bible would not be permitted in the Dominions of Auſtria, on the 10th of April 1583 they ſent the ſaid Dalmatin and Adam Bohoritſch [C] to Wittembergh, with a recommendation to the Elector of Saxony, where the Impreſſion was begun [D] on the 28th of May 1583, and finiſhed in ſix months; ſo that the whole Work was compleated by New-year's day 1584 [E]. Dalmatin dedicated it to the States of Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, and returned thence to his own country with his companion and his printed Copies, after having been at Dreſden to thank the Elector for his protection. This Tranſlation is ſtill uſed in Carniola among the Eccleſiaſtics, who have a permiſſion to read it, that they may properly pronounce the paſſages of Holy Scripture according to the Carniolic Tongue, becauſe there is no other Sclavonic Verſion [F]; for as much as the Work of Primus Truber [G] is likewiſe the production of a Lutheran, and has not, as it is ſaid, been ſo much as publiſhed for the public good. Dalmatin was afterwards

(b) Valvaſor, *la Glorie du Duché de Carniole*, lib. 6. chap. 11. num. 11. pag. 348.

[A] *With a Printer &c.*] This Printer's name was John Manlius; and he had been brought into that country by Primus Truber, about the year 1561. He was the firſt who ſet up a Printing-houſe at Laybach, and began to print the Sclavonian tongue in Latin Letters, which the ſaid Primus Truber had invented, whereas before they wrote in Glaguelitic or Cyrillic characters (1).

(1) Valvaſor, *Glorie du Duché de Carniole*, pag. 340.

[B] *Was done accordingly.*] On the 24th of Auguſt in the year 1581, the following Divines aſſembled for this purpoſe at Laybach, who were well verſed in the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Sclavonian tongues, and were deputed, each from his reſpective country, to reviſe this Work, viz. Jeremiah Hamburger, Doctor of Divinity, Paſtor and Superintendant of the Lutheran Churches of Gratz, in Styria; Bernard Steiner, Paſtor at Clagenfurt, in Carinthia; and George Dalmatin the Tranſlator, with Chriſtopher Spindler, Paſtor and Superintendant of the Church of Laybach, Adam Bohoritſch, John Schweiger, and Felician Truber of Carniola (2).

(2) Ibid. pag. 348.

[C] *Adam Bohoritſch*] As it is uſually written in German, or Bohorizh according to the Orthography of his own country. He was a native of Carniola, and Evangelic Rector at Laybach. While he reſided at Wittembergh, he publiſhed a Book under the Title of *Arcticæ Horulæ ſucceſſivæ de Latino-Carniolana Literatura, ad Latinæ Linguæ analogiam accommodata, unde Moſchoviticæ, Ruthenicæ, Polonicæ, Boëmicæ, Luſaticæ Linguæ cum Dalmatica & Croatica cognatio facile deprehenditur. Witembergæ* 1584. This Book which ſerves for a Grammar, was compoſed with great application, and an Epiſtle Dedicatory was prefixed to it *ad Illuſtrium Styriæ, Carinthiæ, & Carniolæ Procerum filios, univerſi equeſtris ordinis ingenuam juventutem. Witem. Cal. Jan.* 1584 (3).

(3) Ibid.

[D] *The Impreſſion was begun.*] They had agreed with Samuel Seelfiſch, Bookſeller at Wittembergh, that he ſhould print fifteen hundred Copies of it, each Copy to contain two hundred and eighty ſheets of the largeſt paper, on a fine character, with wooden cuts. For which the States of Carniola were to pay after the rate of twenty florins for every bale of five hundred ſheets. The expences of the impreſſion of this Bible amounted to about eight thouſand florins: towards which the States of Styria gave a thouſand florins, thoſe of Carinthia nine hundred, and the Evangelic States of Carniola ſix thouſand one hundred (4).

(4) Ibid.

[E] *In* 1584.] Under the Title of *Biblia tu je uſe ſuetu piſmu, ſtariga inu noviga Teſtamenta Slovenſki, tolmazhena Skuſi Juria Dalmatina &c.* i. e. "The "Bible, or the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New "Teſtament, tranſlated into the Sclavonian tongue, "by George Dalmatin," printed at Wittembergh in the Electorate of Saxony, by the heirs of John Krafft 1584 (5).

(5) Ibid.

[F] *Sclavonian Verſion.*] Stephen Gerlach (6) indeed mentions, that in the month of June 1578 there was found at Vedreno, a village of Bulgaria on the frontiers of Thrace, the Bible in the Sclavonian or Illyrian tongue, at the houſe of an Eccleſiaſtic of that place; but in all likelihood it is neither printed in Latin Characters, nor agrees in Dialect with that which I have ſpoken of above.

(6) In the *Relation of his Journey to Turky.*

[G] *Primus Truber.*] Primus Truber deſerves to have a more ample account given of him. He was firſt a Canon of Laybach, and began in the year 1531 to preach publickly in the Cathedral of that City Luther's doctrine concerning the two kinds in the Euchariſt, and to approve the marriage of Prieſts; ſo that he embraced Luther's party, and left Carniola to retire into the Empire, where the town of Kempſon choſe him for their Paſtor. He preached there for fourteen years, and deſerved well of his country by his Tranſlations. For he tranſlated into the Carniolan tongue, in Latin Characters, not only, 1, The Goſpels, according to the Verſion of Luther, 2, with his Catechiſm, but alſo 3, the whole New Teſtament, and 4, the Pſalms of David in the year 1553. At length the States of Carniola recalled him home. He tranſlated alſo into his mother tongue the Confeſſion of Augſburgh, and Luther's German Sermons, whoſe laſt Treatiſe was printed at Tubingen. Herman Fabricius Moſemannus (7) ſpeaks of Truber's Tranſlation, with the addition of ſome other circumſtances, as follows. "John Ungnad Baron of Sonneck (8) in "Croatia, at the time of the Augſburgh Confeſſion, "cauſed the Bible to be tranſlated into the Sclavonian "language at Aurach in the Dutchy of Wirtembergh. "In this tranſlation he employed three learned Sclavonians; the firſt was named Primus Truber, the "ſecond Anthony Dalmata, and the third Stephen "Conſul. But theſe Books were ſeized on the road, "and are ſtill ſhut up in Caſks at Newſtad in Auſtria. "The Character is altogether ſingular, almoſt reſembling an Aſiatic or Syriac Character, with pretty "large and ſquare letters. A Copy of this Bible may "be ſeen in the Library of the Landgrave of Heſſe. "There are alſo ſome copies of it to be met with "in Sclavonia." *Thus far Fabricius.* Theſe Bibles are without doubt printed in Cyrillic Characters. But as to Truber, he was baniſhed Carniola a ſecond time, and died in the year 1586, according to Martin Zeiler (9). The ſame year he ſubſcribed himſelf as follows, in a Letter he wrote to the Deputies of Carniola, which Subſcription contains his whole life. "Primus Truber, formerly Canon in ordinary, cal-"led, and confirmed at Laybach, Paſtor at Lack, "at Tuffer near Ratſchach, and at St. Bartholomew's "field, Chaplain at S. Maximilian of Cilly, Scla-"vonian Preacher at Trieſte, and after the firſt per-"ſecution Preacher at Roſemburgh on the Tauber, "Paſtor at Kempten and at Aurais, afterwards "Preacher to the States of Carniola, and at Rubia "in the County of Goergh, and after the ſecond "Perſecution Paſtor at Cauffen, and now at Deredin-"gen near Tubingen (10)."

(7) In the *Abridgment of the Hiſtory of the World.*

(8) He was the Emperor's Governor in Styria, and General of the three Provinces of Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, and died in the year 1564, on the 27th of December, aged 71. Valvaſor, *la Glorie du Duché de Carniole*, liv. 12. chap. 9. pag. 523 & liv. 15. chap. 20. p. 467. Mat. Dreſſerus: he wrote a *Hiſtory of the Family of Ungnad*, and principally of this John of Ungnad, Leipſic 1602, in 4to.

(9) In his *Epiſtles.*

(10) Valvaſor, *Glorie du Duché de Carniole*, pag. 348.

afterwards put in poſſeſſion of the Cure of St. Khaziam [*H*] by Chriſtopher Baron of Aurſpergh in the year 1585. And though the Catholics had given him an ignominious name [*I*], and had baniſhed him in 1598, the Baron of Aurſpergh nevertheleſs kept him concealed [*K*] in his houſe.

[*H*] *Of S. Khaziam,*] Or S. Catiani near Aurſpergh, in the Dioceſe of the Patriarch of Aquileia. The Patriarch Gregory, in the year 1620, gave the right of preſentation with all the dependencies of that Benefice to Gebhard of Aurſpergh (11).

(11) Ibid. lib. 8. pag. 729.

[*I*] *Given him an ignominious name.*] They called him *Jure Kobila*, that is, George *Mare*. But this was done by miſtake, becauſe another Lutheran Miniſter, named George Tereſchith, was nick-named Jure Kobila, on account of a Mare which had been given him: for *Jure* in the Carniolan tongue ſignifies *George*, and *Kobila* a *Mare*. Thence it has happened that ſeveral Proteſtants have called our Dalmatin *Jure Kobila* through ignorance (12).

(12) Ibid. pag. 349.

[*K*] *Concealed in his houſe,*] That is, in a vault under the Stable, before the Caſtle; for which reaſon this private vault is to this day called *the Hole of the Preacher Jure Kobila* (13).

(13) Ibid. pag. 349, & 729.

DAMASCENUS (JOHN), one of the moſt illuſtrious Fathers of the lower Empire, flouriſhed in the eighth Century [*A*]. He was born at Damaſcus, where his father, tho' a good Chriſtian † [*B*], had the place of Counſellor of State to the Saracen Chalif. He was a very rich and a very charitable man, and principally delighted in redeeming of Captives. He one day redeemed a very able man named Coſmas, who had been taken at Sea, and made him Tutor to his only ſon. The child made a great progreſs under this excellent Tutor, as well in the ſciences as in zeal for Religion. He became extremely zealous for Images, and diſperſed Letters through the Empire, which wonderfully ſupported the cauſe againſt the efforts of the Emperor Leo Iſauricus, a great enemy to Images. They ſay that this Prince, burning with deſire to revenge himſelf on John Damaſcenus, who then filled the poſt of Counſellor of State to the Chalif, which his father had held before him, made uſe of a forged Letter [*C*] with ſuch ſucceſs, that it occaſioned the Chalif to order his Counſellor's hand to be ſtruck off. It is ſaid that John Damaſcenus, having recommended himſelf to the prayers of the bleſſed Virgin, recovered his hand, and publickly demonſtrated his innocence. The Miniſter who anſwered Father Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm, rejected this ſtory with contempt as an impertinent fable; and not contented with that, made uſe of an argument which, properly ſpeaking, is blaſphemy [*D*]. The imagination of Bzovius is a very pleaſant one: he has

[† His name was Mansûr, and he is ſuppoſed to be the perſon who betrayed Damaſcus to the Saracens. *See* Aſſeman. *Bibl. Orient.* tom. 2. pag. 97. Eutych. *Annal.* tom. 2. pag. 272, &c. ADD. REM.]

[*A*] *He flouriſhed in the eighth Century.*] Alphonſus de Caſtro deſerves cenſure for two reaſons; ſince he has aſſerted (1) that according to Trithemius our John Damaſcenus ſhould be placed under the Empire of Theodoſius the younger, about the year 450. It is not true that Trithemius has ſaid this: he has copied Sigebertus, who ſpoke of the diſputes of John Damaſcenus againſt the Emperor Leo; this belongs to the year 730 (2). But tho' it were true that Trithemius was of that opinion, Alphonſus de Caſtro would not be acquitted; for he ought to have corrected him, and not have adopted his pretended ignorance. We ſhall preſently ſee ſuch another Anachroniſm.

(1) *In Libris adverſus Hæreſes, apud* Philippum Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſ.* tom. 1. pag. 557.

(2) It is 830 in F. Labbe, ibid.

[*B*] *His father was a good Chriſtian.*] John, Patriarch of Jeruſalem, having cauſed ſome inquiries to be made concerning the family of John Damaſcenus, found that his father and mother were Chriſtians, and that they had brought him up in the Chriſtian Faith. Whence it may be concluded that this Father of the Church was never converted from Judaiſm to Chriſtianity: for that could not have been without his having firſt renounced his Baptiſm and the Goſpel. But thoſe who have written his life ſay nothing like it, and it appears that he had always a very great attachment for the Goſpel, as it was then taught by the devout and the zealous; I principally mean the Monks, who were exceſſively fond of images. Wherefore an Author named Peter Galiſſard (3) has committed a double blunder, in ſaying that in the year 470 John Damaſcenus abjured Judaiſm, and embraced the Goſpel. The firſt blunder relates to his pretended converſion; the ſecond conſiſts in the time: for if this perſon was converted, or perverted, it could not be in the year 470, ſince he lived in the VIII Century.

(3) *In* Chronographia, *apud* Theophilum Raynaudum, *Hoploth.* Sect. 2. Serie 1, cap. 3, pag. m. 53.

(4) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. des Iconoclaſtes*, lib, 2. pag. m. 116.

[*C*] *Leo Iſauricus . . . made uſe of a forged Letter to ruin him.*] Some of the Letters which John Damaſcenus had written againſt the Iconoclaſts fell into the hands of Leo, who cauſed *the hand writing* of them *to be ſo well ſtudied by a Pen-man exceedingly well ſkilled in the art of counterfeiting and falſifying of hands, that it was impoſſible to diſtinguiſh the true from the falſe* (4). Thereupon he cauſed a Letter (5) to be written, wherein he pretended that John Damaſcenus exhorted him to cauſe ſome troops to advance towards Damaſcus, and promiſed him, as Governor of the place, to diſpoſe all things in ſuch a manner that the taking of it ſhould be infallible. He ſent this Letter to the Prince of the Saracens; and gloried very much in refuſing to take advantage of a traitor's perfidy, and having the generoſity to diſcover to the Chalif the treaſon of one of his ſubjects. The Chalif, without hearing the proteſtations of innocence which John Damaſcenus made, and without ſuffering him to diſcover Leo's artifice, *commanded that hand with which he ſuppoſed he had written ſo treaſonable a Letter, to be immediately ſtruck off, and ordered it to be publickly expoſed on a gibbet to the ſight of the whole city* (6). Damaſcenus, being retired to his houſe, petitioned the Chalif that his hand might be given him again; which was granted: he then proſtrated himſelf before an image of the Virgin, and *having applied his hand to the place where naturally it ſhould have been,* he beſought the Holy Virgin *to uſe her powerful interceſſion with her Son, that he would pleaſe to reſtore it, that he might continue to maintain the cauſe which he had hitherto ſo happily defended againſt the Iconoclaſts* (7). As he prayed he fell aſleep, and in a dream thought he ſaw the Holy Virgin, who aſſured him that his prayer was heard. *Whereupon awaking ſuddenly, he found his hand ſo perfectly reſtored that he had the free uſe of it as before, with a ſmall circle round his wriſt, which marked the place where he received the blow which had ſevered it from his arm, that it might not be ſaid that another, who had voluntarily ſubſtituted himſelf in his room, had undergone the puniſhment for him. The whole City . . . run the next morning to ſee this ſight. The Chalif, being acquainted with ſo ſurprizing a wonder, . . . would needs ſee him, and be convinced by his own eyes . . . he acknowledged his injuſtice and precipitation, and deteſted the infamous treachery of the Emperor* (8), and would have re-eſtabliſhed Damaſcenus in all his dignities; but he found him too firmly reſolved to become a ſolitary.

(5) You will find it at length with that of Leo in Father *Maimbourg's Hiſtory of the Iconoclaſts*, ibid. He quotes the *Life of John Damaſcenus* compoſed by *John, Patriarch of Jeruſalem.*

(6) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. des Iconoclaſtes*, liv. 2. pag. 122.

(7) Ibid. pag. 123.

(8) Ibid. pag. 124, 125.

[*D*] *A Miniſter . . . made uſe of an argument which, properly ſpeaking, is blaſphemy.*] It would be wrong to think it ſtrange that the Proteſtants ſhould not give credit to the miracle I have juſt related; for it is certain that a great number of Catholics do not believe it; and in the way the Writers on behalf of Images have compoſed their Hiſtories, they are only fit to render even what they truly relate, ſuſpected. Wherefore Monſr. Jurieu would have done nothing but what was reaſonable, if he had only rejected the cutting off and

has reckoned Damaſcenus among the Phyſicians who have been illuſtrious on account of their ſanctity [*E*]. There is more foundation to ſay, that he was the firſt, among the Greeks, who began to treat a ſubject according to the Scholaſtic method [*F*]. This appears principally in his four Books of the Orthodox Faith. He left the Court of the Saracen Prince after the miracle which I have mentioned, and ſhut himſelf up in the Monaſtery of S. Sabas at Jeruſalem, where the Monk who was choſen for his ſpiritual director reſtoring of John Damaſcenus's hand, as a Monkiſh tale. His reflection on the lightneſs of the puniſhment is a very good one; a Prince would not be ſatisfied with cutting off the hand of a Governor who had promiſed to deliver a place to his enemy. But when that Miniſter adds, that ſince the Saracens were not converted at the ſight of ſuch a miracle, and ſince the City of Damaſcus did not renounce Mahometiſm, it muſt be concluded that what has been ſaid of John Damaſcenus is falſe, he muſt give me leave to tell him that he advances an impiety. *The Saracens of thoſe days were very hard of belief*, ſays he (9); *for I am perſuaded that if a like miracle were wrought in Mecca, the inhabitants would immediately become Chriſtians.* Is not this furniſhing the Infidels with weapons to refute all the miracles of Moſes and Jeſus Chriſt? *The Egyptians and the Jews of thoſe days were very hard of belief*, might one ſay; *if ſuch miracles had been wrought in Athens or in Rome, the inhabitants would immediately have become Jews, and afterwards Chriſtians.* It is a little ſurprizing, that a Divine ſhould ſuffer himſelf to be dazzled by a reaſon which is full as ſtrong againſt the truth of the Goſpel, as againſt the fables of the monks: but when one reflects on the power which is uſurped over people of a lively imagination by the firſt thoughts which come into their head, it is no great wonder that the Miniſter I am ſpeaking of has argued in the manner he has done. This however is very aſtoniſhing, that there ſhould be but one man who appears to have taken notice of this dangerous doctrine; and it is remarkable that nobody ſeems to have perceived that the public had been made acquainted with it. It is alſo very remarkable that Mr. Jurieu, who might eaſily have ſaved his orthodoxy, by declaring that he had advanced this unwarily, and without foreſeeing the conſequences of it; but that being become ſenſible of its venom, ſince he had been cenſured on that account, he diſavows this pernicious maxim; it is, I ſay, very remarkable that that Writer has neglected this ſhort and eaſy way of making his innocence appear, and has rather choſen, by ſaying nothing, to furniſh the world with a lawful pretext to accuſe him of perſiſting in the ſame perſuaſion, *viz.* that if at this day a hand which had been cut off ſhould be reſtored at Mecca, that City would immediately become Chriſtian. *Nothing more impious can be advanced*, they are the words of the perſon who has informed againſt ſome of Mr. Jurieu's errors (10): *for it is plainly to declare in the face of heaven and earth, that he is perſuaded that all the miracles of Moſes, of Jeſus Chriſt, and of his Apoſtles, are fables, and conſequently that the Scripture of the Old and New Teſtament is no more than a Romance and a Legend. Who can hear this without horror? And would not Judaiſm and Chriſtianity be utterly overthrown by ſuch an argument? If Father Maimbourg's miracle is falſe, becauſe the whole city of Damaſcus was not converted, it thence follows, will Infidels ſay, that Moſes did no miracles in Egypt, that Jeſus Chriſt did none in Judæa, and that St. Peter did not make the cripple walk who aſked alms of him in the midſt of Jeruſalem; for neither the Egyptians nor the Jews were converted.* Note that this cripple was carried every day to the gate of the Temple, and that afterwards *all the people* ſaw him walk, and knew him to be the ſame man who had been lame (11), and that he was acknowledged to be the ſame by the Magiſtrates (12); and yet Jeruſalem continued in the Jewiſh Religion. The Miracle of John Damaſcenus, as it is related, had nothing more ſignal than that of the lame man, and was not followed, as this was, by a pathetic exhortation.

(9) *Apologie pour les Reformat.* tom. 1. pag. 20.

(10) See the little Book intitled *Declaration de Mr. Bayle touchant un petit Ecrit qui vient de paroître ſous le Titre de* Courte Revue des Maximes de Morale, &c. pag. 15. It was printed in the year 1691.

(11) Acts iii. 9, 10, and 11.

(12) Acts iv. 14.

[*E*] *Bzovius has reckoned him among the Phyſicians who have been illuſtrious on account of their Sanctity.*] Bzovius, in the little Book which he has written concerning the Phyſicians who have been holy men, aſſerts Damaſcenus to be one of the number. The conformity there is between *Manſur* and *Meſue* was, as ſome think, the occaſion of this miſtake (13). John Damaſcenus was called *Manſur*, that is, *redeemed*. Conſtantine Copronymus, who hated him, called him *Manſer*, that is, *baſtard* (14). Bzovius might confound Manſur or Manſer with Meſue, and imagine John Manſur of Damaſcus to be the ſame with John Meſue, alſo of Damaſcus; and that, ſince the latter was a Phyſician, the other muſt neceſſarily have been ſo likewiſe. But this fault might eaſily have been avoided, if he had recollected that John Damaſcenus lived in the VIII Century, and that Meſue lived after the year 1140. William du Val (15) has adopted Bzovius's miſtake, as Bzovius adopted that of ſome other Authors. Take particular notice of what Geſner ſays: for having ſpoken of one John Damaſcenus a Monk and a Prieſt, Author of the IV Books of the Orthodox Faith, he cites a paſſage of Symphorian Champier, which imports that he was a learned Phyſician; *vir fuit in Medicinis doctus*; and one who for his learning and purity of life, was choſen Superior of a Monaſtery in Conſtantinople. Geſner afterwards ſpeaks of one John Damaſcenus ſurnamed Manſur, who, among other Works, wrote divers Parallels on the Scripture. He refutes thoſe who take this John Damaſcenus for Meſue, or ſuppoſe thoſe two perſons to have been contemporaries; he refutes them, I ſay, by a chronological argument: for Meſue, ſays he, is more modern than the other by ſeveral Centuries, having lived in the reign of Frederic Barbaroſſa, about the year 1163. He gives the Titles of the Books of John Meſue, and ſays they had been publiſhed not long before at Baſil, under the name of *Janus Damaſcenus*. He then ſpeaks of one John Damaſcenus Author of the Books of the Orthodox Faith, and of the Parallels. Any one may perceive that this is confounding and multiplying Authors in a ſtrange manner. Tiraquellus has perplexed himſelf a little; for he places (16) one John Damaſcenus Manſur in the Catalogue of noble Phyſicians. The word *Manſur* proves his miſtake; becauſe it prevents one from ſaying that he intended to ſpeak only of John Meſue, whoſe Phyſical Works were printed at Baſil under the name of Janus Damaſcenus..

(13) *See* Theophilus Raynaud, *de malis ac bonis Libris*, Partit. 1, Erotemate X, num. 214. pagm. 137.

(14) Idem, *Hoplotheca*, pag. 53.

(15) In *Hiſtoria Monogrammæ Sti Medicorum*, apud *Th. Raynaud. de malis ac bonis Libris*, pag. 138.

(16) *In Opere de Nobilitate*, apud *Theophil. Raynaud. Hoplath.* pag. 53.

[There were ſeveral Phyſical Writers named John Meſue, the eldeſt of whom was nearly contemporary with John Damaſcenus as will be obſerved elſewhere ‡. ADD. REM.]

‡ In the Article MESUE.

[*F*] *He was the firſt, among the Greeks, who began to treat a ſubject according to the ſcholaſtic method.*] Mr. Arnauld obſerves, that St. John of Damaſcus *was as it were the St. Thomas of the Greeks*, that *they regulated their opinions more by his judgment, than by that of any other Father* (17). It is ſo certain, adds he, *that St. John of Damaſcus has always been the rule of their Doctrine concerning the Euchariſt, that Euthymius, to repreſent the Doctrine of the Greek Church with reſpect to that myſtery againſt the hereſy of the Paulicians, only quotes the famous paſſage of St. Gregory Nyſſen in his Catecheſis, and a paſſage of S. John of Damaſcus where that error of the Stercoraniſts is formally rejected.* Monſr. Claude, in his Anſwer to Mr. Arnauld, grants him this principle: *It is certain*, ſays he (18), *that to judge well of the opinion of the modern Greeks, we muſt go back ſo far as* to John Damaſcenus. Some pages after (19), he explains that Author's opinion; which is not at all conformable to that of the Reformed, neither does it admit Tranſubſtantiation. It is an incomprehenſible piece of Jargon, and ſuch will eternally be the lot of thoſe who ſeek to explain the manner of Myſteries too particularly. The ſureſt way would be to keep to the moſt general expreſſions. There are ſome things the explication whereof ſerves only to increaſe their obſcurity: the greateſt Divines deſerve to be put in mind of the ſaying, *Ne ſutor ultra crepidam*, i. e. *Let not a Shoemaker go beyond his laſt*, conſidering the ſublimeneſs of certain doctrines.

(17) Arnauld, *Perpétuité défendue*, tom. 1. liv. 2. chap. 6. pag. 229. of the Bruſſels Edition, in 12mo.

(18) Claude, *Réponſe à la Perpétuité défendue*, liv. 2. chap. 13. pag. m. 497.

(19) Ibid. pag. 515, *& ſeq.*

afterwards put in poſſeſſion of the Cure of St. Khaziam [*H*] by Chriſtopher Baron of Aurſpergh in the year 1585. And though the Catholics had given him an ignominious name [*I*], and had baniſhed him in 1598, the Baron of Aurſpergh nevertheleſs kept him concealed [*K*] in his houſe.

[*H*] *Of S. Khaziam,*] Or S. Catiani near Aurſpergh, in the Dioceſe of the Patriarch of Aquileia. The Patriarch Gregory, in the year 1620, gave the right of preſentation with all the dependencies of that Benefice to Gebhard of Aurſpergh (11).

(11) Ibid. lib. 8. pag. 729.

[*I*] *Given him an ignominious name.*] They called him *Jure Kobila*, that is, George *Mare*. But this was done by miſtake, becauſe another Lutheran Miniſter, named George Tereſchith, was nick-named Jure Kobila, on account of a Mare which had been given him: for *Jure* in the Carniolan tongue ſignifies *George*, and *Kobila* a *Mare*. Thence it has happened that ſeveral Proteſtants have called our Dalmatin *Jure Kobila* through ignorance (12).

(12) Ibid. pag. 349.

[*K*] *Concealed in his houſe,*] That is, in a vault under the Stable, before the Caſtle; for which reaſon this private vault is to this day called *the Hole of the Preacher Jure Kobila* (13).

(13) Ibid. pag. 349, & 729.

DAMASCENUS (JOHN), one of the moſt illuſtrious Fathers of the lower Empire, flouriſhed in the eighth Century [*A*]. He was born at Damaſcus, where his father, tho' a good Chriſtian † [*B*], had the place of Counſellor of State to the Saracen Chalif. He was a very rich and a very charitable man, and principally delighted in redeeming of Captives. He one day redeemed a very able man named Coſmas, who had been taken at Sea, and made him Tutor to his only ſon. The child made a great progreſs under this excellent Tutor, as well in the ſciences as in zeal for Religion. He became extremely zealous for Images, and diſperſed Letters through the Empire, which wonderfully ſupported the cauſe againſt the efforts of the Emperor Leo Iſauricus, a great enemy to Images. They ſay that this Prince, burning with deſire to revenge himſelf on John Damaſcenus, who then filled the poſt of Counſellor of State to the Chalif, which his father had held before him, made uſe of a forged Letter [*C*] with ſuch ſucceſs, that it occaſioned the Chalif to order his Counſellor's hand to be ſtruck off. It is ſaid that John Damaſcenus, having recommended himſelf to the prayers of the bleſſed Virgin, recovered his hand, and publickly demonſtrated his innocence. The Miniſter who anſwered Father Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm, rejected this ſtory with contempt as an impertinent fable; and not contented with that, made uſe of an argument which, properly ſpeaking, is blaſphemy [*D*]. The imagination of Bzovius is a very pleaſant one: he has

[† His name was Mansûr, and he is ſuppoſed to be the perſon who betrayed Damaſcus to the Saracens. *See* Aſſeman. *Bibl. Orient.* tom. 2. pag. 97. Eutych. *Annal.* tom. 2. pag. 272, &c. ADD. REM.]

[*A*] *He flouriſhed in the eighth Century.*] Alphonſus de Caſtro deſerves cenſure for two reaſons; ſince he has aſſerted (1) that according to Trithemius our John Damaſcenus ſhould be placed under the Empire of Theodoſius the younger, about the year 450. It is not true that Trithemius has ſaid this: he has copied Sigebertus, who ſpoke of the diſputes of John Damaſcenus againſt the Emperor Leo; this belongs to the year 730 (2). But tho' it were true that Trithemius was of that opinion, Alphonſus de Caſtro would not be acquitted; for he ought to have corrected him, and not have adopted his pretended ignorance. We ſhall preſently ſee ſuch another Anachroniſm.

(1) *In Libris adverſus Hæreſes, apud* Philippum Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſ.* tom. 1. pag. 557.

(2) It is 830 in F. Labbe, ibid.

[*B*] *His father was a good Chriſtian.*] John, Patriarch of Jeruſalem, having cauſed ſome inquiries to be made concerning the family of John Damaſcenus, found that his father and mother were Chriſtians, and that they had brought him up in the Chriſtian Faith. Whence it may be concluded that this Father of the Church was never converted from Judaiſm to Chriſtianity: for that could not have been without his having firſt renounced his Baptiſm and the Goſpel. But thoſe who have written his life ſay nothing like it, and it appears that he had always a very great attachment for the Goſpel, as it was then taught by the devout and the zealous; I principally mean the Monks, who were exceſſively fond of images. Wherefore an Author named Peter Galiſſard (3) has committed a double blunder, in ſaying that in the year 470 John Damaſcenus abjured Judaiſm, and embraced the Goſpel. The firſt blunder relates to his pretended converſion; the ſecond conſiſts in the time: for if this perſon was converted, or perverted, it could not be in the year 470, ſince he lived in the VIII Century.

(3) *In* Chronographia, *apud* Theophilum Raynaudum, *Hoploth.* Sect. 2. Serie 1, cap. 3, pag. m. 53.

(4) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. des Iconoclaſtes*, lib, 2. pag. m. 116.

(5) You will find it at length with that of Leo in Father *Maimbourg's Hiſtory of the Iconoclaſts*, ibid. He quotes the *Life of John Damaſcenus* compoſed by *John, Patriarch of Jeruſalem.*

[*C*] *Leo Iſauricus . . . made uſe of a forged Letter to ruin him.*] Some of the Letters which John Damaſcenus had written againſt the Iconoclaſts fell into the hands of Leo, who cauſed *the hand writing* of them *to be ſo well ſtudied by a Pen-man exceedingly well ſkilled in the art of counterfeiting and falſifying of hands, that it was impoſſible to diſtinguiſh the true from the falſe* (4). Thereupon he cauſed a Letter (5) to be written, wherein he pretended that John Damaſcenus exhorted him to cauſe ſome troops to advance towards Damaſcus, and promiſed him, as Governor of the place, to diſpoſe all things in ſuch a manner that the taking of it ſhould be infallible. He ſent this Letter to the Prince of the Saracens; and gloried very much in refuſing to take advantage of a traitor's perfidy, and having the generoſity to diſcover to the Chalif the treaſon of one of his ſubjects. The Chalif, without hearing the proteſtations of innocence which John Damaſcenus made, and without ſuffering him to diſcover Leo's artifice, *commanded that hand with which he ſuppoſed he had written ſo treaſonable a Letter, to be immediately ſtruck off, and ordered it to be publickly expoſed on a gibbet to the ſight of the whole city* (6). Damaſcenus, being retired to his houſe, petitioned the Chalif that his hand might be given him again; which was granted: he then proſtrated himſelf before an image of the Virgin, and *having applied his hand to the place where naturally it ſhould have been,* he beſought the Holy Virgin *to uſe her powerful interceſſion with her Son, that he would pleaſe to reſtore it, that he might continue to maintain the cauſe which he had hitherto ſo happily defended againſt the Iconoclaſts* (7). As he prayed he fell aſleep, and in a dream thought he ſaw the Holy Virgin, who aſſured him that his prayer was heard. *Whereupon awaking ſuddenly, he found his hand ſo perfectly reſtored that he had the free uſe of it as before, with a ſmall circle round his wriſt, which marked the place where he received the blow which had ſevered it from his arm, that it might not be ſaid that another, who had voluntarily ſubſtituted himſelf in his room, had undergone the puniſhment for him. The whole City . . . run the next morning to ſee this ſight. The Chalif, being acquainted with ſo ſurprizing a wonder, . . . would needs ſee him, and be convinced by his own eyes . . . he acknowledged his injuſtice and precipitation, and deteſted the infamous treachery of the Emperor* (8), and would have re-eſtabliſhed Damaſcenus in all his dignities; but he found him too firmly reſolved to become a ſolitary.

(6) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. des Iconoclaſtes*, liv. 2. pag. 122.

(7) Ibid. pag. 123.

(8) Ibid. pag. 124, 125.

[*D*] *A Miniſter . . . made uſe of an argument which, properly ſpeaking, is blaſphemy.*] It would be wrong to think it ſtrange that the Proteſtants ſhould not give credit to the miracle I have juſt related; for it is certain that a great number of Catholics do not believe it; and in the way the Writers on behalf of Images have compoſed their Hiſtories, they are only fit to render even what they truly relate, ſuſpected. Wherefore Monſr. Jurieu would have done nothing but what was reaſonable, if he had only rejected the cutting off and

has reckoned Damaſcenus among the Phyſicians who have been illuſtrious on account of their ſanctity [*E*]. There is more foundation to ſay, that he was the firſt, among the Greeks, who began to treat a ſubject according to the Scholaſtic method [*F*]. This appears principally in his four Books of the Orthodox Faith. He left the Court of the Saracen Prince after the miracle which I have mentioned, and ſhut himſelf up in the Monaſtery of S. Sabas at Jeruſalem, where the Monk who was choſen for his ſpiritual director

reſtoring of John Damaſcenus's hand, as a Monkiſh tale. His reflection on the lightneſs of the puniſhment is a very good one; a Prince would not be ſatisfied with cutting off the hand of a Governor who had promiſed to deliver a place to his enemy. But when that Miniſter adds, that ſince the Saracens were not converted at the ſight of ſuch a miracle, and ſince the City of Damaſcus did not renounce Mahometiſm, it muſt be concluded that what has been ſaid of John Damaſcenus is falſe, he muſt give me leave to tell him that he advances an impiety. *The Saracens of thoſe days were very hard of belief*, ſays he (9); *for I am perſuaded that if a like miracle were wrought in Mecca, the inhabitants would immediately become Chriſtians.* Is not this furniſhing the Infidels with weapons to refute all the miracles of Moſes and Jeſus Chriſt? *The Egyptians and the Jews of thoſe days were very hard of belief*, might one ſay; *if ſuch miracles had been wrought in Athens or in Rome, the inhabitants would immediately have become Jews, and afterwards Chriſtians.* It is a little ſurprizing, that a Divine ſhould ſuffer himſelf to be dazzled by a reaſon which is full as ſtrong againſt the truth of the Goſpel, as againſt the fables of the monks: but when one reflects on the power which is uſurped over people of a lively imagination by the firſt thoughts which come into their head, it is no great wonder that the Miniſter I am ſpeaking of has argued in the manner he has done. This however is very aſtoniſhing, that there ſhould be but one man who appears to have taken notice of this dangerous doctrine; and it is remarkable that nobody ſeems to have perceived that the public had been made acquainted with it. It is alſo very remarkable that Mr. Jurieu, who might eaſily have ſaved his orthodoxy, by declaring that he had advanced this unwarily, and without foreſeeing the conſequences of it; but that being become ſenſible of its venom, ſince he had been cenſured on that account, he diſavows this pernicious maxim; it is, I ſay, very remarkable that that Writer has neglected this ſhort and eaſy way of making his innocence appear, and has rather choſen, by ſaying nothing, to furniſh the world with a lawful pretext to accuſe him of perſiſting in the ſame perſuaſion, *viz.* that if at this day a hand which had been cut off ſhould be reſtored at Mecca, that City would immediately become Chriſtian. *Nothing more impious can be advanced*, they are the words of the perſon who has informed againſt ſome of Mr. Jurieu's errors (10): *for it is plainly to declare in the face of heaven and earth, that he is perſuaded that all the miracles of Moſes, of Jeſus Chriſt, and of his Apoſtles, are fables, and conſequently that the Scripture of the Old and New Teſtament is no more than a Romance and a Legend. Who can hear this without horror? And would not Judaiſm and Chriſtianity be utterly overthrown by ſuch an argument? If Father Maimbourg's miracle is falſe, becauſe the whole city of Damaſcus was not converted, it thence follows, will Infidels ſay, that Moſes did no miracles in Egypt, that Jeſus Chriſt did none in Judæa, and that St. Peter did not make the cripple walk who aſked alms of him in the midſt of Jeruſalem; for neither the Egyptians nor the Jews were converted.* Note that this cripple was carried every day to the gate of the Temple, and that afterwards *all the people* ſaw him walk, and knew him to be the ſame man who had been lame (11), and that he was acknowledged to be the ſame by the Magiſtrates (12); and yet Jeruſalem continued in the Jewiſh Religion. The Miracle of John Damaſcenus, as it is related, had nothing more ſignal than that of the lame man, and was not followed, as this was, by a pathetic exhortation.

(9) *Apologie pour les Reformat.* tom. 1. pag. 20.

(10) See the little Book intitled *Declaration de Mr. Bayle touchant un petit Ecrit qui vient de paroitre ſous le Titre de* Courte Revue des Maximes de Morale, &c. pag. 15. It was printed in the year 1691.

(11) Acts iii. 9, 10, and 11.

(12) Acts iv. 14.

[*E*] *Bzovius has reckoned him among the Phyſicians who have been illuſtrious on account of their Sanctity.*] Bzovius, in the little Book which he has written concerning the Phyſicians who have been holy men, aſſerts Damaſcenus to be one of the number. The conformity there is between *Manſur* and *Meſue* was, as ſome think, the occaſion of this miſtake (13). John Damaſcenus was called *Manſur*, that is, *redeemed*: Conſtantine Copronymus, who hated him, called him *Manſer*, that is, *baſtard* (14). Bzovius might confound Manſur or Manſer with Meſue, and imagine John Manſur of Damaſcus to be the ſame with John Meſue, alſo of Damaſcus; and that, ſince the latter was a Phyſician, the other muſt neceſſarily have been ſo likewiſe. But this fault might eaſily have been avoided, if he had recollected that John Damaſcenus lived in the VIII Century, and that Meſue lived after the year 1140. William du Val (15) has adopted Bzovius's miſtake, as Bzovius adopted that of ſome other Authors. Take particular notice of what Geſner ſays: for having ſpoken of one John Damaſcenus a Monk and a Prieſt, Author of the IV Books of the Orthodox Faith, he cites a paſſage of Symphorian Champier, which imports that he was a learned Phyſician; *vir fuit in Medicinis doctus*; and one who for his learning and purity of life, was choſen Superior of a Monaſtery in Conſtantinople. Geſner afterwards ſpeaks of one John Damaſcenus ſurnamed Manſur, who, among other Works, wrote divers Parallels on the Scripture. He refutes thoſe who take this John Damaſcenus for Meſue, or ſuppoſe thoſe two perſons to have been contemporaries; he refutes them, I ſay, by a chronological argument: for Meſue, ſays he, is more modern than the other by ſeveral Centuries, having lived in the reign of Frederic Barbaroſſa, about the year 1163. He gives the Titles of the Books of John Meſue, and ſays they had been publiſhed not long before at Baſil, under the name of *Janus Damaſcenus*. He then ſpeaks of one John Damaſcenus Author of the Books of the Orthodox Faith, and of the Parallels. Any one may perceive that this is confounding and multiplying Authors in a ſtrange manner. Tiraquellus has perplexed himſelf a little; for he places (16) one John Damaſcenus Manſur in the Catalogue of noble Phyſicians. The word *Manſur* proves his miſtake; becauſe it prevents one from ſaying that he intended to ſpeak only of John Meſue, whoſe Phyſical Works were printed at Baſil under the name of Janus Damaſcenus..

(13) *See* Theophilus Raynaud, *de malis ac bonis Libris*, Partit. 1, Erotemate X, num. 214. pag. m. 137.

(14) Idem, *Hoplotheca*, pag. 53.

(15) In *Hiſtoria Monogrammæ SS. Medicorum*, apud *Th. Raynaud. de malis ac bonis Libris*, pag. 138.

(16) *In Opere de Nobilitate*, apud *Theophil. Raynaud. Hoplath.* pag. 53.

[There were ſeveral Phyſical Writers named John Meſue, the eldeſt of whom was nearly contemporary with John Damaſcenus as will be obſerved elſewhere ‡. ADD. REM.]

‡ In the Article MESUE.

[*F*] *He was the firſt, among the Greeks, who began to treat a ſubject according to the ſcholaſtic method.*] Mr. Arnauld obſerves, that St. John of Damaſcus *was as it were the St. Thomas of the Greeks*, that *they regulated their opinions more by his judgment, than by that of any other Father* (17). It is ſo certain, adds he, *that St. John of Damaſcus has always been the rule of their Doctrine concerning the Euchariſt, that Euthymius, to repreſent the Doctrine of the Greek Church with reſpect to that myſtery againſt the hereſy of the Paulicians, only quotes the famous paſſage of St. Gregory Nyſſen in his Catecheſis, and a paſſage of S. John of Damaſcus where that error of the Stercoraniſts is formally rejected.* Monſr. Claude, in his Anſwer to Mr. Arnauld, grants him this principle: *It is certain*, ſays he (18), *that to judge well of the opinion of the modern Greeks, we muſt go back ſo far as to* John Damaſcenus. Some pages after (19), he explains that Author's opinion; which is not at all conformable to that of the Reformed, neither does it admit Tranſubſtantiation. It is an incomprehenſible piece of Jargon, and ſuch will eternally be the lot of thoſe who ſeek to explain the manner of Myſteries too particularly. The ſureſt way would be to keep to the moſt general expreſſions. There are ſome things the explication whereof ſerves only to increaſe their obſcurity: the greateſt Divines deſerve to be put in mind of the ſaying, *Ne ſutor ultra crepidam*, i. e. *Let not a Shoemaker go beyond his laſt*, conſidering the ſublimeneſs of certain doctrines.

(17) Arnauld, *Perpétuité défendue*, tom. 1. liv. 2. chap. 6. pag. 229. of the Bruſſels Edition, in 12mo.

(18) Claude, *Réponſe à la Perpétuité défendue*, liv. 2. chap. 13. pag. m. 497.

(19) Ibid. pag. 515, & *ſeq.*

rector injoined him perpetual silence. This Monk was so severe, that because his Disciple did not observe the said prohibition, he turned him out of his cell, and ordered him for penance to empty the filth of the Monastery; but seeing him ready to obey, he dispensed with his doing it, and embraced him. John Damascenus was ordained Priest towards the latter end of his life by the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and returned immediately to his Monastery. He died about the year 750. James de Billi published this Father's Works in the year 1577; which Edition was reprinted in 1619. There are wanting in it several Tracts which Leo Allatius communicated to Mr. Aubert, who had some design of publishing a new Edition of John Damascenus (*a*). Father Labbe had also promised one (*b*).

(*a*) Extracted from the *Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, composed by Mr. du Pin, tom. 6. pag. 101, &c. of the Dutch Edition.

(*b*) See the Writing which he published in 1652 intitled, *Conspectus novæ Editionis omnium S. Joannis Damasceni Operum in quatuor partes tributorum*, where he speaks of the precedent Editions.

DAMIAN (PETER) Cardinal and Bishop of Ostia, flourished in the eleventh Century. He had been a Benedictin, and it is thought he would always have preferred solitude to the dignities of the Church, if he had not been forced, as it were, to accept them. He publickly condemned the liberty which the Popes took to oppose the enterprizes of the Emperors by temporal arms [*A*]. He described in a very lively manner the enormous vices of his age in several of his works. That which he intitled *Gomorrhæus* is most commonly quoted. The Controversial Writers speak much of it [*B*]: Pope Alexander II suppressed it; but it has been nevertheless preserved (*a*). The Author of *les Prejugez legitimes contre le Papisme* would find it difficult to answer the Writer who criticised him, with respect to that Book [*C*]. It appears from a Letter of Peter Damian (*b*), that there were some Ecclesiastics who taught that Priests might marry. He deserves commendation

(*a*) See the Remark [*C*].

(*b*) It is the 13th of the 5th Book.

[*A*] *He . . . . condemned the liberty which the Popes took to oppose the enterprizes of the Emperors by temporal Arms.*] His doctrine on this head is very orthodox, and he confirms it by the practice of the primitive Church (1). "He maintains that the offices of Emperor and Pope are distinct, and that the Emperors ought not to meddle with what belongs to the office of the Popes, nor the Popes with what belongs to the office of the Emperors, as to handle arms, to make war, &c. *As the Son of God*, says he, *surmounted all the obstacles of worldly power; not by the severity of vengeance, but by the lively majesty of an invincible patience: so has he taught us rather to bear the fury of the world with constancy, than to take up arms against those who offend us, especially since between the Royalty and the Priesthood there is such a distinction of offices, that it belongs to the King to use secular arms, and to the Priest to gird on the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God, &c. . . . Do we read that St. Gregory ever did or wrote this: he, who suffered so many outrages from the Lombards? Or did St. Ambrose take arms against the Arians, who traversed him and cruelly tormented his Church? Will it be found that any of the Holy Pontifs ever handled arms? Let Ecclesiastical causes then be decided by the Laws of justice, or by the Determinations of a Council of Bishops, lest what ought to be done before a tribunal of Judges, or in an Assembly of Prelates, be ended, to our shame, by a martial conflict.*" What can be more reasonable? and yet Baronius makes no scruple to say that this dogm of Peter Damian is erroneous, and even the spawn of a Doctrine of Julian the Apostate. *We cannot therefore*, says he (2), *neither ought we to excuse him from having fallen into an error which the Church has condemned. After Tertullian, Julian the Apostate is acknowledged to be the original Author of the error from which that of Damian is descended.* This is wretched; since the apostate Prince did no more than call back the Christians to the evident maxims which their master had left them.

(1) Coeffeteau, *Réponse au Mystere d'iniquité*, pag. 667.

(2) Ibidem, pag. 669. He cites *Baronius, ad ann.* 1053. Here are that Cardinal's words, *Errore lapsus convincitur Petrus, quem communi totius Ecclesiæ Catholicæ consensu constat esse damnatum. Post Tertullianum Julianus Apostata fuisse convincitur originarius fator erroris, ex quo iste noscitur propagatus.*

[*B*] *He intitled one of his works* Gomorrhæus. *The controversial Writers speak much of it.*] "By reason of these Laws of Celibacy Sodomy is so prevalent among the Roman Clergy, that Peter Damian, who was then retired to his Hermitage, was obliged to write a Book concerning it, intitled Gomorrhæus, wherein he lays open the several species of that sin; and he dedicated it to Leo IX, adjuring him to provide against it. And Baronius himself acknowledges it in these words: *Briars and nettles had overrun the Housholder's field: all flesh had corrupted his way, and there was need not only of a deluge to wash, but of fire from heaven to consume us as at Gomorrah**. Whereupon Leo made some regulations, and ordained some punishments; but soon after he lost the favour of Leo; and Alexander II then being advanced to the Papal chair, tricked him out of his Book under colour of giving it to the Abbot of S. Saviour to transcribe, pretending that he had spoken too immodestly, as if such ordures could be stirred without raising a stink: of which action the good man bitterly complains, in one of his Epistles to the Cardinals Hildebrand and Stephen, telling them, with an evident irony, *that it was a true mark of sacerdotal cleanness, or rather an argument of the Papal purity* (3)." That my Reader may be assured this passage contains no falsities (4), I shall insert here Coeffeteau's Answer (5). *That in those days the Ecclesiastical Laws were not the occasion of the scandal which Damian laments . . . . is sufficiently demonstrated by the Letter which Pope* Leo IX *wrote to him after he had received his Book, which he praises highly.* The Ecclesiastics, *says he* (a), *of whose most filthy life thou hast discoursed in lamentable words, but full of reason, doubtless do not belong to the lot of the Lord's inheritance, from which they separate themselves by those debaucheries. But if their conversation was chaste, they would not only be called the Temple of God, but even the Sanctuary, where the Lamb, whose whiteness surpasses that of snow, and who takes away the sins of the world, is offered up, &c . . . .* (e). *As to Alexander the Second's, making use of an artifice to suppress Peter Damian's Book, wherein those horrid crimes were expressed a little too freely, no man who loves mere civil decency, will ever condemn it: for without an irony, it is a testimony of great purity, to be offended even at the words which represent any immodest action, tho' it be with detestation. And the Pope was not the only person who was offended at it, but the liberty therein taken universally displeased all good men, it being impossible to stir such ordures without their leaving an ill smell behind them. Wherefore the Pope's artifice was commendable, to chastise the guilty, and to suppress the motions of those horrid impurities: but as we sometimes love our own Works inconsiderately* (i), *Peter Damian could not bear that this fruit of his brain, which he said he had brought forth with extreme labour, should be stifled; for which reason he spoke of it with great passion. Yet after having taken the liberty to speak against the Pope, at the end of his Epistle he corrects himself, and acknowledges there is some presumption in his behaviour, that he has gone too far, and that the pride of his lips deserves chastisement.*

(3) Du Plessis, *Mystere d'Iniquité*, pag. 228.

(4) That is, as to the Facts.

(5) Coeffeteau, *Réponse au Mystere d'Iniquité*, pag. 648.

(a) Epist. Leon. ad Damian. *præfixa* Gomorrhæo; *extat apud* Baron. *ad ann.* 1049.

(e) Du Plessis, pag. 228, *lign.* 34.

(i) Petr. Damian. Epist. ad Stephanum & Hildebrand. Card.

[*C*] . . . . *This Book has been preserved. The Author of the* Préjugez contre le Papisme *would find it difficult to answer the Writer who criticised him on that head.*] Here are the words of the Author of the *Préjugez* (6): *It is from* Cardinal Baronius *that we know that Peter Damian, Cardinal of the Roman Church at that time, wrote a Book intitled* Gomorrhæus, *which he addressed to Leo IX, in which Work he described the manners of the Age, and particularly of the Clergy; and we may guess what it was by the Title: Sodom and Gomorrah were brought into the description of those horrid impurities.* Baronius says that besides the crimes of simony, the the Lord's field was overrun with thorns, and those nettles which shamefully spring up from the putrifaction of the flesh by the dunghil of corruption. For all flesh

(6) Jurieu, *Préjugez legitimes contre le Papisme*, tom. 1. pag. 319.

* Baron. *Vol.* 11. *a.* 1049, *art.* 10, *& seq.* Petri Damiani *Lib. qui inscribitur* Gomorrhæus, *cui præfixa* Epist. Leonis IX.

tion for the great zeal which he teſtifies for the re-eſtabliſhment of good diſcipline, which might ſtem the diſorders to which the Monks and Clergy abandoned themſelves; but the credulity with which he has compiled a great many examples of apparitions of Biſhops, or other perſons condemned to Hell-torments, or to thoſe of Purgatory (c), is not to be excuſed. He had a great devotion for the bleſſed Virgin. You will find the place of his birth, the time of his death, and ſome other circumſtances of his life in Moreri's Dictionary.

(c) See the 19th and 20th of his *Opuſcula*.

fleſh had corrupted his way, ſo that a deluge ſeemed not ſufficient to waſh away its filth. Theſe horrible ſins called for the fire of Gomorrah, which had conſumed the territory of the five Cities. For which reaſon Peter Damian, then a Hermit of Mount Avellano in Umbria, though himſelf obliged to inform the new Pope of all theſe things, by writing him a Book intitled *Gomorrhæus*, wherein he repreſented, in the modeſteſt manner he was able, the four ſpecies of carnal ſins which prevailed in the Church, praying him to pierce thoſe infamous men with the ſword of Phineas, and to reſtore the Church to her purity. *That evil had already continued* 150 *years, that is, from the beginning of the tenth Century to the middle of the eleventh: were there no more than this, would it not be a ſtrong prejudice againſt the Latin Church and againſt Popery? Could it be poſſible that God would have permitted the true Church, without ceaſing to be the ſpouſe of Jeſus Chriſt, to become a Sodom and a Gomorrah, to be plunged in the four moſt enormous ſins of the fleſh, and to continue under that deluge near two hundred years?* This Miniſter had already ſaid in another Book (7): " We produce for example Peter Damian, who in " the XIth Century wrote a Book intitled *Gomorrhæi*, " in which he undertakes to convict the Clergy of that " time of the horrible ſin which occaſioned the burning of Sodom. The Book is loſt; but we have " monuments of it in the Annals of their great Baronius, who ſays that the ſaid Peter Damian, in that " Book (*), *Quadripertita vitia carnis quibus Eccleſia obrueretur, ut decuit, quam potuit honeſte inſinuaſſe*, " had hinted in the moſt decent manner he could, at " the four vices of the fleſh with which the Church " was overrun."

(7) Jurieu, *Apologie pour les Reformat.* tom. I. chap. 9. pag. 152.

(*) Anno 1049, num. 10.

We ſhall immediately ſee a Cenſure, which ſtrikes Baronius no leſs than Monſr. Jurieu: for the Abbot Richard (†) aſſerts that Peter Damian has ſpoken of thoſe diſorders not as an evil which had overflowed the Church, but as the corruption of ſome particular people. But it is very remarkable that the Abbot, inſtead of inſulting Mr. Jurieu, excuſes him as much as he can. *Mr. Jurieu*, ſays he (8), *honeſtly confeſſes he never read this work. . . . . Wherefore we need not be ſurprized*, if he *has been miſtaken in the idea which he formed to himſelf of a work he never ſaw, and which he thinks* is loſt. *It is no wonder, if judging of it only by the Title, and by what Baronius reports of it in general, he imagined &c.* After this he ſhews him, 1, *that the Book is not loſt*; 2, that it does not treat of the *manners of the age, or of the Clergy in general*; and that it *does not repreſent the Latin Church as a Sodom or a Gomorrah*; 3, *that according to the teſtimony of the ſame Peter Damian*, there were *ſeveral great men in that age*. I ſhall not produce the proofs of the third point; but ſhall content myſelf with tranſcribing in part thoſe which relate to the two other. Here follow the words of the Abbot Richard (9). " As to the firſt, It is ſo " far from being true that the work in queſtion is loſt, " that I have it among my own Books, and that it " was printed with the other Works of that Saint, " the beginning of the preſent Century. The perſon " who took care to publiſh them, moreover dedicated " them to Pope Paul V, who granted the privilege " for printing that Edition in the year 1606. If Mr. " Jurieu had been more exact in examining the truth " of the proof which he produces, and to ſee it in the " original; and if he had taken any pains to enquire " after the Book from whence it is taken; the Book- " ſellers of Paris would have furniſhed him with as " many copies of it as he pleaſed, and would have " informed him that the *Gomorrhæus* of Peter Damian " is ſo far from being loſt, that it is not much above " twenty years ſince it was reprinted with all the other " Works of that Cardinal. As to the 2, If Mr. Jurieu had been more careful to ſearch at the Spring-" head for the truth of what he advances; and if he " had read the Book which Peter Damian intitled *the* " *Gomorrhæan*; he would have there found, that the " Cardinal does by no means undertake to convict the " Clergy of that time of the horrible ſin which drew " down fire from heaven on the city of Gomorrah, " and that he does not there deſcribe the manners of " the age, nor yet of the Clergy in general: and in " fine, that it is not true that he repreſents the Latin " Church as a Sodom and a Gomorrah. For he would " have found that in that Book Peter Damian only in-" forms Pope Leo IX of the uncleanneſſes which were " committed by certain Eccleſiaſtics of his quarters; " that is, in the neighbourhood of Mount Apennine, " whither he had retired, and where he lived with " ſome Hermits. *A certain horrible and infamous vice* " *is much ſpread* IN OUR QUARTERS, ſays he to that " Pope, when he acquaints him with the reaſon which " had obliged him to compoſe that work, in the whole " ſequel whereof we do not find he extends that diſor-" der and corruption any farther. Can one with any " ſhew of reaſon ſay, that a vice which had crept in " among ſome Eccleſiaſtics about Mount Apennine, " was the univerſal vice of the age, and of the Clergy? And can one with any juſtice accuſe the whole " Latin Church of a ſin which ſome Eccleſiaſtics of " one particular Province fell into? With what truth " and with what equity, therefore, could Mr. Jurieu " ſay that Peter Damian has undertaken in his *Go-*" *morrhianus* (10) to convict the Clergy of that time " of the moſt horrid of all ſins; to deſcribe therein " the manners of the age and of the Clergy, and to " repreſent the Latin Church as a Sodom and a Go-" morrah; if he had known that in this whole Book " Peter Damian only lays before the Pope the impu-" rities of certain Eccleſiaſtics of a particular Pro-" vince? Mr. Jurieu, therefore, as well as Baronius, " has alledged the teſtimony of this Book, which ſays " nothing of what he imputes to it, only becauſe he " had never read it, and believed the work was loſt."

(†) [It is Father Gerberon who concealed himſelf under this name. CRIT. REM.]

(8) L'Abbé *Richard, Examen des Prejugez de Mr. Jurieu*, chap. 28. pag. 238.

(9) Ibid. pag. 239, 240.

(10) This is not the Title which Mr. Jurieu had given. We have in this Remark [C] an example of the negligence which I ſhall ſpeak of in the Remark [B] of the Article DEMETRIUS.

Let us learn from hence how much an Author is to be pitied when his Library is not furniſhed with all ſorts of Books; and how much he is to be blamed, when, notwithſtanding this, he boldly affirms that ſuch and ſuch Books are not extant. Let us learn alſo with what reſerve we ought to ſpeak of a Work which we know only by the report of another. Who would have thought Baronius a man capable of deceiving the Proteſtants with regard to the idea of Peter Damian's *Gomorrhæus*; to deceive them, I ſay, to the diſadvantage of his own Communion? But it may be aſked, is it a convincing proof of Baronius's error, to ſay that the Abbot Richard maintains the contrary? No, it is only a ſtrong preſumption, which comes very near a good proof; ſince the Author of the *Préjugez* has not offered to maintain what he had advanced. It is preſumed he would not have eaſily digeſted ſuch an Affront, if he had been able to make his Apology. After all, do we not ſee that the Abbot Richard directs us to the Spring-head? He mentions an Edition of the Works of Peter Damian printed at Paris in the year 1663. If any one is incredulous, he need only read the piece in queſtion. Mr. du Pin ſpeaks of it very ſuccinctly, and obſerves that it is the VII of Peter Damian's *Opuſcula*, in the III Tome of his Works (11).

(11) Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques du XI Siecle*, pag. m. 94.

DANAE, the daughter of Leontium. See the Remark [D] of the Article LEONTIUM.

DANDINI (JEROME) an Italian Jeſuit, born at Ceſena in the Eccleſiaſtical State, is the firſt of his Order who taught Philoſophy at Paris: he bore ſeveral honourable offices

fices in the Society; for beſides teaching Divinity at Padua [*A*], he was Rector of the ſeveral Colleges at Ferrara, Forli, Bologna, Parma, and Milan; Viſitor in the Provinces of Venice, Toulouſe, and Guienne; and Provincial in Poland, and in the Milaneze. Clement VIII ſent him to the Maronites of Mount Libanus. He died very aged [*B*] at Forli, the 29th of November 1634. His Commentary on the three Books of Ariſtotle *de Anima* was printed at Paris in 1611, *in folio*; and after his death they publiſhed his Ethics. They make a *folio* which was printed at Ceſena in the year 1651, under the Title of *Ethica ſacra, hoc eſt, de Virtutibus & Vitijs* (*a*). This is all that is ſaid of him by the Hiſtorians of the Jeſuits (*b*): we ſhall have no reaſon to accuſe them of having flattered their Brother, or of having taken over much pains to ſet him out to advantage, when we know what Father Simon ſays of him. He ſays that Dandini *was of a noble family in Italy, of which there are at this day ſome Counts who bear that name, and who live at Ceſena*; that he was a man "who had a penetrating wit, a ſolid judgment, and "great experience . . . . that beſides the School Divinity, which he underſtood perfectly, "he was maſter of the Theology of the Fathers, and above all of Moral Philoſophy, "of which he has compoſed an excellent Treatiſe. . . . . So that the Pope could not make "choice of a man better qualified to treat with the Maronites; that it is true, he wanted "ſkill in the Oriental Languages, but he eaſily ſupplied that deficiency by means of the "Interpreters whom he made uſe of (*c*)." I omit the other elogies which he beſtows upon him [*C*]. It would be wrong to make theſe praiſes paſs for ſuſpected, under pretext that thoſe who tranſlate, or comment on, a Book, are extremely prejudiced in favour of the Author, and declare themſelves the perpetual Protectors, or even the Panegyriſts of their ſentiments; for it is impoſſible to take more liberty with an Author than Father Simon has done with Father Dandini [*D*]: he criticiſes him, he ſtrongly refutes him on a thouſand occaſions, in the Remarks which he has added to his Tranſlation of the Journey to Mount Libanus. This Book was unknown to Father Southwel. It was printed at Ceſena, in 1656 (*d*), under the Title of *Miſſione Apoſtolica al Patriarcha e Maroniti del Monte Libano*. It contains the Relation of this Jeſuit's Journey to the Maronites and to Jeruſalem. Father Dandini taught Philoſophy at Perugia in 1596 (*e*), when he was pitched upon by Clement VIII for the Nunciature of Mount Libanus. He embarked at Venice the 14th of July 1596, and returned to Rome in the month of Auguſt the year following. He departed thence ſoon after to go and diſcharge the Office of Provincial in Poland. The French Tranſlation which was made of his Travels by Father Simon, was printed at Paris in the year 1675, and reprinted at the Hague in 1685. It does not contain the Journey to Jeruſalem [*E*].

(*a*) It is a miſtake in the *Acta Eruditorum* of 1685, pag. 284. to ſay that the Author publiſhed this Book at Paris.

(*b*) Alegambe *and* Southwell.

(*c*) Simon, *Preface* to the *Journey to Mount Libanus*, which he tranſlated from the Italian of this Jeſuit into French.

(*d*) See his *Relation*.

(*e*) In the Dutch Edition it is falſly printed 1599.

[*A*] *He taught Divinity at Padua.*] I durſt not ſay he was the firſt Jeſuit who taught that Science at Padua; and yet it would be the beſt courſe a Tranſlator could take, if they who write in Latin preſcribed to themſelves as rigorous a Law as that of our French Grammarians: but the great liberty which is taken in Latin not to remove all equivocal expreſſions, cauſes a Tranſlator, who ſticks to the moſt natural and exact ſenſe, to depart ſometimes from Truth. However it be, here are the words of Alegambe: *Hanc* (Philoſophiam) *etiam profeſſus eſt primus è Noſtris Lutetiæ Pariſiorum; Theologiam verò Patavii* (1). Father Southwel has made no alteration in this paſſage. My Reader may do as he pleaſes; and may underſtand it to mean that no Jeſuit had taught Divinity at Padua before Father Dandini.

(1) Alegambe, *Bibliotheca Script. Societ. Jeſu*, pag. 182.

[*B*] *He died very aged.*] Father Alegambe had made him fourſcore years old. *Obiit demum Forlivii octogenarius die* 29 *Novembris anno ſalutis* 1634 (2). Father Southwel has made no alteration in theſe words: yet he ought not to have left them as he found them; for here is what he adds to his predeceſſor's text: *Cooptatus in ſocietatem anno ſalutis* 1569, *ætatis* 18, *vota quatuor ſolemnia nuncupavit* (3). i. e. "He was "admitted into the Society in the year 1569, in the "18th year of his age, and made the four ſolemn "vows." To ſay after this that he died at the age of fourſcore, the 29th of November 1634, is not the part of an Hiſtorian who writes with any exactneſs.

(2) Idem, ibid.

(3) Sotuel, *de Script. Societ. Jeſu*, pag. 338.

[*C*] *I omit the other Elogies which F. Simon beſtows upon him.*] Father Dandini, ſays he (4), "endeavoured "to diveſt himſelf of all the prejudices which he "attributes to thoſe who had been at Mount Libanus "before him. He did not wholly rely on the Popes "Bulls, which however made the beſt part of his inſtructions, becauſe he did not think them infallible "as to the facts in queſtion. But he heard with a "great deal of patience the Patriarch and the principal Maronites, who complained of ſome Jeſuits who "had preceded him in the ſame employ; all which "precautions are convincing proofs of his prudent conduct. Wherefore he ſeemed to have nothing elſe in "view, than to diſcover the true belief of the Maronites. Yet, as will be ſeen in the Remarks which "I have ſubjoined to my Tranſlation, all the penetration of his mind, and all the efforts of his prudence "could not prevent his being impoſed on.

(4) Simon, *Preface to the French Tranſlation of the* Journey to M. Libanus.

[*D*] *It is impoſſible to take more liberty with an Author than Father Simon has done with Father Dandini.*] The laſt words of the foregoing quotation are a proof of it. Let us produce the judgment which he has paſſed on this Jeſuit's ſtyle. *His Style*, ſays he (5), *is ſometimes ſo negligent, and ſo full of ſuperfluous words, uſeleſs epithets, and exaggerations, that I have thought it proper to repreſent his ſenſe rather than his words, though I ſtill preſerve ſomething of his character almoſt throughout. Wherefore, to write with more perſpicuity, I have been frequently obliged to make two or three periods of one of his.*

(5) Idem, ibid.

[*E*] *Father Simon's Tranſlation . . . . does not contain the Journey to Jeruſalem.*] The reaſon which the Tranſlator gives for this is, *that as we have a great number of the like Relations, he thought he might be excuſed from preſenting the public with this, becauſe it contains ſcarce any thing which has not been already obſerved by other travellers.*

DANTE, one of the firſt Poets of Italy, was born at Florence the 27th of May (*a*) 1265 (*b*). He was of a good family [*A*], and was inſtructed in polite Learning with great

(*a*) Reuſner. *in Diario*, pag. 81.

(*b*) Volaterranus, *Commentar. Urbanor.* lib. 21. pag. m. 770.

[*A*] *He was of a good family.*] They ſay Cacciaguida his great great grandfather (1) was the ſon or grandſon (2) of Eliſha Frangipani, and that he married a Ferrareſe Lady of the family of *Aligheri*. They add, that the ſon of Cacciaguida by that Lady took the name and arms of his mother, and thence it came to

(1) He calls himſelf the father of Dante's great grandfather in the 15th Canto of that Poet's *Paradiſe*, pag. m. 331.

(2) *Vel nepos vel filius.* Papyr. Maſſo, *in* Elog. tom. 2. pag. 16. Bullart, *Académie des Scienc.* tom. 2. pag. 106, ſhould not have ſaid *Nephew*.

great care (*c*). He had among other maſters the famous Brunetti (*d*), who was one of the moſt able men of that time. He ſoon diſcovered the inclination which Nature had given him for Poetry (*e*); and as he fell in love as early as his age permitted him [*B*], he compoſed a great many Verſes in his youth. It was to Love-Poetry that he conſecrated the firſt fruits of his Muſe (*f*); but afterwards he undertook a more ſerious Work. He began it in Latin Verſe, and finiſhed it in Italian. The cauſe of this change was, that he felt too much ſlowneſs in the motions of his poetic vein when he made uſe of the language of ancient Rome. He did well to apply himſelf to his mother-tongue, ſince he excelled in Tuſcan Poetry (*g*). He would have been more happy, had he never meddled with any thing elſe; for being ambitious, and having attained ſome of the moſt conſiderable poſts in the Commonwealth, he was cruſhed by the ruins of the faction which he embraced. The city of Florence being divided into two Factions, one named the White, and the other the Black, found itſelf reduced to ſo tumultuous a ſtate, that Pope Boniface VIII ſent Charles of Valois (*h*) thither in the year 1301, to re-eſtabliſh the public tranquillity. No better way was found to pacify the city, than to expel thence the faction of the White. This was the reaſon why our Dante, who had favoured that faction, was ſent into baniſhment [*C*]. I have elſewhere (*i*) obſerved that this was the reaſon why he publiſhed

(*c*) Idem, ibid.

(*d*) Michael Pocciant. *de Scriptor. Florentinis*, pag. 33, & 44. See the Remark [*K*].

(*e*) Volaterranus, *Comment.* lib. 21. pag. 771.

(*f*) Papyr. Maſſo, *Elogior.* tom. 2. pag. 28.

(*g*) Idem, ibid.

(*h*) Brother to Philip the Fair, King of France.

(*i*) In the Article CAPET.

to paſs that the family of Dante had the ſurname of Alighieri (3). Note that Cacciaguida was born at Florence in the year 1160 (4). The anceſtors of Dante being ſtrongly attached to the party of the Guelphs (5), were twice driven from Florence by the Ghibelins. Some are of opinion he ſhould be called *Dante d'Alighieri del Bello*, and that *Alighieri* was the name of his father, and *Bello* the name of his family. See the proofs which Vincent Buonanni gives of it (6). However, our Poet's name was *Durantes*, of which by abbreviation they made *Dantes*, while he was a child (7). Grangier is viſibly miſtaken in the paſſage I am going to cite. It ſerves for a Commentary on ſome Verſes wherein Cacciaguida declares (8) that he had better ſay nothing of his anceſtors, or of the place which they quitted to retire to Florence, than to ſpeak of either. *This he ſays out of modeſty*, they are the words of Grangier (9), *rather than for that he knew not any other more ancient original of his anceſtors, or that beyond Cacciaguida their family was of ſmall account, obſcure, and ignoble. For Dante ſeems to intimate in his Hell that his anceſtors were deſcended from the old Romans, who built Florence, after they had quitted the Colony of Fiezola. In the 15th Canto, lamenting his exile, and the wrong which the Florentines did him, he makes Ser Brunetto Latini to ſpeak thus.*

(3) See *Dante's Paradiſe*, Canto 16. pag. m. 339.

(4) *Dante's Paradiſe*, Canto 16. pag. m. 350.

(5) Idem, in the 10th Canto of *Hell.*

(6) In his *Diſcorſo ſopra l'Inferno de Dante*, pag. 2, 3, & 184.

(7) Volaterranus, lib. 21. pag. 770.

(8) In the 16th Canto of *Paradiſe.*

(9) Grangier, *Commentaire ſur le Paradis de Dante*, pag. 351, 352.

Faccian le beſtie Fiezolane ſtrame
Di lor medeſme, & non tocchin la pianta
S'alcuna ſurge ancor nel lor lettame,
In cui riviva la ſementa ſanta
Di quei Roman, che vi rimaſer quando
Fu fatto il nido di malitia tanta.

. . . . . *Let the beaſts of Fiezola*
Make fodder of themſelves, nor touch the plant,
If any yet ſpring from amidſt their dung,
Wherein the ancient ſacred ſeed revives
Of Romans, who remained there, when ſhe
Was made the neſt of ſo much wickedneſs.

It is certain Dante deſigns to ſay nothing here in praiſe of his own anceſtors in particular, and only takes notice that there were ſome families in Florence which were deſcended from the ancient Romans. How many cities are there among thoſe which have been Roman Colonies, where ſimple artiſans, ſprung from perſons of the dregs of the people for twenty generations, would tell no lie if they ſaid, at a venture, that they are deſcended from the ancient Romans? What uſe would this be of to prove their Family to be illuſtrious, and of diſtinguiſhed nobility?

[*B*] *He fell in love as early as his age permitted him.*] Thus I think I may tranſlate the following words of Volaterranus, *amavit in adoleſcentia Beatricem* (10). This Beatrix was the daughter of Folco Portinari (11): ſome aſſert, that our Poet loved her honourably, but that when ſhe was dead he grew very debauched, giving himſelf up to laſcivious amours (12). Others ſay that *the chaſt love which he bore her was the reaſon why after her death he turned the real truth into a poetical fancy, feigning Beatrix to be Theology* (13). They who have read this Poem know that Beatrix moraliſes very much therein, and that ſhe appears in the character of a grave Doctor. Read what follows; you will there find moreover that ſhe was but his ſecond miſtreſs; however depend not on that. "It is obſerved that he had "two miſtreſſes in his youth; one named Gentucca, "with whom he fell in love when he was in the city "of Lucca, the other Beatrix Portinaria, daughter of "Folco Portinaria, whom he loved with an ardent, "but chaſt affection. As this love frequently inter-"mixed itſelf with the ſublime conceptions of his "mind, he reſolved to eternize it in his Verſe by "vailing Theology under the fine name of Beatrix: "and deſiring to follow the ſteps of Virgil in the deſ-"cent of his Æneas to Hell, he introduces this daugh-"ter of the Empyreum, who comes to preſent that "Prince of the Latin Poets to him for his conductor "in ſo obſcure and difficult ways (14)." It is certain that this Gentucca was not Dante's firſt miſtreſs: he fell not in love with her till he had been exiled, becoming enamoured of her during the ſtay he made at Lucca after his baniſhment (15). Take notice that the names of his miſtreſſes have been better preſerved than thoſe of his three wives. Papyrius Maſſo acknowledges that he knows not the names of thoſe three wives. *Uxores tres habuiſſe dicitur, quarum incertum eſt nomen & mihi prorſus obſcurum* (16). He adds that Dante left a ſon who was an Advocate, and ſettled at Verona, and that his poſterity was illuſtrious. He takes notice, among his deſcendants, of one PETER DANTE, to whom Philelphus is ſaid to have dedicated the life of our Poet; and a Dante the third of the name, who was exhorted by the Florentines to return to Florence in the year 1495, and rejected their exhortation. He ſays alſo that they all left the name *Aligheri*, and took only that of Dante; thereby teſtifying that the glory of their family proceeded wholly from that great Poet (17). He ſeems not to have known what Pierius Valerianus acquaints us with concerning this third DANTE, which is, that he died in the utmoſt poverty. He was learned, and could make good Latin Verſes. When he began to put his compoſitions in order, with an intent to publiſh them as a *viaticum* of his immortality (18), the enemies which Julius II had raiſed up againſt the Venetians took Verona (19). Dante, who had fled to Mantua with his wife and children, found himſelf reduced there to indigence; and as old age rendred him leſs fit to reſiſt the hardſhips of ſo melancholy a condition, he fell ſick, and died miſerably in that exile, after ſuffering tedious pains (20). Gyraldi mentions a Dante, who was reckoned the fifth: *Fuere ex eadem familia*, ſays he (21), *& alii, in quibus Veronæ natus* Danthis *& ipſe nomine qui, ut audivi, quintus ab illo eſt, & latina & vernacula lingua non ſine laude verſus ſcribit.* i. e. "There were others alſo "of the ſame family, among whom was one *Dante* "born at Verona, who, as I have heard, is the fifth "from him, and writes Verſes both in Latin and in "Italian which are much commended."

(10) Volaterr. *Comm. Urban.* lib. 21. pag. 771.

(11) Grangier, *ſur le Chant* 30. *du Purgat. de Dante*, pag. 520.

(12) Vincenzio Buonanni, *Diſcorſo ſopra l'Inferno ne Dante*, pag. 17.

(13) Grangier, *ſur le Chant* 30. *du Purgatoire*, pag. 520.

(14) Bullart, *Académie des Scienc.* tom. 2. pag. 308.

(15) See his *Purgat.* Canto 24. pag. m. 416.

(16) Papyr. Maſſo, *Elogior.* tom. 2. pag. 27.

(17) Idem, ibid.

(18) *Scripta ſua cæperat in claſſes inſtruere, & immortalitati ſuæ viaticum comparare.* Pierius Valerianus, *de Literat. Infelicitate*, pag. 37.

(19) It was the native city of the third *Dante.*

(20) *Ex* Pierio Valeriano, *de Litterator. infelicit.* pag. 37.

(21) Lilius Gyrald. *de Poët. Hiſt.* Dial. V, pag. 308.

[*C*] *Our Dante . . . was ſent into baniſhment.*] The preſence of Charles of Valois was ſo far from quieting the troubles with which the city was agitated, that it ſerved only to increaſe them. The faction of the Black, finding themſelves favoured by that Prince, committed

publiſhed a ridiculous falſhood concerning the extraction of Hugh Capet. He did not ſupport his misfortune with conſtancy: his reſentment was exceſſive; he endeavoured to revenge himſelf at the expence of his country, and did all he could to expoſe it to a bloody war [D]. All the efforts he made to get himſelf recalled were vain: he could never return thither any more; and he died in his exile, in the month of July 1321. He had the ſtrength of mind to compoſe his own Epitaph in Latin Verſe a little before he expired [E]. Let us remember that he applied himſelf diligently to ſtudy during his baniſhment, and wrote ſome Books wherein he ſhewed more fire and ſpirit than he would have done had he enjoyed a more quiet ſtate of life [F]. It is thought that indignation againſt his country gave new vigour to his pen and to his imagination. Some doubt a little the truth of what is aſſerted, that after his baniſhment he went to ſtudy at Paris (k). The

(k) See the Remark [K].

committed a thouſand violences; they expelled thoſe of the contrary faction, and burned or pulled down their houſes; and this was not done without murdering a great many perſons. Our Dante who was then of the Council of eight (22), and one of the chief magiſtrates of the city called *Priors*, had been deputed by the Pope to negotiate a peace. In his abſence, he was condemned to baniſhment, his houſe was demoliſhed, and all his lands pillaged (23).

(22) *Octovirali ſupremæ poteſtatis magiſtratu inſignem.* Paulus Jovius, *Elogior.* cap. 4. pag. m. 19.

(23) *See* Spondanus, *Annal. Eccleſ. ad ann.* 1501, num. 3, & 4. He cites *Villani*, lib. 8. cap. 48.

[D] *He did all he could to expoſe his country to a bloody war.*] He incited Can della Scala, Prince of Verona, to make war on the Florentines (24), and he led the Emperor to the ſiege of Florence (25). They ſpeak of a Letter which he wrote to that Prince during the ſiege of Breſcia (26). I imagine he therein made a paſſionate deſcription of the injuſtices which he had ſuffered in his own country, and exhorted the Emperor to chaſtiſe it.

(24) Volaterr. *Comm. Urban.* lib. 21. pag. 771.

(25) It is thus that *Volaterranus* expreſſes himſelf: *Etiam Henricum ſextum ad Florentiæ obſidionem* DUCENDO. Idem, ibid. He ſhould have ſaid *ſeptimum*, and not *ſextum*.

[E] *He died in his Exile . . . He had the ſtrength of mind to compoſe his own Epitaph . . . . a little before he expired.*] He died at Ravenna; and it is thought that grief was the cauſe of his death. He enjoyed an honourable retreat in the Court of Guy Polentano, Prince of Ravenna, when the Republic of Venice prepared to make war on that Prince (27), who diſpatched him to Venice to negotiate a peace there. The Venetians behaved with arrogance; they would neither receive Dante nor hear him: ſo that he returned to Ravenna, his journey proving fruitleſs, and he fell ſoon after into the ſickneſs of which he died, and which was ſuppoſed to be occaſioned by grief. *Revertens itaque Ravennam rebus infectis paulò poſt morbo contracto uti exiſtimatur ex animi dolore extinctus eſt* (28). Papyrius Maſſo has ſpoken of this Embaſſy, without ſaying any thing of the ill ſucceſs of it: he inſinuates, on the contrary, that Dante was well received; for he pretends they ſhewed him the Arſenal, and that Dante himſelf relates it (29). Nothing is more falſe than this laſt aſſertion, and perhaps the other is not a whit more true. As to the Epitaph, here is my Author (30). *Obiit, adeo mentis compos quod ſex verſus in extremo vitæ ſuæ edidit poſtmodum in proprio tumulo inciſos: & ſunt hi,*

(26) *See* Pocciani, *de Scriptor. Florent.* pag. 45. *and* Papyr. Maſſo, *Elogior.* tom. 2. pag. 19.

(27) Volaterran. *Comment. Urban.* lib. 21. pag. 771.

(28) Idem, ibid.

(29) *Luſtravitque navalem apparatum urbis & armamentarium ſumptu atque opere viſendum, ut primis ſtatim verbis Cantici vigeſimi primi inferorum indicat.* Papyr. Maſſo, *Elogior*, tom. 2. pag. 21.

Jura Monarchiæ, Superos, Phlegetonta, Lacuſque
Luſtrando cecini, voluerunt fata quouſque:
Sed quia pars ceſſit melioribus hoſpita caſtris,
Auctoremque ſuum petiit, felicior aſtris
Hic claudor Danthes patriis extorris ab oris,
Quem genuit parvi Florentia mater amoris.

That is, "He died, ſo perfectly maſter of his underſtanding that in the laſt moments of his life he compoſed ſix verſes, which were afterwards cut on his tomb; and are theſe,

"Of Monarch's rights, of Heaven's bleſt abodes,
"Of Phlegethon, and Hell's infernal lakes,
"I ſung, while fate allow'd: but ſince my ſoul
"To better climes, and her great Author's fled,
"Here Dante lies; fair Florence gave me birth,
"But, baniſh'd thence, a diſtant land a grave."

(30) Pocciantius, *de Script. Florent.* pag. 45, 46. See alſo *Paul Jovius*, cap. 4. pag. 9. I correct the faults of the preſs in the Verſes of the Epitaph in *Poccianti*.

Moreri ought not to have omitted the circumſtance of the time, when he ſaid Dante *had compoſed this Epitaph himſelf.* He adds, *that at the beginning of the XVIth Century*, Bernard Bembo cauſed *the Tomb to be repaired.* This agrees not with Poccianti, who takes notice that this reparation was made in the year 1433 (31); but there are ſo many errors of the preſs in that Italian's Book, that I dare not warrant that date to be exact.

(31) Poccianti, ibid. pag. 46.

[F] *He ſhewed more fire and ſpirit in ſome of his Books, than he would have done had he enjoyed a more quiet ſtate of life.*] This is an Obſervation of Paul Jovius. *Sed exilium*, ſays he (32), *vel toto Etruriæ principatu ei majus, & glorioſius fuit, quum illam ſub amara cogitatione excitatam, occulti, divinique ingenii vim exacuerit, & inflammârit. Enata ſiquidem eſt in exilio comœdia triplex Platonicæ eruditionis lumine perilluſtris, ut abdicata patria totius Italiæ civitate donaretur.* i. e. "But his exile was greater and more glorious for him "than the Sovereignty of all Tuſcany, when he pointed "and inflamed the force of his concealed and divine ge-"nius, which was excited by bitter reflections. For in his "baniſhment was produced a threefold Comedy ſhining "with the light of Platonic learning, that ſince he was "exiled from his native country, he might become a "Denizen of all Italy." Latomus diſplays the ſame thought in the ſix verſes he made on Dante, which you may find in Paul Jovius (33). The queſtion is whether the remembrance of his baniſhment did not too much excite his anger; for it often happens that thoſe who write in that condition carry the Satire too far. Let us tranſcribe the paraphraſe of Mr. Bullart (34): *He determined to take that ſignal vengeance on the authors of his exile, which burſt forth in his triple Poem of Paradiſe, Purgatory, and Hell. He dipped his pen as much in the gall of his anger, as in the living ſprings of Helicon: he joined the bitterneſs of his ſoul to the ſweetneſs of his Poetry: he was at the ſame time animated by his learned Muſe, and by his reſentment. The partialities of the Great, with the corruption of manners, furniſhing his wit with all the matter he could deſire for ſuch a ſubject, he diſplayed before the eyes of all Italy that admirable Satire, which ſending its pointed darts even to the thrones of the Popes, Emperors, and Kings of the earth, diſcovers their private actions with a liberty which ſeems to fear neither their power nor their indignation. He particularly blackens the reputation of Pope Boniface VIII, becauſe he had ſupported the party of his perſecutors. He diſhonours by his verſes the memory and race of Charles of Valois, the chief inſtrument of his baniſhment; ſaying that Hugh Capet was the ſon of a Butcher . . . . Dante, in his Poem, alſo vents his indignation againſt the City of Florence, comparing it to a den of robbers, and to a proſtitute; becauſe ſhe ſet all public Offices to ſale, and was continually changing her Magiſtrates, her coin, and her cuſtoms, the more eaſily to ſupport the inconveniencies of her government.* Mr. Bullart ſhould have added that he decries Florence as a City where the women abandoned themſelves to lewdneſs. He introduces Foreſe (35), who wonders in Purgatory that his widow lives chaſtly in the midſt of ſo many immodeſt women. I ſet down his words, according to Grangier's Tranſlation:

(32) Jovius, *Elogior.* cap. 4. pag. 19.

(33) Ibid. pag. 20.

(34) Bullart, *Academie des Sciences*, tom. 2. pag. 307.

(35) He was paternal Uncle to the Civilian Francis Accurſius. Grangier, *Comment. ſur le Purgatoire de Dante*, pag. 401.

A Dieu tant plus eſt chere, & tant plus agréable
Ma vefve, que beaucoup au monde j'ay aymé,
Que plus ſeule à bien faire elle eſt par trop loüable.
Pour ce que le pays de Sardaigne eſtimé
Barbare, eſt bien plus chaſte en ce qui eſt des femmes,
Que là où je la laiſſe au milieu des infames.
O frere bon & doux, que veux tu que je dye?
Desjà le temps futur m'eſt au devant des yeux
Qui ſuivra non de loing l'heure qui nous manie.
Lors l'on interdira pour adviſer au mieux
En la chaire publicque aux Dames Florentines
De monſtrer leurs tetins, & leurs molles poitrines (36).

(36) Dante, Canto 23 of *Purgatory*, pag. m. 396.

"The widow'd charmer, who my bed did ſhare,
"Merits by virtue Heav'ns peculiar care;
"Who chaſtly lives amidſt a wanton race,
"Lewder than thoſe Sardinia's coaſts embrace.

The moſt conſiderable of his Works is the Poem intitled, *The Comedy of Hell, Purgatory, and Paradiſe.* It has ſerved ſome Commentators for a Text [G], and has furniſhed matter for a war between ſeveral Critics [H]. It contains certain things which do not pleaſe

" What ſhall I ſay? Hope riſes in my breaſt,
" And to my ſight the future ſtands confeſt:
" I ſee reform'd the Ladies of the town,
" And pulpits preach each wanton faſhion down."

Let us add the Tranſlator's Paraphraſe (37): " The time " will ſoon come (ſays he) when the wrath of God will " overflow in ſuch a manner to the great calamity of the " Republic of Florence, for the immodeſties and lewd- " neſs of the Florentine Ladies; that if they be deſirous to " appeaſe his wrath, the Preachers will be obliged pub- " licly to forbid them going with their necks and " breaſts uncovered. This is what he means by *Nel* " *qual ſarà in Pergamo* (ſo he calls the pulpit of truth) " *interdetto A le ſfaciate donne Fiorentine*, properly " ſhameleſs, *L'andar moſtrando con le poppe il petto*, " that is, to walk through the city with their neck " bare, to ſhew their large breaſts, and high cheſts." A French Writer of the XVIth Century has more ſtrongly expreſſed this ſort of nudity, for which he blames the French Ladies. *As to our women*, ſays he (38), *they have learned the manner of the ſoldiers of theſe times, who take a pride in ſhewing their gilt and ſhining breaſt-plates, when they march to their reviews; for whether they go to maſs to obtain pardons, or walk abroad to viſit the orchards, or gardens, or other private places, which it is not decent to name, and that for a very good reaſon, they expoſe their naked breaſts to view, ſhewing their waiſtes, diaphragms, heart, lungs, and other pectoral parts, endued with a perpetual motion; which theſe good Ladies make to keep time, or meaſure, like a clock, or rather like a Smith's bellows, which kindle the fire for their forge: in the ſame manner do theſe gentlewomen go, kindling a fire in the heart of the Heliogabaliſts of our Court, who are already but too effeminate, and heated in their luſts; yet to inflame them the better, or abſolutely to burn them, our Court Medeas invent all the artifices which nature has produced to aſſiſt mankind for good purpoſes, to turn them into laſcivious, and filthy things.* The abuſe was not ſo great ſome years after (39).

The Proteſtants have made good advantage of Dante's invectives againſt the abuſes of the Court of Rome (40). See below the Remark [I].

[G] *His Poem of Hell, &c. has ſerved ſome Commentators for a Text.*] See the Edition of his Italian Poems publiſhed at Venice in the year 1564, *in folio*, by the Care of Francis Sanſovino (41): you will there find the Notes of Chriſtopher Landino, and thoſe of Alexander Vellutelli. Thoſe of Vincenzo Buonanni on this Poet's Hell fell into my hands very lately: they were printed at Florence, *in 4to*, in the year 1572, and dedicated to Francis of Medicis, Prince of Tuſcany (42). The Author promiſed a like Commentary on Dante's Purgatory and Paradiſe: I do not know whether he kept his Word; but I know that Bernardino Daniello has written a Comment on all the three Poems, and that long before him Benevenuto d'Imola had done the ſame thing with a great deal of wit and learning. *Benevenutus ſummus Philoſophus & Poëta Comœdiarum Dantis interpres, qua in re cum excellenti ingenio doctrinam quoque ſummam oſtendit* (43). Grangier, Counſellor and Almoner to the King, and Abbot of St. Bartholomew at Noyon, has turned them into *French rhime*, and written a Commentary on them. His work was printed at Paris in the year 1597, in three volumes in 12°. Monſr. Baillet (44) will inform you of the judgment which the Critics have paſſed on theſe three Poems. He ſays, that in the opinion of Caſtelvetro, they ought to be conſidered as an Epic Poem, tho' the Italians have given them the title of a Comedy. It muſt be obſerved that the Author himſelf gave them the ſame title (45). Thoſe who to prove he wrote part of this work before his baniſhment, ſhould come and tell us that the XXI Canto of Hell was compoſed in the year 1300, would produce but a very weak proof; for he has plaid with dates according to his own fancy. Does he not introduce people who foretell him what had already befallen him (46)? He tranſports himſelf therefore to a time anterior to that wherein he wrote his Poem.

[H] . . . . *And has furniſhed matter for a war between ſeveral Critics.*] Some have cenſured Dante, and others have written his Apology. James Mazzoni is reckoned one of his moſt learned Defenders. He publiſhed two volumes againſt one Caſtravilla, who had criticiſed Dante (47). A learned man of Siena, named Beliſarius Bulgarini, wrote Notes againſt this Work of Mazzoni, at the requeſt of Horatio Capponi Biſhop of Carpentras. Somebody ſtole them from him, and publiſhed them under his own name, and under the title of *Brevis atque ingenioſa contra Dantis opus Diſputatio.* He was ſo plainly convicted of his theft, that he was obliged to make a Recantation, which he publiſhed together with a Work wherein he anſwered Bulgarini's Objections againſt Dante. A learned man of Bologna, named Jerom Zobbius, took part in this quarrel, and publiſhed a work in the year 1583, which he intitled, *Dantes & Petrarcha ab Hieronymo Zobbio defenſi:* Bulgarini made uſe of this opportunity to expoſe the fraud of his plagiary the more ſenſibly, and printed a new Book wherein he refuted what Capponi had objected againſt the four firſt parts of his Remarks againſt Mazzoni. He alſo publiſhed two others, one againſt that of Zobbius, and the other againſt the Palinody and Apology of the plagiary. Here are already four Works of Bulgarini. He publiſhed another in Italian, in which he refuted what Zobbius had written in defence of Dante concerning the poetical particles. His ſixth work is intitled: *Beliſarii Bulgarini, Aperti, Academici Inthronati, Notæ ad primam Dantis defenſi partem Jacobi Mazzoni.* Laſtly, he printed a Book againſt a Manuſcript which was falſly attributed to Speron Sperone, and which maintained the cauſe of Dante (48). It is affirmed that he came off victorious from this long diſpute, and that the force of his reaſons made it plainly appear that the Comedy of Dante belonged to no one ſpecies of Poetry, ſince it was far from being conformable to the precepts of Ariſtotle. *Ne multis morer, finis fuit ejuſmodi, ut Bulgarinus certaminis victor diſcederet, cum, certiſſimis validiſſimiſque rationibus, adverſariorum copias, pro Dante propugnantes, profligaſſet, obtinuiſſetque, illius comœdiam veram poëmatis cujuſpiam rationem non habere, quod ab Ariſtotelis præceptis longiſſime aberraret* (49). Ugurgieri informs us that the Comedy of Dante raiſed one of the moſt memorable Wars among the *literati* and the *virtuoſi* of Italy that has been ſeen of the kind (50). He adds that Mazzoni's Work threw oil into the fire, and that the piece which was ſtollen from Bulgarini, and which the plagiary publiſhed under his own name, was the ſtumbling block. Bulgarini laid claim to his property by publiſhing that piece, and putting his own name to it: he was refuted by the plagiary; but he returned to the charge, and took advantage of the confeſſion of the theft. His Reply was printed at Siena, in the year 1588: I ſet down the title of it, that the plagiary's name may be known, which has not yet appeared in the Liſt of this ſort of Thieves. *Il Bolgarino avvantaggioſi nella cauſa per la confeſſione del furto riſpoſe all' Avverſario con un libro ſtampato per Luca Bonetti in Siena l'anno* 1588 *che fu intitolato; Diſeſe in riſpoſta dell' Apologia e Palinodia di Monſignor Aleſſandro Cariero Padovano in propoſito della Commedia di Dante* (51). Lilius Gyraldus ſpeaks of an Auguſtin Monk, who was from his youth greatly prepoſſeſſed in favour of Dante, and refuted thoſe who criticiſed that Poet, on all occaſions. *Certe in eo* (Danthe) *poeticam diſpoſitionem majoremque diligentiam pleroſque deſiderare video, ejuſque linguæ nitorem: quos Joannes Stephanus eremita, & amicus chariſſimus, & municeps noſter, qua eſt eruditione, & quo à teneris erga Danthem fuit ſtudio, mirabiliter ſolitus eſt refellere* (52). i. e. " It is certain that moſt people find " Dante deficient in poetical diſpoſition, care, and puri- " ty of language: whom John Stephanus the Hermit, my " dear friend and fellow citizen, uſed to refute admirably " and with great learning, out of the affection he bore to " Dante from his childhood." I do not find this John Stephanus in the *Apparato de gli Huomini illuſtri della Città di Ferrara*, publiſhed in the year 1620 by *Agoſtino Superbi da Ferrara, Theologo e predicatore de' Minori*

(37) Grangier, *Commentaire ſur le Purgatoire de Dante*, pag. 404.

(38) Nicolas de Montand, *Miroir des François*, liv. 1. pag. 17, 18. Edition of 1581.

(39) See in the Remark [B] of the Article DEMPSTER, the ſcandal given to the inhabitants of Paris.

(40) *See among others* Flacius Illyricus, *in Catalogo Teſtium Veritatis*, and *Wolfius*, in the 1ſt Volume *Lectionum memorabilium, & reconditarum*, pag. m. 612.

(41) I have ſeen an Edition of Venice printed (I believe) from this, in 1578, in folio, dedicated the 10th of June 1578, by Gio. Ant. Rampazetto, to William of Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua.

(42) And not to the Great Duke Coſmo, as Michael Poccianti, *de Script. Florentin.* pag. 169, aſſerts.

(43) Leand. Albert. *in Deſcript. Ital.* pag. 493.

(44) At the beginning of the 3d part of *Jugemens ſur les Poetes.*

(45) See the 16th, and 21ſt Canto's of Hell.

(46) See below Citation (76).

(47) Nicius Erythræus, *Pinacoth.* 1. pag. 68.

(48) Extracted from Nicius Erythræus, *Pinac.* 2. pag. 72, 73.

(49) Idem, ibid. pag. 73.

(50) Ugurgieri, *nelle* Pompe Saneſi, *apud* Lorenzo Craſſo, *Iſtoria de Poëti Greci*, pag. 85, 86.

(51) Idem, ibid. *apud eundem* Craſſo, pag. 86.

(52) Lilius Gyraldus, *Hiſt. Poëtar.* Dial. 5. *ſub fin.* pag. m. 308.

pleaſe the Pope's friends, and which ſeem to ſignify that Rome is the ſeat of Antichriſt (*l*). Another Book of Dante has much diſpleaſed the Court of Rome, and has made him paſs for a Heretic [*I*]. We muſt not forget that this great Poet met with ſome illuſtrious patrons

(*l*) See the Remark [*I*].

(53) Idem, ibid.

(54) Raphael Volaterranus, lib. 21. pag. 771.

(55) Moreri wrongly quotes *Bartoli*, lib. 1. *de iniquit. reis.* Here are three faults: 1, A Reader would think himſelf referred, not to *Bartolus* the Civilian, but to the Jeſuit *Bartoli*; 2, He ſhould have quoted *lege* 2, and not *libro* 1. The 3d fault is his ſaying *iniquit. reis*, inſtead of *inquir. reis.* [Or rather *de requirendis reis*, as it is quoted after Bartolus by John Nevisan, *Foret nuptiale*, lib. 1. n. 132. It is the 17th Title of the 48th Book of the Digeſt, where it is expreſſed thus: *De requirendis, vel abſentibus damnandis. De inquirendis reis* is properly the 40th Title of the 9th Book of the Code. CRIT. REM.]

(56) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1321, num. 7. He cites the 1ſt Book of *Volaterranus's Anthropology.* This quotation, copied by *Moreri*, is good for nothing; for the *Anthropology* is not divided into particular Books; it reaches from the 13th Book of the Author's *Commentaries* inclusively to the 24th excluſively. What *Spondanus* quotes is in the 21ſt Book.

(*) Anton. *Tit.* 21. cap. 5. § 2.

(57) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1321, num. 7.

(58) Poccianti us, *de Script. Florent.* pag. m. 45.

(59) Idem, ibid.

(60) Idem, ibid.

(61) Du Pleſſis, *Myſtere d'Iniquité*, pag. 419, 420.

nori Conventuali. Gyraldus adds, that the Olivetan Monks preſerved the Latin Verſion of Dante's Poems, which one of them made in Latin Hexameters, as a kind of ſacred treaſure. *Vidi qui Latinum Danthem fecerat carmine hexametro, ex Olivetanis videlicet ſodalibus Piſtorienſem quendam eorum temporum: quem librum (prob ſumme optime Deus, quanta cuſtodia aſſervatum in Olivetano cœnobio) ipſi non ſine ambitione mihi, tanquam rem ſacram aliquam oſtenderant* (53).

[*I*] . . . . *Another Book . . . . has made him paſs for a Heretic.*] It is that *de Monarchia*; wherein he maintains that the authority of the Emperors ought not to depend on that of the Popes. This was his Hereſy (54): *Scripſit præter hæc Opuſculum de Monarchia, ubi ejus fuit opinio quod imperium ab eccleſia minime dependeret. Cujus rei gratia tanquam hereticus poſt ejus exitum damnatus eſt, cum aliorum, tum Bartoli juriſperiti ſententia ſuper lege* 1. *c. præſules. lib. digeſtorum de inquirendis reis* (55). Spondanus, a French Biſhop, has on this occaſion ſhewn himſelf a perfect Ultramontane; for he quotes this Remark of Volaterranus without the addition of any corrective (56). He takes the ſame courſe in citing St. Antoninus, who, as he ſays, has amply refuted the moſt capital error that he found in the Writings of this Poet, which is his leſſening the power of the Popes over the temporalities of Kings. *Quem* (Dantem) *egregias animi dotes ac ſcientiæ laudem & præclara ſcripta, tum aliis erroribus maculaſſe obſervavit ſanctus Antoninus* (*): *tum eo maximè, quo tertiâ parte tractatus ſui de Monarchiâ conatus eſt deprimere auctoritatem Romani Pontificis ſupra Imperatores ſeu Reges Romanorum in temporalibus, quem idem Antoninus pluribus confutat* (57). A true diſciple of the Sorbonne, and a true ſon of the Gallican Church, would not have ſpoken in ſuch a manner. Take notice that this Analiſt dares not ſpecify the other errors which St. Antoninus obſerved in our Poet. Poccianti has not been ſo diſcreet: for he tells us that S. Antoninus cenſured Dante for having omitted the Limbo of infants, and for having looked on the voluntary abdication of Pope Cæleſtin as a meanneſs of ſoul (58). He adds, that in this particular, and on account of his doctrine of the independence of the Emperors, this great Poet deſerves blame. *In his culpandus venit vates iſte perglorioſiſſimus* (59). He is ſilly enough to aſſert that both divine and human Writings do every where teach how erroneous the opinion of independency is; for, ſays he, as the Moon is inlightened by the Sun, ſo is the temporal power illuminated by the ſpiritual. Here are his words; it is proper to quote them, leſt the Reader might ſuſpect me to be guilty of fraud. *Cæterum in tertia parte Monarchiæ affirmat Romanos Imperatores nullam dependentiam habere à Papa, ſed à ſolo Deo, niſi in ſpectantibus ad forum animarum, non autem in rebus temporalibus; quod quam erroneum ſit, ubique locorum in humanis & divinis literis explicatur: ſicut namque luna illuminatur à ſole, ita poteſtas temporalis à ſpirituali* (60).

Mr. du Pleſſis Mornai alledges ſeveral opinions of Dante, which are not very conformable to Popery (61): "He wrote a Treatiſe intitled *De Monarchia*, "in which he proves that the Pope is not ſuperior to "the Emperor, and has no manner of authority over "the Empire; directly againſt the Clementine *Paſtoralis*, which aſſerts both the one and the other: he "even goes ſo far as to ſay, in his Purgatory:

"*Di hoggi mai che la Chieſa di Roma*
"*Per confonder in ſe due reggimenti*
"*Cade nel fango & ſe bruta & la ſoma.*
"Di maintenant que l'Egliſe de Rome,
"Qui fond en un les deux gouvernemens,
"Tombe en la fange, & ſe gaſte, & la ſomme.

"Say now, the Church of Rome, thro' wild ambition,
"Confounding the two Governments in one,
"Falls in the mire, and fouls herſelf and burthen;

"Deſtroys herſelf and the charge committed to her.
"He alſo confutes the Donation of Conſtantine, which "he maintains to be a fiction; and of ſmall authority, "ſuppoſing it real; for which reaſon he was by ſome "condemned as a Heretic. *That the Decretiſts, men "utterly unacquainted with all ſound Divinity and Philoſophy, aſſert that the traditions of the Church are "the foundation of faith; an execrable thing, ſince it "cannot be doubted but that thoſe who before the traditions of the Church believed in Chriſt the Son of "God, either to come, or already come to ſuffer for us, "and hoping have been fervent in charity, are coheirs with him in eternal life.* In his Italian Poem "of Paradiſe, he complains that the Pope of a Shepherd is become a Wolf, and has led the ſheep "aſtray; That for this reaſon the Goſpel and the "Doctors of the Church are neglected, and the Decretals only are ſtudied; That the Pope and his "Cardinals are wholly attentive on this; Their "thoughts go not to Nazareth, where the angel Gabriel opened his wings, but to the Vatican and "other choſen places of Rome, which have been the "Burying-places of the Soldiers who followed St. "Peter, whoſe doctrine they have really buried at "Rome; That heretofore war was made on the "Church with the ſword, but now it is done by taking from her the bread which God gives her, and "which he denies to none, to wit, the preaching of "his word, *But thou*, ſays he, addreſſing himſelf to "the Pope, *who writeſt only to blot out*, or *by a Chancellor, thinkeſt that Peter and Paul, who died for the "Lord's vineyard which thou ſpoileſt, are yet alive; "but thou knoweſt neither the one nor the other.* In "another place, he ſays, That it is a ſhame the holy "Scripture ſhould be wholly caſt aſide, or elſe forced "or wreſted; That they do not conſider how much "blood it coſt to publiſh to the world; and how "agreeable it is to him who approaches it with humility; That, on the contrary, every one endeavours to make himſelf conſiderable by his own inventions, and the Goſpel is ſilent; Vain Queſtions "and fables eccho from the pulpit all the year long, "and the poor ſheep come back fed with wind: And "ſeveral other paſſages might be produced out of the "ſame Work againſt the Pope's pardons and indulgences, and the other abuſes of the Church of "Rome, which he paints in ſuch colours, that it is "eaſy to ſee he had marked well the Whore in the "Revelations (a)." Coeffeteau, in his Anſwer to this paſſage (62), obſerves I, That Dante was a Ghibelin (63), and full of reſentment for the ill treatment he had received from the contrary faction. II, That Dante *owns both the Donation and the cauſe which is alledged for it, to wit, the cure of Conſtantine's Leproſy. It is true that in this Book* de Monarchia (e), *he endeavours to prove that Conſtantine could not make ſuch a Donation, becauſe it was to diſmember the Empire: but a Poet is not a judge of this matter of State.* III, That as to what he ſays concerning traditions, *there is no harm in it, provided it be rightly underſtood.* IV, That he blames only the Popes of *his time, whom he treats as enemies, and perſecutors of his faction.* V, That *when he ſpeaks of thoſe Pontifs, he proteſts that he reverences their dignity, though he blames their perſons.* VI, That he has condemned none but *impoſtors, who preached falſe indulgences, or made a ſordid traffick of true ones.* Here are ſome Verſes of Dante quoted by Coeffeteau as a proof of his Orthodoxy with regard to the ſubmiſſion which is due to the Pope.

(a) Dante, *del Paradiſo*, cant. 9, & 29, & *del Purgatorio*, cant. 32.

(62) Coeffeteau, *Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, pag. 1032, 1033.

(63) The Ghibelins were the Faction which oppoſed the Popes.

(e) Dantes Alig. lib. 3. *de Monarch.* c. ultim.

Siate Chriſtiani à movervi piu tardi (64),
Non ſiate come penne ad ogni vento,
Et non crediate ch' ogni acqua vi lavi,
Havete il vechio, e'l novo teſtamento,
El paſtor de la chieſa, che vi guida:
Queſto vi baſti à voſtro ſalvamento (i).

"Ye Chriſtians, learn more conſtancy to know,
"Nor turn, like feathers, with all winds that blow;
"Think not in every common ſtream you may
"Waſh the infectious ſtains of guilt away.
"You have the ſacred Scriptures for your guide,
"The Paſtor of the Church you have beſide:
"And theſe for your ſalvation will ſuffice.

(64) Grangier tranſlates this 1ſt Verſe thus: *Pour les Vœux, ô Chreſtiens, ſoyez d'un cœur plus grave.* The Poet had been ſpeaking of raſh Vows.

(i) Cant. 5. *del Paradiſo.*

patrons in his misfortune, but could not always preſerve their affection [K]; for though he was

To this Rivet anſwers (65) that *the Author of the little Italian Book, intitled* Aviſo piacevole dato à la bella Italia, *had collected the principal pieces, from which Bellarmin had ſupplied Coeffeteau* with defenſive arguments; that it is neceſſary therefore for *the Reader, who would enter into an examination of theſe things*, to compare *Bellarmin with the Animadverſions of the learned Junius, wherein he will find ſolid confirmations againſt all theſe illuſions and ſubterfuges, and will plainly perceive, that this man ſaw Antichriſt in a ſeat reſpected by him, but the profanation of which he lamented, in a word, the man of ſin whom he deteſted, in the Temple of God which he revered:* Rivet exhorts the Adverſaries to obſerve theſe Verſes of Dante:

(65) Rivet, *Remarques ſur la Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, Part. 2. pag. 494, &c.

De voi Paſtor s'accorſe l'Uvangeliſta,
Quando colei che ſiede ſopra l'acque
Puttaneggiar co' i Regi à lui fu viſta;
Quella che con le ſette teſte nacque,
Et da le dieci corna hebbe argumento
Fin che virtute al ſuo marito piacque (*).

(*) Canto 19. *del Ieſerno.*

" 'Twas you, O Pope, th' Evangeliſt foreſaw,
" When he beheld the Harlot on the floods
" Whore with the Kings and Monarchs of the earth:
" Her who beſtrode the ſeven-headed beaſt,
" From the ten horns receiving power, till God
" Exert his juſtice, and his word fulfil.

(66) Rivet, *Remarques ſur la Rép. au Myſtere d'Iniquité*, Part. 2. pag. 495.

There certainly, proceeds that Miniſter (66), *he acknowledges that St. John, in the 17th Chapter of the Revelations, ſpoke of the Pope, under the name of the whore ſitting on the waters, and of the beaſt with ſeven heads and ten horns, whatever he may elſewhere ſay of the ſeat and of the power of the keys. Nobody denies that thoſe things, conſidered in themſelves, are to be reſpected in every Church: but if they are uſurped by a Tyrant, nothing hinders but he may be deſcribed ſuch as he is.... As to* Conſtantine's Donation, *whoever conſiders the matter well will find, that he has ſet down the common and received opinion in his time* (67) *by way of conceſſion, not as his own belief, which never aſſented to ſuch an abſurdity.* As to the ſix Verſes quoted by Coeffeteau, his Antagoniſt tranſlates them in this manner. *Be ye, O Chriſtians, more ſlow to be moved: be not as feathers to every wind, and believe not that all water will waſh you; you have the Old and New Teſtament; the Paſtor of the Church who guides you. This is ſufficient for your Salvation.* After which he ſpeaks thus: " Would Coeffeteau really adviſe all " Chriſtians, in order to confirm themſelves againſt " lightneſs of belief, to take the Old and New Teſ- " tament? He would take care not to do that. But " he is not aſhamed to aſſert of the Pope, that he is " *the Paſtor who is ſufficient for our Salvation*; and " would fain make Dante to have blaſphemed thus, " who without doubt ſpoke of the true Saviour who " guides us by the Old and New Teſtament." We have here a ſignal inſtance of the illuſions into which a man may fall, when he ſticks to the firſt ſenſe which a Writer's expreſſions offer to his mind. They who read theſe ſix Verſes of Dante, and take them *in ſenſu obvio quem ipſamet propoſitionum verba præ ſe ferunt* (68); i. e. *in the obvious ſenſe which the very words of the propoſitions offer*; they who underſtand them, I ſay, as Innocent XII would have the five propoſitions of Janſenius underſtood, believe the Poet meant that in order to be ſaved, we need only conform ourſelves to the Old and New Teſtament, and follow the way which the Pope as Paſtor of the Church ſhews us. But perhaps this is not the true ſenſe of Dante; it may be he meant what Rivet imputes to him. Let us learn from hence that an Author, who would prevent future ages from conſtruing what he has ſaid in divers contrary ways, wiſhes a thing almoſt impoſſible. If a man was able to foreſee the controverſies which will ariſe three or four hundred years hence, he would expreſs himſelf in a more preciſe manner; but I do not know whether Languages would afford terms ſufficient to take away all equivocations, and to obviate all cavils.

(67) See the 19th Canto of *Hell*, pag. m. 236.

(68) Theſe words are taken from a Brief of Innocent XII to the Biſhops of Flanders, dated the 6th of Feb. 1694.

Take notice of one thing, that Dante furniſhes proofs, both to thoſe who ſay he was a good Catholic, and to thoſe who ſay he was not. The Author of *l'Aviſo à la bella Italia* has collected the latter: Bellarmin has collected the former; and beſides he has eluded, in the beſt manner he could, all the paſſages produced in the *Aviſo*. Gretſer refers us to that Cardinal; and it is almoſt the only anſwer he gives to the paſſage of Mr. du Pleſſis. *In Dante*, ſays he (69), *luculentiſſima teſtimonia pro Pontificis Romani auctoritate, proque omnibus illis capitibus, quæ Pleſſæus & Illyricus attingunt, inveniuntur. Qua de re operæ pretium erit legere Bellarminum in libello proprio contra Italum quendam calumniatorem, qui ex Dante potiſſimum, Romani Pontificis majeſtatem labefactare nitebatur: Ad omnia enim profani hominis objecta reſpondit Illuſtriſſimus Bellarminus: Et cap. 19. plurima loca ex Dante producit, quæ cum Pleſſæi & Illyrici delirationibus non magis conſonant, quàm dies cum nocte, æther cum Tartaro.* i. e. " In Dante we find the cleareſt proofs for the author- " rity of the Roman Pontif, and for all thoſe points " which du Pleſſis and Illyricus touch upon. Con- " cerning which it would be worth while to read Bel- " larmin's Anſwer to a certain Italian Libeller, who " endeavoured to weaken the Pope's authority chiefly " from Dante: for the illuſtrious Bellarmin has an- " ſwered all that profane fellow's objections: and in " the 19th chapter produces ſeveral paſſages out of " Dante, which agree no more with the wild notions " of du Pleſſis and Illyricus, than day with night, or " heaven with hell."

(69) Gretſerus, *Exam. Myſterij Pleſſæani*, pag. 463.

[K] *He met with ſome illuſtrious Patrons in his misfortune, but could not always preſerve their affection.*] I find ſome diſorder in the accounts which have been given of his travels after his exile. Some Authors ſay, that ſeeing himſelf baniſhed, he felt a more ardent thirſt after learning ariſe in his ſoul, and that he went firſt to Bologna, there to apply himſelf to the more ſublime Sciences, and afterwards to Paris. *Exulem ubi ſe vidit, tum verò magis incenſus eſt ſtudio liberalium Artium, ac Bononiæ primùm dedit operam gravioribus ſcientiis, indéque Lutetiam Pariſiorum profectus eſt.* This is what Papyrius Maſſo ſays (70): Mr. Bullart aſſerts that he went from *Bologna* to Paris, *to learn Philoſophy and the principles of Divinity* (71). Naudé tells us (72) that Boccace *has left in writing that* Dante, *being expelled Florence by the violence of the Black and White factions* (73), *retired to Paris, and much frequented the Univerſity, diſputing pro and con in all faculties* (*), ubi ſæpiſſimè adverſus quoſcumque circa quamcumque facultatem volentes reſponſionibus aut poſitionibus objicere diſputans intravit Gymnaſium: *and himſelf in the tenth Canto of his Paradiſe expreſſes a great eſteem for one Seguter, an excellent Philoſopher and Logician, who read Lectures in his time in the great Schools of* la rue aux Fouerres, *whoſe learning, he ſays, was not unenvied.*

(70) Papyr. Maſſo, *Elogior.* tom. 2. pag. 18.

(71) Bullart, *Académie des Sciences*, tom. 2. pag. 307.

(72) Naudé, *Addit. a l'Hiſt. de Louïs XI*, pag. 175, 176.

(73) He was expelled only by the Faction of the Black.

(*) Lib. 15. *Genealog.* cap. 6.

Queſti, ond' à me ritorna il tu' rigardo
E' il lume d'uno ſpirto che'n penſieri
Gravi à morire, gli parv' eſſer tardo.
Eſſa è la luce eterna di Siggieri,
Che leggendo nel vico de li ſtrami
Sillogizzò invidioſi veri.

That is,

" He on the left, where now you turn your eyes,
" Is the great Siggieri, learn'd and wiſe,
" Who ſick of Life, and the World's empty ſhow,
" Chid tardy death, and thought he mov'd too ſlow.
" In Lectures he deliver'd from the chair
" Such wond'rous truths, as envy pin'd to hear.

To know whether the Words of Boccace invincibly prove that our Poet ſtudied at Paris after his exile, it is neceſſary to ſee what goes before. Boccace had been ſaying, *Fuit inter cives ſuos egregia nobilitate verendus: & quantumcunque tenues eſſent illi ſubſtantiæ, & à cura familiari, & poſtremo à longo exilio angeretur, ſemper tamen Phyſicis atque Theologicis imbutus vacavit ſtudiis, & adhuc Julia fatetur Pariſiis, in eadem ſæpiſſimè adverſus quoſcunque*, &c (74). i. e. " He claimed " reſpect of his fellow citizens on account of the no- " bleneſs of his birth; and how ſlender ſoever his " means

(74) Boccatius, *de Geneal. Deorum*, lib. 15. cap. 6. *apud* Papyr. Maſſon. *Elogior.* tom. 2. pag. 21

was a man of few words, he gave his tongue a little too much liberty on some occasions (*m*). He left some children (*n*). A very singular instance is given of his attention in reading [*L*].

(*m*) *Erat morosissimus & Philosophorum instar, ut qui tristitiam præ se ferre videretur, nec facile loqui & brevissime conceptiones animi exprimere solebat.* Papyr. Masso, *Elogiorum* tom. 2. pag. 28.

(*n*) See the Remark [*B*].

" means were, and tho' he was distressed by the care " of his family, and at last by a long banishment, yet " he always found time to cultivate the Study of Na- " tural Philosophy and Divinity, in which he was well " skilled, as Paris can testify where he frequently &c." It is clear from this passage that Dante when banished often disputed with great vigour in the Colleges of Paris. Nevertheless I know some think Boccace mistaken as to the time: they cannot persuade themselves that Dante, who had been one of the chief Governors of the Florentines, and was animated with an extreme desire of restoring his Faction, amused himself with wrangling in the Colleges at above thirty five years of age (75). They are of opinion therefore that he only shewed this humour for disputation in the Schools of Paris when he was a young Scholar, and before his promotion to the Council of Eight. They say he was a pupil of Brunetto at Paris, and that Brunetto died before Dante was banished: and this they prove from the Xth Canto of Hell (76). It is certain we there find that Dante had been the Scholar of the deceased Brunetto Latini.

Se fosse tutto pieno il mio domando,
Rispos' io lui, voi non sareste anchora
Dell' humana natura posto in bando,
Che'n la mente m'è fitta, & hor m'accora
La cara, buona imagine paterna
Di voi, quando nel mondo ad hora ad hora
Mi mostravate, come l'huom s' eterna,
Et quant'io l'habbia in grado mentre vivo,
Convien che nella mia lingua si scerna (77).

" Oh! had the Gods, in pity, I reply'd,
" Heard Dante's ardent wish, you had not dy'd:
" The world had still enjoy'd its wonder and its pride.
" Paternal likeness I beheld in you,
" And all your father rises to my view.
" Fix'd in my Mem'ry lives your pious care,
" Which taught me first immortal fame to share:
" His gratitude let Dante's pen declare."

But we do not find there in what City it was that he had him for his Master. However it be, I shall produce Grangier's Note on these words of Dante, *Siete voi qui Ser Brunetto.* " Ser Brunetto Latini was of " Florence, and a Notary or Secretary of great es- " teem and well skilled in his business, but a man of " very little conscience; for which reason being ac- " cused of several forgeries, he went to live at Paris, " where reading public Lectures in Natural Philosophy, " he became Dante's Master, and as a Mathematician " or Astrologer foretold him, that he would be one of " the most learned men of his time. Our Poet feigns " that he finds him damned in this place with the So- " domites, for the same vice (78)." Add to this that Dante supposes (79) the Professor Seguier was dead. It is probable therefore that he had heard and known him before the time he feigns him to be conducted to paradise; and that time was prior to his banishment. To conclude, it may be observed that several Authors, who speak of what he did after his misfortunes, only mention the retreats which he went to seek in the Courts of some Princes of Italy.

According to Volaterranus (80) he first retired with those of his faction to Martello de Malespina: he went afterwards to Verona, to Can della Scala; and at length to Ravenna, to Guy Polentano, four years after his banishment. Neither the order nor the time has been well observed in this Relation. We learn from Dante himself, that he retired first to Verona, to a Lord of the family della Scala (81):

Il primo tuo rifuggio, e'l primo hostello
Sara la cortesia del gran Lombardo,
Che'n su la scala porta il santo uccello:
C'haura in te si benigno riguardo:
Che del far & del chieder tra voi due
Fia prima quel, che tra gli altri è piu tardo (82);

" For refuge to the Lombard Prince repair,
" Whose arms an eagle on a ladder are:
" This Lord shall first your wand'ring steps receive,
" And favours, faster than you ask them, give;"

and that he had been banished near six years (83) when he took refuge with the Marquess de Malespina. Frehe- rus says he went first to Paris, and that he departed thence to wait on the King of Aragon who had invited him, and loaded him with favours: and that he after- wards accepted the invitation of Can della Scala, who took great delight in conversing with learned men, and gave him signal marks of his liberality (84). This account is no better than that of Volaterranus. I own Boccace observes that Dante was greatly beloved by Frederic of Aragon, King of Sicily (85).

To finish my Commentary, I have this more to say, that Dante had not the good fortune to please his Patron of Verona long. He was plainly given to understand that they were weary of him: the great Can della Scala said to him one day, It is a strange thing that such a one who is a madman should please us all, and gain the love of every body, which you who pass for a wise man are not able to do. There is nothing strange in that, answered Dante; you would not wonder at it, if you knew how much the conformity of people's minds con- ciliates friendship. Every body sees the Answer was too shocking not to put our Poet absolutely out of fa- vour with the Prince of Verona. You are going to read this fact in Latin, and a little more at large. *Dantes Aligherius*, they are the words of Petrarch (86), *& ipse conciviis nuper meus, vir vulgari eloquio clarissi- mus fuit, sed moribus parumper contumacior, & ora- tione liberior quàm delicatis ac studiosis ætatis nostræ prin- cipum auribus atque oculis acceptum foret. Is igitur exul patria, cùm apud Canem magnum, commune tunc afflic- torum solamen ac profugium versaretur, primo quidem in honore habitus, deinde pedetentim retrocedere cœperat, minúsque in dies domino placere. Erant in eodem con- victu histriones ac nebulones omnis generis, ut mos est, quorum unus procacissimus obscœnis verbis ac gestibus, multùm apud omnes loci ac gratiæ tenebat. Quod molestè ferre Dantem suspicatus Canis, producto illo in medium, & magnis laudibus concelebrato, versus in Dantem: Mi- ror, inquit, quid causæ subsit, cur hic cùm sit demens, nobis tamen omnibus placere novit, & ab omnibus diligi- tur, quod tu qui sapiens diceris non potes? Ille autem: Minimè, inquit, mirareris, si nosses quòd morum paritas & similitudo animorum amicitiæ causa est.*

[*L*]. *A very singular instance is given of his attention in reading.*] He went one day into a Bookseller's shop, which looked into the great square of the city. His intention was to see some public games which were to be celebrated; but having met with a Book which he had a mind to consult, he read it with such appli- cation that, as he returned home, he protested with an oath that he had neither seen nor heard any thing that had passed, or had been said, during the celebration of the games. Dantem Florentinum *ferunt ad spectacula ductum apud Bibliopolam, quòd ex ejus taberna in forum prospectus esset, consedisse, librumque, cujus fuisset cupi- dus, invenisse; quem tam avide attenteque legerit, ut domum rediens juramento testatus sit, nihil se vidisse aut audisse ex iis, quæ in foro dicta factaque essent, quemad- modum de eo scribit Æneas Sylvius* (87).

(75) According to *Buonanni*, who places his birth in the year 1260, he would have been above 41. See his *Discourse* on the 21st Can- to of *Hell*, pag. 137.

(76) *Dante* sup- poses that he found him in Hell: now he supposes his Jour- ney to Hell was made in the year 1300, and he was not banished till 1301.

(77) Dante, Canto 15 *del In- ferno*, pag. m. 116.

(78) Grangier, *sur le XV Chant de l'*Enfer de Dante, pag. 166, 167.

(79) In the 10th Canto of *Para- dise*, pag. m. 230.

(80) Volaterran. *Comment. Urban.* lib. 21. pag. 771.

(81) *Grangier*, on this passage of *Dante*, calls him Albouin, and makes him the Elder Brother of Can the Great.

(82) Dante, Canto 17 *del Paradiso*, pag. m. 445.

(83) See the 8th Canto of *Purga- tory*, pag. 138.

(84) Paulus Fre- her. *in Theatro*, pag. 1422. He cites the 50 *Lives of Boissard.*

(85) Boccat. *Ge- nealog. Deorum*, lib. 14. cap. 11. *apud* Papyr. Masson. *Elogior.* tom. 2. pag. 214.

(86) Petrarcha, *Rerum Memoran- darum*, lib. 4. *apud* Papyr. Masson. ibid. pag. 22, 23.

(87) Philippus Carolus, *Ani- madv. in Aulum Gellium*, pag. 592.

DANTE (PETER VINCENT) was of Perugia, and of the Family of the Rainaldi. He was a man of much wit: he understood polite Literature, the Mathema- tics, and Architecture; and composed such fine Verses in imitation of Dante, that it was thought the sublimeness of that great Genius was in some sort revived in him. They even gave him the surname of Dante, which pleased the Family so well, that his des-

cendants quitted the name of *Rainaldi*, and ſubſtituted that of Dante in its room. Our Peter Vincent invented ſome machines which were admired by the ſkilful, and wrote a Commentary in Italian on the Sphere of John de Sacroboſco (*a*). He died very old, in the year 1512, leaving a ſon and a daughter (*b*) [*A*], of whom I ſhall ſpeak in the Remark.

(*a*) It was printed at Perugia, in the year 1544: it was reprinted there in 1574, with the addition of a *Letter* from the Author to Alphanus his Maſter. Oldoïni, *Athen. Auguſt.* pag. 283.

(*b*) Extracted from the *Athenæum Auguſtum* of *Auguſtin Oldoïni*, a Jeſuit, pag. 283.

[*A*] *He left a ſon and a daughter.*] JULIUS DANTE his ſon was well ſkilled in Architecture and in Mathematics. He wrote a Book de *Alluvione Tyberis*, and Notes *in Ornamenta Architecturæ*. He died in the year 1575. I ſhall make a ſeparate Article for Ignatius Dante, his ſon, wherein I ſhall alſo ſpeak of Vincent Dante, another of his ſons. THEODORA DANTE, his ſiſter, having retired into the country in the year 1497, to fly the plague which afflicted the city of Perugia, was ſo well inſtructed in the Mathematics by her father, that ſhe deſerved an honourable rank among the moſt famous Mathematicians of the age. She compoſed Books in that Science, and taught it her nephew Ignatius with great ſucceſs (1). The Abbot de la Roque is in the wrong to ſay ſhe flouriſhed towards the end of the XVI Century. See his *Journal des Savans* of the 12th of December 1678, page 460 of the Dutch Edition.

(1) Extracted from the *Athen. Auguſtum* of *Auguſtin Oldoïni*, pag. 198, 313, 314.

DANTE (IGNATIUS), grandſon of the preceding, was born at Perugia, and took the habit of a Dominican Monk. He became ſkilful in Philoſophy and Divinity, and yet more ſo in the Mathematics. He was invited to Florence by the Great Duke Coſmo I, and explained to him the Sphere, and the Books of Ptolemy. He read public Lectures on the ſame ſubject, and had a great many Auditors in the Univerſity of Bologna, when he explained Geography and Coſmography there. Being returned to Perugia, he made a fine Map of that City, and of its whole territory. The reputation of his Learning cauſed him to be invited to Rome by Gregory XIII, who employed him in making Geographical Maps and Plans. He acquitted himſelf ſo well therein, that the Pope thought himſelf obliged to raiſe him to the dignity of a Biſhop; wherefore he gave him the Biſhopric of Alatri near Rome. The new Prelate failed not to go and reſide in his Dioceſe; but Sixtus V, who ſucceeded Gregory XIII, would have him near his perſon, and ordered him to return to Rome. Dante was preparing for that journey, when death conſtrained him to take a longer, the 19th of October 1586 (*a*). He is the Author of ſome Books [*A*]. I ſhall ſpeak of his Brother in a Remark [*B*].

(*a*) Extracted from Oldoïni, *Athen. Auguſt.* pag. 161, 162.

[*A*] *He is the Author of ſome Books.*] He publiſhed at Florence, in 1569, a Treatiſe of the Conſtruction and Uſe of the Aſtrolabe. He alſo wrote Notes on the Sphere of Sacroboſco, on the Aſtrolabe, and on the Univerſal Planiſphere. He made a Sphere of the World in five Tables. Add hereto his Optics of Euclid and Heliodorus of Lariſſa, and his Commentary on the two rules of James Barozzi. The two laſt Works are in Italian (1). Voſſius did not know this Author. In the Oxford Catalogue we only find the *Commentario alle regole delle proſpettiva di Jac. Barozzi*, printed at Rome, 1583.

(1) Extracted from Oldoïni, *Athenæum Auguſt.* pag. 162.

[*B*] *I ſhall ſpeak of his Brother in the Remark.*] That is to ſay, of VINCENT DANTE, the ſon of Julius, and grandſon of Peter Vincent, and nephew of the learned Theodora. He applied himſelf to the ſtudies of the family, and ſucceeded therein extremely well; for he was a good Architect, and a good Mathematician. Beſides, he was very well ſkilled in ſculpture and painting. He made a ſtatue of Julius III at Perugia. Philip II King of Spain had a mind to employ him in finiſhing the Eſcurial, and offered him very large penſions; but Dante did not enjoy health ſufficient to undertake that voyage. He ſtayed in his native city (2), and he applied himſelf to Poetry and the Mathematics. He compoſed ſeveral Works, and among others the Lives of thoſe who had excelled in Statuary. *Monumenta plura reliquit, inter quæ connumerantur Vitæ Italico idiomate cælatorum ſtatuarum illuſtrium* (3). He died at Perugia in the year 1576, at the age of forty ſix (4).

(2) That is, at Perugia.

(3) Oldoïni, *Athen. Auguſt.* pag. 329.

(4) Extracted from *Oldoïni*, ibid.

DANTE (JOHN BAPTIST) a native of Perugia, was an excellent Mathematician. One of his moſt ſubtle inventions was to make a pair of wings ſo exactly proportioned to the weight of his body, that he made uſe of them to fly with. He made the experiment of it ſeveral times [*A*], over the lake of Traſimenus, and with ſuch ſucceſs that it inſpired him with the boldneſs to divert the whole city of Perugia with the ſight. The time he pitched upon was the ſolemnity of the marriage of Bartholomew d'Alviano with the ſiſter of John Paul Baglioni. When the crowd of ſpectators was aſſembled in the great ſquare, behold, our Dante at once ſhooting from the higheſt place of the city appeared all covered with feathers, and moving two large Wings in the midſt of the air. He directed his flight over the ſquare, and ſtruck the people with admiration. Unfortunately, the iron with which he managed one of his wings broke; and then, not being able to balance the weight of his body, he fell on the Church of our Lady, and broke his thigh. It was ſet by the Chirurgeons; and he was afterwards invited to profeſs the Mathematics at Venice. He died of ſickneſs before he was forty years old (*a*). There is no need to ſay why he was ſurnamed Dædalus. I make no doubt but he was related to the other Dantes of Perugia whom I have mentioned; and am ſurprized that Oldoini, who furniſhes me with this Article, ſays nothing either of his family, or of the age (*b*) wherein this Dædalus lived.

(*a*) Extracted from Oldoïni, *Athenæum Auguſt.* pag. 168, 169.

(*b*) By the circumſtance of the marriage of Bartholomew d'Alviano it may be known that he flouriſhed towards the end of the 15th Century.

[*A*] *He made himſelf wings ſo exactly proportioned to his body, that he made uſe of them to fly with. He made the experiment of it ſeveral times.*] I fancy ſeveral of my Readers will believe nothing of it: yet it is a thing, as is ſaid, which has been practiſed at other places. See the laſt *Journal des Savans* of the year 1678.

DARIUS, firſt of the name, King of Perſia, was the ſon of Hyſtaſpes (*a*), and one of the ſeven Lords who aboliſhed the Tyranny of the Magi; and it was he who ſlew

(*a*) He was Governor of Perſia. *Herodot.* lib. 3, cap. 70.

(b) *Herod.* lib. 3. cap. 78.

ſlew the pretended Smerdis (b) [*A*]. That I may not repeat what is to be found in Moreri's Dictionary, I ſhall only ſay that the Epitaph of this King of Perſia contained a very remarkable ſingularity [*B*]. Darius had more wives than Moreri gives him [*C*]. That Author has very ill reckoned up this Prince's expeditions [*D*].

[*A*] *It was he who ſlew the pretended Smerdis.*] I do not comprehend what Moreri means by telling us, that the deſign which the ſeven great Lords formed to dethrone Smerdis, was *happily executed by Cambiſes, who died very ſoon after*. For, in the firſt place, it was not Smerdis who uſurped the crown. Smerdis the ſon of Cyrus had been put to death by the order of his brother Cambyſes. The uſurper was a Magus, who paſſed for Smerdis the ſon of Cyrus. In the ſecond place, the ſame Lords, who formed the deſign of dethroning that uſurper, were thoſe who executed it: and therefore the whole glory of the execution ought not to be attributed to one *Cambiſes*. This is the more unpardonable in Moreri, becauſe he has not ſaid whether his pretended *Cambiſes* was one of thoſe Lords. In the third place, there was no Cambyſes concerned, either in the deſign of expelling the Magi, or in the execution of that enterprize. IV. Laſtly, none of thoſe who executed it died very ſoon after, or before they proceeded to the election of a new Monarch.

[*B*] *This King's Epitaph contained a very remarkable ſingularity.*] Darius in his Epitaph boaſts of having been a great drinker; *Titulo res digna ſepulchri*; a circumſtance worthy to be inſcribed on a tomb-ſtone. Ἠδυνάμην καὶ οἶνον πίνειν πολὺν, καὶ τοῦτον φόρειν καλῶς (1): *I could both drink a great deal of wine, and carry it well.* It cannot be denied but that, phyſically ſpeaking, the quality which Darius here glories in is a good one; for certainly it is a ſtrength, a power, and the effect of a robuſt conſtitution: but, beſides its being a quality almoſt conſtantly attended with a moral irregularity, I do not ſee why the faculty of drinking much ſhould be more valued than that of eating much. Now it is certain that one feels a ſort of natural averſion to great eaters. Demoſthenes was much in the right, when he told thoſe who praiſed Philip King of Macedon for being a ſtout drinker (2), *that it was not a kingly quality, but the property of a ſponge* (3). But as every Nation has its peculiar taſte, that of the Perſians was to eſteem thoſe who could bear a great deal of wine. The younger Cyrus valued himſelf on this qualification, as a thing which rendred him more worthy of the ſceptre than his elder brother (4).

(1) Athen. lib. 10. cap. 9. pag. m. 434.

(2) Νὴ Δία συμπόταν ἱκανώτατον, *ſtrenuum profecto compotatorem.* Plut. *in Demoſth.* pag. 853.

(3) Idem, ibid.

(4) Above, Citation (29) of the Article CYRUS.

[*C*] *He had more wives than Moreri gives him.*] "According to the opinion of Herodotus he had two "wives Atoſſa and Ariſtona." This is what Moreri ſays: but if he had taken the pains to turn over Herodotus, he would have found there that Darius had three or four wives, beſides thoſe two. That Prince's firſt wife was the daughter of Gobryas: he married her before his advancement to the throne, and had three ſons by her, the eldeſt of whom, Artabazanes, was excluded from the ſucceſſion in favour of Xerxes, who was the eldeſt by the ſecond wife. As the mother of Xerxes was the daughter of Cyrus, and as he was born after his father was King, he was preferred to Artabazanes whoſe mother was not a Princeſs, and who was born before Darius came to the Crown. This is what we find in the firſt chapters of the VII Book of Herodotus; and here are already two wives of Darius: the daughter of Gobryas, whoſe name I know not, and Atoſſa the daughter of Cyrus, and mother of Xerxes. This daughter of Cyrus had already been wife to her brother Cambyſes (5), and afterwards to the Magus who uſurped the crown under the falſe name of Smerdis. She had a ſiſter yet a maid named Artyſtona, whom Darius eſpouſed likewiſe (6). He alſo married the Princeſs Parmys, the daughter of Smerdis the ſon of Cyrus; and Phædima the daughter of Otanes, one of the ſeven Lords who deſtroyed the falſe Smerdis (7). This Phædima had belonged to Cambyſes, and was one part of the ſucceſſion which fell to the pretended Smerdis; for he did not forget to poſſeſs himſelf of all the wives of Cambyſes. The laſt, by the advice of her father, when ſhe lay with the uſurper, diſcovered that he had no ears, which fully detected the impoſture (8). Darius moreover took to wife Phratagune, the ſole daughter and heireſs of Atarnes his brother (9). So that here are fairly ſix wives of this Monarch mentioned by Herodotus. They give him a ſeventh, named Pantapla, who had alſo belonged to the falſe Smerdis (10).

(5) *Herod.* lib. 3. cap. 88.

(6) Idem, ibid.

(7) Idem, ibid.

(8) *Herod.* lib. 3. cap. 68, 69.

(9) Idem, lib. 7. cap. 224.

(10) Hieronymus, *in cap.* 11. Danielis, *apud* Chriſtianum Matthiæ, *in Theatro quatuor Monarch.* pag. m. 207.

[*D*] *Moreri has very ill reckoned up this Prince's expeditions.*] The foundation of my preſent criticiſm is not his ſaying that *Darius made five conſiderable expeditions*; but his having, after ſuch a ſetting out, taken notice only of three, thoſe of Samos, Babylon, and Scythia. They who would diſcover and unravel the two others, will be obliged to reckon for the fourth that which is but a branch or ſequel of the third, and to tack to it the campain of Marathon. After which they muſt take the chaſtiſing of the revolted Egyptians for the fifth. Thus, by gueſſing at a man's meaning, and extracting it from the chaos of a very confuſed Narration, we ſhall arrive at the promiſed number, I mean five expeditions; but at the ſame time we ſhall diſcover a great many blunders. Here are the words of Moreri. Darius *returning* from Scythia, *left his General Megabyzus with eighty thouſand men to conquer Europe. It* (11) *is memorable for the defeat of the Perſians in the battle of Marathon . . . his army compoſed of above five hundred thouſand men was defeated by twelve thouſand Athenians.* Megabyzus being left in Europe with a detachment (12) of Darius's army, is no more than a ſequel of the Scythian expedition. To reduce the exploits of Megabyzus and the battle of Marathon to one expedition is to confound things prodigiouſly. There was an interval of twenty years between the expedition of Scythia and the Battle of Marathon. It is in this interval that Writers uſually place Darius's fourth expedition (13), the War of Ionia (14), during which the Athenians aſſiſted the rebel Ariſtagoras, and helped him to burn the City of Sardis. And it was to revenge this affront that Darius cauſed a formidable army to paſs into Greece, which was overthrown in the plain of Marathon. This is reckoned for Darius's fifth expedition. As to the revolt of the Egyptians, he died while he was making preparations to puniſh it (15). Therefore he employed no troops againſt them, as Moreri aſſerts.

(11) This word can refer to nothing that goes before.

(12) We may give this name to a Body of 80 thouſand men, conſidering Darius's whole army.

(13) See the *Theatre* of *Chriſtianus Matthias*, pag. m. 205.

(14) Moreri ſays nothing of it.

(15) *Herod.* lib. 7. cap. 4.

DASSOUCI, or D'ASSOUCI (CHARLES COYPEAU, SIEUR) a French Muſician and Poet in the ſeventeenth Century. He publiſhed his own Adventures, which are very odd, in a ſtyle bordering on buffoonry. He relates that he was born at Paris (*a*); that his father Gregory Coypeau Sieur d'Aſſouci, an Advocate in the Parliament (*b*), the ſon of a Cavalier of Cremona named d'Agnanis, an excellent maker of violins (*c*), was of Sens in Burgundy (*d*); that his mother was of Lorrain (*e*), a very little woman, and very choleric; and that there was ſo little concord between her and her huſband [*A*], that,

(a) D'Aſſouci, in the 2d tome of his *Adventures*, pag. 55.

(b) Ibid. pag. 57.

(c) Ibid. pag. 56.

(d) Ibid. pag. 54. [Sens is not in Burgundy but in Champagne. CRIT. REM.]

(e) Ibid.

[*A*] *His mother was . . . . a very little woman, and very choleric; and there was . . . little concord between her and her huſband.*] We are going to ſee an inſtance of the diſorders of the pen to which they expoſe themſelves who ſet up for Jokers and burleſque Writers. They find themſelves obliged to divert the public at their own expence, and to level their buffoonry at themſelves, and whatever they ought to ſpare the moſt. Here is the way in which our d'Aſſouci ſpeaks of his mother.: "She was a little bit of an Amazon, haſty "and choleric, who to repair the defects of her dimi- "nutive ſize, wore ſuch high pattins, that whoever "would have taken the pains to ſplit the cork of "them, might have eaſily made very good ſchool fag-

that, *having divided their children and their ſubſtance, they parted by mutual conſent* (*f*); that he lived with his father at Paris, and was treated ſo ill by the maid-ſervant, that it occaſioned his playing *ſeveral wild pranks* (*g*); and that at nine years of age (*h*) *he took his flight as far as Calais* (*i*), where he made people believe he underſtood Aſtrology, and was *ſon to that great and renowned Calculator of Nativities* (*k*) *named Cæſar* (*l*); that having by a little artifice cured a perſon who conceited himſelf ſick, he paſſed for a famous Magician (*m*), though he was yet but nine years old; that thoſe who *had received him into their houſe, having ſome intimation that the fooliſh mob were for throwing him into the ſea, . . . , ſent him privately out of Calais* (*n*). I have not found the ſequel of his adventures till the time that the Duke de St. Simon got Lewis XIII *to hear him* at St. Germain (*o*) [*B*]. *He hit* that Prince's *humour* (*p*) by a drinking Song he made, and which every body ſung at Court. The King *liſtened to his Songs ever after, and granted him free admittance into his cloſet*; and they called d'Aſſouci *Phœbus garderobin, becauſe he had his lutes always in the King's wardrobe* (*q*). He continued this game under the minority of Lewis XIV. That young Prince read our Poet's Verſes *in bed before he went to ſleep, ana always laughed, and that very properly, at the jeſt which ſeveral Courtiers, who laughed unſeaſonably, could not take* (*r*). He *diſdained not to give ear to his ſongs, and to ſing them himſelf.*

(*f*) D'Aſſouci, ibid. pag. 62.

(*g*) Ibid. pag. 64.

(*h*) Ibid. pag. 69.

(*i*) Ibid. pag. 68.

(*k*) Ibid. pag. 73.

(*l*) See the Article RUGGERI, Remark [*E*] at the beginning.

(*m*) D'Aſſouci, *Avantures*, tom. 2. pag. 89.

(*n*) Ibid. pag. 90.

(*o*) Ibid. pag. 47.

(*p*) Ibid. pag. 48.

(*q*) Ibid. pag. 47.

(*r*) Ibid. in the Epiſtle Dedicatory to the King.

" gots of them; ſo that ſhe never put them off, without " loſing juſt one half of her illuſtrious perſon. For which " reaſon my father, who was not ſo ſubtil a Wit as to " be wholly detached from matter, uſed to ſay my " mother was ſo little that ſhe was loſt in the bed, " and not finding her between the ſheets, he complain- " ed that ſhe had no body, but was all ſpirit. But, to " make amends, beſides the qualification ſhe had of ſing- " ing like an Angel, and playing divinely on the lute, " ſhe was endued with ſuch a marvellous ſpirit of con- " tradiction, and ſo imperious a temper, that in forty " years time, having never agreed with my father the " Advocate in any one thing, the poor Gentleman " durſt ſcarce open his mouth, for fear of having an " affront put on his underſtanding. And tho' I was " very young then, I remember that my father one " day ſpeaking of the Laws, and my mother hav- " ing a mind to talk of them too, they had ſo furi- " ous a diſpute about a paſſage of Juſtinian, that they " both took ſword in hand, and fought a duel for " the explication of the Law *Frater à fratre* (1)." A little lower he makes no ſcruple to declare, that his father had made his ſervant maid his concubine. *Being ſubject to the caprices of a ſervant, I began to taſte the bitters of life before I had taſted the ſweets of it. For this ſervant, or rather this miſtreſs, with whom my father took libertis which I may permit you to gueſs at, but not to read, bearing as great a hatred to me, as I bore to her, there was not an hour in the day but we were at daggers drawing* (2).

(1) D'Aſſouci, *Avantures*, tom. 2. pag. 58, &c.

(2) Ibid. pag. 62, 63.

A man of his humour no doubt had read the Writings of Father Garaſſe, and I imagine he took from thence what he ſays about his mother's pattins; for here is a paſſage of that Jeſuit's *Doctrine curieuſe*. " Saint Vincent Ferrier tells us in one of his Sermons, " that a Gentleman in his time having married " a woman by proxy, whom perhaps he had never " ſeen but in a picture, of a good ſize and tolerable " height in appearance, found himſelf ſtrangely de- " ceived when he ſaw her in the chamber without pat- " tins, for ſhe was diminiſhed and ſhortened by one " half, which frighted him ſo that he aſked her ſome- " what angrily, *Ubi poſuiſti reliquum perſonæ tuæ?* " Where have you left the reſt of your perſon? The " matter was, ſhe had put off her pattins, which made " her appear twice as tall as ſhe really was (3)." Had d'Aſſouci read Brantome's Memoirs, he would very probably have added to what he ſays about his mother's pattins ſome alluſion to Hercules's club, tho' it had been only to diſguiſe his theft. Read the following paſſage; " I remember that once at Court, a very hand- " ſome tall Lady was looking at a fine and magnifi- " cent hunting piece of tapeſtry, in which Diana and " all her retinue of Virgin huntreſſes were naturally " repreſented, and tho' they were all dreſſed, ſhewed " their beautiful feet and fine legs; ſhe had one of her " companions near her, a woman of very low ſtature " and ſmall ſize, who was alſo amuſing herſelf with " looking at the tapeſtry, and ſaid to her: Ha, little " one, if we all dreſt in this manner, you would be a " great loſer by the bargain; for your great pat- " tins would diſcover you, and you would not have " ſo good a grace in walking, and ſhewing your legs, " as we who are tall; ſo that you would be obliged " to hide your ſelf, and appear abroad but ſeldom: " therefore thank the faſhion, and the long gowns " we wear, which favour you very much, by conceal- " ing your legs ſo cleverly that with your monſtrous " pattins of a foot high, they are more like clubs " than legs; for if a man was in diſtreſs for a wea- " pon, he need only cut off one of your legs, and " take it by the upper end, and with your foot ſhod " and grafted into your great pattins he might do " wonders (4)." Julius Cæſar Scaliger obſerves that the women of Italy wore very high pattins, and that his father uſed to ſay, that men who had ſuch wives found but half of them in bed, the other half remaining in their pattins. *Soccus humilis eſt. Italas mulieres altiſſimis uſas vidimus, quamvis diminutiva voce dicant Socculos. Patris mei perfacetum dictum memini, Ejuſmodi uxorum dimidio tantum in lectis frui maritos, altero dimidio in ſoccis depoſito* (5). One of theſe huſbands complained very pleaſantly that he had married a wife compoſed of two moieties, being half wood and half fleſh (6). Scioppius fancies he has found in Juvenal that in certain women the two parts of this diviſion were not equal, and that the human body ought to be conſidered as the appendix only. The paſſage is thus in the printed Editions:

(3) Garaſſe, *Doctrine Curieuſe*, pag. 323.

(4) Brantôme, *Dames Galantes*, tom. 1. pag. 340, 341.

(5) Jul. Cæſ. Scaliger, *Poet.* lib. 1. cap. 13. pag. m. 48.

(6) *Unde etiam cujuſdam querela, qui ſe uxorem ſemilignean duxiſſe dicebat*, Comment. in Alciati Emblem. pag. m. 589.

Si breve parvi
Sortita eſt lateris ſpatium, breviorque videtur
Virgine Pygmæa, nullis adjuta cothurnis,
Et levis trectâ conſurgit ad oſcula plantâ (7).

(7) Juven. Sat. 6. ver. 502.

That is,

——— " Look behind,
" And then ſhe dwindles to the Pygmy kind:
" Duck-legg'd, ſhort-waiſted, ſuch a Dwarf ſhe is,
" That ſhe muſt riſe on tip-toes for a kiſs."

Dryden.

But Scioppius, inſtead of *adjuta* would have us read *adjuncta*, and confirms his conjecture by an example. *Parvam puellæ ſtaturam exprimit, dum eam cothurnis adjunctam ait, ſicut Cicero de genero ſuo*, quis meum generum alligavit gladio (8)? i. e. " He expreſſes the girl's low " ſtature, by ſaying ſhe was joined to her buſkins, as " Cicero ſaid of his ſon-in-law, *Who has tied my ſon-* " *in-law to a ſword?*"

(8) Scioppius, *Verifimil.* lib. 4. cap. 10. pag. m. 148, 149.

[*B*] *The Duke de S. Simon got Lewis XIII to hear him at St. Germain.*] If we ſtick to the Author's Relation, this advantage was procured him about the year 1640; for he ſuppoſes that in 1655 one of the King's footmen told him, *I have known you above theſe fifteen years; it was I who went to fetch you when the Duke de S. Simon got the King to hear you at S. Germain* (9). This ſhews that the Sieur d'Aſſouci had not before that time been admitted into that Prince's preſence. Why, therefore, does he tell us in another place (10) that he *diverted King Lewis XIII twenty years together?* This is not the firſt time I have obſerved that Authors are not good Chronologers in their own Hiſtory. Take notice our ſpark acquaints us (4) that he had been in the ſervice of the Duke d' Angoulême, natural ſon of Charles IX, and that he triumphed over all the endeavours which were uſed to get him turned out.

(9) D'Aſſouci, tom. 1. pag. 47.

(10) Ibid. tom. 2. pag. 14.

(11) Ibid. pag. 10.

himſelf (s). D'Aſſouci, having a mind to return to Turin to their Royal Highneſſes Court (t), left Paris about the year 1655, *with ſo much precipitation, that he had ſcarce time to pay ſome of his debts* (u). He was accompanied by two Muſic-Pages (x); he arrived at Lyons, after having met with ſeveral vexatious accidents, and made an acquaintance with a man who has appeared in a corner of Monſieur Boileau's Satires, and who for that reaſon deſerves a place in my Commentary [C]. He found many charms at Lyons: he there entertained with his Muſic *all the Convents of ſinging Nuns*, and *there was not one of thoſe devout virgins who had not already a copy of his Ovid in a merry humour* (y). This was the Title of a Work, wherein he tranſlated part of Ovid's Metamorphoſes into burleſque Verſe. He ſtaid three months at Lyons in the midſt of diverſions, plays, and entertainments (z), being highly careſſed by Moliere, and the Bejars (aa); after which he went to Avignon with Moliere (bb), and then to Pezenas where the Aſſembly of the States of Languedoc was held (cc). He was maintained by thoſe Players a whole winter (dd), and he received conſiderable preſents from the Prince of Conti, Monſieur de Guilleragues, and ſeveral perſons of that Court (ee). He had loſt one of his Muſic-boys, and as *he found himſelf in that Province of France which produces the fineſt voices as well as the fineſt fruits*, he would not return thence into Piedmont without trying to fill up the vacancy. He followed Moliere as far as Narbonne (ff); and afterwards went to Montpellier, where he ran the riſque of his life. This accident is become very famous by the Relation of the Journey of Meſſieurs de Bachaumont and la Chapelle [D]. I ſhall ſpeak of it in the Remarks. He continued three months longer at Montpellier after he had been diſcharged out of priſon (gg), and compoſed there

(s) D'Aſſouci, *Avantures*, tom. 2. pag. 12.

(t) He ſays in the 3d Volume of his *Relations*, pag. 153. that the Count d'Harcourt had formerly given him to the Dutcheſs of Savoy.

(u) D'Aſſouci, tom. 1. pag. 2.

(x) Ibid. pag. 3.

(y) Ibid. pag. 296.

(z) Ibid.

(aa) They were Players belonging to *Moliere's* Company.

(bb) D'Aſſouci, tom. 1. pag. 309.

(cc) Ibid. pag. 315.

(dd) Ibid. pag. 316.

(ee) Ibid. pag. 318.

(ff) Ibid. pag. 319.

(gg) D'Aſſouci, tom. 2. pag. 164.

[C] *He had made an acquaintance with a man who has appeared in a corner of Monſr. Boileau's Satires, and who for that reaſon deſerves a place in my Commentary.*] D'Aſſouci, in the Relation of his Journey from Chalons on the Saone to Lyons, tells us *that having made his muſic-boys ſing ſeveral moving and paſſionate ſongs* (12), he drew an Auditor who was blind, and who *had on each ſide of his mandibles at leaſt a quarter of a yard* of ears, *ſo fine and ſo crimſon, that tho' his noſe was full as high coloured, it was difficult to decide which bore the bell, either the purple of his noſe, or the cinnabar of his ears* (13). Being aſked who he was, he anſwered (14): "I am . . . . "one of the deſcendants of Homer, and I dare ven- "ture to ſay I have even ſome advantage over that di- "vine perſon; for though he was blind as I am, and "ſung his verſes publickly from door to door as I "do mine, he had only his legs hairy, whereas I am "all over as rough as a bear. . . . I am a famous "Poet and Singer, but a Singer bleſt with ſo power- "ful an Organ, and ſo ſtrong and clear a voice, "that provided I drink but one dram of brandy, if "I were to ſing on the Auguſtins Key, the King "might hear me from the windows of his Louvre. "He had no ſooner ſaid this than, without being "aſked, he drew a little Book covered with blue paper "out of his pocket, and having given it to a young "lad who led him, they united their two voices, and "ſetting their hats on one ſide, they ſung theſe "agreeable ſongs:

"*Helas, mon amy doux &c.*

"Alas, ſweet friend &c."

"And this other, which Gautier-Garguille ſung formerly;

"*Baiſez-moy Julienne.*
"*Jean Julien je ne puis.*

"Kiſs me, Juliana.
"John Julian, that I cannot."

"After this, he ſung one of his own compoſition, "ſpick and ſpan new, the title of which was: *A pi-* "*tiful and diverting ſong on the death of a Shoe-* "*maker, who cut his throat with his paring knife,* "*to revenge himſelf on the infidelity of his wife.*" D'Aſſouci had a mind to know his name, and the place where he held his Parnaſſus. *My name*, ſays he, *is Philippot at your ſervice, otherwiſe the Savoyard; and if ever you paſs over the Pont-neuf, on the ſteps of that bridge you will find my Parnaſſus; the brazen horſe is my Pegaſus, and the Samaritaine the fountain of my Helicon* (15). He gave d'Aſſouci one of his Books of ſongs (16). *My late father*, added he (17), *God reſt his ſoul, has ſung the ſongs of Guedron, and the late Boeſſet a thouſand times.*

(12) Ibid. tom. 1. pag. 247.

(13) Ibid. pag. 249.

(14) Ibid. pag. 251.

(15) Ibid. pag. 257.

(16) Ibid. pag. 259.

(17) Ibid. pag. 261.

If Notes be not written on Boileau's Satires within theſe hundred years, there will be ſome paſſages in them leſs intelligible than the moſt obſcure which are to be found in the Confeſſion of Sanci and the Catholicon. And I am perſuaded that a Commentator on thoſe Satires in the XIXth Century would be overjoyed to meet with this ſcrap of the Hiſtory of a famous Singer on the Pont-neuf, and would willingly inſert it as an ornament in his Notes on this paſſage:

Le bel honneur pour vous, en voiant vos Ouvrages
Occuper le loiſir des Laquais & des Pages,
Et ſouvent dans un coin renvoiez à l'écart
Servir de ſecond tome aux Airs du Savoiard (18).

(18) Des-Preaux, Satire 9. ver. 75.

"What envy'd honour, that your Works engage
"Th' attention of each Footman, and each Page;
"Or in ſome place remote, at Wakes and Fairs,
"Furniſh a ſecond Tome to the Savoyard's airs!"

[D] *He ran the riſque of his life at Montpellier. This accident is become very famous by the Relation of the Journey of Meſſieurs de Bachaumont and la Chapelle* †.] As this Relation is in every body's hands, I ſhall only take out of it the chief particulars which concern our Muſician. Meſſieurs de Bachaumont and la Chapelle tell us they arrived at Montpellier the day that *d'Aſſouci was to be burnt there for a crime which is abominated by the women.* They very pleaſantly deſcribe the indignation of the fair ſex; they ſay that *a man of quality had procured the wretch's eſcape*, and that the women raiſed an inſurrection in the city on that account, *and had already torn two or three people to pieces, only for being ſuſpected of being acquainted with d'Aſſouci*; that they were afraid of being likewiſe taken for his friends, and left the town with precipitation: that they met him *with a pretty page who followed him*; that he gave them an account in few words of all the diſaſters which had befallen him; that having ſeen ſeveral towns in Provence, they went to Avignon, and one evening, *as they were taking the air on the banks of the Rhone in a clear moon ſhine*, they met the Sieur d'Aſſouci; and aſked him maliciouſly:

Ce petit garçon qui vous ſuit,
Et qui derriere vous ſe gliſſe,
Que ſçait il? en quel exercice,
En quel art, l'avez-vous inſtruit?
Il ſçait tout, dit-il; s'il vous duit,
Il eſt bien à vôtre ſervice.

"The youth who after you comes trudging,
"(He's an apt Scholar, we imagine)

† [This perſon's name ſhould be written ſimply *Chappelle.* CRIT. REM.]

"What

there a *Relation of that tragi-comical Adventure*; but he did not print it, though the Chief Juſtice, who had ſeen it, had given him leave (*bb*). He afterwards ſaw ſeveral Towns of Provence; he went to wait on the Prince of Morgues at Monaco, who gave him thirty Piſtoles; he paſſed the Col de Tende &c. (*ii*). Being arrived at Turin, he had ſome trouble to confute by his preſence the falſe report of his execution which had been read in the burleſque Gazette. He uſed all imaginable endeavours to procure himſelf a fixed ſettlement in that Court (*kk*), and he ſuppoſes he ſhould have ſucceeded therein,

(*bb*) Ibid. pag. 163.

(*ii*) D'Aſſouci, *Avantures d'Italie*, pag. 74.

(*kk*) See the Remark [*E*].

" What has he learn'd, ſince here you brought him?
" What exerciſes have you taught him?
" O Gentlemen, the Spark reply'd,
" The Boy's a knowing Boy, and try'd;
" Yet I can part with him with eaſe:
" He's at your Service, if you pleaſe."

We then thanked him very civilly, as you would have done, and made him no other anſwer than

Adieu, bon ſoir, & bonne nuit:
De vôtre Page qui vous ſuit,
Et qui derriere vous ſe gliſſe,
Et de tout ce quil ſçait auſſi,
Grandmerci Monſieur d'Aſſoucy;
D'un ſi bel offre de ſervice,
Monſieur d'Aſſoucy grandmercy (10).

(19) *Voyage de Bachaumont & la Chapelle*, pag. m. 75.

" Adieu, good Monſr. D'Aſſoucy,
" Thank you for your civility:
" But keep your page, and all he knows:
" Once more, Monſieur, a good repoſe!"

Few Books of Wit have been ſo much read and admired as the Relation of theſe two Gentlemen's Journey; and they have thereby contributed more than any body to make d'Aſſouci's name odious, contemptible, and abominable. It has been reported, *that his enemies, to ruin him, ſhewed* that Relation *to Pope Clement IX* (20). This was a tickliſh affair; for it contains a pretty malicious paſſage, and very likely to diſpleaſe the Court of Rome. It is that wherein it is ſuppoſed that d'Aſſouci, having eſcaped the flames at Montpellier, judges himſelf out of danger, ſince he is got to Avignon:

(20) D'Aſſouci, *Avantures*, tom. 2. pag. 271.

Mais enfin me voila ſauvé;
CAR *je ſuis en terre Papale* (21).

(21) *Voyage de Bachaumont*, pag. 75.

" At length a ſafe Retreat I've found;
" FOR now I ſtand on Papal Ground."

The unfortunate d'Aſſouci experienced but too dearly the prejudice which the Relation of Meſſieurs Bachaumont and la Chapelle did him (22): he wrote againſt the latter, and abuſed him very much: and as he pretended to have been the perſon who taught him to make verſes, and that ſome pieces of Poetry had been publiſhed in his praiſe of Mr. Chapelle's compoſition, he called him to an account for his ingratitude and inconſtancy (23). He maintained it was a falſhood to aſſert that he had been met by thoſe travellers, either near Montpellier or at Avignon (24): he affirms that he did not leave Montpellier till three months after his enlargement, ſo that they advanced a notorious falſity, in ſaying they found him out of that city the very day he was ſet at liberty (25). He aſſerts they did not go to Montpellier till two years after his adventure; whence he concludes that they have made uſe of a very malicious fiction to aſperſe him (26). The miſchief is, that tho' he convicts them of having taken the ſame liberties in their repreſentation of this affair, as are taken by Writers of Romances, he cannot deny the main matter; for he owns he was put into a dungeon at Montpellier, and accuſed of an infamous commerce. *Inſtead*, ſays he (27), *of attributing to the merit of my art the pains I was at in ſeeking out a ſinging-boy for the ſervice of* the Dutcheſs of Savoy, the people *ſaid it was to make a traffick of him with the Princes of Italy*, or *that under pretence of muſic* (28), *I travelled the world over in this manner, looking out for boys, not to teach them to ſing, but to ſell them to the Chirurgeons of Montpellier to make anatomies of them . . .* (29). *What ſhall I ſay more? the Catholics, who are called in that country* Catholiques a gros grain, *or* coarſe-ſpun Catholics, *called me Parpaillot* (30); *and the Parpaillots called me an Atheiſt: but the fine Ladies, who loved their intereſt better, and were more ſpeculative, ſetting God aſide, called me Heretic, not in point of Religion, but in point of Love; and without remembring the many ſerenades I had given them, and the many marks of affection I had ſhewn them, when, in my younger years, while I ſtaid at Montpellier, I taught them to play on the Lute, and ſhewed them the fingering of that inſtrument, they unjuſtly accuſed me of the inſenſibility which Orpheus of old had for the Bacchants, and all this without any other foundation than their chimerical imagination already prepoſſeſſed by the report they had heard of my long acquaintance with C. the late D. B. and the late C. and fomented by the malice of thoſe irritated minds.* Take notice that he aſſigns for the cauſe of all this perſecution, the anger of a Lady *who was adored by all Montpellier* (31), and who *failed not to ſet her whole wit to work, and employ all her engines, to deſtroy him* (32). Several *preciſe dames took the part of this irritated woman, and ſwore by their patches and by their paint-pot, never to plaiſter their faces till they had cauſed his aſhes to be ſcattered in the wind* (33). He was ſo imprudent as to affront them in a Poem which he diſperſed under the Title of *Articles de Paix aux Précieuſes de Montpellier*; *Articles of Peace to the preciſe Ladies of Montpellier*. Theſe verſes were very ſhocking and ſatirical. They were, no doubt, the more offended at them, becauſe he therein freely declared the true reaſon why, as he ſaid, they perſecuted him, and required that he ſhould be puniſhed for an example. He promiſed them to be more gallant for the future, and made them an offer of his abilities, though a little extenuated by age.

(30) That is, Huguenot.

(31) D'Aſſouci, *Avantures*, tom. 2. pag. 100.

(32) Ibid. pag. 102.

(33) Ibid. pag. 118.

Mais r'aſſurez vos cœurs jaloux,
Eſclave des charmes plus doux,
J'adore par tout la nature,
Sans m'appliquer à la torture,
Que la plus belle d'entre vous
Vienne un peu tenter l'avanture.
Je veux mourir ſous l'impoſture,
Si je n'appaiſe ſon courroux.
Sec & paſſé comme je ſuis,
Et non du tout ſi beau qu'un Ange,
Je fais pourtant ce que je puis,
Je ne ſuis pas un maſle étrange,
Garçon loyal & bon Chrêtien,
J'aime plus que voſtre entretien.
Pourquoy donc, ſexe au teint de roze,
Quand la charité vous impoſe
La loy d'aimer voſtre prochain,
Me pouvez-vous hair ſans cauſe,
Moy qui ne vous fis jamais rien?
Ha! pour mon honneur je voy bien
Qu'il vous faut faire quelque choſe (34).

(34) Ibid. pag. 122.

(55) Ibid. pag. 268.

" This jealous rage, ye fair, give o'er;
" Your charms, I ſwear, I ſtill adore!
" Let but the faireſt try my Love,
" If to her wiſh I fail to prove,
" May future ages, to my ſhame,
" Brand me with an Impoſtor's name.
" 'Tis true, the verge of age I touch,
" Nor can I brag of beauty much:
" Yet I do, Ladies, what I can,
" And who does more, is more than man.
" The fair, I vow, I never baulk,
" And can do ſomething more than talk.
" Why then this cauſeleſs hate to me,
" Who ne'er did aught? Ha! now I ſee
" 'Tis that's my crime (and I repent me);
" I muſt DO ſomething to content ye."

(36) *Here is a paſſage of Chapelle's Relation:*
L'on auroit dit à voir ainſi
Ces Bacchantes échevelées,
Qu'au moins ce Monſieur d'Aſſoucy
Les auroit toutes violées; i. e.
One wou'd have fancy'd, thus to ſee
Theſe Bacchants with diſhevell'd hair,
This rampant Monſieur d'Aſſouci
Had raviſh'd every woman there;
And yet he had never done any thing to them.

Moreover, he accuſes la Chapelle of having ſtollen this thought from him (35). See the margin (36), and regard not the reflections of ſome cenſorious people.

therein, if he had not amuſed himſelf with making Verſes, if he had not thought it ſufficient to make his court to the principal Deities, and if he had not raiſed the jealouſy of the Muſicians of that country (*ll*). He pretends that the beauty of his Poetry expoſed him to the indignation of a Poet of Auvergne, who ſet up for a notable fellow at Turin, and affected to criticize and perſecute him (*mm*). He adds, that having neglected the Favourites, becauſe he impolitickly fancied it was enough for him to make his court to their Royal Highneſſes [*E*], he expoſed himſelf to the ill offices of ſeveral people; and this did him great injury. He perceived they grew cold towards him, and the worſt was, that having requeſted either to be diſmiſſed or to have ſettled a penſion (*nn*), he obtained the former to his great regret (*oo*). I cannot give the ſequel of his adventures, having at hand only the three firſt parts of the Hiſtory which he has written of them. I recollect that about the year 1674 he publiſhed two ſmall volumes which he had compoſed in the priſon of the Chatelet at Paris; he was ſtill confined there at that time, and I am not acquainted with the particulars of his enlargement. There is no need to conſult the Satires of his enemies, to form a very bad opinion of him: what he owns, or relates himſelf, is ſufficient for that purpoſe. I do not know whether at preſent (*pp*) a Licence could be obtained at Paris for the printing of ſuch a Work as the Relations of our burleſque Poet; for they are ſown thick with profane expreſſions. Note alſo that, among other things, he was accuſed of impiety: yet he boaſts of having taken pen in hand in defence of the Church of Rome [*F*]. He complains of Monſieur Boileau, who notwithſtanding had ſaid

(*ll*) D'Aſſouci, *Avantures d'Italie*, pag. 330, &c.

(*mm*) Ibid. pag. 283.

(*nn*) Ibid. pag. 338.

(*oo*) Ibid. pag. 342.

(*pp*) This was written in October 1699.

They ſay that incontinence being the ſtrongeſt pillar of the Empire of Gallantry, it would be in vain to aſk, in a ſtate of diſgrace, *but what have I done? what crime can I be accuſed of? I am not conſcious of any ill attempt; I have kept my ſelf quiet; I have done nothing.* This would be a very bad way of juſtifying one's ſelf; for it is principally by quietiſm, or inaction, that one becomes culpable in the eyes of thoſe who govern that Empire. Lazy people are looked on there as very bad ſubjects: idleneſs is the greateſt rebellion that can be committed; it is high treaſon in the firſt degree: the ſins of commiſſion in that country are infinitely more ſlight than the ſins of omiſſion; the latter are never venial, but are faults not to be forgiven. In a political ſtate Tyrants would be ſooner depoſed than Princes who do nothing: but in this other world of which we are ſpeaking, the juſteſt cauſe for depoſing, baniſhing, &c. is that which the French alledged againſt their Kings of the firſt race; and it would be better to commit many violences, than deſerve the epithet which was given to a certain Prince (37). Theſe are the ſcandalous reflections which I adviſe you not to give ear to; have more regard to the reflections which may be made on a Remark I ſhall mention elſewhere (38).

(37) Ludovicus nihil fecit. i. e. *Lewis did-nothing.*" He was the laſt King of France of the 2d Race.

(38) In the Remark [*C*] of the Article of HENRY III.

(39) Mr. de la Bruyere.

(40) D'Aſſouci, *Avantures d'Italie*, pag. 332, &c.

[*E*] *He very impolitickly fancied it was enough for him to make his court to their Royal Highneſſes.*] What he ſays on this head is very judicious, and equals, not as to the phraſes, but as to the thoughts, any of the moſt ſolid paſſages of our modern Theophraſtus (39). *As I had no other view,* ſays he (40), *than to pleaſe their Royal Highneſſes, becauſe, according to my poor ambition, it ſeemed ſufficient for obtaining the little advantage I was purſuing, to merit their eſteem, inſtead of making my Court to thoſe who might aſſiſt me, and yet more to thoſe who could not hurt me. I only omitted viſiting the Marchioneſs de Lans, and Madam Servien my principal protectreſs; but I alſo neglected all who were in favour, and the Favourite himſelf: a great piece of madneſs indeed, and well deſerving the chaſtiſement I received for it, and which all thoſe muſt expect, who, like me, are ſo audacious as to attempt to ſcale heaven, and enter Paradiſe in ſpite of the Saints: a great piece of madneſs to truſt one's fortune to one's merit with Princes; and ſo much the greater as moſt Princes who think themſelves free (becauſe they command others) ſeeing but very little, and that with the eyes of other people, and ſcarce ever commanding any thing but what they are ordered to command, are generally the ſlaves of their ſlaves, and conſequently the greateſt ſlaves of all mankind: I experienced it in this Court to my coſt, when inſtead of cringing to thoſe in favour, kiſſing my Poets hands and feet, admiring his wit and verſes, and printing them in letters of gold, I, poor Myrmidon, fighting againſt a giant of favour, fought againſt my ſelf, ſince every victory I gained over his pen, was a trophy which I erected to his glory, and a precipice which I dug for my own fortune; I, poor fool, a greater fool than John des Vignes, inſtead of forbearing to make Verſes, or making ſuch as my Curate did, who diſpleaſed no body, would meaſure my pen with a Poet who wore a ſword, and who was as noble as the King, and as valiant as Cæſar .... Princes, who, as I have already ſaid, ſeeing for the moſt part only with others eyes, and conſidering perſons no otherwiſe than as they are beloved by thoſe whom they love. If I did not ſee my ſelf quite forſaken, at leaſt I ſaw my ſelf neglected as much as I had neglected others. The preſents which uſed to come every week, came now but once a month, and among the uſual bounties of thoſe benign conſtellations, obſerving a certain coldneſs which did by no means agree with the hopes I had entertained of obtaining a ſettlement . . . I made &c.* (41). A good Courtier does not imitate the Huguenots, who invoke none but God: he imitates the devotees of the Romiſh Communion, who are much more aſſiduous in the worſhip of the Saints, than in that of God. D'Aſſouci conformed his devotions to the ideas of the Proteſtants, and did not find his account in it. Let us ſee a little of the deſcription he has given of his zeal for the Ducheſs Royal. *During fourteen months that I lived in that Court, it is incredible what pains I took to obtain* a penſion: *for I let ſlip no opportunity of making my ſelf neceſſary. Tho' for Church Muſic I am no Orlando de Laſſus, and tho' I had already but too much employment for the ſervice of that Princeſs's chamber, yet having often heard that one cannot go to Paradiſe without the good will of the Saints, in order to render them propitious, I undertook likewiſe to compoſe Muſic for her Chappel. Whether ſhe heard Maſs in her chamber, or at the Church of the Holy Handkerchief, or at any other Church, I followed her every where like a ſhock dog, my lute and my boy Pierrotin were always to be ſeen attending her; by which means I became in a ſhort time the moſt devout perſon in the world. For it muſt not be ſuppoſed that this pious Princeſs, who uſually wept at the altars, would have thought ſhe had ſatisfied her devotion by aſſiſting at a ſingle Maſs; ſhe muſt always hear two at the leaſt, and moſt commonly three, during which I was performing a very long and very devout piece of Muſic, and always on both knees. Judge, Reader, whether I ſhould not be wholly God's; and yet, I aſſure you, to importune him with my prayers was the leaſt of my thoughts. Apollo, who held me every where faſt by the collar, gave me yet leſs reſpit in that holy place; I had my imagination always filled with the idea of ſome fine Motet; and tho' the words, which I muttered between my teeth, were all holy and ſacred, it was not ſo much for the glory of God that I was deſirous of uniting them to my compoſitions, as for the ſatisfaction of that mortal Goddeſs; whom, at that time, wretched I would have preferred before the Deity himſelf* (42). See the Margin (43).

(41) Ibid. pag. 337.

(42) Ibid. pag. 168, &c.

(43) My zeal was ſo great towards theſe benign powers, *ſays he, pag.* 176, that if I had had as much towards God, I doubt not but he would have already rewarded me with Paradiſe.

[*F*] *He boaſts of having taken pen in hand in defence of the Church of Rome.)* One of the extravagancies with which he reproaches his enemies, is their accuſing him of irreligion. You have been ſo malicious and fooliſh, ſays he to them (44), *as to repreſent him . . . as an impious perſon, whom God has expoſed to your perſecutions only in order to perfect him in the exerciſe of piety; and to make him paſs for a Writer at enmity with holy things, who has in his writings defended*

(44) D'Aſſouci, tom. 2. pag. 20.

(qq) D'Aſſouci, *Avantures d'Italie*, pag. 273, &c.

ſaid nothing but what was very juſt againſt Burleſque [G]. The paſſage wherein he ſpeaks of four mad Poets (qq) is diverting: I ſhall only tranſcribe what concerns the perſon whom he names, and who is an Author in print [H]. He had for his enemies, among others, Cyrano de Bergerac (rr), and Loret. The latter abuſed him on all occaſions

(rr) The Pieces againſt *Soutidas*, which are to be found in his Works, are againſt *D'Aſſouci*.

Rome againſt the attacks of the enemy of her glory, and of her altars, and who has employed all his ink, and ſpent all his incenſe, in favour of her holy Miniſters and ſacred Prelates. He ought not to have made a merit of having undertaken ſuch a Work. Had devotion any ſhare in it? Was it not rather to obtain ſome recompence? That is the Pole-ſtar of ſuch Writers as he: they paſs from a profane ſubject to one altogether heavenly, the moment the hopes of gain appear on that ſide (45):

(45) *Si doloſi ſpes affulſerit ummi*. Perſius, *in Prologo*. See the conduct of *Aretin*, above in the Remark [I] of the Article ARETIN (Peter.)

Græculus eſuriens in cœlum, juſſeris, ibit (46).

" All things the hungry Greek exactly knows:
" And bid him go to heav'n, to heav'n he goes."
Dryden.

(46) Juven. Sat. 3. ver. 78.

[G] *He complains of Mr. Boileau, who notwithſtanding had ſaid nothing but what was very juſt againſt Burleſque.*] D'Aſſouci refutes in the beſt manner he is able (47) theſe words of Boileau,

(47) D'Aſſouci, *Avantures d'Italie*, pag. 241.

Qu'enfin la Cour deſabuſée
Mepriſa de ces vers l'extravagance aiſée.

" The Court, at length, being undeceived, deſpis'd
" The eaſy nonſenſe of this Poetry."

(48) Ibid. pag. 252.

It is very eaſy, ſays he (48), *to affect a fellow who laughs at every thing; but it is very hard to move a coſtive Stoic who laughs at nothing: for which reaſon, whatever is ſaid of Heroic poetry, it is far from being ſo difficult of acceſs as the fine Burleſque, which is the utmoſt effort of the imagination, and the touch-ſtone of wit. Nor is every wit capable of it: for to ſucceed therein it is not ſufficient to have an ordinary ſhare of wit, but a man muſt be endued with a peculiar genius, which is ſo rare, eſpecially in our climate, that excepting two perſons, of whom France will have me to be one, every body knows that whoever has meddled with this kind of Burleſque has only waſted paper . . . . . If I be aſked why this Burleſque which has ſo many excellent parts, and agreeable turns, after having ſo long diverted France, has ceaſed to divert our Court; it is becauſe Scarron has ceaſed to live, and I have ceaſed to write: and if I had a mind to continue my Ovid in a merry humour, the ſame Court, which is to this day diverted with the Verſes I preſent it, would be diverted with it as much as formerly, and my Bookſellers, who have ſo often reprinted that Work, would again publiſh as many more Editions of it* (49). A man who ſo frankly declares the high opinion he has conceived of his own poetry, may, if you will, be a witneſs of ſmall credit with regard to the praiſes he beſtows on himſelf; but when he declares that he was very ſenſible of the affront contained in theſe words of Mr. Boileau,

(49) Ibid. pag. 261.

Et juſqu'à d'Aſſoucy tout trouva des Lecteurs;

" And even d'Aſſouci could readers find;"

he ought to paſs for a very ſincere witneſs. " Ah! " dear Reader, if thou didſt but know how this " *even d'Aſſouci* ſticks to my heart, thou wouldeſt pity " my fate: I am inconſolable for it, and cannot re- " cover from my ſwoon, eſpecially when I reflect that " in prejudice to my Titles, I am in this verſe, which " to me ſeems as deciſive as a Decree of the Court of " Parliament, deprived of all my honours, and that " Charles d'Aſſoucy, of Emperor, as he once was, of " the Burleſque, the firſt of the name, is now become, " if he is to be believed, the vileſt reptile of Parnaſ- " ſus, and the Scullion of the Muſes. What is to be " done, Reader, in this extremity? After the excom- " munication which he has pronounced on this poor " diſgraced Burleſque, who will ever vouchſafe to " read it, or even to look upon it, on pain of his " malediction (50)? "He comforts himſelf with the thought that jealouſy was the occaſion of this thundering cenſure (51): *See, dear Reader, what I have gotten by making good burleſque Verſes; for if I had made as bad ones as my Poet* (52), *he* (53) *would have ſuffered me to live as well as the Author of Ovid turned buffoon; but it is no new thing to ſee jealous people condemn things which are excellent, and blame what exceeds their capacity.* Let us add here the judgment he has made of the moſt ſupremely impertinent of all ſorts of Poetry. *It makes one laugh*, ſays he (54), ... *but it is not ſufficient to meet with that impertinence in its higheſt degree, which is ſo neceſſary in this ſort of verſe; it muſt be alſo accompanied with a certain ſimplicity which the beſt wits cannot comprehend, and which the more a man excells be can the leſs imitate; as clearly appears in the Great Bible of Chriſtmas Carols; for though ſeveral great wits have ſtrove to imitate, in their Carols, thoſe precious Carols of Antiquity, none has found, nor ever will find the ſecret; and the old Carols, being on all occaſions preferred before the new ones, will be always the more honoured and eſteemed in all ages, the more ſilly they are, and more excellently filled with this admirable ſort of impertinence and ſimplicity: for, in fine, is there any man of ſenſe, who knows at what and when to laugh, that does not laugh heartily when he reads theſe Verſes, which I have taken out of a Book which was ſold at an auction for twenty piſtoles, intitled,* Les pois pilez? *It was Chriſt taking leave of S. Matthew in theſe words:*

(50) Ibid. pag. 263.

(51) Ibid. pag. 265.

(52) That is, a Poet of Auvergne, who was at Turin.

(53) That is, Monſieur Boileau.

(54) D'Aſſouci, *Avantures d'Italie*, pag. 320.

D I A L O G U E.

C. Adieu Matthieu.
M. Adieu, Dieu.
C. Prens ta lance & ton épieu,
Et t'en vas en Galilée.
M. Prendray-je auſſi mon épée?
C. Et quoy donc?
M. Adieu donc.

C. Adieu, Matthew.
M. Adieu, God.
C. Take thy lance and thy javelin,
And go hence to Galilee.
M. Shall I take my ſword too?
C. And why not?
M. Adieu then.

Can any thing be more ſilly or impertinent than to make theſe celeſtial perſons ſpeak thus? Yet, can any thing be more comical, or more natural? And will you not allow that theſe Verſes which would make S. Matthew laugh, and even our Saviour himſelf, if he were ſtill on earth, are better worth than all thoſe indifferent Verſes which are in the world, and have no manner of reliſh?

[H] *I ſhall tranſcribe what concerns a mad Poet, . . . who is an Author in print.*] " But who can better au- " thorize this authentic madneſs than the poor deceaſed " Ragueneau? Ragueneau, known to all Parnaſſus; " Ragueneau, beloved by all the Poets, and cheriſhed " by all the Players. In a word, this famous Paſtry- " cook Ragueneau, who working inceſſantly with ſix " journey-men in his ſhop, by a continual fire, at a " well-accuſtomed oven, cared not a fig for all the " Paſtry-cooks in Paris; that famous Paſtry-cook Ra- " gueneau, who made it rain nothing but ſavoury pies " on Parnaſſus. That nurſing-father of the Muſes, " after having well fed thoſe ungrateful girls, alas! " what is become of him? It is you, Beïs, whom I " aſk this queſtion, and who inſpired him with the " madneſs of making verſes; you, Beïs, who have " deprived us of the beſt Paſtry-cook in Paris, to make " of him the worſt Poet in the Univerſe. It is you, " barbarous man, who muſt one day anſwer in the " valley of Jehoſaphat, not only for all the ink and " paper which he has waſted in this lower world, but " alſo for all the pies which (without including thoſe " Parnaſſus has cheated him of) you have devoured " for him at the oven's mouth. Yes, Beïs, you muſt " one day account for that harmleſs wretch: for, in " fine, he was the beſt natured man in the world; " he

caſions in his *Gazette burleſque*, and was ſo ready at ſpreading diſadvantageous news of d'Aſſouci [*I*], that he ſeveral times publiſhed an account of his death, and always falſely.

" he truſted all Parnaſſus, and when one had no mo-
" ney, he was over paid, was too well ſatisfied, and
" contented, if one vouchſafed to applaud his Works
" were it only by the wink of an eye. I remember
" that for having only had the patience to hear one
" of his Pindaric Odes, he gave me above three
" months credit, and never aſked me for a farthing . .
(55) Ibid. pag. 283, &c. " . . (55). Being paid by no body, and his Credi-
" tors reſolving to be paid, poor Ragueneau remain-
" ed quite buried under the ruins of his oven. It was
" on a day moſt inauſpicious for the Poets, who at
" peep of day were met in the ſtreet wiping their
" mouths, after they had taken their laſt breakfaſt
" with him, that a file of hungry Bailiffs, under the
" very beard of Apollo, yet dropping with the fat of
" ſo many ſavoury pies, had the boldneſs to take his
" dear and well beloved Ragueneau by the collar,
" and conduct him, without any reſpect either to his
" Verſes, or his Muſes, into a priſon, whence (after
" a year's captivity) getting diſcharged in order to
" preſent the public with his excellent works, which
" (in imitation of Theophile) he had compoſed
" there, but finding no Poet in Paris who would
" maintain him in his turn, or even hear one
" of his verſes, nor any Paſtry-cook who would
" truſt him with ſo much as a ſingle pye on
" the credit of one of his Sonnets; curſing the age,
" and deteſting the ignorance of the times, he left the
" town with his wife and children, himſelf making
" the fifth, reckoning a little aſs loaded with Epi-
" grams, to go ſeek his fortune in Languedoc, where
" having met with a company of Players who wanted
" a man to act a Swiſs, he entred himſelf among
" them as an Underſtrapper; but tho' his part never
" conſiſted of above four verſes at moſt, he performed
" it ſo well, that before he had followed the trade a
" year, he acquired the reputation of the worſt Actor
" in the world; ſo that the Players, not knowing
" what to employ him in, would have made him their
" candle-ſnuffer; but he would not accept that offer,
" judging it repugnant to the honour and dignity of a
" Poet. Afterwards, not being able to reſiſt the force
" of his deſtiny, I ſaw him ſnuff the candles very
" dextrouſly in the ſervice of another company: be-
" hold the fate of mad-men when they turn Poets,
" and the fate of Poets when they become mad-
(56) Ibid. pag. 283, &c. " men (56)!"

[*I*] *Loret . . . was . . . . ready at publiſhing diſadvantageous news of d'Aſſouci.*] The moment I was ar-
" reſted, my enemies . . . . immediately ſent to Paris
" the news of my death, which being by no means
" diſagreeable to the late Loret, without waiting the
" confirmation, inſpired him with thoſe fine Verſes
" which he compoſed in great haſte to my praiſe,
" and which have ſince, to his confuſion, galloped a-
" bout in his Gazette. This ſcurvy Poet is now gone
" to lie in the other world, and for my part I am ſtill
(57) D'Aſſouci, tom. 2. pag. 155. " in this (57)." Hereto let us add the following paſ-
ſage: *Theſe are the ſame Blockheads who, ſerving for eccho's to hearſay, have ſo often killed me in their Gazettes, and who after they had drowned me at Ferrara and at Venice, before I had ſet a foot there, have taken me out of the ſea and all its rivers, to come and fry me at Montpellier, and at length, having thrown me out of the frying-pan into the fire, bowelled me, ſtewed me, and minced me as ſmall as meat for a pye, have reſtored me to my firſt condition to fricaſſy me over again at Avignon, from whence, of their great favour, they have once more removed me without any hurt or ſolution of continuity, to confine me for the reſt of my days in the priſons of the Inquiſition, from whence, notwithſtanding, I am come forth as brilliant and as ſound as ever I was born, without loſing a hair of my head by time in all the travels which theſe fools have made me to take* (58). He took the utmoſt revenge he was able on Loret, and accuſed him of a notorious fraud. Theſe are his words: (58) Ibid. pag. 23, &c.

" What had I done to this Billingſgate Rimer, ſo ſau-
" cily to inſult the honour of my Muſes, more intel-
" ligent and chaſte than his? Though his trade of
" cheating at Play might well excuſe him from mak-
" ing ſuch ſorry verſes, did I call him Sharper? did
" I call him Billingſgate Poet? did I not always call
" him Loret? When I plaid againſt him at the late
" Marſhall de Chombert's, did he not rob me of money
" enough by his falſe cards, without robbing me be-
" ſides of my honour and fortune by his falſe rimes?
" could my Ovid in a merry humour have vexed him to
" that degree that he muſt revenge himſelf on my Ver-
" ſes to the prejudice of my reputation? Yet this bar-
" barous Rimer has cruelly revenged himſelf; ſeeing it is
" on this baſis that the fooliſh mob, yet more barbarous
" than he, have ſince founded their calumnies with
" which they perſecute me thro' the whole earth, as
" well as ſo many honeſt people, who would believe,
" till the day of judgment, that I had been broiled
" by the Savages of Montpellier, if my Writings, at
" leaſt as durable as his, did not verify the contrary.
" Yes, this Scoundrel has cruelly revenged himſelf;
" ſince it is he who has furniſhed all my enviers with
" a pretext to ſlander me, who has ruined my fortune,
" and deſtroyed my hopes, made my beſt friend my
" perſecutor, and who, in a word, has expoſed me to
" ſo many perils and mortal diſgraces. Good God!
" can one ſee ſuch aſſaſſinations without horror? and
" can France ſuffer ſuch aſſaſſins without ſhame (59)?" (59) D'Aſſouci, *Avantures d'Italie*, pag. 87, &c.

I think they alſo gave out that he had been hanged in effigie; for he complains that they repreſented him as *a man whoſe picture had ſerved for a Scare-crow in a Hemp-field, and a public terror to the wicked*; but he maintains that this picture was *never ſeen but at the Bookſellers ſhops in the Hall*, that his portraiture may yet be ſeen ſhining *in the front of all his Works, and that the moſt curious Painters ſeek after it at this day as an Original worthy their copying* (60). I do not believe they do it in order to have a fine face to draw by; for d'Aſſouci's is far from being handſome. I have not found in the Relation of Monſr. Bachaumont and la Chapelle, that they make him the *Therſites of our age* (61). He complains of this (62), and oppoſes to ſo injurious an affront the Verſes which were made on his picture: (60) D'Aſſouci, tom. 2. pag. 21. (61) Ibid. pag. 259. (62) Ibid. pag. 257.

On vous avertit que voicy
Le portrait du grand d'Aſſoucy,
Cette merveille de noſtre âge.
Contemplez-le donc bien; & ſi
A peu près aux traits du viſage
Vous croyez qu'un tel perſonnage
Ne peut qu'avoir bien réüſſi,
Achetez viſte ſon Ouvrage,
Et vous verrez qu'il eſt ainſi. CHAPELLE.

" You are inform'd that here you ſee
" The Portrait of great D'Aſſouci;
" View him, and if his Looks proclaim
" He muſt have gain'd immortal fame,
" Purchaſe his Work, and you will ſee
" That it is juſt as I tell ye."

DATI (CARLO) Profeſſor of polite Learning at Florence his native Country, became very famous, as well on account of his Works, as of the Elogies which a great number of Writers have beſtowed on him [*A*]. He was very courteous and obliging to all

[*A*] *He became very famous, as well by his Works, as by the Elogies which a great number of Writers have beſtowed on him.*] You will find in the 3d Volume of Signor Leti's *Italia regnante* all the Commentary which this Text requires: I ſhall tranſcribe but a ſmall part of it. Signor Leti (1) obſerves that the Book intitled *Lettera di Timauro Antiate à Filaleti, della vera ſtoria della cicloide, e della famoſiſſima eſperienza dell' argento vivo*, is a Compoſition of Carlo Dati: he refers us to the 149th page of Placcius *de Scriptis & Scriptoribus Anonymis atque Pſeudonymis*. This reference is a good one; for we find in the page quoted that the pretended

(1) Leti, *Italia regnante*, Parte 3. pag. 363, 364.

all the learned travellers who paſſed through the city of Florence; and ſeveral of them have teſtified their gratitude in their Writings (*a*). He was a Member of the Academy *della Cruſca*, and in that quality took the ſurname of *Smarrito*. He wrote a Panegyric on Lewis XIV in Italian, and publiſhed it at Florence in the year 1669 (*b*). The French Tranſlation which another perſon made of it was printed at Rome the year following. He had already publiſhed ſome Italian Poems in praiſe of the ſame Prince (*c*). You may thereby know in what time he flouriſhed.

(a) *See* Leti's *Italia regnante*, Parte 3. p. 169, &c. Konig *refers us to page* 170 *of this Work of Signor* Leti, *wherein he commits two faults; in not ſetting down the Volume, and in quoting the page wrong.*

(b) Leti, *Italia regnante*, Parte 3. pag. 367.

(c) Ibid. pag. 363, 367.

pretended *Timauro Antiate* is Carlo Dati, and that this appears manifeſtly from the 26th page of the Letter. We alſo find there that this Piece was printed at Florence in the year 1663, and that the Author proves two things; one, that Father Merſenne is not the inventor of the Cycloïd, as has been aſſerted in the Hiſtory of that curve; but that the glory of this invention belongs to Galilei: the other, that Torricellius is not guilty of the Plagiariſm imputed to him, with regard to the Hypotheſis which explains the ſuſpenſion of the quickſilver by the preſſure of the air. He was the firſt Author of that Hypotheſis, if we believe Carlo Dati. It is very probable that Monconys confounds things when he ſays: *Signor Carlo Dati gave me his printed Letter to prove that Torricellius had firſt found out the Cycloid* (2). The principal Work to which our Dati applied himſelf was that *della Pittura antica*. He publiſhed an Eſſay or Part of it in the year 1667. I ſhall cite it below (3). The elogy which Chimentelli has given this Writer is the only one which I ſhall copy among ſeveral others quoted by Signor Leti. *Nec ſecus inter rariſſimos numerandus, qui Librum utendum permiſit, Clariſſimus & amiciſſimus D. Carolus Datus, noſtræ flos illibatus Urbis, ſuadæque Etruſcæ medulla, quam omni literarum paratu quotidie auget, atque illuſtrat. Parum enim mereri putat, qui per ſe tam egregiè meretur, niſi ad benè merendum de Republica Literaria alios omni ope, & conſilio adjuvet. Nihil ut minus ſuum habeat, quam quod in uſum & gloriam eruditionis impendi poſſit; penè ipſum ſe ſibi ſubtrahens, nedum temporis, aut operæ parcus* (4). i. e. "Nor is he to "be mentioned without the higheſt commendation, "who lent me the Book, the learned and obliging "Carlo Dati; the unſullied flower of our city, and "the marrow of Tuſcan eloquence, which he daily "improves and adorns with new acquiſitions from "every part of learning. For he who deſerves ſo extreamly well on his own account, thinks his merit "but ſmall, unleſs he aſſiſts others alſo with his whole "power and counſel to deſerve well of the Republic "of Learning. So that he accounts nothing leſs his "own, than what may be parted with for the advantage "and glory of learning; almoſt wholly neglectful of "himſelf, ſparing neither time nor labour."

(2) Monconys, *Voyages*, Part. 2. pag. 483. at the year 1664.

(3) In the Remark [*L*] of the Article ZEUXIS.

(4) Chimentelli-us, *de Honore Bi-ſellij*, pag. 86. *apud* Leti, *Italia regnante*, tom. 3. pag. 373.

☞DAVENANT, or D'AVENANT (WILLIAM), an eminent Poet in the ſeventeenth Century, was born in the Pariſh of St. Martin in the City of Oxford about the latter end of February $160\frac{5}{6}$, and baptized March the 3d following. His father, John Davenant, was a Vintner, and kept a Tavern, in Mr. Wood's time (*a*) known by the name of the Crown, and was Mayor of that City in the year 1621; and was remarkably of a very grave melancholic diſpoſition, ſo that he was ſcarce ever ſeen to laugh (*b*). His mother was a woman of great beauty and wit (*c*). Our Author was educated in Grammar under Mr. Edward Sylveſter (*d*), who taught a private ſchool in All-Saints Pariſh in Oxford (*e*), and in Academical Learning in Lincoln College under the tuition of Mr. Daniel Hough, Fellow of that College, about the year 1620 or 1621 (*f*). He made ſome progreſs in Logic and Natural Philoſophy (*g*); but his genius, which was always oppoſite to thoſe ſtudies, "led him into the pleaſant paths of Poetry, ſo that "though he wanted much of Univerſity Learning, yet he made as high and noble "flights in the Poetical Faculty, as fancy could advance without it (*h*)." Having made but a ſhort ſtay in the College, he entered into the ſervice of Frances, the firſt Ducheſs of Richmond, and afterwards of Fulke Grevil, Lord Brooke, who having an excellent taſte for Poetry, was greatly charmed with him (*i*). After his death in the year 1628 he applied himſelf to the writing of Poetry and Plays [*A*] with ſuch ſucceſs, that he procured himſelf the friendſhip of Mr. Endymion Porter, and Henry Jermyn, afterwards Earl of

(a) Wood, *Hiſt. & Antiquitat. Univerſit. Oxon.* lib. 2. pag. 168. edit. Oxon. 1674 in fol.

(b) Idem, ibid.

(c) Idem, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 411. 2d edit. London 1721.

(d) Idem, ibid.

(e) Idem, col. 40 and 505.

(f) Idem, col. 411.

(g) Idem, *Hiſt. & Antiq.* pag. 168.

(h) Idem, ibid. and *Athen. Oxon.* col. 411.

(i) Idem, *Athen. Oxon.* col. 411.

[*A*] *Applied himſelf to the writing of Plays.*] We ſhall give a catalogue of all his Dramatic Writings. I. *Albovine King of the Lombards his Tragedy*. London 1629 in 4to; dedicated to the Duke of Somerſet. This Play is recommended by eight copies of Verſes (1). II. *Juſt Italian*; a Tragi-Comedy. London 1630 in 4to. (2), and dedicated to the Earl of Dorſet, and commended by the Verſes of his Friends, Mr. William Hopkins and Mr. Thomas Carew (3). III. *Cruel Brother*; a Tragedy. London 1630 in 4to. (4). Dedicated to the Lord High Treaſurer Weſton. IV. *Cælum Britannicum*; *a Maſque at Whitehall, the* 18*th Feb.* 1633. Mr. Wood tells us (5), that "this is attributed "to Davenant, but Thomas Carew and Inigo Jones "drew it up;" and it is omitted by Mr. Langbaine. V. *Triumphs of Prince* D'Amour; *a Maſque preſented by his Highneſs at his Palace in the Middle-Temple the* 24*th of February* 1635. London 1635 in 4to. This Maſque, at the requeſt of the Honourable Society of the Middle-Temple, was invented and written by our Author in three days; and was preſented by the Members thereof as an entertainment to the Prince Elector. The muſic of the Songs and Symphonies was compoſed by Mr. Henry and Mr. William Lawes, his Majeſty's Servants (6). VI. *Platonick Lovers*; a Tragi-Comedy. London 1636 &c. (7). VII. *The Wits*; a Comedy. London 1636 &c. (8). It is dedicated to *the chiefly beloved of all, that ingenious and noble Endymion Porter, of his Majeſty's Bed-Chamber*. It was often acted with applauſe (9). VIII. Britannia Triumphans: *A Maſque preſented at Whitehall by the King's Majeſty and his Lords on Sunday after Twelfth Night, an.* 1637. London 1637 in 4to. In this Maſque he was aſſiſted by Inigo Jones, Surveyor of his Majeſty's Works (10). IX. *Temple of Love*; *preſented by the Queen's Majeſty, and her Ladies at Whitehall.* "This Maſque for the new-"neſs of the invention, variety of ſcenes, apparitions, "and richneſs of habits, was generally approved to "be one of the moſt magnificent, that hath been done "in England (11)." X. Salmacida Spolia: *A Maſque preſented to the King and Queen at Whitehall the* 21*ſt Jan.* 1639. London 1639 in 4to. The ſubject was ſet down by our Author and Inigo Jones; the invention, ornament, ſcenes, &c. by the latter; and what was ſpoken or ſung was written by Davenant then her Majeſty's Servant; and the Muſic compoſed by Lewis Richard, Maſter of her Majeſty's Muſic (12). XI. *Unfortunate Lovers*; a Tragedy. London 1643, and 1649 in 4to. XII. *Love and Honour*; a Tragi-Comedy. London 1649 in 4to. It was ſeveral times acted with good applauſe (13). XIII. *The firſt day's entertainment at* Rutland-Houſe, *by Declamations and Muſick, after the manner of the Antients.* London 1657 in 8vo. It was publiſhed in September 1656 (14). This ſubject of the former of thoſe declamations is concerning public entertainment by moral repreſentations,

(1) *Account of the Engliſh Dramatick Poets. By Gerard Langbaine*, pag. 107. edit. London 1691. Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 413. 2d edit. London 1721.

(2) Wood, ibid.

(3) Langbaine, pag. 108.

(4) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(5) *Ubi ſupra.*

(6) Langbaine, pag. 111.

(7) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(8) Idem, ibid.

(9) Langbaine, pag. 111.

(10) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(11) *See* Langbaine, pag. 111.

(12) Wood, col. 413.

(13) Idem, *and* Langbaine, pag. 109.

(14) Wood, col. 413.

of St. Albans, and all the wits of that time, and particularly of Sir John Suckling, who mentions him in his *Seſſion of Poets* [B]. Upon the death of Ben Johnſon in 1637 (*k*) he was created Poet Laureat (*l*). In May 1641, being accuſed with ſeveral other perſons of an attempt to engage the Army againſt the Parliament, he abſconded, but upon the iſſuing out of a Proclamation againſt him and his confederates, he was apprehended at Feverſham in Kent, and committed to the cuſtody of the Serjeant at Arms. However being bailed in July following, he retired to France; but in his way thither was ſeized by the Mayor of Canterbury, and ſtrictly examined; upon which Sir *John Mennes* has a pleaſant Poem. After he had ſpent ſome time in France he returned, and was entertained by William Marquis of Newcaſtle, and by him made Lieutenant General of his Ordnance. In Sept. 1643 (*m*) he received the honour of Knighthood from his Majeſty near Glouceſter, during the ſiege of that city. Upon the declining of the King's cauſe he retired again into France, and changed his Religion for that of Rome. About 1646 he was ſent over to England by the Queen to perſuade his Majeſty to grant the conceſſions inſiſted on by the Parliament with regard to the Church [C]; but returning without

(*k*) He died Auguſt the 16th that year.

(*l*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 412.

(*m*) *See* Thomas Walkley's *New Catalogue of the Dukes, Marqueſſes, Earls, Viſcounts, Barons of England, &c. alſo Baronets, Knights, &c.* London 1658 in 8vo, pag. 163.

tions, the diſputants being *Diogenes* the Cynic, and *Ariſtophanes* the Poet. The latter diſpute is between a *Pariſian* and a *Londoner*, who declaim concerning the pre-eminence of Paris and London. The vocal and inſtrumental muſic was compoſed by Dr. Charles Coleman, Capt. Henry Cook, Mr. Henry Lawes, and Mr. George Hudſon (15). XIV. *Play-Houſe to be let; containing the Hiſtory of Sir* Francis Drake, *and the cruelty of the Spaniards at Perue.* Mr. Wood (16) ſtiles this a *Comedy*; but Mr. Langbaine tells us (17), that he does not know under what ſpecies to place this Play, "it conſiſting of ſeveral Pieces of different kinds "handſomely tacked together, ſeveral of which the "Author wrote in the times of Oliver, and were "acted ſeparately by ſtealth; as the *Hiſtory of Sir* "Francis Drake expreſſed by inſtrumental and vocal "Muſic, and by art of perſpective in Scenes, &c. "*The cruelty of the Spaniards in Peru.* Theſe two "Pieces were firſt printed in 4to. They make the "third and fourth acts of this Play. The ſecond act "conſiſts of a French Farce, tranſlated from Mo-"liere's *Sganarelle, ou le Cocu imaginaire*, and pur-"poſely by our Author put into a ſort of jargon com-"mon to Frenchmen newly come over. The fifth "act conſiſts of *Tragedie traveſtie*, or the actions of "Cæſar, Anthony, and Cleopatra in Verſe burleſque." XV. *News from Plymouth*; a Comedy. XVI. *Law againſt Lovers*; a Comedy, according to Mr. Wood; or a Tragi-Comedy, according to Mr. Langbaine (18), who tells us, that it is formed from two Plays written by Shakeſpeare, viz. *Meaſure for Meaſure*, and *Much Ado about Nothing*; and that "tho' not only the cha-"racters, but the language of the whole Play almoſt, "borrowed from Shakeſpeare, yet where the lan-"guage is rough or obſolete, our Author has taken "care to poliſh it." XVII. *The Diſtreſſes*, a Tragi-Comedy. XVIII. *The Siege*; a Comedy or Tragi-Comedy (19). XIX. *Fair Favourite*; a Tragi-Comedy. XX. *The Siege of Rhodes*; a Tragi-Comedy in two parts. London 1663 in 4to (20). Mr. Langbaine obſerves (21), that *theſe Plays were in the times of the Civil War acted in* ſtilo recitativo, *and printed in quarto, but afterwards enlarged by the Author, and acted with applauſe at the Duke of York's Theatre in Lincoln's-Inn-Fields.* XXI. *Man's the Maſter*; a Comedy. London 1669 in 4to. XXII. He aſſiſted Mr. Dryden likewiſe in the *Tempeſt, or the Enchanted Iſland*; printed at London 1676 in 4to. This Play is altered from Shakeſpeare's *Tempeſt*. Mr. Dryden in the Preface to it dated December the 1ſt, 1669, tells us, that "Sir William Davenant, as he was a man "of quick and piercing imagination, ſoon found that "ſomewhat might be added to the deſign of Shake-"ſpear, of which neither *Fletcher* (22) nor *Suckling* (23) "had ever thought. And therefore to put the laſt "hand to it, he deſigned the counterpart to Shake-"ſpear's plot, namely, that of a man, who had ne-"ver ſeen a woman; that by this means thoſe two "characters of innocence and love might the more "illuſtrate and commend each other. This excellent "contrivance he was pleaſed to communicate to me, "and to deſire my aſſiſtance in it. I confeſs, that "from the very firſt moment it ſo pleaſed me, that "I never writ any thing with more delight. I "might likewiſe do him that juſtice to acknowledge, "that my writing received daily his amendments; "and that is the reaſon why it is not ſo faulty, as the "reſt which I have done without the help or correc-"tion of ſo judicious a friend. The comical parts "of the Sailors were alſo of his invention, and for "the moſt part his writing, as you will eaſily diſcover "by the Stile."

(15) Langbaine, pag. 108.

(16) Col. 413.

(17) Pag. 109.

(18) Pag. 108.

(19) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, and Langbaine, pag. 110.

(20) Wood, col. 414.

(21) Pag. 110.

(22) In his *Sea-Voyage*, which Mr. Wood, col. 414 erroneouſly ſuppoſes to be written by *Shakeſpear*.

(23) In his *Goblins*.

[B] *Sir John Suckling, who mentions him in his* Seſſion of Poets.] He has the following lines relating to him (24).

William Davenant *aſham'd of a fooliſh miſchance,*
That he had got lately travelling in France,
Modeſtly hoped the handſomneſs of's Muſe
Might any deformity about him excuſe.

(24) Fragmenta aurea. *A Collection of all the incomparable Pieces written by Sir John Suckling &c.* pag. 8. London 1648.

And afterwards;

Surely the company would have been content,
If they could have found any preſident;
But in all their Records either in Verſe or Proſe,
There was not one Laureat without a Noſe (25).

(25) *See* Wood, col. 412.

[C] *About* 1646 *he was ſent over to England by the Queen to perſuade his Majeſty to grant the Conceſſions inſiſted on by the Parliament with regard to the Church.*] The Earl of Clarendon gives us an account of this (26), and tells us that the French Embaſſador having by an Expreſs informed Cardinal Mazarine, that the King was too reſerved in giving the Parliament ſatisfaction, and therefore wiſhed that ſome perſon might be ſent over, who was like to have ſo much credit with his Majeſty as to perſuade him to what was neceſſary for his ſervice; *the Queen, who was never adviſed by thoſe, who either underſtood or valued her true intereſt, conſulted with thoſe about her, and ſent Sir* William D'Avenant, *an honeſt man and a witty, but in all reſpects inferior to ſuch a truſt, with a Letter of Credit to the King, (who knew the perſon well enough under another character than was like to give him much credit in the argument, in which he was intruſted) although her Majeſty had likewiſe other ways declared her opinion to his Majeſty, that he ſhould part with the Church for his peace and ſecurity.* Sir Will. D'Avenant had by the countenance of the French Embaſſador eaſy admiſſion to the King, who heard him patiently all he had to ſay, and anſwered him in that manner, that made it evident he was not pleaſed with the advice. When he found his Majeſty unſatisfied, and that he was not like to conſent to what was ſo earneſtly deſired by them, by whoſe advice he was ſent, who undervalued all thoſe ſcruples of conſcience, which his Majeſty himſelf was ſtrongly poſſeſſed with, he took upon himſelf the confidence to offer ſome reaſons to the King, to induce him to yield to what was propoſed; and among other things ſaid, "It was the advice and opinion "of all his friends." His Majeſty aſking, "What "friends?" and he anſwering, that it was the opinion of the Lord *Jermyn*; the King ſaid, that "the Lord "*Jermyn* did not underſtand any thing of the Church." Sir William ſaid, "the Lord *Colepepper* was of the "ſame mind." The King ſaid, "Colepepper had "no Religion;" and aſked, "Whether the Chancel-"lor of the Exchequer was of that mind." To which he anſwered, "He did not know; for that he was not "there, and had deſerted the Prince;" and thereupon ſaid ſomewhat from the Queen of the diſpleaſure ſhe had

(26) *Hiſtory of the Rebellion*, B. 10. pag. 495. edit. Oxon. 1732, in fol.

out ſucceſs to Paris, where Charles Prince of Wales then was, began to write his Poem intitled *Gondibert* [*D*]. He afterwards formed a deſign for carrying over a conſiderable number of Artificers, eſpecially Weavers, from France to Virginia, by the encouragement of Henrietta Maria, the Queen-mother of England, who obtained leave for him of the King of France. This ſcheme he effected ſo far, that he and his company had

had conceived againſt the Chancellor; to which the King ſaid, "The Chancellor was an honeſt man, and "would never deſert him nor the Prince, nor the "Church; and that he was ſorry he was not with his ſon, "but that his wife was miſtaken." *D'Avenant* then offering ſome reaſons of his own, in which he mentioned the Church ſlightingly, as if it were not of importance enough to weigh down the benefit that would attend the conceſſion; his Majeſty was tranſported with ſo much indignation, that he gave him a ſharper reprehenſion than was uſual for him to give any other man, and forbid him to preſume to come again into his preſence. *Whereupon*, ſays Lord Clarendon (27), *the poor man, who had in truth very good affections, was exceedingly dejected and afflicted, and returned into France, to give an account of his ill ſucceſs to thoſe, who ſent him.*

(27) Ibid.

[*D*] *His Poem intitled*, Gondibert.] The firſt two Books were finiſhed before his voyage to America, and the third Book was written during his impriſonment in Cowes-Caſtle in the Iſle of Wight in the year 1650 (28). He publiſhed at Paris 1650 in 12mo a *Diſcourſe* upon this Poem by way of Preface to it in a Letter to Mr. Thomas Hobbes, dated from the Louvre at Paris January 2d, 1650, with the Anſwer of Mr. Hobbes, dated at Paris January 10th the ſame year. Mr. Waller and Mr. Cowley wrote commendatory Verſes on the firſt two Books of this Poem. The three firſt Books of it were printed under the following title; *Gondibert, an Heroic Poem, written by Sir* William D'Avenant. London 1651 in 4to and 12mo. The ſeventh and laſt Canto of the third Book was printed at London in 8vo 1685 (29). Mr. Hobbes in his *Letter* abovementioned affirms (30), that he *never yet ſaw a Poem, that had ſo much ſhape of art, health of morality, and vigour and beauty of expreſſion as this of* our Author. But that Gentleman obſerves in his Letter *to the Honourable* Edward Howard *on his intended Impreſſion of his Poem of the* Britiſh Princes, dated at Chatſworth Novemb. 6th, 1668, that his "judgment in Poetry hath been "once already cenſured by very good Wits for com-"mending *Gondibert*. But yet they have not, I "think, *continues he*, diſabled my teſtimony. For "what authority is there in wit? A Jeſter may have "it; a man in drink may have it, and be fluent over "night, and wiſe and dry in the morning. What is "it? Or who can tell whether it be better to have it, "or be without it, eſpecially if it be a pointed wit? "I will take my liberty to praiſe what I like, as well "as they do to reprehend what they do not like." Mr. Langbaine tells us (31), that it was deſigned by him to be an imitation of an Engliſh Drama, it being to be divided into five Books, as the other is into five Acts; the Canto's to be the parallel of the Scenes, with this difference, that this is delivered narratively, the other dialogue-wiſe. The honourable Edward Howard Eſq; (32) tells us, that in this Poem "there are "many remote and excellent thoughts, with apt and "perſpicuous expreſſions, the eſſential dignities of the "Muſes, whoſe chiefeſt beauties flow from the ornaments of words, and delightful variety of imagination, from which choice productions of nature the "Muſes are moſt deſirous to adopt their children, and "in no ſmall degree are juſtly acknowledged to the "honour of his pen. Notwithſtanding which his "Heroic Poem of *Gondibert* (coming into the world "in a capricious time of cenſure) perhaps did not "meet with a deſerved reception, though the ſevereſt "judges, I doubt not, are forced to grant, that there "is in that work more to be praiſed than pardoned." Mr. Thomas Rymer (33) obſerves, that our Author's wit is well known, and that in the *Preface* to this Poem there appear ſome ſtrokes of an extraordinary judgment; that he is for *unbeaten tracks, and new ways of thinking*; but that certainly in his untried ſeas he is no great diſcoverer. One deſign of the Epic Poets before him, was to adorn their own country, there finding their heroes and patterns of virtue, whoſe example, as they thought, would have the greateſt influence and power over poſterity. "But this Poet, ſays Mr. Ry-"mer, ſteers a different courſe. His Heroes are all "foreigners: he cultivates a country, that is nothing "akin to him; it is Lombardy that reaps the honour "of all. Other Poets chooſe ſome action or heroe ſo "illuſtrious, that the name of the Poem prepared "the reader, and made way for its reception. But "in this Poem, none can divine what great action "he intended to celebrate; nor is the reader ob-"liged to know whether the Heroe be Turk or Chri-"ſtian. Nor do the firſt lines give any light or pro-"ſpect into his deſign. Methinks tho' his Religion "could not diſpenſe with an Invocation, he needed "not have ſcrupled at the propoſition. Yet he rather "chooſes to enter in at the top of the houſe, becauſe "the mortals of *mean* and *ſatisfied minds* go in at "the door. And I believe, the reader is not well "pleaſed to find his Poem begin with the Praiſes of "*Aribert*, when the title has promiſed a *Gondibert*. "But before he falls on any other buſineſs, he preſents "the reader with a deſcription of each particular He-"roe, not truſting their actions to ſpeak for them, as "former Poets have done. Their practice was fine "and artificial, his (he tells us) is a *new way*. Many "of his characters have but little of the heroick in "them; *Dalga* is a jilt, proper only for Comedy; "*Birtha* for a Paſtoral; and *Aſtragon*, in the manner "here deſcribed, yields no very great ornament to "an Heroic Poem: nor are his battles leſs liable to "cenſure, than theſe of Homer. He dares not, as "other Heroic Poets, heighten the action, by making "Heaven and Hell intereſſed, for fear of offending "againſt probability; and yet he tells of

(28) This appears from a marginal note upon the title of the third Book, pag. 237. edit. London 1651 in 4to.

(29) Wood, col. 413.

(30) Pag. 86.

(31) Pag. 112.

(32) *Preface* to his *Britiſh Princes, an Heroick Poem*, edit. London 1669, in 8vo.

(33) *Preface* to his *Tranſlation of Rapin's Reflexions on Ariſtotle's Treatiſe of Poetry.*

"....*Threads by patient* Parcæ *ſlowly ſpun.*

"And for being dead, his phraſe is,

"*Heaven call'd him where peacefully he rules a Star.*

"And the Emerald he gives to *Birtha* has a ſtronger "tang of the old woman, and is a greater improbabili-"ty, than all the enchantments in *Taſſo*. A juſt medium "reconciles the fartheſt extreams, and one preparation "may give credit to the moſt unlikely fiction. In "*Marino*, Adonis is preſented with a diamond ring, "where indeed the ſtone is much-what of the ſame "nature; but this preſent is made by Venus; and "from a Goddeſs could not be expected a gift of ordi-"nary virtue." Mr. Rymer then remarks, that although a Poet is obliged to know all arts and ſciences, yet he ought diſcreetly to manage this knowledge. *He muſt have judgment to ſelect what is noble or beautiful and proper for his occaſion. He muſt by a particular Chymiſtry extract the eſſence of things, without ſoiling his wit with the groſs and trumpery. But ſome Poets labour to appear ſkilful with that wretched affectation; they dote on the very terms and jargon; expoſing themſelves rather to be laught at by the Apprentices, than to be admired by Philoſophers. But whether D'Avenant be one of thoſe, I leave others to examine.* The ſame Critic afterwards tells us, that the ſort of Verſe, of which Sir William makes choice, might contribute much to the *vitiating of his ſtyle*: for thereby he obliges himſelf to ſtretch every period to the end of four lines. Thus the ſenſe is broken perpetually with parentheſes, the words jumbled in confuſion, and a darkneſs ſpread over all; ſo that the ſenſe is either not diſcerned, or found not ſufficient for one juſt verſe, which is ſprinkled on the whole Tetraſtich. In the Italian and Spaniſh where all the rhymes are diſſyllable, and the percuſſion ſtronger, this kind of verſe may be neceſſary; and yet to temper that grave march, they repeat the ſame rhyme over again, and then they cloſe the ſtanza with a couplet, farther to ſweeten

had ſailed into the main Ocean, when being ſeized by ſome of the Parliament's Ships, he was carried priſoner, firſt to the Iſle of Wight in 1650 [*E*], and afterwards to the Tower of London, in order to be tried for his life by the *High Court of Juſtice* the year following; but by the mediation of Milton and others he had his liberty allowed him as a priſoner at large [*F*]. At that time Tragedies and Comedies being prohibited, "he "contrived a way to ſet up an *Italian Opera* to be performed by Declamations and "Muſic; and that they might be performed with all decency, ſeemlineſs, and without "rudeneſs and profaneneſs, John Maynard Serjeant at Law, and ſeveral ſufficient Citi-"zens were engagers (*o*)." This *Italian Opera* began in Rutland-Houſe in Charter-Houſe-Yard, May the 23d 1656, and was afterwards removed to the Cock-pit in Drury-Lane, and was much frequented for many years. So that having laid the foundation of the Engliſh Stage by this Muſical Drama, after the Reſtoration he revived and improved it by painted ſcenes (*p*) [*G*], and erected a new Company of Actors under the Patronage of James Duke of York, who acted ſeveral years at the Tennis-Court in Little Lincoln's-Inn-Fields. In 1648 there had been printed his *Madagaſcar with other Poems. The ſecond Edition*; London, in 24mo. To which are prefixed commendatory verſes by Endymion Porter, Sir John Suckling, Thomas Carew, and William Habington. And his Works were publiſhed together in fol. in 1673. He died at his houſe in Little Lincoln's-Inn-Fields April the 7th 1668, aged ſixty three, and was interred two days after in

(o) Idem, *Athen. Oxon.* col. 412.

(p) *Theatrum Poetarum: or a Compleat Collection of the Poets, eſpecially the moſt eminent of all Ages. By* Edward Phillips. *Modern Poets*, pag. 191. edit. London 1675.

ſweeten the ſeverity. But in French and Engliſh, where we rhime generally with only one ſyllable, the ſtanza is not allowed, much leſs the alternate rhyme in long Verſe; for the ſound of the monoſyllable rhyme is either loſt before we come to its correſpondent, or we are in pain by the ſo long expectation and ſuſpence. "This alternate rhyme, and the down-"right morality throughout whole Canto's together, "ſays Rymer, ſhew *D'Avenant* better acquainted with "the *Quatrains* of *Pybrach*, which he ſpeaks of, than "with any true models of Epic Poeſie. After all, D'A-"venant is ſaid to have a particular talent for the *Man-"ners*; his thoughts are great; and there appears "ſomething roughly noble throughout this Fragment, "which had he been pleaſed to finiſh it, would doubt-"leſs not have been left ſo open to the attack of cri-"ticks." Mr. Thomas Blackwell, Profeſſor of Greek in the Univerſity of Aberdeen, has the following paſſage with regard to this Poem (*) ; *It was indeed a very extraordinary project of our ingenious countryman, to write an Epic Poem, without making fables, or allowing the ſmalleſt fiction throughout the compoſure. It was like lopping off a man's limb, and then putting him upon running races; tho' it muſt be owned that the performance ſhews with what ability he would have acquitted himſelf, had he been ſound and entire.* This Poem was rallied by ſeveral of the Wits of that time, particularly Sir John Denham, John Donne, LL. D. ſon of Dr. John Donne Dean of St. Paul's, Sir Allen Broderick, &c. who publiſhed at London 1653 in one ſheet and an half in 8vo *Certain Verſes written by ſeveral of the Author's friends to be reprinted with the ſecond Edition of* Gondibert. Upon which Sir William Davenant wrote an Anſwer to them, intitled, *The incomparable Poem* Gondibert *vindicated from the Wit-Cabals of four Eſquires*, Clinias, Dametas, Sancho, *and* Jack-pudding. London 1653, one ſheet in 8vo. This, tho' pretended to be written by a friend of Sir William's, was actually his own performance.

(*) *An Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer*, pag. 141. edit. London 1735.

[*E*] *Carried priſoner, firſt to the Iſle of Wight in* 1650.] On the 9th of July 1650 an Act paſſed the Parliament for the Trial of him and ſeveral others by an High Court of Juſtice (35). In the *Poſtſcript to the Reader* at the end of his *Gondibert*, dated at Cowes-Caſtle in that Iſle. Oct. 22, 1650, he has the following paſſage in the *Poſtſcript* to *Gondibert*, which ſhews he was then under ſtrong apprehenſions of ſuffering death: "I "am here arrived at the middle of the 3d Book, which "makes an equal half of the Poem; and I was now by "degrees to preſent you (as I promis'd in the Preface) "the ſeveral keys of the main building; which ſhould "convey you through ſuch ſhort walks as give an ea-"ſy view of the whole frame. But it is high time "to ſtrike ſail, and caſt Anchor (though I have run "but half my courſe) when at the helme I am threatned "with death; who, though he can viſit us but once, "ſeems troubleſome; and even in the innocent may "beget ſuch gravity, as diverts the Muſick of Verſe. "And I beſeech thee (if thou art ſo civil as to be "pleaſed with what is written) not to take it ill, that "I run not on to my laſt gaſp. For though I intend-"ed in this Poem to ſtrip nature naked, and clothe her "again in the perfect ſhape of virtue; yet even in "ſo worthy a deſigne I ſhall aſke leave to deſiſt, when "I am interrupted by ſo great an experiment as dy-"ing; and it is an experiment to the moſt experienc-"ed; for no man (though his mortifications may be "much greater than mine) can ſay, *He has already "dy'd.*"

(35) Whitelocke, *Memorials of the Engliſh Affairs*, pag. 464. edit. London 1732, in fol.

[*F*] *But by the mediation of Milton and others he had his liberty allowed him as priſoner at large.*] This we are aſſured of by Mr. Wood (36), who likewiſe tells us, that he was particularly aſſiſted in this exigence by "two godly Aldermen of York, to whom he had ſhew-"ed great civility, when they had been taken pri-"ſoners in the North by ſome of the forces under "William Duke of Newcaſtle." Mr. Richardſon likewiſe in his *Life of Milton* (37) tells us, that Sir *William Davenant* obtained that Poet's *Remiſſion* at the Reſtoration, *in return for his own Life procured by Milton's intereſt, when himſelf was under condemnation,* Anno 1650. *A Life was owing to* Milton (Davenant's) *and it was paid nobly,* Milton's *for* Davenant's, *at* Davenant's *interceſſion.* Mr. Richardſon informs us, (38) that he had this ſtory from Mr. Pope, who had it from Mr. Betterton the Actor. "Sir William was his Pa-"tron. . . . . Betterton was 'Prentice to a Bookſeller, "John Holden (39), the ſame who printed Davenant's "*Gondibert*. There Sir William ſaw him, and per-"ſuading his maſter to part with him, brought him "firſt on the ſtage. Betterton then may well be al-"lowed to know this tranſaction from the fountain-"head." Oct. 9, 1652 he wrote the following Letter from the Tower to Whitelocke, one of the Lords Commiſſioners of the Great Seal (40). "My Lord, I am in "ſuſpence whither I ſhould preſent my thankfulneſs "to your Lordſhip for my liberty of the Tower; be-"cauſe when I conſider how much of your time be-"longs to the publick, I conceive that to make a re-"queſt to you, and to thank you afterwards for the "ſucceſs of it, is to give you no more than a ſucceſſion "of trouble, unleſs you are reſolved to be continually "patient and courteous to afflicted men, and agree in "your judgment with the late wiſe Cardinal, who "was wont to ſay, *If he had not ſpent as much time in "civilities as in buſineſs, he had undone his maſter.* But "whilſt I endeavour to excuſe this preſent of thank-"fulneſs, I ſhould rather aſk your pardon for going "about to make a preſent to you of myſelf, for it "may argue me to be incorrigible, that after ſo many "afflictions, I have yet ſo much ambition as to deſire "to be at liberty, that I may have more opportunity "to obey your Lordſhip's commands, and ſhew the "world how much I am &c."

(36) Col. 412.

(37) Pag. 89. prefixed to *Explanatory Notes and Remarks on Milton's* Paradiſe Loſt. *By J. Richardſon*, Father and Son. London 1734 in 8vo.

(38) Ibid. pag. 90.

(39) Mr. Gildon in his *Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton*, pag. 5. tells us, *that Mr. Betterton was Apprentice to Mr.* Rhodes *a Bookſeller.*

(40) See *Whitelocke's Memorials*, pag. 546, 547.

[*G*] *Having laid the foundation of the Engliſh Stage by this muſical Drama, after the Reſtoration he revived and improved it by painted Scenes.*] Mr. Dryden tells us (41), that with regard to *Heroic Plays*, "the firſt "light we had of them on the *Engliſh Theatre*, was "from the late Sir Will. D'Avenant. It being forbid-"den him in the rebellious times to act *Tragedies* and "*Comedies*, becauſe they contained ſome matter of

(41) *Eſſay of Heroick Plays.*

in the South Croſs Iſle or South Tranſcept of Weſtminſter-Abby (*q*). We ſhall give his character in the note [*H*]. He had ſeveral ſons. His fourth ſon, WILLIAM, was educated at Magdalen Hall in the Univerſity of Oxford, where he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts July the 19th 1677 (*r*), and July the 5th 1680 that of Maſter of Arts (*s*); and entering into Holy Orders about the ſame time, was preſented to a Living in Surrey by Robert Wymondſol of Putney Eſq; with whom travelling into France in quality of a Tutor, he was drowned in the Summer time in the preſence of his Pupil, as he was diverting himſelf in ſwimming in a river near Paris, in the year 1681 (*t*). He tranſlated from French into Engliſh with ſome Additions, *Notitia Hiſtoricorum ſelectorum*; or *Animadverſions upon the famous Greek and Latin Hiſtorians*, written by *La Mothe le Vayer*; Oxford 1678 in 8vo.

(*q*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* col. 415.

(*r*) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 205.

(*s*) Idem, ibid. col. 213.

(*t*) Idem, ibid.

" ſcandal to thoſe good people, who could more eaſily " diſpoſſeſs their lawful Sovereign, than endure a wan- " ton jeſt; he was forced to turn his thoughts ano- " ther way, and to introduce the examples of moral " virtue, writ in Verſe, and performed in recitative " Muſick. The original of this Muſick, and of the " Scenes, which adorned his work, he had from the " Italian Opera's; but he heightened his characters " (as I may probably imagine) from the examples of " Corneille and ſome French Poets. In this condition " did this part of Poetry remain at his Majeſty's re- " turn; when growing bolder, as now being owned " by a public authority, Davenant review'd his *Siege* " *of Rhodes*, and cauſed it to be acted as a juſt *Drama*. " But as few men have the happineſs to begin and fi- " niſh any new project, ſo neither did he live to make " his deſign perfect. There wanted the fullneſs of a " plot, and the variety of characters to form it as it " ought. And perhaps ſomewhat might have been " added to the beauty of the ſtile; all which he would " have performed with more exactneſs, had he pleaſed " to have given us another work of the ſame nature. " For my ſelf and others who come after him, we are " bound with all veneration to his memory, to ac- " knowledge what advantage we received from that " excellent ground-work, which he laid; and ſince " it is an eaſy thing to add to what already is invent- " ed, we ought all of us, without envy to him or " partiality to our ſelves, to yield him the precedence " in it."

" priſing; and thoſe firſt thoughts of his, contrary to " the old Latin proverb, were not always the leaſt " happy. And as his fancy was quick, ſo likewiſe " were the products of it remote and new. He bor- " rowed not of any other; and his imaginations " were ſuch as could not eaſily enter into any other " man. His corrections were ſober and judicious; " and he corrected his own writings much more ſe- " verely than thoſe of another man, beſtowing twice " the time and labour in poliſhing, which he uſed in " invention." In the *Seſſion of the Poets* printed in *the Miſcellany Poems* publiſhed by Mr. Dryden (43), he is mentioned in theſe lines;

(43) Part 2. pag. 90, & *ſeqq.* 4th ed. London 1716.

Apollo *concerned to ſee the tranſgreſſions*
Our paltry Poets do daily commit,
Gave order once more to ſummon a Seſſions,
Severely to puniſh the abuſes of wit.

Will D'avenant *would fain have been Steward o' th'*
Court,
To have fin'd and amerc'd each man at his will;
But Apollo, *it ſeems, had heard a report,*
That his choice of new Plays did ſhew h'ad no ſkill.

Beſides ſome critics had ow'd him a ſpite,
And a little before had made the God fret,
By letting him know the Laureat did write
That damnable farce, The houſe to be let.

And afterwards (44):

(44) Pag. 95.

Damn'd Holden *with's* dull German Princeſs *appear'd,*
Whom if D'avenant *begot, as ſome do ſuppoſe,*
Apollo *ſaid, the Pillory ſhould crop off his ears,*
And make them more ſuitable unto his noſe.

T.

[*H*] *We ſhall give his character in the Note.*] Mr. Dryden tells us (42), that in the time he wrote with him, he had the opportunity to obſerve ſomewhat more nearly of him, than he had formerly done, when he had only a bare acquaintance with him: " I found " him, *ſays he*, of ſo quick a fancy, that nothing " was propoſed to him, on which he could not ſud- " denly produce a thought extreamly pleaſant and ſur-

(42) *Preface to the Tempeſt.*

☞DAVENANT (CHARLES), an eminent Civilian and Writer, and eldeſt ſon of the preceding, was born in London or Weſtminſter in 1656, and educated in Grammar Learning at Cheame in Surrey under Mr. George Aldrich of Cambridge. He became Fellow Commoner of Baliol College in Oxford in Midſummer-Term 1671; but left that Univerſity without taking a Degree (*a*). However he afterwards obtained the Degree of Doctor of the Civil Law at Cambridge or Dublin, and applied himſelf to that profeſſion (*b*). In 1677 his Tragedy of *Circe* [*A*] was acted at the Duke of York's Theatre. In 1685 he was elected Burgeſs for St. Ives in Cornwall to ſit in the Parliament, which met at Weſtminſter May the 19th the ſame year (*c*); and about the ſame time was jointly impowered with the Maſter of the Revels to inſpect the Plays deſigned for the Stage, that no immoralities might be preſented (*d*). He wrote ſeveral political Tracts [*B*]. He died in the year 1712.

(*a*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 945. and *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 213. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*b*) Idem, *Ath. Oxon. ubi ſupra.*

(*c*) Idem, ibid.

(*d*) Idem, ibid. and *Account of the Engliſh Dramatick Poets.* By Gerard Langbaine, pag. 116. edit. Oxford 1691 in 8vo.

[*A*] *His Tragedy* of Circe.] The Prologue was written by Mr. Dryden; and the Epilogue by the Earl of Rocheſter. Mr. Gerard Langbaine tells us (1), that he had ſeen this Play acted with good applauſe: and that the Scenes and Machines may give it a title to that ſpecies of Dramatic Poetry called an *Opera*.

(1) *Account of the Engliſh Dramatick Poets*, pag. 116.

[*B*] *He wrote ſeveral political tracts.*] I. *An Eſſay upon ways and means of ſupplying the war.* London 1695 in 8vo. II. *Diſcourſes on the public revenues and trade of* England. London 1698, 2 Volumes in 8vo. The *firſt Part* is intitled, *Diſcourſes on the publick Revenues, and on the trade of England. In two parts. viz.* 1. *Of the uſe of Political Arithmetick in all conſiderations about the Revenues and Trade.* 2. *On credit, and the means and methods, by which it may be reſtored.* 3. *On the management of the King's Revenues.* 4. *Whether to farm the Revenues may not, in this juncture, be moſt for the publick Service?* 5. *On the publick Debts and Engagements.* The *ſecond part* is intitled, *Diſcourſes on the Publick Revenues, and on the Trade of England; which more immediately treat of the forcign Traffick of this Kingdom, viz.* 1. *That the foreign Trade is beneficial to England.* 2. *On the Protection and care of Trade.* 3. *On the Plantation Trade.* 4. *On the Eaſt-India Trade. Part II. To which is added the late Eſſay on the Eaſt-India Trade.* This was animadverted upon in *A Vindication of ſome aſſertions relating to Coin and Trade from the Reflections of Dr.* Davenant *in his* Diſcourſes on the Publick Revenues. London 1699 in 8vo. The tranſlation of Xenophon's *Diſcourſe*

DAVID, King of the Jews, was one of the greateſt men in the World, though we ſhould not conſider him as a Royal Prophet, who was a man after God's own heart. The firſt time the Scripture makes him appear on the ſtage (*a*), is to acquaint us that Samuel appointed him King, and performed the ceremony of anointing him. David was then but a ſimple ſhepherd. He was the youngeſt of the eight ſons of Jeſſe the Bethlehemite [*A*]. After this the Scripture informs us that he was ſent to King Saul (*b*), to

(*a*) 1 Samuel, chap. xvi. ver. 13.

(*b*) Ibid. ver. 20.

Diſcourſe upon improving the Revenue of the State of Athens, annexed to our Author's *Diſcourſes*, was done by *Walter Moyle* Eſq; who in the dedication of it, obſerves, that "the great Trade to the Eaſt-Indies, "with ſome few regulations, might be eſtabliſhed "upon a bottom more conſiſtent with the manufactures "of England. But in all appearance, ſays he, this "is not to be compaſſed, unleſs ſome public ſpirited "man with a maſterly genius be placed at the head "of our affairs in India; and tho' we who are his "friends are loth to loſe him, it were to be wiſhed, "for the good of the Kingdom, that the Gentleman (2), "whom common fame, and the voice of the world "have pointed out as the ableſt man for ſuch a "ſtation, would employ his excellent judgment and "talents that way, in the execution of ſo uſeful a "deſign. The general intereſt of a nation ought to "be the care of particular men, the main bent of "their ſtudies, and the chief purſuit of their enquiries. "Every man ought to ſet his helping hand to ſuch a "work; and your own generous labours upon this "ſubject have ſet an excellent pattern to the reſt of "the world." III. *An Eſſay upon the probable methods of making a people gainers in the Ballance of Trade. Treating of theſe Heads, viz. Of the People of England. Of the Land of England and its Product. Of our Payments to the Publick, and in what manner the Ballance of Trade may be thereby affected. That a country cannot increaſe in Wealth and Power but by private Men doing their Duty to the public, and but by a ſteady Courſe of Honeſty and Wiſdom in ſuch as are truſted with the Adminiſtration of Affairs. By the Author of* The Eſſay on Ways and Means. London 1699 in 8vo. IV. *A Diſcourſe upon Grants and Reſumptions. Shewing how our Anceſtors have proceeded with ſuch Miniſters as have procured to themſelves Grants of the Crown-Revenue; and that the Forfeited Eſtates ought to be applied towards the payment of the publick Debts. By the Author of* The Eſſay on Ways and Means. London 1700 in 8vo. In the *Introduction* (3) he obſerves, that "he has conſtantly "endeavoured to make his ſtudies tend to the ſervice "of the public; and his aim has been to incite in "young Gentlemen a deſire of being acquainted with "the buſineſs of the Nation; and this knowledge ly-"ing under abundance of rubbiſh, his ſcope has been "to remove this rubbiſh, and to dreſs up crabbed "matters as agreeably as he can, and to give, as it "were, ſhort maps of things, which others will not "take the pains to travel through themſelves. In or-"der to which he has devoted his hours of leiſure to "inquiries into the Trade and Revenues of this "Kingdom; and not ſerving his country in an ac-"tive life, he hopes to make his ſolitude and con-"templation of ſome uſe, ſo as to ſhew himſelf not "altogether an unprofitable member of the common-"wealth." There have been ſeveral Editions of this Book. V. *Eſſays upon, I. The Ballance of Power. II. The Right of making War, Peace, and Alliances. III. Univerſal Monarchy. To which is added an Appendix, containing the Records referred to in the ſecond Eſſay.* London 1701 in 8vo. In anſwer to this was publiſhed *Animadverſions on a late Factious Book, intitled,* Eſſays upon, I. The Ballance of Power; &c. *With a Letter containing a cenſure upon the ſaid Book: wherein the King, the Miniſtry, and the Church of England are cleared from the malicious aſperſions caſt upon them by the enemies of this Government.* London 1701 in 8vo. pagg. 72. The Author of this Pamphlet tells us (4), that Dr. Davenant "made himſelf conſpicuous, "and ſecured a great party in the nation by his *early* "*Quarrel to the Government*, upon account of the "male-adminiſtration of affairs; which he would per-"ſuade the world to be the reſult of his *Love to his* "*Country*; when we all know, his ſpleen has no "other cauſe than his having no more a ſhare in the "management of one of the branches of the Reve-"nue." VI. *Eſſays upon Peace at home, and War abroad. In two Parts. By* Charles D'Avenant, *LL. D.* London 1704 in 8vo. In the *Introduction* to the *firſt Part* (5) he obſerves, that part of theſe Diſcourſes had been written ſome time, and were deſigned to be made public againſt the meeting of that Parliament, which was to ſit the 13th of November 1701, and which, "to the infinite grief and ſurprize of many, who "loved and conſulted their country's quiet, was diſ-"ſolved upon the 11th of the ſame month. But the "Author not being able to judge what kind of fer-"ment this ſudden diſſolution might produce, and "apprehending in general from divers ſymptoms, "that on both ſides the paſſions were ſo enflamed, as "not to be capable at that ſeaſon of liſtening to "terms of moderation; he reſolved that for the pre-"ſent theſe Tracts of his ſhould not be publiſhed." Dr. D'Avenant is ſaid likewiſe to have been the Author of *A Picture of a modern Whig*; in two Parts, 8vo. London 1701, 1702. and *Reflections upon the Conſtitution and Management of the Trade to Africa:* in three Parts. fol. London 1709. T.

(2) Dr. D'Avenant.

(3) Pag. 41.

(4) Pag. 5.

(5) Pag. 16.

[*A*] *He was the youngeſt of the Sons of Jeſſe.*] Jeſſe was deſcended in a right line from Judah, one of the twelve Sons of Jacob, and dwelt at Bethlehem, a ſmall city of the tribe of Judah. Some modern Rabbins ſay that when David's mother conceived him, Jeſſe did not think he enjoyed his wife, but his maid-ſervant; and hereby they explain the 5th Verſe of the LIſt Pſalm, wherein David declares, that *he was ſhapen in iniquity, and that his mother conceived him in ſin.* This, ſay they, ſignifies that Jeſſe *his father committed an adultery when he begot him, becauſe tho' he begot him on his wife, he thought he begot him on a maid-ſervant, whoſe chaſtity he had tried to corrupt* (1). This explication is not very conformable to the doctrine of Original Sin; for which reaſon Father Bartolocci (2), having reported this opinion of the modern Rabbins, has thought himſelf obliged occaſionally to examine, whether the ancient Jews acknowledged the truth of that Doctrine. If the Suppoſition of theſe Rabbins be true, they would be much in the right to ſay that Jeſſe had committed adultery; but, on the other hand, it muſt be owned, that he would not have ſinned, if he had gotten his maid with child, when he really believed he was enjoying his wife. This Rabbinical ſuppoſition is repugnant to the Tradition which St. Jerom mentions. He ſays it was believed that Jeſſe, the father of David, never committed any actual ſin, and that there was no ſpot in him but what he brought from his mother's womb. *Mirum eſt quod de Iſaï patre Davidis refert Hieronymus, illum nunquam aliud peccatum commiſiſſe quam quod ex origine contraxit. Quo enim loco legimus:* Amaſa † ingreſſus eſt ad Abigail filiam Naas ſororem Sarviæ; *ſic Hieronymus* ‡, Naas interpretatur coluber, quia eum nullum admiſiſſe mortiferum perhibent peccatum, niſi quod originaliter de ſerpente antiquo contraxit. Eſt autem Naas qui & Iſaï pater David. *Eamdem traditionem refert Abulenſis* ‡, *& monet Naas eundem eſſe qui & Jeſſe ſive Iſaï patrem Davidis, quod quidem & antea Liranus* * *docuerat* (3). i. e. "It is a wonderful thing which St. "Jerom relates of Jeſſe the father of David, that he "was never guilty of any other ſin than what he had "contracted originally. For the paſſage wherein we "read, that *Amaſa went in to Abigail the daughter* "*of Nahaſh, ſiſter to Zeruiah*, is thus expounded by "St. Jerom: *Nahaſh ſignifies a ſerpent; for they ſay* "*he was guilty of no deadly ſin, but what he origi-*"*nally contracted from the old ſerpent. Now Nahaſh* "*is the ſame with Jeſſe the father of David.* Abu-"lenſis mentions the ſame tradition, and obſerves "that Nahaſh is the ſame with Jeſſe or Iſaï the father "of David; which de Lyra had likewiſe taught be-"fore." They who admit the impertinence of theſe Rabbins concerning the conception of David, might eaſily proceed to another impertinence, and rank David among the illuſtrious baſtards. The phyſical rea-

(1) See the *Journal des Savans* of the 14th of July 1692, pag. 465 of the Dutch Edition.

(2) In *Bibliotheca magna Rabbinica*, Part. 2. pag. 4. quoted in the *Journal des Savans*, ibid.

† Lib. 2 Reg. 17, 25.

‡ *Hieron Trad. Hebr. in Lib.* 2 *Reg. cap.* 17.

‡ *Toſtat.* 2 *Reg.* 17. *Quæſt.* 27.

* *Liran. ibid.*

(3) Theſe words with the Citations which accompany them, are Father *Camart's*, pag. 126, 127, *de Rebus geſtis Eliæ.*

to cure him of his fits of frenzy, by the ſound of Muſical Inſtruments. A ſervice of ſuch importance made him ſo much beloved by Saul, that that Prince retained him in his houſe, and made him his Armour-bearer (*c*). The Scripture ſays afterwards (*d*), that he returned from time to time to his father's houſe to take care of the flocks, and that one day his father ſent him to Saul's camp with ſome proviſions, which he deſigned for his three ſons who were in the army. David, in performing that order, heard the challenge which a Philiſtine named Goliath, proud of his ſtrength and gigantic ſtature, came every day to offer the Iſraelites, but which not one of them dared to accept. He diſcovered an earneſt deſire to go and fight that giant; whereupon he was brought to the King, and aſſured him that he ſhould triumph over the Philiſtine. Saul gave him his armour; but as David found it cumberſome, he put it off, and reſolved to make uſe only of his ſling; which he did with ſuch ſucceſs, that he felled the boaſter with a ſtone (*e*), and then killed him with his own ſword, and cut off his head, which he preſented to Saul [*B*]. That Prince had aſked his General, when he ſaw David march againſt Goliath, *whoſe ſon is this youth* (*f*) [*C*]? The General anſwered that he did not know, and received orders from Saul to enquire whoſe ſon he was; but Saul himſelf learned it from the young man's mouth; for when he was brought to him after the victory, he aſked him, *Whoſe ſon art thou?* and David anſwered, that he was the ſon of Jeſſe (*g*). Then Saul retained him in his ſervice, without permitting him to return home to his father any more (*h*). But as the Songs which were ſung through all the cities on the defeat of the Philiſtines, aſcribed ten times more glory to David than to Saul (*i*), the King conceived a violent jealouſy, which increaſed more and more, becauſe the employments which he gave to David in order to remove him from Court, ſerved only to render the young man's merit the more illuſtrious, and to gain him the affection and admiration of the people. By a falſe piece of policy he would needs have him for his ſon-in-law: he hoped that the condition on which he deſigned to give him his ſecond daughter would deliver him from that object of averſion; but he was confounded by his own artifice. He demanded for his daughter's dowry a hundred fore-ſkins of the Philiſtines: David brought him two hundred fairly told (*k*); ſo that inſtead of periſhing in that enterprize, as Saul hoped, he returned with a new acceſſion of glory. He married Saul's daughter, and thereby became but the more formidable to the King (*l*): all his expeditions againſt the Philiſtines were very ſucceſsful; his name grew famous; and he was in high eſteem (*m*); ſo that Saul, who was much leſs acquainted with the virtue of his ſon-in-law, than the diſpoſition of the people, thought nothing could prevent his being depoſed, but the death of David. He therefore reſolved to get rid of him once for all; and truſted his eldeſt ſon with the deſign, who, far from entring into his father's jealouſy, gave David notice of the black contrivance (*n*). David fled, and was purſued from place to place, till he had given inconteſtable proofs of his probity, and of his fidelity to his father-in-law, to whom he did not the leaſt harm on two favourable opportunities (*o*) which he had of killing him, if he had pleaſed. This made Saul reſolve to leave him at reſt. But as David apprehended that Prince might reſume his ill deſigns, he remitted nothing of his former precautions; on the contrary, he provided himſelf a ſafer refuge than before in the land of the Philiſtines (*p*). He aſked of the King of Gath a City to dwell in, from whence he made frequent incurſions into the neighbouring countries [*D*]; and

(*c*) Ibid. ver. 21.

(*d*) Ibid. chap. xvii. ver. 15.

(*e*) Ibid. ver. 49, 50.

(*f*) Ibid. ver. 55.

(*g*) Ibid. ver. 58.

(*h*) Ibid. chap. xviii. ver. 2.

(*i*) *The women anſwered one another as they played and ſaid, Saul hath ſlain his thouſands and David his ten thouſands.* 1 Sam. chap. xviii. ver. 7.

(*k*) Ibid. ver. 27.

(*l*) Ibid. ver. 29.

(*m*) Ibid. ver. 30.

(*n*) Ibid. chap. xix. ver. 1 & 2.

(*o*) Ibid. chap. xxiv and xxvi.

(*p*) Ibid. chap. xxvii.

ſon which is given why baſtards are ſo frequently born with ſuch extraordinary natural talents might be properly alledged here with regard to the father.

[*B*] *He ſlew Goliath with his own ſword, and cut off his head, which he preſented to Saul.*] The arms of Goliath were preſerved as a monument of the Iſraelites glory. David carried them firſt to his tent (4), but probably they were afterwards put in a holy place; for we read (5) that David having aſked the Prieſt Ahimelech, if he could not furniſh him with a ſpear or ſword, the Prieſt anſwered him that the ſword of Goliath was there, wrapped in a cloth behind the Ephod, and that he might take it: whereupon David cauſed it to be delivered him. As to Goliath's head, it was carried to Jeruſalem (6), when David had made choice of that city for the capital of his Kingdom. Joſephus ſays poſitively that it was David himſelf who conſecrated Goliath's Sword to God (7).

(4) 1 Sam. chap. xvii. ver. 54.

(5) Ibid. chap. xxi. ver. 8 & 9.

(6) Ibid. chap. xvii. ver. 54.

(7) Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. vi. cap. xi & xiv.

[*C*] *Saul had aſked his General . . . whoſe ſon is this youth?*] It is a little ſtrange that Saul did not know David that day, ſince the young man had ſeveral times played on inſtruments of muſic in his preſence, to calm the diſmal vapours which diſturbed him. If ſuch a relation were found in Thucydides or Livy, all the critics would unanimouſly conclude that the tranſcribers had tranſpoſed the pages, forgotten ſomething in one place, repeated ſomething in another, or inſerted additional paſſages in the Author's Work. But we muſt not entertain ſuch ſuſpicions with regard to the Bible. Notwithſtanding, ſome have been ſo bold as to pretend that all the Chapters, or all the Verſes of the firſt Book of Samuel are not placed in their original order. The Abbot de Choiſi, in my opinion, removes the difficulty a better way. *David*, ſays he (8), *was brought to Saul, who did not know him again at firſt, tho' he had ſeen him frequently when he uſed to ſend for him to play on the harp: but as this was ſeveral years ago, and as David was then very young, and came to Court in quality of a Muſician, and then appeared in the habit of a Shepherd, it is no wonder that a King overwhelmed with buſineſs, and whoſe mind was diſordered, ſhould forget the features of a young man's face, who had nothing extraordinary in him.* I only wiſh he had not ſaid: 1, that *it was ſeveral years* ſince Saul had ſeen David: 2, that *David was very young* when he came to Saul's Court in quality of a Muſician. There is no likelihood that he was much older when he killed Goliath, than when he came the firſt time to Saul's Court; for at the time of his firſt journey thither he *was a mighty man, and a man of war, and prudent in matters* (9); he was but thirty years old when he was elected King after Saul's death; and there muſt neceſſarily have been an interval of ſeveral years between the death of Goliath, and that of Saul. See the Remark wherein we criticiſe Moreri, and the Remark [*L*].

(8) *Hiſt. de la Vie de David*, pag. 8, 9. of the Amſterdam Edition, 1692.

(9) 1 Sam. chap. xvi. ver. 18.

[*D*] *He aſked of the King of Gath a city . . . . from whence he made frequent incurſions into the neighbouring*

and it was not his fault that he did not fight againſt the Iſraelites [*E*] under the banner of that Philiſtine Prince, in the unhappy war wherein Saul periſhed. He returned to Judæa after the death of Saul, and was there declared King by the tribe of Judah (*q*). However the other Tribes ſubmitted to Iſh-boſheth the ſon of Saul; which was the effect of the fidelity of Abner (*r*). This man, who had been General of the Army under King Saul, placed Iſh-boſheth on the throne, and maintained him on it againſt all the efforts of David; but not bearing to be cenſured by Iſh-boſheth for having taken one of Saul's concubines (*s*), he treated with David to put him in poſſeſſion of Iſh-boſheth's kingdom. The negotiation had been ſoon concluded to the ſatisfaction of David, if Joab (*t*), to revenge a private quarrel, had not killed Abner, whoſe death only haſtened the ruin of the unfortunate Iſh-boſheth. Two of his chief Captains ſlew him, and brought his head to David, who, far from rewarding them as they expected, commanded them to be put to death (*u*). Iſh-boſheth's ſubjects quickly made a voluntary ſubmiſſion to David. That Prince had reigned ſeven years and an half over the tribe of Judah; and he afterwards reigned about thirty three years over all Iſrael (*x*). This long reign was remarkable for great ſucceſſes, and glorious conqueſts: it was ſcarce diſturbed by any other means than the criminal attempts of the Prince's own children [*F*]. Theſe are uſually the enemies which

(*q*) 2 Samuel, chap. ii. ver. 4.

(*r*) Ibid. ver. 8.

(*s*) Ibid. ch. iii.

(*t*) He was the General of David's Army.

(*u*) 2 Sam. chap. iv.

(*x*) Ibid. chap. v. ver. 5.

ing countries.] David, having ſtaid ſome time in the Capital of King Achiſh, with his little band of 600 bold Adventurers, was afraid of being burthenſome to that Prince, and begged he would aſſign him another habitation. Achiſh appointed him the City of Ziklag. David removed thither with his followers, and did not ſuffer their ſwords to ruſt in their ſcabbards. He often led them out on parties, and killed man and woman without mercy: he left only the cattle alive, which was all the booty he returned with: he was afraid leſt the priſoners ſhould diſcover the whole myſtery to King Achiſh; for which reaſon he carried none with him, but put both ſexes to the ſword. The myſtery which he would not have diſcovered, was that theſe ravages were committed, not on the lands of the Iſraelites, as he made the King of Gath believe, but on the lands of the ancient inhabitants of Paleſtine (10). To ſay the truth, this conduct was very unjuſtifiable: to cover one fault, he committed a greater. He deceived a King to whom he had obligations; and to conceal this deceit, he exerciſed extreme cruelty. If David had been aſked, *By what authority doſt thou theſe things?* what could he have anſwered? Has a private man, as he was, a fugitive, who finds ſhelter in the territories of a neighbouring Prince, a right to commit hoſtilities for his own account, and without a commiſſion from the Sovereign of the country? Had David any ſuch commiſſion? On the contrary, did he not act in oppoſition to the intentions and intereſts of the King of Gath? It is certain that if a private perſon, let his birth be ever ſo great, ſhould behave at this day as David did on this occaſion, he would unavoidably have no very honourable names given him. I know very well that the moſt illuſtrious Heroes, and the moſt famous Prophets of the Old Teſtament, have ſometimes approved the deſtroying all things which had life with the edge of the ſword; and therefore I ſhould be far from calling what David did inhumanity, if he had been authorized by the orders of any Prophet, or if God had himſelf by inſpiration commanded him to act as he did: but it plainly appears from the ſilence of the ſcripture, that he did all this of his own head.

(10) Ibid. chap. xxvii.

A REFLECTION on David's conduct towards Nabal.

I ſhall add a word concerning what he had determined to do with Nabal. While that man, who was very rich, was ſhearing his ſheep, David ſent to aſk him very civilly for ſome gratification: his meſſengers failed not to repreſent that Nabal's Shepherds had never received any damage from David's people. As Nabal was very churliſh, he aſked in a rude manner who David was, and reproached him with having thrown off his maſter's yoke: in a word, he declared that he was not ſuch a fool as to give what he had provided for his domeſtics to ſtrangers and vagabonds. David, enraged at this anſwer, armed 400 of his Soldiers, and put himſelf at their head; fully reſolved not to ſuffer one ſoul to eſcape the edge of the ſword. He even bound himſelf to it by an oath; and if he did not execute this bloody purpoſe, it was becauſe Abigail came to appeaſe him by fair ſpeeches and preſents (11). Abigail was Nabal's wife, and a woman of great merit, beautiful, and witty, and pleaſed David ſo well, that he married her ſo ſoon as ſhe became a Widow (12). Let us ſpeak ſincerely: is it not inconteſtable that David was going to commit a very criminal action? He had no right to Nabal's goods, nor any authority to puniſh him for his incivility. He ranged up and down with a band of truſty friends: he might indeed be allowed to aſk ſome gratification of people who were at their eaſe; but if they refuſed, he ought to have taken it patiently, nor could he compel them to it by military execution, without plunging the world again into the terrible confuſion which is called the ſtate of nature, wherein no other Law is acknowledged but that of the ſtrongeſt. What ſhould we ſay at this day of a Prince of the blood royal of France, who being diſgraced at Court, ſhould take refuge where he could with ſuch friends as ſhould be willing to follow his fortune? What judgment, I ſay, ſhould we make of him, if he ſhould take it into his head to raiſe contributions in the countries where he ſhould canton himſelf, and to put all to the ſword in the villages which ſhould refuſe to pay his taxes? What ſhould we ſay if this Prince ſhould fit out veſſels, and cruize at ſea to take all the Merchant ſhips he could light on? Sincerely ſpeaking, had David a better authority to exact contributions from Nabal, and to maſſacre all the men and women in the country of the Amalekites &c, and to take all the cattle he found there? I agree it may be anſwered me, that we are at this day better acquainted with the Law of Nations, the *Jus belli & pacis*, of which ſuch fine ſyſtems have been written; and therefore ſuch behaviour was more excuſable in thoſe times than it would be now. But the profound reſpect which we ought to entertain for this great King, this great Prophet, ought not to hinder us from diſapproving the blemiſhes which are to be found in his life; otherwiſe we ſhould give occaſion to the profane to reproach us, and to ſay it is ſufficient to make an action juſt that it be done by certain perſons whom we reverence; than which nothing would be more fatal to Chriſtian Morality. It is of great concern to true Religion, that the lives of the Orthodox be judged by the general ideas of right and order.

(11) 1 Sam. chap. xxv.

(12) Ibid. ver. 42.

[*E*] *It was not his fault that he did not fight againſt the Iſraelites.*] While David with his little flying camp was exterminating all the infidel countries whereever he could penetrate, the Philiſtines were making preparations in their dominions for war againſt the Iſraelites. They aſſembled all their forces; and David and his bold Adventurers joined the army of Achiſh, and would have fought like Lions againſt their brethren, if the diſtruſtful Philiſtines had not conſtrained Achiſh to diſmiſs them. It was feared leſt in the heat of the battle they ſhould fall on the Philiſtines, in order to make their peace with Saul. When David was informed that by reaſon of theſe ſuſpicions he muſt be obliged to quit the army, he was concerned at it (13). He had reſolved, therefore, to contribute with all his might to the victory of the uncircumciſed Philiſtines over his own brethren, the people of God, and the Profeſſors of the true Religion. I leave nice Caſuiſts to judge whether theſe were ſentiments worthy of a true Iſraelite.

(13) *And David ſaid unto Achiſh, But what have I done? and what haſt thou found in thy Servant, ſo long as I have been with thee unto this day, that I may not go to fight againſt the enemies of my Lord the King?* 1 Sam. chap. xxix. ver. 8.

[*F*] *His right . . . . was only diſturbed by the criminal attempts of his own children.*] The moſt conſiderable of their attempts was the revolt of Abſalom, who

which Sovereigns have moſt to fear. David was very near being forced to return to the mean condition in which Samuel found him. Humanly ſpeaking, this reverſe of fortune would have been inevitable [G], had he not found ſome perſons to act a Traitor's part towards Abſalom his ſon (y). David's piety is ſo conſpicuous in his Pſalms, and in ſeveral of his actions, that it cannot be ſufficiently admired. There is one thing which is no leſs admirable in his conduct; to wit, that he could ſo happily reconcile ſo much piety with the looſe maxims of the art of reigning. It is commonly believed that his adultery with Bath-ſheba, the murder of Uriah, and the numbring of the people, are the only faults with which he can be charged: but this is a great miſtake; for there are many other things in his life which deſerve cenſure [H]. He is a Sun of holineſs in the Church,

(y) Ibid. chap. xv. ver. 34, &c.

who forced this great Prince to fly from Jeruſalem in a mournful condition, with his head covered, his feet bare, melting into tears, and having his ears ſaluted by nothing but the groans of his faithful ſubjects (14). Abſalom entered Jeruſalem as it were in triumph: and that the zeal of his adherents might not grow cool, on an imagination that this quarrel between the father and the ſon might be made up, he did a thing very proper to perſuade them that he would never be reconciled to David. He lay with the ten concubines of that Prince in the ſight of all the world (15). It is very probable that this crime would have been forgiven him: the extreme affliction into which his death threw David is a proof of it. He was the beſt father that ever was; his indulgence to his children was exceſſive, and he himſelf was the firſt who ſuffered by it. For if he had puniſhed the infamous action of his Son Amnon (16), as the thing deſerved, he would not have had the ſhame and diſpleaſure to ſee another revenge the injury done to Tamar; and if he had chaſtiſed him who revenged that injury, as he ought to have done, he would not have run the riſque of being abſolutely dethroned. David's deſtiny was the ſame with that of moſt great Princes; he was unhappy in his family. His eldeſt ſon violated his own ſiſter, and was killed by one of his brothers on account of that inceſt: the author of that fratricide lay with David's concubines. What a ſcandal muſt it be to pious ſouls, to ſee ſo many infamous actions committed in the family of this King?

(14) 2 Sam. chap. xv.

(15) Ibid. chap. xvi.

(16) *He raviſhed Tamar, and was for that crime ſlain by the order of Abſalom, Tamar's brother both by father and mother.* Ibid. chap. xiii.

[G] *He was very near being obliged to return to the .... condition in which Samuel found him.... This reverſe of fortune was inevitable.*] It may be ſeen by this example that there is no depending on the fidelity of the people; for, in ſhort, David was both a good, and a great King. He had made himſelf beloved, and eſteemed, and he had all imaginable zeal for the religion of the country. His ſubjects, therefore, had reaſon to be contented, and if they had been to chooſe a Prince, could they have wiſhed him to be better qualified? Yet they are ſo unſteady in their duty to David, that his ſon Abſalom, to get himſelf declared King, has no more to do than to make himſelf popular for ſome time, and to keep ſome emiſſaries in each Tribe. We may apply this maxim to the people, *Caſta eſt quam nemo rogavit.* i. e. *She is chaſte who has never been aſked the queſtion.* If we do not ſee more Kings dethroned, it is becauſe the people have not been ſollicited to revolt by intrigues properly conducted. There is nothing wanting but that: if the Prince is not a bad one, it is eaſy to make him paſs for ſuch, or for a ſlave to ill Councels.

[H] *It is commonly believed that his adultery &c. are the only faults he can be charged with ... there are many other things in his life which deſerve cenſure.*] We have already taken notice of ſome which relate to the time when he was a private man; here are others; which refer to the time when he was on the throne.

I. His polygamy cannot well be excuſed; for tho' God tolerated the practiſe in thoſe days, we muſt not think it might be carried very far, without looſing the reins too much to ſenſuality. Michal, Saul's ſecond daughter, was David's firſt wife; ſhe was taken from him during his diſgrace (17): he ſucceſſively married ſeveral others (18), and yet demanded the firſt again: to reſtore her to him, they were obliged to force her from a huſband who loved her greatly, and who followed her as far as he could, weeping like a child (19). David made no ſcruple to ally himſelf with the daughter of an uncircumciſed perſon (20); and tho' he had children by ſeveral wives, he took concubines at Jeruſalem. He choſe, without doubt, the handſomeſt he could meet with; ſo that it cannot be ſaid that he took much pains to mortify nature, with reſpect to the pleaſures of love.

(17) 1 Sam. chap. xxv. ver. 44.

(18) 2 Sam. chap. iii, & v.

(19) Ibid. chap. iii. ver. 16.

(20) Talmai King of Geſhur. Ibid. ver. 3.

II. So ſoon as he heard of Saul's death, he ſet himſelf, without loſs of time, to ſecure the ſucceſſion. He went to Hebron, and *immediately on his arrival there, the whole Tribe of Judah, of which he had* GAINED THE PRINCIPAL MEN BY PRESENTS, *acknowledged him for King* (21). If Abner had not preſerved the reſt of the ſucceſſion for Saul's ſon, there is no doubt but by the ſame method, I mean by *gaining the principal men by preſents*, David would have become King of all Iſrael. But what happened after Abner's fidelity had preſerved eleven whole Tribes for Iſh-boſheth? The ſame which would have happened between two infidel and moſt ambitious Princes. David and Iſh-boſheth made inceſſant war on one another (22), to try which of the two could get the others ſhare, in order to enjoy the whole kingdom without diviſion. What I am going to ſay is a great deal worſe. Abner, being diſcontented with the King his maſter, reſolves to diſpoſſeſs him of his dominions, and to deliver them up to David: he acquaints David with his intentions; and goes to him himſelf, to concert meaſures for putting them in execution. David gives ear to the traitor, and is willing to gain a Kingdom by intrigues of this nature (23). Can it be ſaid that theſe are the actions of a Saint? I own there is nothing in all this but what is agreeable to the precepts of Policy, and the methods of human prudence; but I ſhall never be perſuaded that the ſtrict laws of equity, the ſevere morals of a good ſervant of God, can approve ſuch conduct. Take notice that David did not pretend that Saul's ſon reigned by uſurpation: he allowed him to be a righteous man (24), and conſequently a lawful King.

(21) *Hiſt. de la Vie de David*, par l'Abbé *de Choiſi*, pag. 47.

(22) 2 Sam. chap. iii. ver. 1.

(23) Ibid. chap. iii.

(24) Ibid. chap. iv. ver. 11.

III. I paſs the ſame judgment on the ſtratagem which David made uſe of during Abſalom's revolt. He would not permit Huſhai one of his beſt friends to follow him, but ordered him to go over to Abſalom's party, that he might give ill counſel to that rebellious ſon, and be able to inform David of all the deſigns of the new King (25). This ſtratagem, without doubt, is very commendable, if we judge of things according to human prudence, and the policy of Sovereigns. It ſaved David, and from that age to our own incluſively, has produced an infinite number of adventures, uſeful to ſome, and pernicious to others; but a rigid Caſuiſt will never take this ſtratagem for an action worthy of a Prophet, a Saint, or an honeſt man. An honeſt man, as ſuch, would rather loſe a crown, than be the cauſe of his friend's damnation: and it is to damn our friend as much as in us lies, to puſh him on to commit a crime; and it is a crime to feign to embrace a man's party with zeal; to feign it, I ſay, in order to ruin that man by giving him evil counſel, and revealing all the ſecrets of his cabinet. Can there be a more treacherous piece of villany than this of Huſhai? So ſoon as he perceives Abſalom, he cries out, *God ſave the King, God ſave the King*; and when he is aſked the reaſon of his ingratitude in not following his intimate friend, he gives himſelf airs of devotion, and alledges reaſons of conſcience, *I will be his whom the Lord hath choſen* (26).

(25) Ibid. chap. xv.

(26) Ibid. chap. xvi. ver. 18.

IV. When David, by reaſon of his great age, could not get heat under all the cloaths they covered him with, it came into their heads to ſeek for a young girl to nurſe him, and to lie with him. He ſuffered them to bring to him for that purpoſe the moſt beautiful maiden that could be found (27). Can this be ſaid to be the action of a very chaſte man? Will a man who is filled with the ideas of purity, and perfectly reſolved

(27) 1 Kings, chap. i.

Church, through which, by his Writings, he diffuſes a light full of conſolation and piety, which we cannot enough admire; but he had his ſpots: and even in his laſt words we find

reſolved to do what decency, and ſtrict morality require of him, ever conſent to theſe remedies? Can a man conſent to them, unleſs he prefers the inſtincts of nature, and the intereſts of the fleſh, before thoſe of God's Spirit?

V. David has long been blamed for having committed a crying injuſtice againſt Mephibosheth, the ſon of his intimate friend Jonathan. The fact is, David ſtanding no more in fear of Saul's faction, was well pleaſed to ſhew himſelf liberal to all thoſe who might yet remain of that family. He was informed that there was left a poor cripple, named Mephibosheth, the ſon of Jonathan. He ſent for him, and gave him all the lands which had belonged to King Saul, and ordered Ziba, an old ſervant of that family, to improve thoſe lands for his benefit, and for the maintenance of Mephibosheth's ſon; for as to Mephibosheth, he was to eat at King David's table as long as he lived (28). When that Prince fled from Jeruſalem, for fear of falling into the hands of Abſalom, he met Ziba, who brought him ſome refreſhments, and told him in a few words that Mephibosheth ſtaid at Jeruſalem, in hopes that among thoſe revolutions he might recover the kingdom. Whereupon David gave him all that belonged to Mephibosheth (29). After the death of Abſalom, he found that Ziba had been a falſe accuſer, and yet he only took from him the half of what he had given him; and reſtored to Mephibosheth but one half of his eſtate. Some Writers pretend that this injuſtice, which was the greater becauſe David had the utmoſt obligations to Jonathan, was the reaſon why God permitted Jeroboam to divide the Kingdom of Iſrael in two (30). But it is certain that the ſins of Solomon were the true cauſe why God permitted that diviſion (31). All the Interpreters have not forborn to apologize for David. Some of them maintain that Ziba's accuſation was not unjuſt, or at leaſt that it was founded on ſo many probabilities, that it might be credited without paſſing a raſh judgment (32). But there are but few people who are of their opinion. Moſt of the Fathers, and of the Moderns, believe Ziba was a calumniator, and that David ſuffered himſelf to be impoſed on. Mark well the thought of Pope Gregory: he owns that Mephibosheth was ſlandered, and yet he inſiſts that the ſentence which ſtripped him of all his eſtate was juſt. He inſiſts on it for two reaſons: 1, becauſe David pronounced it; 2, becauſe a ſecret judgment of God intervened. *Non me latet, præter Interpretes in contrarium ſupra adductos, S. Gregorium contra Davidem ſtare l. 1. dialo. c. 4. Quamvis enim ait, latam à Davide contra innocentem Jonathæ filium ſententiam, quia per Davidem lata eſt, & occulto Dei judicio pronunciata, juſtam credi, tamen diſerte agnoſcit Miphiboſethum fuiſſe innocentem. Ex quo aperte ſequitur, ſententiam Davidis non fuiſſe juſtam. In quo cogimur S. Gregorio non adhærere, cum compertiſſima ſit Davidis ſanctitas; nec eum poſtea ſarciſſe hujuſmodi diſpendium aliunde conſtet* (33). The Author whom I quote takes another way: ſince the holineſs of David, ſays he, is well known to us, and ſince he never ordered any reparation of the wrong which he had done to Mephibosheth, we are to conclude that the ſentence was juſt. This is to eſtabliſh a very dangerous principle; we muſt no longer examine the actions of the old Prophets by the ideas of Morality, ſo as to condemn thoſe which ſhould be conformable thereto; and conſequently Libertines might accuſe our Caſuiſts of approving certain actions which are viſibly unjuſt; to approve them, I ſay, in favour of certain people, and by accepting of perſons. Let us act in a better manner, and apply to the Saints what has been ſaid of great Wits, *Nullum ſine venia placuit ingenium.* The greateſt Saints have need of pardon in ſome reſpects.

VI. I ſay nothing of the reproach which was made David by Michal one of his wives, on account of the garb he put himſelf into when he danced in public. If he had diſcovered his nakedneſs, his action might be deemed ill, morally ſpeaking: but if he did no more than make himſelf contemptible by his poſtures, and by not keeping up the majeſty of his character, it was but an imprudence at moſt and not a crime. It ought to be well conſidered on what occaſion it was that he danced: it was when the Ark was carried to Jeruſalem (34); and conſequently the exceſs of his joy, and of his leaping, teſtified his attachment and ſenſibility for holy things. A modern Author has endeavoured to juſtify the nakedneſs of S. Francis of Aſſiſi by that of David: *Michal David's wife*, ſays he (35), *having, from a window, ſeen her huſband, tranſported with a holy fervour, dancing and leaping before the Ark of the Lord, deſpiſed him in her heart, and . . . ſaid to him by way of raillery,* How glorious was the King of Iſrael to day, who uncovered himſelf to day in the eyes of the handmaids of his ſervants, as one of the vain fellows ſhameleſly uncovereth himſelf! *Theſe laſt words of the ſacred text ſeem to ſhew that David ſtripped himſelf ſtark naked; yet, as the ſame text* (v. 14), *ſpeaking of David's dancing before the ark, ſays he was girded with a linnen Ephod, I do not think he ſtripped himſelf naked. But he ſtripped himſelf ſo far as to appear as it were naked, and to make his behaviour judged unworthy the gravity and majeſty of a King: and the more ſo, for that the thing was done publickly, and before a great multitude. The action of David, attended with all theſe circumſtances, is not more favourable than that of St. Francis, which had a very few ſpectators* (36): *ſo that if the action of the latter deſerves cenſure, that of the former cannot be excuſed; and accordingly we read that Michal ridiculed it. But let us ſee whether the Holy Ghoſt has ridiculed it; and we ſhall thereby ſee whether we ought to ridicule the action of S. Francis.* He ſets down, after this, what David anſwered to Michal, and what the Scripture obſerves concerning that woman's ſterility. A great many Ladies would deſerve to become barren, if nothing more were wanting than to be of Michal's taſte. It would be thought very ſtrange in any part of Europe, if on a day of proceſſion of the Holy Sacrament the Kings ſhould dance in the ſtreets with nothing but a ſmall girdle on their bodies.

VII. The conqueſts of David ſhall be the ſubject of my laſt obſervation. There are ſome rigid Caſuiſts, who do not think that a Chriſtian Prince can lawfully engage in a War, merely out of a deſire to aggrandize himſelf. Theſe Caſuiſts approve of none but defenſive Wars, or in general thoſe which only tend to get every man reſtored to the poſſeſſions which belong to him. On the foot of this Maxim, David would frequently have undertaken unjuſt Wars; for, beſides that the Scripture often repreſents him as the aggreſſor, we find that he *extended the bounds of his empire from Egypt to the Euphrates* (37). That we may not therefore condemn David, we had better ſay, that conqueſts may ſometimes be permitted; and that conſequently care ſhould be taken leſt, in declaiming againſt modern Princes, our cenſures fall unawares on that great Prophet.

But if, generally ſpeaking, the conqueſts of that holy Monarch have raiſed his glory without prejudice to his juſtice, it will be difficult to admit this propoſition when we enter into particulars. Let us not, by our conjectures, pry into ſecrets which Hiſtory has not revealed to us: let us not conclude that, ſince David was willing to take advantage of the treaſon of Abner and of Huſhai, he therefore ſtuck not to make uſe of ſtratagems of almoſt every kind againſt the infidel Kings whom he ſubdued. Let us confine our ſelves to what the ſacred Hiſtory has told us of the manner wherein he treated the vanquiſhed, *He alſo brought forth the people that were in Rabbah* (38), *and put them under ſaws, and under harrows of iron, and under axes of iron, and made them paſs through the brick-kiln: and thus did he unto all the cities of the children of Ammon* (39). The Geneva Bible obſerves in the Margin of this Verſe, that *theſe were different ways of putting people to death which were anciently practiſed.* Let us ſee how he treated the Moabites: *He meaſured them with a line, caſting them down to the ground; even with two lines meaſured he to put to death, and with one full line to keep alive* (40). That is to ſay, he determined to put to death preciſely two thirds of them neither more nor leſs (41). Edom received yet a harſher treatment: he there ſlew all the males; *Six months did Joab remain there with all Iſrael, until he had cut off every male in Edom* (42). Can this method of making war be denied

(28) 2 Sam. chap. ix.

(29) Ibid. chap. xvi.

(30) *Id gravis peccati injuſtitiæ erga innoxium Mephibosethum, damnant Abulenſis 2 Reg.* 16. *q.* 6. & *c.* 19. *q.* 29. & *Rickelius ac Cajetanus, ibi: nec non Salianus anno mundi* 3010, *à num.* 21. & *alii plerique anteriores, ut Lyranus, Hugo, Rabanus, alique: quibus ob hanc injuſtitiam in Mephibosethum, nexa cum infidelitate magna & ingratitudine in Jonathan ejus patrem, viſum eſt ſciſſum eſſe ſub Roboano, Davidis regnum. Et ita videtur aſſeri apud Hieronymum in Tradit. Hebr. ad l.* 2. *Reg. c.* 19. Th. Raynaudus, *Hoplolth.* Sect. 2. Serie 2. cap. 10. pag. m. 231.

(31) 1 Kings, chap. xi. ver. 11.

(32) *Vide* Petrum Joannem Olivi, *apud* Theoph. Raynaud. *Hoplolth.* Sect. 4. cap. 3. pag. 523, & *ipſum* Raynaud. pag. 232.

(33) Th. Raynaud. pag. 232.

(34) 2 Sam. chap. vi.

(35) Ferrand, *Réponſe à l'Apologie pour la Reformation*, pag. 364, 365.

(36) *Francis of Aſſiſi being brought by his father to the Biſhop, that he might make a renunciation, in the Biſhop's preſence, of all his paternal eſtate, returned his father his very cloaths, and ſtripped himſelf ſtark naked in the preſence of the Aſſiſtants. The Biſhop roſe from his ſeat, and covered him with his cloak.* Bonaventure, *Vie de S. François*, quoted by Ferrand, *Réponſe à l'Apologie pour la Reformation*, pag. 363, 364.

(37) The Abbot de Choiſi, *Hiſt. de la Vie de David*, pag. 64.

(38) It was the chief City of the Ammonites.

(39) 2 Sam. chap. xii. ver. 31.

(40) Ibid. chap. viii. ver. 2.

(41) See the Note of the Geneva Bible.

(42) 1 Kings, chap. xi. ver. 15.

(z) See the Remark [I] at the end.

find the indirect dealings of policy [I]. The holy Scripture relates them only hiſtorically; for which reaſon every one is at liberty to judge of them (z). Let us conclude with

nied to be blame-worthy? Have not the Turks and Tartars a little more humanity? And if a vaſt number of Pamphlets daily complain of the military executions of our own time, which are really cruel and highly to be blamed, tho' mild in compariſon of David's, what would not the Authors of thoſe Pamphlets ſay at this day, had they ſuch uſage to cenſure as the ſaws, the harrows, and the brick-kilns of David, and the general ſlaughter of all the males, both old and young?

[I] *Even in his laſt Words we find the indirect dealings of Policy.*] Underſtand me right: I do not mean that David when in thoſe circumſtances did not ſpeak his real thoughts; but that the frank and plain manner in which he opened his heart, is a demonſtration that he had formerly in two remarkable inſtances ſacrificed juſtice to utility. He well knew that Joab deſerved death, and that the ſuffering the aſſaſſinations with which that man's hands were polluted to go unpuniſhed, was a flagrant injury done to the laws, and to juſtice. Joab nevertheleſs had kept his places, his intereſt, and his authority. He was brave, he ſerved the King his maſter faithfully and to good purpoſe; and dangerous diſcontents might be apprehended if he attempted to puniſh him. Theſe were the political reaſons which made the Law give place to Utility. But when David had no further uſe for that General, he gave orders that he ſhould be put to death; this was one of the clauſes of his Will (43). Solomon, his Succeſſor, was charged with a like execution againſt Shimei. This man, when he heard that David was flying from Jeruſalem in great diſorder, becauſe of Abſalom's revolt, came to inſult him by the way, and loaded him with reproaches even harder than the ſtones he caſt at him (44). David bore this injury very patiently: he therein acknowledged and adored the hand of God, with marks of ſingular piety; and when his affairs were ſettled again, he pardoned Shimei, who was one of the firſt to ſubmit, and to implore his mercy (45). David ſwore that he would not put him to death, and was as good as his word till he came to dye; but ſeeing himſelf on his death-bed, he charged his ſon to put that man to death (46); an evident proof that he had only let him live, firſt to gain the glory of being a merciful Prince, and afterwards to avoid being reproached to his face with having broke his word. I would fain know whether, ſtrictly ſpeaking, a man who promiſes his enemy his life, acquits himſelf of that promiſe, when he orders him to be put to death by his Will?

(43) 1 Kings, chap. ii. ver. 6.

(44) 2 Sam. chap. xvi. ver. 5, &c.

(45) Ibid. chap. xix. ver. 19, &c.

(46) 1 Kings, chap. ii. ver. 9.

* [To the objections, which Mr. Bayle makes here, it may be added, that, as this Verſe is tranſlated, David commends his ſon Solomon for his *Wiſdom*, and yet by expreſly ordering him to ſlay *Shimei* leaves him no room for the exerciſe of this wiſdom in the caſe: and, what is more, Solomon did not in any proper ſenſe comply with his father's dying requeſt; for if Shimei had not gone out of Jeruſalem, his *hoary head*, (according to the ſtory) would not have been *brought down to the grave with blood*. But all theſe difficulties are at an end, if we tranſlate the Verſe in the following manner. *Now therefore do not hold him guiltleſs, (for thou art a wiſe man, and knoweſt what thou oughteſt to do unto him) but do not bring down his hoary head with blood to the grave.* By putting the middle words into a Parentheſis, the laſt ſentence of the verſe is connected to the firſt; and then the negative particle *al*, which is in the firſt, may be borrowed to ſupply the ſenſe in the laſt. This is done by our Engliſh Tranſlators in *Deut.* xxxiii. 6. *Levit.* x. 6. *Pſ.* ix. 19. and cxliii. 7. and in ſome other places of the Old Teſtament; and therefore it might as well have been done here. If this Tranſlation be right, then David's direction to his ſon Solomon will be, that he ſhould not put Shimei to death for his former crime of curſing David, becauſe of the oath, which David had ſworn to him: but at the ſame time, that he ſhould not *hold him guiltleſs*, leaving it to the *Wiſdom* of Solomon to inflict a proper puniſhment upon him, provided it were not a capital one. And in this Solomon ſtrictly obeyed his father's command, by only confining Shimei to Jeruſalem, and puniſhing him afterwards with death only for his ſecond tranſgreſſion, when he went out of the bounds of his impriſonment without the King's leave and in direct diſobedience to his command. CRIT. REM.]

From all that has been ſaid in the precedent Remarks, and in this, it may be eaſily inferred, that if the people of Syria had been as great Writers of Libels, as the Europeans are at this day, they would have ſtrangely diſfigured David's glory. With what infamous names and titles would they not have loaded that troop of Adventurers who went to join him, after he had retired from Saul's Court? The Scripture informs us that all thoſe who were perſecuted by their Creditors, all the diſcontented, and all who were in bad circumſtances, repaired to him, and that he became their Captain (47). Nothing is capable of being more maliciouſly miſrepreſented than a thing of this kind. Thoſe who have written the Hiſtory of Catiline, and of Cæſar, would furniſh a ſatyrical Painter with a great many colours. Hiſtory has preſerved a ſmall ſpecimen of the abuſes to which David was expoſed among the friends of Saul. This ſpecimen ſhews that they accuſed him of being a man of blood, and looked on the rebellion of Abſalom as a juſt puniſhment for the miſchiefs which they ſaid David had done to Saul, and his whole family. I ſet down the words of the Scripture in the margin (48); and here are thoſe of Joſephus (49): Δαβίδῃ δὲ γενομένῳ κατὰ χώραμον ἥτω καλουμένον τόπον ἐπέρχεται τῶ Σαούλε συγγενὴς ὄνομα Σεμεεί . . . . καὶ λίθοις τε ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκαπηγόρει. φίλων καὶ σκιπόνλων ἔτι μᾶλλον, βλασφημῶν διετέλει, μιαιφόνον καὶ πολλῶν ἀρχηγὸν κακῶν ἀποκαλῶν· ἐκέλευε δὲ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὡς ἐναγῆ καὶ ἐπάραλον, ἐξιέναι, καὶ τῷ Θεῷ χάριν ἔχειν ὁμολογεῖ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτὸν ἀφιλομένῳ, καὶ διὰ παιδὸς ἰδίε τὴν ὑπὲρ ὧν ἥμαρτεν εἰς αὐτὸ δεσπότην δίκην αὐτῷ εἰσπραξαμένῳ. i. e. "But when David came "near a place called Bachora, there came a kinſman of "Saul's, named Semei . . . . who threw ſtones at "him and reviled him; and when his friends protected him, he abuſed him yet worſe, calling him a "bloody man, and the author of many miſchiefs; "and bidding him leave the land, as an impure and "execrable perſon: and he gave God thanks that he "had deprived him of the kingdom, and puniſhed him "by means of his own ſon for what he had committed againſt his maſter." They carried things too far: it is true, that by the teſtimony of God himſelf David was a man of blood; for which reaſon God would not permit him to build the Temple (50). It is true alſo that to appeaſe the Gibeonites he delivered up to them two ſons and five grandſons of Saul, who were all ſeven hanged (51). But it is falſe that he ever made any attempt either on the life or the crown of Saul.

(47) *Convenerunt ad eum omnes qui erant in anguſtia conſtituti, & oppreſſi ære alieno, & amaro animo, & factus eſt eorum princeps.* 1 lib. Samuel. cap. xxii. ver. 2.

(48) *The words of Shimei, according to the Scripture, are theſe:* Come out, come out, thou bloody man, and thou man of Belial: the Lord hath returned upon thee all the blood of the houſe of Saul, in whoſe ſtead thou haſt reigned, and the Lord hath delivered the Kingdom into the hand of Abſalom thy ſon: and behold, thou art taken in thy miſchief, becauſe thou art a bloody man. 2 *Sam.* chap. xvi. ver. 7, 8.

(49) *Antiq.* lib. 7. cap. 8. pag. 230.

(50) 1 Chron. chap. xxii. ver. 8. and chap. xxviii. ver. 3.

(51) 2 Sam. chap. xxi.

They who may think it ſtrange that I ſhould ſpeak my opinion of certain Actions of David, compared with natural Morality, are deſired to conſider three things. I. That they are themſelves obliged to confeſs that this Prince's behaviour to Uriah is one of the greateſt crimes that can be committed. There is therefore no other difference between us, than with regard to the number of his faults: for I acknowledge as well as they, that the failings of this Prophet are no argument againſt his having been a man full of piety, and extraordinary zeal for the glory of the Lord. He was ſubject to the alternatives of paſſions and grace: a fatality adhering to our nature ever ſince the ſin of Adam. The grace of God guided him often; but in ſeveral inſtances his paſſions got the upper hand; and Policy ſilenced Religion. II. That it is very allowable for private perſons, ſuch as my ſelf, to judge of facts contained in Scripture, when they are not expreſly qualified by the Holy Ghoſt. If the Scripture in relating an action blames or commends it, it is no longer allowed to appeal from that judgment; but every one ought to regulate his approbation or his diſapprobation by the model of the Scripture. I have not acted contrary to this duty: the facts, on which I have delivered my poor opinion, are related in the ſacred Hiſtory, without any character of approbation (52). III. That great injury would be done to the eternal Laws, and by conſequence

AN important Advertiſement with relation to what has been ſaid above.

(52) *I obſerve the Scripture acquaints us that David conſulted and followed the orders of God, when Aggreſſors were to be repulſed,* 2 Samuel, *chap. xxiii, and xxx; but that he did not conſult God when he had a mind to ruin Nabal, nor when he went to exterminate the neighbours of Achiſh, and made him believe that he ravaged the dominions of Saul. It is a ſign God did not approve ſuch actions.*

with saying that the History of King David may encourage several crowned heads against the alarms which severe Casuists might give them, by maintaining that it is scarce possible for a King to be saved. The Life of this great Prince published by the Abbot de Choisi is a very good book; it would have been much better if he had taken the pains to set down in the margin the years of every action, and the passages of the Bible or of Josephus which supplied him with what he advances. A Reader is not pleased to be left ignorant whether what he reads comes from a sacred source, or from a profane one. I shall not take notice of many faults of Moreri [K]. The Article of David, which I have lately read in the Dictionary of the Bible, will furnish me with matter for a Remark [L]. I have

consequence to true Religion, if a handle was given to libertines to object to us, that so soon as a man has a share in the inspirations of God, we look on his conduct as the rule of manners; so that we dare not condemn those actions which are diametrically opposite to the notions of equity, when it is he who has committed them. There is no medium; either these are unworthy actions, or actions like these are not wicked: now, as we must necessarily chuse the one or the other of these two propositions, is it not better to consult the interest of Morality, rather than the glory of a particular person? Otherwise, should we not declare that we had rather prejudice the honour of God, than that of a mortal man?

[K] *I shall not take notice of many faults of Moreri.*] Only five.

I. David was two and twenty years old, when Samuel *anointed him with the oil appointed for the consecreation of Kings*. This is inconsistent with what follows, and with what goes before. He had just said that David *was born in the year of the world* 2950, and a little after he tells us that David vanquished Goliath in the year of the world 2971. It is manifest that the victory over Goliath was posterior to David's being anointed; whereas, according to Moreri, the ceremony of anointing him was not performed till a year after that victory. To correct this fault it should be said that David was anointed at the age of twenty (53). The rest wants no correction; for it is true that David overcame Goliath the year after he was anointed.

(53) *He was born, according to* Calvisius, *in the year of the World* 2860, *and was anointed by Samuel in the year of the World* 2880, *and killed Goliath the year after.*

II. It is not true that Saul renewed the persecution against David, after the latter had twice forborne to do him the least harm, tho' he had the most favourable opportunity in the world. It is a little surprizing that the Scripture, to aggravate Saul's crime, should not take notice that he quickly repented of his reconciliation with David, and rendred himself guilty of black ingratitude. In the XXIVth Chapter of the Ist Book of Samuel, he is informed that David, having it in his power to kill him in a cave, would not do him any hurt: he admires this generosity; he prays God to reward it; he owns that the crown is destined for David; he recommends his family to him; and returns home. In the XXVIth Chapter of the same Book, he is informed that David having it in his power to kill him by night in his tent, retires without touching him: he admires this generosity; he gives David his blessing; he foretels him all sorts of prosperity; and returns to his house. Moreri supposes that these two actions, so very like one another, happened the same year. I repeat it: it is a little surprizing that the Scripture does not make use of the first of these two facts, to make Saul's obstinacy in persecuting his Son-in-Law more odious. Two or three lines might have produced a considerable effect: a Reader would have been struck to see that Saul, being obliged to his son-in-law for his life, praises him, admires him, wishes him a thousand blessings, and yet in a little time takes the field again to destroy him. The laws of History require, without doubt, that in speaking of this new pursuit, it should be observed that it was an infraction of that solemn agreement which had followed the adventure of the cave: and yet you will not find one tittle in the Scripture concerning this circumstance. Here is further matter of surprize. David representing to Saul that he had not deserved the persecution which he suffered, and that he could easily have killed him in his tent, does not put him in mind that it was the second time he had had the King's life in his power, and that the King had soon forgotten the adventure of the cave. Saul, on his part, owns himself in the wrong, and speaks to David with the utmost civility, and yet takes no notice that it was the second time he owed his life to him.

OBSERVATIONS on a Narrative contained in the Books of Samuel.

It must be confessed that such circumstances are not to be forgotten. Besides, we see that on the first of these two occasions, David and Saul make use of nearly the same words as they do on the second. If I saw two accounts of this nature in Ælian, or in Valerius Maximus, I should make no difficulty to believe that they were but one action, which having been related two different ways, served for the subject of two articles, or of two chapters. The fact would be, that David having the life of Saul, his cruel persecutor, in his hands, religiously preserved it. The two ways of relating the affair would be, 1, that Saul, being obliged to step aside from his men on a private occasion, entered into a cave where David was; 2, that David by night slipped thro' the camp as far as Saul's tent, while the guards were fast asleep. I leave Father Simon and the Critics of his size to examine whether the Historical Books of the Old Testament might not possibly relate the same thing twice. It seems to me that the action of the Ziphites, related in the 23d chapter of the 1st Book of Samuel, is not different from that which is related in the 26th chapter of the same Book. Whoever will take the pains to compare those two Relations, will doubtless be of my mind. But what is very certain is, that Saul did not persecute David after the second reconciliation. This is Moreri's second fault.

The IIId consists in his asserting that David *was so well received* by Achish King of Gath, *that the sudden favour shewn him was very near causing the great men to revolt*. There is not a word of truth in all this; and I see nothing that could have produced such a falsehood, except the suspicions which were formed against David, when they saw him with his troops in the rear-guard of Achish's army. The chiefs of the Philistines would absolutely have David return back to the city which had been given him (54). These Chiefs were very different from the great men of the King of Gath's Court.

(54) 1 Sam. chap. xxix.

IV. The supposed discontent of the great men did not oblige David to retire from that Court. He retired from thence out of respect; he was apprehensive lest he and his people might incommode the Prince by their abode in the Capital: he therefore begged of Achish to assign him some other habitation; which was granted him. This happened before the Chiefs of the Philistines demanded that David should quit their camp.

V. It should not have been said that David *returned* to Ziklag, since no notice had been taken that he had dwelt there before.

[L] *The Article of David . . . . in the Dictionary of the Bible will furnish me with matter for a Remark.*] The Printers were got thus far when I was shewn a Dictionary (55), which I immediately consulted in the Article of the Prophet David. I have found some passages in it which have given me occasion to make a few Observations. I. It is not true that David came into the world 110 years before the birth of Jesus Christ: there were above a thousand years (56) between the birth of the one and that of the other. II. The Author ought not to have suppressed the inroad made by David on the allies of his Patron, nor the lie he made use of to persuade Achish that he made them on the lands of the Israelites. Neither ought he to have suppressed the unfair War which he made on those people: he put both men and women to the sword. It is not allowable in a Dictionary to imitate the Panegyrists, who only touch on the bright circumstances: a Writer of such a Work should act like an Historian, and tell both the good and the bad; and this is what the Scripture has done. III. We cannot therefore approve the affectation which appears here of saying nothing of David's stratagems, as well against Ishbosheth,

(55) It is the *Dictionary of the Bible* composed by Mr. *Simon*, Priest, Doctor of Divinity, and printed at Lyons, 1693, in folio.

(56) There were 1090, according to *Calvisius*.

I have forgot to obſerve that it would be unreaſonable to blame David for excluding his eldeſt ſon from the ſucceſſion [*M*].

as againſt Abſalom; and to ſpeak only of the Wars for which David had provocation. Should not ſomething have been ſaid of thoſe wherein the Scripture repreſents him as the Aggreſſor, and of the aſtoniſhing ſeverity with which he treated the vanquiſhed? IV. The Author does worſe than ſuppreſs, he ſuppoſes, without any foundation in Scripture, that *the Syrians, the Ammonites, the Moabites, and the other neighbouring nations attacked David.* The Sacred Hiſtory plainly inſinuates that they only endeavoured to defend themſelves, in which they were far from ſucceeding (57). V. He ſuppoſes alſo, without any foundation in Scripture, that that Prince married the young girl whom they brought him to try to warm him. I might excuſe this, without prejudice to what I have ſaid concerning that extraordinary method of reviving natural heat. I do not think that the moſt indulgent of our modern Caſuiſts would conſent that an old man wholly incapable of conſummating the marriage, ſhould marry a young girl with no other view than to warm his hands and feet by her. They would conclude, no doubt, that he would ſin, and would be the occaſion of his companion's ſinning alſo. VI. The Author endeavours to remove the difficulty which ſtares every Reader in the face, when he conſiders that Saul did not know David on the day that Goliath was killed: he endeavours, I ſay, to remove it, and perplexes himſelf more that he needs; for he ſays in one place (58), that David, at the age of ſeventeen, went to play on the harp to Saul, and in another (59) he makes him to be but fourteen or fifteen, and a *very little* boy. Preſently after, deſigning to refute thoſe who ſay that his combat againſt Goliath was prior to his *playing on the harp*, he forms a ſpecious objection to himſelf, drawn from the commendation which was given David of being a valiant man, and a good warrior (60) by thoſe who propoſed him to Saul as a proper perſon to drive away by Muſic the evil ſpirit which troubled Saul. *To this I anſwer*, ſays he, *that we are not to conclude from theſe two words* Fortiſſimum & Bellicoſum, *that the combate was before the playing on the harp, becauſe the epithet of ſtrong may be given to any one, provided he be really ſo with reſpect to his age. Is not he very ſtrong who can run down Lions and Bears, fight with them, and ſtrangle them?* Here is an anſwer which ſuppoſes that David being yet *very little*, and *a young lad of fourteen or fifteen years old*, had fought with Lions, had run them down, had ſtrangled them, and might be called a ſtrong man, a Warrior, and a man prudent in matters. This difficulty is conſiderable enough to deſerve to be obviated: whence comes it then that our Author does not ſo much as ſeem to perceive it? His ſilence will not prevent Readers, who have any penetration, from ſeeing very plainly that ſince David fought Goliath at the age of one and twenty (61), he muſt be near twenty years old the firſt time he went to Saul's Court. And ſo the reaſon which our Author advances as the beſt why Saul did not know David the day of the combate againſt Goliath, is good for nothing (62). This reaſon is, becauſe a little boy alters his features ſo much in ſeven years time, that thoſe who do not ſee him again till after an abſence of ſeven years do not know him. This is not David's caſe; therefore recourſe muſt be had to other reaſons. The Author mentions thoſe which ſeveral Commentators have deviſed. If they do not fully ſatisfy thoſe who are not difficult to be pleaſed, the fault muſt be laid on the nature of the queſtion. VII. The Author forgets the ſtrongeſt proof that can be alledged againſt thoſe who will have it that David was not ſent for to drive away Saul's evil ſpirit, till after the combate with Goliath. He does not alledge that thoſe people reverſe the order in which the Scripture relates the events; he does not alledge that Saul's ſervant who praiſed David for being robuſt, a warriour, eloquent, and beautiful, ſaid nothing of the victory over Goliath. Now it is impoſſible to comprehend that they who were deſirous of recommending him to the King after that combate ſhould be ſo ſtupid as not to tell the Prince at once, *The ſame young man who ſlew Goliath plays well on muſical inſtruments: and he will cure you.*

The fear of being too prolix prevents my examining whether the Author has failed in exactneſs in the remainder of the Article. He has avoided the inconvenience which I have remarked in the Abbot de Choiſi; having ſet down the years wherein David did ſuch and ſuch a thing.

[*M*] *It would be unreaſonable to blame David for excluding his eldeſt ſon from the ſucceſſion.*] David left his kingdom to Solomon, in prejudice of the right of primogeniture; a right which in hereditary crowns ought to be inviolably maintained, unleſs one wou'd open a door to a thouſand civil wars. Nevertheleſs David had very juſt reaſons to contravene that right, becauſe Adonijah his eldeſt ſon had been ſo impatient to reign, that he aſcended the throne before David was dead (63). This indulgent father durſt not ſhew his reſentment of an impatience which in reality differed not from uſurpation; he had been always very tender to his children: and his almoſt decrepid age was not very fit to correct the ſoftneſs which attends tender hearts: but Solomon's mother, ſtirred up and directed by a Prophet (64) whom Adonijah had not invited to the royal feaſt (65), warded off the blow; ſhe and the Prophet obliged David to declare in favour of Solomon, and to give the neceſſary orders for the inſtallment of that young Prince. Adonijah gave himſelf for loſt, and took refuge at the foot of the altar: but Solomon ſent to aſſure him that he would do him no hurt provided he behaved well and prudently for the future (66). Notwithſtanding he cauſed him to be ſlain for a reaſon which ſeems pretty ſlight; I mean becauſe Adonijah had aſked in marriage the Shunamite who had ſerved to warm David (67). This confirms what I have ſaid above, that the Royal Prophet was unhappy in children. They had no natural affection, either for him or for one another. Here is the wiſeſt of them all, who ſheds the blood of his eldeſt brother for a trifle; for it muſt not be imagined that he put him to death on the account of the irregularity of Adonijah's love. All the ſons of David ought to look on the Shunamite as forbidden fruit. Her virginity had belonged to their father; and he would have actually taken poſſeſſion of it, had his ſtrength permitted. Adonijah therefore was to blame for caſting his eyes on that girl; but it was not for this reaſon that his brother killed him: it was becauſe his petition awakened Solomon's jealouſies, and made him fear leſt, if he was accuſtomed to aſk favours, he might, in a ſhort time think of inſiſting on his right of primogeniture (68), A policy in ſome reſpects like that of the Ottomans occaſioned his deſtruction.

(57) See the 2d Book of Samuel, chap. viii.

(58) Pag. 249.

(59) Pag. 259.

(60) *Et reſpondens unus de pueris ait, ecce vidi filium Iſai Bethlemitem ſcientem pſallere, & fortiſſimum robore, virum bellicoſum, &c.* Ibid. pag. 259. See 1 Sam. chap. xvi. ver. 18.

(61) It is the ſuppoſition of the Author of the *Dictionary of the Bible*, pag. 249.

(62) He cites the Author of the *Hiſtory of the Bible*, who puts eight years between the 1ſt time that Saul ſaw David, and the 2d, and who ſuppoſes David was but fifteen the 1ſt time.

(63) 1 Kings, chap. i.

(64) By the Prophet Nathan.

(65) 1 Kings, chap. i. ver. 10, and 26.

(66) Ibid. ver. 51, 52.

(67) Ibid. ch. ii.

(68) Ibid. ver. 22.

THIS is the Article as it was reformed by Mr. Bayle, on ſome Complaints againſt the preceding.

DAVID, King of the Jews, was one of the greateſt men in the World, though we ſhould not conſider him as a Royal Prophet, and a man after God's own heart. The firſt time the Scripture makes him appear on the ſtage (*a*), is to acquaint us that Samuel appointed him King, and performed the ceremony of anointing him. David was then but a ſimple ſhepherd. He was the youngeſt of the eight ſons of Jeſſe the Bethlehemite [*A*]. After

(*a*) 1 Samuel, chap. xv. ver. 13.

[*A*] *He was the youngeſt of the Sons of Jeſſe the Bethlehemite.*] Jeſſe was deſcended in a right line from Judah, one of the twelve ſons of Jacob, and dwelt at Bethlehem, a ſmall city of the Tribe of Judah. Some modern Rabbins ſay, that when David was conceived. Jeſſe his father did not think he enjoyed his Wife, but his maid-ſervant; and hereby they explain the 7th Verſe of the LIſt Pſalm, where David declares *that he was ſhapen in iniquity, and that his mother conceived him in ſin.* This, ſay they, ſignifies that Jeſſe *his father committed an Adultery when he begot him, becauſe tho' he begot him on his wife, he thought he begot him*

on

(b) Ibid. ver. 20. After this, the Scripture informs us that he was ſent to King Saul (b), to cure him of his fits of frenzy, by the ſound of Muſical Inſtruments [B]. A ſervice of ſuch importance made him ſo much beloved by Saul, that that Prince retained him in his family, and made (c) Ibid. ver. 21. him his Armour-bearer (c). The Scripture proceeds to tell us (d) that David from time (d) Ibid. chap. xvii. ver. 15. to time returned home to his father's, to take care of the flocks, and that one day his father ſent him to Saul's camp with ſome proviſions, which he deſigned for three other of his ſons who were in the army. David, in executing this order, heard the challenge which a Philiſtine named Goliath, proud of his ſtrength and gigantic ſtature, came every day to offer the Iſraelites, without any one of them daring to accept it. He ſhewed a great deſire to go and fight this giant; whereupon he was brought to the King, and aſſured him that he ſhould triumph over the Philiſtine. Saul gave him his armour; but as David found it cumberſome, he put it off, and reſolved to make uſe only of his ſling; (e) Ibid. ver. 49, 50. which he did with ſuch ſucceſs that he felled the boaſter with a ſtone (e), and then killed him with his own ſword, and cut off his head, which he preſented to Saul [C]. That Prince had aſked his General, when he ſaw David march againſt Goliath, *Whoſe ſon is* (f) Ibid. ver. 55. *this youth* (f) [D]? The General anſwered that he did not know, and received orders from

(1) See the *Journal des Savans* of the 14th of July 1692, pag. 465 of the Dutch Edition.

(2) In *Bibliotheca magna Rabbinica*, Part. 2. pag. 4. quoted in the *Journal des Savans*, ibid.

(†) Lib. 2 Reg. 17. 25.

(‡) *Hieron. Trad. Hebr. in Lib.* 2 *Reg. cap.* 17.

(‡) *Toſtat.* 2 *Reg.* 17. *Quæſt.* 27.

(*) *Liran. ibid.*

(3) Theſe words are Father *Camart's*, pag. 126, 127, *de Rebus geſtis Eliæ.*

(a) 2 Sam. chap. xvii. ver. 25.

(4) This Book is intitled, *Precetti da eſſer imparati dalle Donne Ebree.* i. e. "Precepts to be "learned by the "Hebrew Wo- "men." See above the Remark [A] of the Article ARODON.

(5) *Precetti da eſſer imparati &c.* cap. C. pag. 67.

(6) *Ancora che Iſaï non lo faceſſe con buona voluntà, dubitando che ſi publicaſſe ſua vergogna.* Ibid. pag. 68.

(7) *Precetti da eſſer imparati &c.* pag. 69.

(8) 1 Samuel, chap. xvii. ver. 54.

(9) Ibid. chap. xxi. ver. 8, 9.

(10) Ibid. chap. xvii. ver. 54.

(11) Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. 6. cap. 11, and 14.

on no other than a maid-ſervant, whoſe chaſtity he had tried to corrupt (1). This explication is not very conformable to the doctrine of original ſin; for which reaſon Father Bartolocci (2), having reported this opinion of the modern Rabbins, has thought himſelf obliged occaſionally to examine, whether the ancient Jews acknowledged the truth of this Doctrine. If the ſuppoſition of thoſe Rabbins be true, they would be much in the right to ſay that Jeſſe had committed adultery; but on the other hand, it muſt be owned that he would not have ſinned, if he had gotten his maid with child, when he really believed he was enjoying his wife. This Rabbinical ſuppoſition is very repugnant to the Tradition which St. Jerom mentions. He ſays it was believed that Jeſſe the father of David never committed any actual ſin, and that there was no ſpot in him but what he brought from his mother's womb. *Mirum eſt quod de Iſai patre Davidis refert Hieronymus, illum nunquam aliud peccatum commiſiſſe quam quod ex origine contraxit. Quo enim loco legimus:* Amaſa (†) ingreſſus eſt ad Abigail filiam Naas ſororem Sarviæ; *ſic Hieronymus* (‡), Naas interpretatur coluber, quia eum nullum admiſiſſe mortiferum perhibent peccatum, niſi quod originaliter de ſerpente antiquo contraxit. Eſt autem Naas qui & Iſaï pater David. *Eamdem traditionem refert Abulenſis* (‡), *& monet Naas eundem eſſe qui & Jeſſe ſive Iſaï patrem Davidis, quod quidem & antea Liranus* (*) *docuerat* (3). i. e. "It is "a wonderful thing which St. Jerom relates of Jeſſe "the father of David, that he was never guilty of any "other ſin than what he contracted originally. For "the paſſage wherein we read that *Amaſa* (a) *went* "*in to Abigail the daughter of Nahaſh, ſiſter to Zeru-* "*iah*, is thus expounded by St. Jerom: *Nahaſh* "*ſignifies a ſerpent; for they ſay he was guilty of no* "*deadly ſin, but what he originally contracted from the* "*old ſerpent. Now Nahaſh is the ſame with Jeſſe,* "*the father of David.* Abulenſis mentions the ſame "tradition, and obſerves that Nahaſh is the ſame with "Jeſſe or Iſai the father of David; which de Lyra had "likewiſe taught before." They who admit the impertinence of theſe Rabbins concerning the conception of David, might eaſily proceed to another impertinence, and rank David among the illuſtrious baſtards. The Phyſical reaſon which is given why baſtards are ſo frequently born with ſuch extraordinary natural talents, might be properly alledged here with regard to the father.

I have juſt read an Italian Book (4), wherein this Story of the Rabbins is told us in the following manner. David's father was in love with a maid-ſervant, and after frequent applications, he told her at laſt that ſhe ſhould prepare herſelf to lie with him that night. She being no leſs virtuous than beautiful, complained to her miſtreſs, that ſhe could not be at reſt for Jeſſe's ſollicitations. *Che non poteva haver ripoſo, riſpetto che il patrone continuamente la tentava per farla giacere una notte con lui* (5). Promiſe to content him to night, anſwered her miſtreſs, and I will go and put myſelf in thy place. The project was put in execution two or three nights together. When Jeſſe found that his Wife, with whom he had not lain for a long time, was notwithſtanding with child, he accuſed her of adultery, and would not give credit to what ſhe told him of the bargain ſhe had made with the ſervant. Neither he nor his ſons would ſee the child which ſhe brought into the world, but conſidered him as a baſtard: he treated her with the utmoſt contempt, and cauſed the child to be brought up in the country among the Shepherds. He did not acquaint his neighbours with this ſecret; but concealed his domeſtic ſhame for the ſake of his children. Matters remained in this ſtate till the Prophet Samuel came to ſeek a King in Jeſſe's family. His choice not fixing on any of the ſons which he ſhewed him, David was forced to be fetched: they ſent for him with repugnance, becauſe they were afraid of diſcovering a ſhameful ſecret (6); but when they ſaw that this ſuppoſed baſtard was the perſon whom the Prophet ſought, they ſoon changed their minds; nothing was heard but fine hymns. David began with a *Te Deum:* he praiſed God who had heard his prayers and delivered him from the mark of baſtardy. Jeſſe continued and ſaid, *The ſtone which the builders refuſed, is become the head-ſtone of the corner, which ſhall ſupport the whole houſe.* His other ſons, Samuel, &c. alſo ſpoke ſentences. The Rabbin adds that Jeſſe's intention was good; his Wife was old, his maid was young, and he had a deſire to get more children. *Il penſiero d'Iſaï era buono, perche eſſendo la patrona vecchia, e la maſſera giovane, havea deſiderio di haver altri figlivoli* (7). What a rare Apology is this! if ſuch excuſes ſhould be received, what a multitude of lewd people might be ſheltered from cenſure? Were there ever any doctrines concerning the direction of the intention more commodious than this?

[B] *He was ſent to King Saul, to cure him of his fits of frenzy, by the ſound of muſical Inſtruments.*] I might produce a great many Collections on this ſubject; but I forbear, and refer you to thoſe of Caſpar Lœſcherus, Profeſſor of Divinity at Wittemberg. Conſult his *Diſſertatio Hiſtorico-Theologica de Saule per Muſicam curato.* It was printed at Wittembergh in the year 1688.

[C] *He ſlew Goliath with his own ſword, and cut off his head, which he came and preſented to Saul.*] The arms of Goliath were preſerved as a monument of the Iſraelites glory. David carried them firſt to his tent (8), but probably they were afterwards put in a holy place; for we read (9) that David having aſked the Prieſt Abimelec, if he could not furniſh him with a Spear or Sword, the Prieſt anſwered him: *the Sword of Goliath is here, wrapped in a cloth behind the Ephod; if thou wilt take that, take it:* and thereupon David had it delivered to him. As to Goliath's head, it was carried to Jeruſalem (10), when David had made choice of that city for the capital of his Kingdom. Joſephus ſays poſitively that it was David himſelf who conſecrated Goliath's Sword to God (11).

[D] *Saul had aſked his General. . . . Whoſe ſon is this youth?*] It is a little ſtrange that Saul did not know David that day, ſince the young man had ſeveral times played on inſtruments of muſic in his preſence to calm the diſmal vapours which diſturbed him. If ſuch a relation were found in Thucydides or Livy, all the Critics would unanimouſly conclude that the Tranſcribers had tranſpoſed the pages, forgotten ſomething in one place, repeated ſomething in another, or inſerted additional paſſages in the Author's Work. But we muſt not entertain ſuch ſuſpicions with regard

from Saul to enquire whoſe ſon he was: but Saul himſelf learned it from the young man's mouth; for when he was brought to him after the Victory, he aſked him, *Whoſe ſon art thou?* and David anſwered him he was the ſon of Jeſſe (*g*). Then Saul retained him in his ſervice, without letting him go home to his father any more (*h*). But as the ſongs which were ſung through all the cities on the defeat of the Philiſtines, aſcribed ten times more glory to David than to Saul (*i*), the King conceived a violent jealouſy, which increaſed more and more, becauſe the employments which he gave to David in order to remove him from Court, ſerved only to render the young man's merit the more illuſtrious, and to gain him the affection and admiration of the people. By a falſe piece of policy, he would needs have him for his ſon-in-law: he hoped that the condition on which he deſigned to give him his ſecond daughter would deliver him from that object of averſion; but he was confounded by his own artifice. He demanded for his daughter's dowry a hundred fore-ſkins of the Philiſtines. David brought him two hundred fairly told (*k*); ſo that inſtead of periſhing in that enterprize, as Saul hoped, he returned with a new acceſſion of glory. He married Saul's daughter, and thereby became but the more formidable to the King (*l*): all his expeditions againſt the Philiſtines were very ſucceſsful; his name grew famous; and he was in high eſteem (*m*): ſo that Saul, who was much leſs acquainted with the virtue of his ſon-in-law, than the diſpoſition of the people, thought nothing could prevent his being depoſed, but the death of David. He therefore reſolved to get rid of him once for all. He truſted his eldeſt ſon with the deſign, who, far from entring into his father's jealouſy, gave David notice of the black contrivance (*n*). David fled, and was purſued from place to place, till he had given inconteſtable proofs of his probity, and of his fidelity to his father-in-law, to whom he did not the leaſt hurt on two favourable opportunities (*o*) which he had of killing him if he had pleaſed. This made Saul reſolve to leave him at reſt. But as David apprehended that Prince might reſume his ill deſigns, he remitted nothing of his former precautions; on the contrary, he provided himſelf a ſafer refuge than before in the land of the Philiſtines (*p*). He aſked of the King of Gath a City to dwell in, from whence he made frequent inroads into the neighbouring countries (*q*). He returned to Judæa after Saul's death, and was there declared King by the Tribe of Judah (*r*). However, the other Tribes ſubmitted to Iſh-boſheth the ſon of Saul; which was the effect of the fidelity of Abner (*s*). This man, who had been General of the Army under King Saul, placed Iſh-boſheth on the throne, and maintained him on it againſt the efforts of David; but not bearing to be cenſured by Iſh-boſheth for having taken one of Saul's concubines (*t*), he treated with David to put him in poſſeſſion of Iſh-boſheth's kingdom. The negotiation would have ſoon been concluded to the ſatisfaction of David, if Joab (*u*), to revenge a private quarrel, had not killed Abner, whoſe death only haſtened the ruin of the unfortunate Iſh-boſheth. Two of his chief Captains ſlew him, and brought his head to David, who, far from rewarding them as they expected, commanded them to be put to death (*x*). Iſh-boſheth's ſubjects quickly made a voluntary ſubmiſſion to David. That Prince had reigned ſeven years and an half over the Tribe of Judah; and he afterwards reigned about thirty three years over all Iſrael (*y*). This long reign was remarkable for great ſucceſſes, and glorious conqueſts: it was ſcarce diſturbed by any other means than the criminal attempts of the Prince's own children [*E*]. Theſe are uſually the enemies which Sovereigns have the moſt to fear. David was very near being reduced to the mean condition

(*g*) Ibid. ver. 58.

(*h*) Ibid. chap. xviii. ver. 2.

(*i*) *The women anſwered one another as they played and ſaid, Saul hath ſlain his thouſands and David his ten thouſands.* 1 Sam. chap. xviii. ver. 7.

(*k*) Ibid. ver. 27.

(*l*) Ibid. ver. 29.

(*m*) Ibid. ver. 30.

(*n*) Ibid. chap. xix. ver. 1 & 2.

(*o*) Ibid. chap. xxiv and xxvi.

(*p*) Ibid. chap. xxviii.

(*q*) Ibid.

(*r*) 2 Samuel, chap. ii. ver. 4.

(*s*) Ibid. ver. 8.

(*t*) Ibid. ch. iii.

(*u*) He was the General of David's Army.

(*x*) 2 Sam. chap. iv.

(*y*) Ibid. chap. v. ver. 5.

to the Bible. Notwithſtanding ſome have been ſo bold as to pretend that all the Chapters, or all the Verſes of the firſt Book of Samuel are not placed in their original Order. The Abbot de Choiſi, in my opinion, removes the difficulty a better way. *David*, ſays he (12), *was brought to Saul, who did not know him again at firſt, tho' he had ſeen him frequently when he uſed to ſend for him to play on the harp: but as this was ſeveral years ago, and as David was then very young, and came to Court in quality of a Muſician, and then appeared in the habit of a ſhepherd, it is no wonder that a King, overwhelmed with buſineſs, and whoſe mind was diſordered, ſhould forget the features of a young man's face, in whom there was nothing extraordinary.* I only wiſh he had not ſaid: 1, that *it was ſeveral years* ſince Saul had ſeen David: 2, that *David was very young* when he came to Saul's Court in quality of a Muſician. There is no likelihood that he was much older when he killed Goliath, than when he came the firſt time to Saul's Court; for at the time of his firſt going thither he *was a mighty man and a man of war, and prudent in matters* (13); he was but thirty years old when he was elected King after Saul's death; and there muſt neceſſarily have been an interval of ſeveral years between the death of Goliath, and that of Saul. See the Remark wherein we criticize Moreri, and the Remark [*I*].

(12) *Hiſt. de la Vie de David*, pag. 8, 9. of the Amſterdam Edition, 1692.

(13) 1 Sam. ch. xvi. ver. 18.

[*E*] *His reign . . . . was only diſturbed by the criminal attempts of his own children.*] The moſt conſiderable of their attempts was the revolt of Abſalom, who forced this great Prince to fly from Jeruſalem in a mournful condition, with his head covered, his feet bare, melting into tears, and having his ears ſaluted by nothing but the groans of his faithful ſubjects (14). Abſalom entred Jeruſalem as it were in triumph: and that the zeal of his adherents might not grow cool on an imagination, that this quarrel between the father and the ſon might be made up, he did a thing very proper to perſuade them that he would never be reconciled to David. He lay with the ten concubines of that Prince in the ſight of all the World (15). It is very probable that this crime would have been forgiven him: the extreme ſorrow into which his death threw David is a proof of it. He was the beſt father that was ever ſeen; his indulgence to his children was exceſſive, and he himſelf was the firſt who ſuffered by it. For if he had puniſhed the infamous action of his ſon Amnon (16), as the thing deſerved, he would not have had the ſhame and diſpleaſure to ſee another revenge the injury done to Tamar; and if he had chaſtiſed him who revenged that injury, as he ought to have done, he would not have run the riſque of being abſolutely dethroned. David's deſtiny was the ſame with that of moſt great Princes: he was unhappy in his family. His eldeſt ſon violated his own ſiſter, and was killed by one of his brothers on account of that inceſt: the author of that fratricide lay with David's concubines.

(14) 2 Sam. chap. xv.

(15) Ibid. chap. xvi.

(16) *He raviſhed Tamar, and was for that crime ſlain by the order of Abſalom, Tamar's brother both by father and mother.* Ibid. chap. xiii.

condition in which Samuel found him. Humanly ſpeaking, this reverſe of fortune would have been inevitable [*F*], had he not found ſome perſons to act a Traitor's part towards Abſalom his ſon (z). David's piety is ſo conſpicuous in his Pſalms, and in ſeveral of his actions, that it cannot be ſufficiently admired. He is a Sun of holineſs in the Church, through which by his writings he diffuſes a light full of conſolation and piety; but he had his ſpots [*G*]. The Life of this great Prince publiſhed by the Abbot de Choiſi is a good Book, and would have been much better, if he had taken the pains to ſet down in the margin the years of every action, and the paſſage of the Bible or of Joſephus which ſupplied him with what he advances. A Reader is not pleaſed to be left ignorant whether what he reads comes from a ſacred, or a profane ſource. I ſhall not take notice of many faults of Moreri [*H*]. The Article of David, which I have lately read in the

(z) Ibid. chap. xv. ver. 34, &c.

[*F*] *He was very near being reduced to the condition . . . . in which Samuel found him . . . . This reverſe of fortune was inevitable.*] It may be ſeen by this example that there is no depending on the fidelity of the people; for, in ſhort, David was both a good, and a great King. He had made himſelf beloved, and eſteemed, and he had all imaginable zeal for the Religion of the country. His ſubjects therefore had reaſon to be contented, and if they had been to chooſe a Prince, would they have wiſhed him better qualified? Yet they are ſo unſteady in their duty to David, that his ſon Abſalom, to get himſelf declared King, has no more to do than to make himſelf popular for ſome time, and to keep ſome emiſſaries in each Tribe. We may apply this Maxim to the people, *Caſta eſt quam nemo rogavit*; i. e. *She is chaſte who has never been aſked the queſtion.* If we do not ſee more Kings dethroned, it is becauſe the people have not been ſollicited to revolt by intrigues properly conducted. There is nothing wanting but that: if the Prince is not a bad one, it is eaſy to make him paſs for ſuch, or for a ſlave to evil Councils. Pretences are never wanting; and provided they are dextrouſly ſupported, they paſs for a lawful reaſon, how weak ſoever they may be at the bottom.

[*G*] *He had his ſpots.*] The numbring of the people was a thing which God looked on as a great ſin (17). His amour with the wife of Uriah, and the orders he gave to deſtroy her huſband (18), are two moſt enormous crimes; but he was ſo grieved for them, and expiated them by ſo admirable a repentance, that this is not the paſſage of his life wherein he contributes the leaſt to the inſtruction and edification of faithful ſouls. We therein learn the frailty of the Saints; and it is a precept of vigilance: we therein learn in what manner we ought to lament our ſins; and it is an excellent model. As to the Remarks, which certain Critics diſplay in order to ſhew that in ſome other actions of his Life he deſerved to be highly blamed, I ſuppreſs them in this Edition, and the more willingly for that perſons much more intelligent than my ſelf in ſuch matters, have aſſured me that all theſe clouds of Objections are eaſily diſperſed, if it be but conſidered, I, That he was King *de jure* during the life of Saul; II, That he had with him the High Prieſt, who conſulted God to know what ought to be done; III, That the command given to Joſhua to exterminate the infidels of Paleſtine was ſtill in force; IV, That ſeveral other circumſtances taken from Scripture may convince us of David's innocence in a conduct, which conſidered in general appears wicked, and which would be ſo at this day.

(17) 2 Sam. chap. xxiv.

(18) Ibid. chap. xi.

[*H*] *I ſhall not take notice of many faults of Moreri.*] Five only.

I. David was two and twenty years old, when Samuel *anointed him with the oil appointed for the conſecration of Kings.* This is inconſiſtent with what follows, and with what goes before. Our Author had juſt ſaid that David *was born in the year of the world* 2950, and a little after he tells us that David vanquiſhed Goliath in the year of the world 2971. It is manifeſt that the victory over Goliath was poſterior to David's being anointed; whereas, according to Moreri, the ceremony of anointing him was not performed till a year after that victory. To correct this fault, it ſhould be ſaid that David was anointed at the age of twenty (59). The reſt needs no correction; for it is true that David overcame Goliath the year after he was anointed.

(19) *He was born, according to* Calviſius, *in the year of the World* 2860, *and was anointed by Samuel in the year of the World* 2880, *and killed Goliath the year after.*

II. It is not true that Saul renewed the perſecution againſt David, after the latter had twice forborn to do him the leaſt harm, tho' he had the moſt favourable opportunity in the world. It is a little ſurprizing that the Scripture, to aggravate Saul's crime, ſhould not take notice that he quickly repented of his reconciliation with David, and rendred himſelf guilty of black ingratitude. In the XXIVth Chapter of the firſt Book of Samuel, he is informed that David, having it in his power to kill him in a cave, would not do him any hurt: he admires this generoſity; he prays God to reward it; he owns that the crown is deſtinated for David; he recommends his family to him; and returns home. In the XXVIth Chapter of the ſame Book, he is informed that David, having it in his power to kill him by night in his tent, retires without touching him: he admires this generoſity; he gives David his bleſſing; he foretells him all ſorts of proſperity; and returns to his houſe. Moreri ſuppoſes that theſe two actions, ſo very like one another, happened the ſame year. I repeat it: it is a little ſurprizing that the Scripture does not make uſe of the firſt of theſe two facts, to make Saul's obſtinacy in perſecuting his ſon-in-law more odious. Two or three times might have produced a conſiderable effect: a Reader would have been ſtruck to ſee that Saul, being obliged to his Son in Law for his Life, praiſes him, admires him, wiſhes him a thouſand bleſſings, and yet in a little time takes the field again to deſtroy him. The laws of Hiſtory require, without doubt, that in the ſpeaking of this new purſuit, it ſhould be obſerved that it was an infraction of that ſolemn agreement which had followed the adventure of the cave: and yet you will not find one tittle in the Scripture concerning this circumſtance. Here is further matter of ſurprize. David repreſenting to Saul that he had not deſerved the perſecution which he ſuffered, and that he could eaſily have killed him in his tent, does not put him in mind that it was the ſecond time he had had the King's life in his power, and that the King had ſoon forgotten the adventure of the cave. Saul, on his part, owns himſelf in the wrong, and ſpeaks to David with the utmoſt civility, and yet takes no notice that it was the ſecond time he owed his life to him. It muſt be confeſſed that ſuch circumſtances are not to be forgotten. Beſides, we ſee that on the firſt of theſe two occaſions, David and Saul make uſe of nearly the ſame words as they do on the ſecond. If I ſaw two accounts of this nature in Ælian or in Valerius Maximus, I ſhould make no difficulty to believe that they were but one Action, which having been related two different ways, ſerved for the ſubject of two articles, or of two chapters. The fact would be, that David having the life of Saul, his cruel perſecutor, in his hands, religiouſly preſerved it. The two ways of relating the affair would be, 1, that Saul, being obliged to ſtep aſide from his men on a private occaſion, entred into a cave where David was; 2, that David by night ſlipped thro' the camp as far as Saul's tent, while the guards were faſt aſleep. I leave Father Simon and the Critics of his ſize to examine whether the Hiſtorical Books of the old Teſtament might not poſſibly relate the ſame thing twice. It ſeems to me that the action of the Ziphites, related in the XXIII Chapter of the I Book of Samuel is not different from that which is related in the XXVI Chapter of the ſame Book. Whoever will take the pains to compare theſe two Relations, will doubtleſs be of my mind. But what is very certain is, that Saul did not perſecute David after the ſecond reconciliation. This is Moreri's ſecond fault.

Observations on a Narrative contained in the Books of Samuel.

The III conſiſts in his aſſerting that David *was ſo well received* by Achiſh King of Gath, *that the ſudden favour ſhewn him was very near cauſing the great men to revolt.* There is not a word of truth in all this; and

the Dictionary of the Bible will furniſh me with matter for a Remark [*I*].

and I ſee nothing that could have produced ſuch a falſhood, except the ſuſpicions which were formed againſt David, when they ſaw him with his troops in the rear-guard of Achiſh's army. The chiefs of the Philiſtines would abſolutely have David return back to the city which had been given him (20). Theſe Chiefs were very different from the great Men of the King of Gath's Court.

(20) 1 Sam. chap. xxix.

IV. The ſuppoſed diſcontent of the Great Men did not oblige David to retire from that Court. He retired thence out of reſpect: he was apprehenſive leſt he and his people ſhould incommode the Prince by their abode in the capital: he therefore deſired Achiſh to aſſign him ſome other habitation; which was granted him. This happened before the Chiefs of the Philiſtines demanded that David ſhould quit their camp.

V. It ſhould not have been ſaid that David *returned* to Ziklag, ſince no notice had been taken that he had dwelt there before.

[*I*] *The Article of David .... in the Dictionary of the Bible will furniſh me with matter for a Remark.*] The Printers were got thus far when I was ſhewn a Dictionary (21), which I immediately conſulted in the Article of the Prophet David. I have found ſome paſſages in it, which have given me occaſion to make a few Obſervations. I. It is not true that David came into the world 110 years before the birth of Jeſus Chriſt: there were above a thouſand years (22) between the birth of the one and that of the other. II. The Author endeavours to remove the difficulty which ſtares every Reader in the face, when he conſiders that Saul did not know David on the day that Goliath was killed: he ſtrives, I ſay, to remove it, and perplexes himſelf more than he needs; for he ſays in one place (23) that David, at the age of ſeventeen went to play on the harp to Saul, and in another (24) he makes him to be but fourteen or fifteen, and a *very little* boy. Preſently after, deſigning to refute thoſe who ſay that his combate againſt Goliath was prior to his *playing on the harp*, he forms a ſpecious Objection to himſelf drawn from the commendation which was given David, of his being a valiant man and a good warrior (25). *To this I anſwer*, ſays he, *that we are not to conclude from theſe two words*, Fortiſſimum & Bellicoſum, *that the combate was before the playing on the harp, becauſe the epithet of ſtrong may be given to any one, provided he be really ſo with reſpect to his age. Is not he very ſtrong who can run down Lions and Bears, fight with them, and ſtrangle them?* Here is an Anſwer which ſuppoſes that David being yet *very little*, and *a young lad of fourteen or fifteen years old*, had fought with lions, had run them down, had ſtrangled them, and might be called a ſtrong man, a warriour, and a man prudent in matters. This difficulty is conſiderable enough to deſerve to be obviated: whence comes it then that our Author does not ſo much as ſeem to perceive it? His ſilence will not prevent Readers, who have any penetration, from ſeeing very plainly that ſince David fought Goliath at the age of one and twenty (26), he muſt be near twenty years old the firſt time he went to Saul's Court. And ſo the reaſon which our Author advances as the beſt why Saul did not know David the day of the combate againſt Goliath, is good for nothing (27): The reaſon is, becauſe a little boy alters his features ſo much in ſeven years time, that thoſe who do not ſee him again till after an abſence of ſeven years, do not know him. This is not David's caſe: therefore recourſe muſt be had to other reaſons. The Author mentions thoſe which ſeveral Commentators have deviſed. If they do not fully ſatisfy thoſe who are not difficult to be pleaſed, the fault muſt be laid on the nature of the queſtion. III. The Author forgets the ſtrongeſt proof that can be alledged againſt thoſe who will have it that David was not ſent for to drive away Saul's evil ſpirit, till after the combate with Goliath. He does not alledge that thoſe people reverſe the order in which the Scripture relates the events; he does not alledge that Saul's ſervant, who praiſed David for being robuſt, a warrior, eloquent, and beautiful, ſaid nothing of the Victory over Goliath. Nor is it impoſſible to comprehend that they who were deſirous of recommending him to the King after that combate ſhould be ſo ſtupid as not to tell the Prince at once, *The ſame young man, who ſlew Goliath, plays well on muſical Inſtruments, and he will cure you.*

(21) It is the *Dictionary of the Bible* compoſed by Mr. *Simon*, Prieſt, Doctor of Divinity, and printed at Lyons, 1693, in folio.

(22) There were 1090, according to *Calviſius*.

(23) Pag. 249.

(24) Pag. 259.

(25) *Et reſpondent unus de pueris ait, ecce vidi filium Iſai Bethlemitem ſcientem pſallere, & fortiſſimum robore, virum bellicoſum, &c.* Ibid. pag. 259.] See 1 Sam. chap. xvi. ver. 18.

(26) It is the ſuppoſition of the Author of the *Dictionary of the Bible*, pag. 249.

(27) He cites the Author of the *Hiſtory of the Bible*, who puts eight years between the 1ſt time that Saul ſaw David, and the 2d, and who ſuppoſes David was but fifteen the 1ſt time.

The fear of being too prolix prevents my examining whether the Author has failed in exactneſs in the remainder of the Article. He has avoided the inconvenience which I have remarked in the the Abbot de Choiſi; having ſet down the years wherein David did ſuch and ſuch a thing.

(a) He is alſo called *Aurat*, *d'Aurat*, *Dorat*.

(b) Papyr. Maſſo, *in Elog. Jo. Aurati.*

DAURAT (*a*) (JOHN) in Latin *Auratus*, a learned Philoſopher and excellent Poet, was a Limoſin [*A*], and of an ancient family, whoſe name, they ſay, he quitted [*B*], to take another which has been a fruitful ſource of a great many witticiſms [*C*]. Going to the capital of the Kingdom (*b*) to finiſh his ſtudies, he there made an extraordinary progreſs, and diſtinguiſhed himſelf in ſuch a manner by his ſkill in Greek, and his talent at

[*A*] *He was a Limoſin.*] Thuanus, La Croix du Maine, Du Verdier, Mr. Menage, and ſeveral others, make him a native of Limoges. It may be queſtioned whether they have juſt grounds for it, conſidering that Papyrius Maſſo ſays he was born near the head of the Vienne (1). Had he been born in the Capital of the Limoſin, I do not think his friends, when they were writing his Elogy, would have aſſigned for his birth-place a village which they do not ſo much as name.

(1) Pap. Maſſo, *in Elogio Jo. Aurati.*

(2) La Croix du Maine, *Biblioth.* pag. 201.

(3) Menage, *Remarques ſur la Vie d'Ayrault*, pag. 186. Baillet, *Auteurs déguiſez*, pag. 155.

(4) The cuſtom of dining too early.

(5) Coulon, *Rivieres de France*, Part. 1. pag. 323.

(6) Menage, *Remarques ſur la Vie d'Ayrault*, pag. 186, 499.

(7) Naud. *Præf. in* Opuſc. Niphi.

[*B*] .... *and of an ancient family, the name of which they ſay he quitted.*] He was of the family of Dinemandi and Bremondais (2). It is ſaid (3) that the name of Dinemandi, ſignifying in the language of the country *One who dines in the morning*, and thereby intimating ſomething mean (4), did not pleaſe him, and that he changed it into that of *Daurat*, which ſignifies in Gaſcon the ſame as the French word *Doré*, i. e. *Gilt*, and which had been formerly given to one of his anceſtors on account of his fair hair. Others aſſert that our Poet took this new name becauſe his birth-place was ſituate on the little River Aurance (5). Monſr. Menage informs me that Daurat's mother was of the family of *Bermondet* (6): wherefore the name ſhould be ſo corrected in La Croix du Maine, and *Bremondais* ſtruck out. Naudé does not forget our Daurat, when he ſpeaks (7) of thoſe who have changed the name of their family. *Illud .... pro Joanne* Manepranſo, *Auratum .... exhibet.* Mr. Menage has introduced Daurat under the name of *Orthrophagus*, in his Metamorphoſis of Gargilius Macro. See below the Remark [*D*] of the Article Goulu (Nicholas).

[*C*] .... *To take another which has been a fruitful ſource of a great many witticiſms.*] They could not miſs of this, in an age wherein puns, clenches, and low jeſts were current coin; but now they are cried down, and will not paſs. Du Verdier Vau-Privas (8) has preſerved us a ſonnet full of gilding, or alluſions to gold, in honour of John Dorat. The learned Francis Hottoman doubtleſs thought it a lucky hit when he made this diſtich againſt him:

(8) *Biblioth.* pag. 685, 686.

Ex ſolido eſſe prius vulgus quem credidit auro,
Extrorſum auratus, plumbeus intus erat (9).
That is,
"He who the vulgar fancied heretofore
"Was ſolid gold, proves lead juſt gilded o're."

(9) *Matagonis de Matagonibus, ad Italogalliam Matharelli*, pag. m. 248.

Neither Daurat nor his diſciple Ronſard got any thing by exerciſing their Muſes againſt the Proteſtants; it was attacking too rough antagoniſts. The former, adopting a very low idea or metaphor, wrote againſt the frogs of the great lake of Geneva, and compared them to the frogs in the Revelations. It was very proper indeed, to talk to them of the Revelations. In this anſwer they feigned among other things, that their frogs inſtead of croaking, cried AU

at Poetry, that he became one of the Profeſſors of the Univerſity of Paris. In the year 1560, as it is ſaid, he ſucceeded John Stracellus in the poſt of the King's Reader and Profeſſor of the Greek Tongue (*c*); but before this he had been Principal of the College of Coqueret (*d*), after having been Tutor to John Anthony de Baïf, in the houſe of Lazarus de Baïf, his father, Maſter of Requeſts. He had continued to inſtruct this young pupil in the College of Coqueret, and he had alſo the famous Ronſard (*e*) for his ſcholar there, during the ſpace of ſeven years. One of the moſt obſervable and moſt glorious elogies of Daurat is, that his ſchool produced a great number of able men (*f*). He had an excellent method of teaching, and his aſpect which was ſomewhat clowniſh and diſagreeable [*D*], was no obſtacle to the ſucceſs of his Lectures. He was acceſſible to every body, he loved to cut jokes, and ſometimes even made great entertainments, appearing on all occaſions very far from being avaricious [*E*]; which, with the ſtars or fatality attending his profeſſion, might well be the cauſe of the poverty to which he found himſelf

(*c*) Du Breul, *Antiq. de Paris*, pag. m. 565.

(*d*) Dinet, *Vie de Ronſard.*

(*e*) Ronſard's entrance into this College falls about the year 1545, ſince he was then above 20 years old.

(*f*) *Docuit diu ſumma cum gloria & diſcipulos habuit omnes fere præſtantiores Galliæ viros, vicinarumque gentium lectiſſimos.* Papyr. Maſſo, *in Elog. Jo. Aurati.* See alſo *Thuan.* lib. 89. Sammarth. *Elog.* lib. 3. pag. m. 55.

RAT AU RAT † *de Limouſin*, and complained of the RONSES ‡ *de Vandomois* (10). They even returned him the abuſe in kind, for they called him the Limoſin frog (11). Hottoman called him Radiſh-eater (α §). *Vidi multos*, ſays he (12), *qui dicebant quod illa carmina melius valebant aureum quam omnia poëtaſtrorum epigrammata in fine tui libri poſita duos denarios, etiam ſine excipiendo ſuum vicinum Lemovicem raphanophagum Joh. Auratum.* i. e. "I have ſeen ſeveral who "ſaid thoſe verſes were better worth a piſtole than all "thoſe Poetaſters epigrams placed at the end of your "book were worth two pence, even not excepting "your neighbour John Daurat the Limoſin radiſh-"eater." I do not know whether Daurat ever turned into verſe the anſwer he made uſe of againſt a Miniſter of Geneva, who had told him *that the ſign of the Croſs, which the Catholics make on their perſons, ſeems deſigned to drive away the flies.* Du Verdier Vauprivas, who mentions (13) this anſwer (14) with great marks of approbation, pretends that Daurat paſſing thro' Geneva, in his return from Italy, was ſollicited to embrace Calviniſm, and that he was promiſed *a good Salary, but he could not accuſtom himſelf to that doctrine.* It was after this journey, doubtleſs, that he wrote the Poem which drew on him a ſhower of alluſions.

† Alluding to *Auratus.*

‡ Or *Thorns*, in alluſion to *Ronſard.*

(10) *See* Garaſſe, *Doctrine Cur.* pag. 127.

(11) Le Labour. *Addit. a Caſteln.* tom. 2. pag. 674.

(12) *Matagonis de Matagonibus, ad Italogalliam Matharelli*, pag. 247.

(13) *Proſopographie*, tom. 3. pag. 2575.

(14) It turns upon Beelzebub's ſignifying the *Lord of flies.*

[§ α] The word Raphanophagus uſed by Francis Hottoman, ſhould be rendered by *mâche-rabe*, or *Turnip-eater*, which is the nick-name of the Limoſins, and particularly of the Peaſants, ſuch as Daurat, to judge of the man by his clowniſh outſide. *The devil take this turnip-eater* (maſche-rabe), *he ſtinks ſo*, ſays Pantagruel in Rabelais †, ſpeaking of the Limoſin School-boy who had *befouled himſelf* while that Giant held him by the throat. Beſides, we know the Magnificat of the Peaſants of the Limoſin: *Monſieur Saint Marſau noſtre bon fondature, Prega per nous noſtre Seignour, qu'il nous veuille bien garda noſtra raba, noſtra caſtagna, noſtra fama. Alleluia.* i. e. "Monſr. St. "Marſaw, our good founder, pray for us to our "Lord, that he will be pleaſed to preſerve our tur-"nips, our cheſnuts, and our honour. Alleluia." As the perſons of the Limoſin are very poor, and for want of corn, fill their bellies with a ſort of rapes or large round turnips, which they do not take even the time to boil; from thence came this nick-name, which reproaches theſe poor people both with their poverty, and the unſavoury blaſts one is expoſed to when near them. John de la Bruiere-Champier, in his Treatiſe *de re cibaria* * where he ſpeaks of ſeveral ſpecies of this ſort of rapes, ſays: *Subaudis ac Lemovicis palma tribuitur, ut olim apud Romanos Nurſinis. Vulgus Gallicum Sabaudis atque Lemovicis rediiſſe ad reſtim clamat, ubi rapa gelu exuſta fuerint, aut aliqua injuria ſoli cælive perierint. . . . Inflationes crudiora minuſque cocta facere creduntur. Unde crepitus Ventris ingentes veſcentibus fiunt.* i. e. Thoſe of Savoy "and the Limoſin are eſteemed the beſt, as were thoſe "of Nurſia among the Romans. The common peo-"ple of France ſay the Savoyards and Limoſins may "hang themſelves when their rapes are ſpoiled by the "froſt, or deſtroyed by any injury of the ſoil or wea-"ther. . . . When raw or not enough boiled they are "thought to cauſe wind: for which reaſon thoſe who "feed on them are ſubject to rouſing exploſions." Moreover Rabelais, where he ſpeaks of thoſe thick and ſhort perſons whom the French call *Nabottes* ‡, and compares them to this ſort of turnips, might have furniſhed Mr. Menage with an authority to put to the Etymology he gives of that word. CRIT. REM.]

† Book 2. chap. 6.

* Lib. ix. cap. 2.

‡ Rabel. lib. II. chap. 27.

§ [*D*] *His aſpect was ſomewhat clowniſh and diſagreeable.*] Moreri has overſtrained theſe Words of Maſſo, *tametſi vultu ſubruſtico & inſuavi erat*, by tranſlating them thus; *they who writ his Elogy confeſs that he was the ugliest man in the world, and had the appearance of a clown.* This is a ſignal falſification to the prejudice of this famous Poet Laureat. The Latin we have juſt read differs but by one half from what has been ſaid of Voiture; *viz. that he had a countenance ſomewhat ſilly, but yet agreeable* (15). I am willing to believe that Daurat fell infinitely ſhort of the politeneſs which ſhone in Voiture: but I cannot imagine he was deſtitute of that knowledge of the world, and thoſe graces of converſation, which men of learning ought to poſſeſs in order to be eſteemed in a Court; for we ſhall ſee below that Charles IX took exceeding great pleaſure in hearing him, and admired his diverting ſtories, and his jeſts: and we learn from Brantôme that Daurat viſited people of the beſt quality. *The firſt time*, ſays he (16), *that I heard the ſtory* of the Epheſian Matron, *Monſr. d'Aurat told it to the brave Monſr. du Gua, and to ſome company who dined with him.* He adds that *Mr. d'Aurat ſaid he had it from Lampridius*; but Petronius is the Author from whom he had it, and I ſhould rather impute this little ſlip of memory to Brantôme than to our Poet. Du Verdier obſerves that *Daurat was a little man of a mean aſpect, but of great wit* (17).

(15) *Hiſt. de l'Acad. Françoiſe*, pag. m. 301.

(16) Dames Galantes, tom. 2. pag. 140.

(17) Du Verdier, *Proſopographie*, tom. 3. pag. 2575.

[*E*] *He was very far from being avaricious.*] This commendation and the foregoing directly contradict the calumnies of Scaliger; for here is what he ſays (18) under the word Auratus: *Il eſt fort fantaſque & ſordidus comme Moncaud, ſed non tam. Il coupoit toutes les marges de ſon Barthole & eſcrivoit là. Il a peu de livres.* i. e. "He was very fantaſtical and almoſt as "ſordid as Moncaud. He uſed to cut off all the mar-"gins of his Bartolus, and to write on them. He "has but few Books." How can this be reconciled with Papyrius Maſſo, who maintains that our Poet valued money no more than dirt, and judged thoſe unworthy of the name of a Poet who were too good huſbands? Add to this the teſtimony of Thuanus, which I quote in the following remark. When we conſider that Scaliger has highly praiſed Daurat with regard to Poetry, and critical learning, we cannot believe that he was prejudiced againſt him; and yet what dependence is there on what he ſays? Does he not aſſert that Daurat had a ſalary of 1200 crowns at Padua or at Piſa? and yet who dares believe that Daurat ever had a Profeſſorſhip in either of thoſe two cities? Does not Scaliger ſpeak as if Daurat was yet alive? but is this conſiſtent with a thouſand other things which are in the *Scaligerana*, and which muſt neceſſarily have been ſaid ten or twelve years after Scaliger was ſettled at Leyden, where he arrived in 1593, five years after the death of Daurat? To remove theſe difficulties, muſt we not ſuppoſe a thing which is falſe, *viz.* that the two nephews of Peter Pithœus, who collected the *Scaligerana*, lived fifteen or twenty years with Scaliger? One of theſe two things muſt have happened, either that Scaliger's memory frequently failed him in the converſations he had with thoſe young men, or elſe that they confounded what they heard from him. However, it cannot be denied but that he had ſeen Daurat: he acquaints us (19) that they went together to pay a viſit to the Sieur de la Croix du Maine, and that Daurat, who could not pronounce the Letter B, ſaid to him as they were coming away, *Oſcura diligentia*; which was the judgment he paſſed on the labours of the perſon, whom they

(18) In the 2d *Scaligerana.*

(19) *Scaligerana*, pag. m. 148.

himſelf reduced [*F*], and which has given him a place in the Liſt of learned men who have been very near ſtarving (*g*). However, Charles IX had honoured him with the title of his Poet, and had taken great delight in converſing with him [*G*]. It was not in his reign, but in the reign of Henry II (*h*), that Daurat was Preceptor to the King's pages for a year [*H*]: I know not whether the vexations, which obliged him to quit that poſt, proceeded, either wholly, or in part, from the malapertneſs of thoſe lads. Conſidering the age in which he lived, we ought to forgive him the taſte he had for Anagrams, of which he was the firſt reſtorer (*i*): it is pretended that he found the Model of them in Lycophron. He brought them ſo much into vogue, that every body would needs try at them. He paſſed for a geat conjurer in that way, and ſeveral illuſtrious perſons gave him their names to anagrammatize. He undertook alſo to explain the Centuries of Noſtradamus, which he did with ſuch ſucceſs [*I*], if ſome perſons ſay true, that he ſeemed to be inveſted with the character of his Interpreter, or Sub-prophet. But theſe are not the ſhining parts of his life (§ β). It is better ſtill to ſee him married again, in his extreme old age, to a young girl of nineteen [*K*], and to hear him ſay for his excuſe, that it

(g) *See* Maturin. Simonius, *de Literis pereuntibus*, apud *Barthium in Stat.* pag. 447.

(h) About the year 1554. *See* Thuan. lib. 13. towards the end, pag. m. 278. See alſo the Article LORRAINE, Remark [*N*].

(i) Papyr. Maſſo, *Elog. Jo. Auratı. Claudius Verderius, Cenſur. in Auctor.* pag. 45. Dinet, *Vie de Ronſard.*

they had been to viſit. I had forgotten a very ſtrong Objection, which is alone ſufficient to convince us that one man is here taken for another. Can it be ſaid of Daurat, a man who minded nothing but Greek, and Poetry, that Bartolus was a book of his? It belongs to a Profeſſor of Law to ſignalize his ſordid avarice by writing on the parings of his Bartolus.

[*F*] . . . . *Which . . . . might be the cauſe of the poverty to which he found himſelf reduced.*] Thuanus, owning, on the one hand, that Daurat enjoyed to the time of his death the penſion which had been continued to him when he ſurrendred his place, acknowledges, on the other, that he had always neglected his private intereſt, and had been for a long time reduced to deplorable indigence. *Vir ad aliorum ſtudia ac commoda promovenda natus, qui rem familiarem tota vita neglexerat, deploranda jam pridem egeſtate premeretur* (20). Papyrius Maſſo allows he left no riches, tho' he had in his old age taſted of the bounty of King Charles IX. *Exceſſit è vita dives opibus, iis præſertim quas virtus parit, non quibus mortalium genus avidum expleri nequit* (21). i. e. "He died rich indeed in "thoſe treaſures which are procured by virtue, but "not in thoſe of which greedy mortals are ſo in-"ſatiably covetous." This invincibly refutes the pretended niggardlineſs of which the *Scaligerana* accuſes him; nor can the policy which Charles IX made uſe of with regard to Poets be an objection of any weight. Brantôme (22) tells us that Prince *was a great lover of poetry, and recompenſed thoſe who preſented him with verſes, not at once, but by little and little, that they might be continually forced to do well; ſaying that Poets were like horſes, which ſhould be fed, but not pampered and made fat; becauſe then they are good for nothing.* This would be a weak Objection; for with whatever reſerve that Monarch had gratified his Poet, he would at leaſt have put a man who was ſordidly covetous in ſuch a condition as to be above poverty.

(20) Thuan. lib. 89. pag. 175.

(21) Papyr. Maſſo, *Elog.* tom. 2. pag. 290.

(22) *Vie de Charles IX.*

[*G*] *Charles IX . . . . took great delight in converſing with him.*] I am going to ſet down the whole paſſage of Papyrius Maſſo; which furniſhes matter for criticiſm. *Carolo nono*, ſays he (23), *Regi Chriſtianiſſimo chariſſimus atque acceptiſſimus fuit* (Auratus). *Is enim in decrepita ætate facetias hominis & argutias mirabatur, honeſtabatque præmiis poëtæ ſui venerabilem ſenectam.* i. e. *Daurat* was much beloved and careſſed by the "moſt Chriſtian King Charles IX; for he admired "the man's pleaſantry and wit in a decrepit age, and "honoured his venerable Poet with rewards." Methinks this Writer is much in the wrong to repreſent our Poet as a decrepit old man in the reign of Charles IX: it is not a proper way of ſpeaking of a man who is but ſixty or ſixty five, who lives to above fourſcore with little or no ſickneſs, and who gets children but a few years before his death. Now this may be ſaid of Daurat, according to Papyrius Maſſo, whoſe words follow (24): *Prope octogenarius aliquot jam pridem procreatis liberis, amiſſaque priori conjuge adoleſcentulam duxit, ex eaque Polycarpum, ſeniles delicias, filiolum incredibili gaudio ſuſcepit, blandiuſculè cum eo colludens, & inſtar ſimiæ manibus efferens . . .* (25) *deceſſit proſpera fere ſemper uſus valetudine . . . anno Domini* 1588 . . . *major octuagenario.* i. e. "Being near fourſcore, and "long ago father of ſeveral children, having loſt his "firſt wife, he married a young girl, and by her, to "his great joy, had a ſon named Polycarp, the de-"light of his old age, whom he uſed fondly to play "with, and to dandle in his arms like an ape . . . . "After a life of almoſt perpetual good health he died ". . . in the year 1588 . . . at the age of above four-"ſcore." On the other hand it is notorious that the reign of Charles IX reaches but from 1561 to 1574. To conclude, Lorenzo Craſſo, who thought it was King Henry III who conferred the title of *Poeta Regius* (26) on Daurat, did not know that honour was of more ancient date. You ſee Papyrius Maſſo ſays that Charles IX called Daurat his Poet.

(23) Payyr. Maſſo, *Elog.* tom. 2. pag. 290.

(24) Idem, ibid. pag. 289.

(25) Idem, ibid. pag. 290.

(26) *Iſtor. de Poëti*, pag. 265.

[*H*] *He was Preceptor to the King's Pages for the ſpace of a year.*] Thuanus does not ſay how long this employment laſted; he only ſays that Daurat exerciſed it before he was Profeſſor: *Primum pueris regiis erudiendis admotus, dein . . . . in regio gymnaſio diu Profeſſor*: in which paſſage the French Tranſlator has been guilty of a blunder; for he has rendred it, *he was firſt employed in inſtructing the King's ſons* (27): but Mr. Menage quotes (28) ſome Verſes of Daurat, which prove that he held this poſt but a year, and that it had given him a great deal of vexation:

(27) *See* Teiſſier, *Elog.* tom. 2. pag. 138.

(28) *Rem. ſur Ayrault*, pag. 187.

Aulica jam paſſus faſtidia mille per annum;
Hunc tandem in portum, ventis jactatus & undis,
Nauſeam ut evomerem tanti maris, alter Ulyſſes
Evaſi.

That is,

"Twelve months I bore the toſſings of a Court,
"Till, wind and weather beat, I made this Port,
"Where, like a ſecond Ithacus, I ſhou'd
"Diſcharge my ſea-ſick ſtomach of its load."

Mr. Menage adds that Papyrius Maſſo ſpeaks of this Preceptorſhip: but I have not found any ſuch thing in the Elogies of that Writer.

[*I*] *He undertook to explain the Centuries of Noſtradamus, . . . with ſucceſs.*] Mr. Teiſſier (29) quotes for this Papyrius Maſſo and Sammarthanus, who ſay nothing of it: he ſhould have quoted la Croix du Maine (30) and Du Verdier Vau-Privas. The words of the latter are remarkable: *Dorat*, ſays he (31), *ſet up for an Interpreter of Dreams: he valued the Centuries of Noſtradamus, containing certain prophecies of which he gave interpretations confirmed by ſeveral events, and uſed to ſay an Angel dictated them to Michael Noſtradamus* (32) *when he wrote them.*

(29) *Elog.* tom. 2. pag. 110.

(30) *Biblioth.* pag. 330.

(31) *Proſopogrophie*, tom. 3. pag. 2575.

(§ β) [The Memoirs of the State of France †, after having ſpoken of the Maſſacre of the Admiral de Châtillon, and the manner in which the body of that Nobleman had been ſerved by the mob, ſays that *John Dorat the Poet wrote ſome Latin Verſes, in which he derides the Admiral, blazoning each member of his mutilated body.* I doubt whether this paſſage of Daurat's Life be more to his honour than others with which he has been reproached. CRIT. REM.]

(32) The French Edition has, & *diſoit Michel que Noſtre Dame*, which is plainly a fault of the preſs.

† Tom. 1. fol. 278, *verſo.*

[*K*] *He was married again . . . . to a girl of nineteen.*] So we ſhould tranſlate theſe words of Sammarthanus, *undeviginti annorum puella.* Moreri, Teiſſier (33), and Bullart (34), who make this girl two and twenty, would doubtleſs be very hard put to it to produce a contemporary Writer to warrant their aſſertion, who deſerves equal credit with him whom I oppoſe to them. Mr. Menage ſays ſhe was but eighteen (35).

(33) *Eloges*, tom. 2. pag. 110.

(34) Bullart, *Acad. des Scienc.* vol. 2. pag. 360.

(35) *Remarq. ſur la Vie d'Ayrault*, pag. 187.

it was a poetic licence (*k*); and that being to die by the thruſt of a ſword, he choſe rather to perform the execution with a bright ſword, than a ruſty one (*l*). This new marriage proved fruitful, and made him father of a ſon, for whom he ſhewed his fondneſs by a thouſand ridiculous actions (*m*). If Thuanus and his Tranſlator had conſidered this, they would doubtleſs have weighed their expreſſions better for the honour of the young married woman [*L*]. Daurat had by his firſt wife, among other children, a ſon who was the Author of ſome French Verſes which have been printed (*n*), and a daughter whom he married to a learned man named Nicholas Goulu (*o*), in whoſe favour he reſigned his place of Regius Profeſſor of the Greek Tongue [*M*]. He made a great many Verſes [*N*], in Latin, Greek, and even in French: and indeed it was his diſeaſe to make too many; for no Book was printed, nor did any perſon of conſequence die, but Daurat made ſome Verſes on the ſubject, as if he had been Poet in ordinary of the Kingdom, or

(*k*) Sammarth. *in ejus* Elogio.

(*l*) Papyr. Maſſo, *in Elog. Jo. Aurati.* I quote his words in the Remark [*G*].

(*m*) Idem, ibid.

(*n*) They are in the Collection of his Father's Poems, and if the Title ſays true, they were made by the Author at ten years of age. Menage, *Remarq. ſur la Vie d'Ayrault*, pag. 187. The daughter alſo was learned, as we ſhall obſerve under the Article of GOULU (Nicholas).

(*o*) Sammarth. *in ejus Elogio.* La Croix du Maine, pag. 201.

[*L*] *For the honour of the young married woman.*] Thuanus has actually ſaid, *that what leſſened the regret for Daurat's death, was that old age had rendred him incapable of all the functions of his office* (36). Who would not believe him unable to get a child? Who would believe that a good old man who had not ſtrength to explain a Verſe of Homer to his Scholars, ſhould have preſerved vigour enough to conſummate his marriage with a young girl? So that we cannot literally believe Thuanus's relation, without entertaining violent ſuſpicions againſt our Poet's young ſpouſe, as if ſhe had put in practice the maxim, *that a woman of ſenſe never wants heirs*, or as if her huſband might with great reaſon have applied to himſelf this old ſentence;

Qu'autant vieillard à la barbe fleurie,
Pour ſes voiſins que pour lui ſe marie.

"That an old Grey-beard takes a wife no leſs
"To ſerve his neighbours, than himſelf to bleſs."

(36) So theſe Latin words have been tranſlated, *Ob ſenium inutilis ejus opera eſſe cœpiſſet.*

Thus Amiot tranſlates the following Greek words, ſpoken by a man advanced in years: Γαμῶ γέρων, ἐν οἴδα, κὴ τοῖς γείτοσι. *Duco uxorem, probe ſcio, vicinis quoque* (37). In reality, nothing would appear more contradictory to thoſe who pay the ſalaries of Profeſſors and Miniſters, than to ſee that in order to get a man declared *Emeritus*, whoſe wife ſhould be with child, it ſhould be alledged that age had rendred him utterly incapable of mounting the chair.

(37) Plutarch. *an ſeni ſit gerenda Reſpub.* pag. 789.

Take notice ſome people (38) ſay *that a little before* he died *he had married a young ſervant-maid, tho' he was fourſcore years old . . . and that it is not ſaid that he had any children by her* (39), *as he had by a very virtuous Lady who was his firſt wife.* Here is a man, therefore, proper to be put into the Catalogue which Mr. Menage mentions (40).

(38) Pierre de S. Romuald, *Journal Chronol. & Hiſtor.* at the 6th of October, pag. m. 396. He places Ronſard's death on that day 1589.

(39) This is falſe. See the Remark [*G*], Citation (24).

(40) See the Article BRISEIS, Citation (15).

[*M*] *He married a daughter . . . to . . . N. Goulu, in whoſe favour he reſigned his Poſt of Regius Profeſſor of the Greek tongue.*] Sammarthanus, without ſetting down the time, ſays that Daurat having been made *Poeta Regius*, reſigned his poſt of Profeſſor to Goulu his ſon-in-law. Thuanus ſpeaks of the thing in a manner yet more uncertain: he contents himſelf with ſaying (41) that after Daurat had for a long time diſcharged the office of Profeſſor in the College Royal, he became *Emeritus*, gave over the functions of that employment, and enjoyed a penſion which was paid him to his death. But du Breul acquaints us with the time; for he ſays that *Nicholas Goulu was promoted to d'Aurat's place by the King's Warrant of the 8th of November* 1567 (42). I ſhall make two Remarks on the whole; one, that Thuanus ſhould not have ſaid that Daurat's death was the leſs regretted becauſe old age, and the civil war which had driven all the youth from Paris, had began to render his labour uſeleſs. This ſignifies that he might have ſtill done ſervice if there had been any ſcholars at Paris, and that he had actually been ſerviceable till he ſunk under the infirmities of old age. He had not therefore given over the functions of the Profeſſorſhip ſo early as the year 1567, when he was ſucceeded in the place by his ſon-in-law; for if he had given them over then, the two reaſons alledged by Thuanus why the loſs of this Profeſſor was the leſs regretted, would be moſt falſe: it ſeems therefore that this great Hiſtorian has contradicted himſelf with regard to Daurat. He ſays ſomewhere that our Profeſſor reſigned his office before the death of Turnebus (43), and retired to the Fauxbourg de S. Victor, where he (Thuanus) had ſeen him often, and inquired of him concerning Budæus, Brixius, and Tuſanus. *Jam Joannes Auratus profeſſioni renunciaverat, & in Sanvictorianum ſuburbium conceſſerat; quo frequens itabat Thuanus ex ejuſque colloquiis ſemper inſtructior redibat, de Budæo quem ille puer viderat, Germano Brixio, Jacobo Tuſano ſedulo eum percontatus* (44). My ſecond Remark is, that la Croix du Maine declares in 1584, *that Aurat continues to read the ordinary Lectures of his Profeſſorſhip every day at Paris; ſo greatly does he delight in ſerving the public, and in making of ſcholars.* Some body muſt needs be miſtaken here, on one ſide or other. What ſeems moſt probable to me is, that our Profeſſor having obtained leave to reſign his poſt to his ſon-in-law, continued notwithſtanding to teach as before, at leaſt in private.

(41) Lib. 89, *ſub fin.*

(42) Du Breul, *Antiquitez de Paris*, pag. 565.

(43) That is, before 1572.

(44) Thuan. *de Vita ſua*, lib. 1.

[*N*] *He made a great many Verſes.*] Du Verdier Vau-Privas tells us an unlikely ſtory when he ſays (45) *that the Odes, Epigrams, Hymns, and other Poems in Greek and Latin* compoſed by Dorat *amount to above fifty thouſand verſes:* but make what abatement you pleaſe, it will ſtill be certain that he compoſed a great number of Poems in thoſe two languages, to which we muſt add thoſe which he wrote in French; for the ſame du Verdier obſerves, that though he applied himſelf wholly to Greek and Latin Poetry, he did not however *omit to make verſes in French, of which very few have been publiſhed.* He gives the Titles of two French Poems; and Monſr. Teiſſier gives the Titles of the Latin ones. Conſult the margin (46). Moreover Mr. Menage was not in the right to ſay *that Daurat made no French Verſes*, and thereupon to maintain that Monſr. Baillet was in the wrong to affirm that the Pleias or Conſtellation invented by Ronſard was compoſed only of French Poets (47). If Mr. Menage's aſſertion were true, viz. *that Daurat the chief of that Conſtellation made no French Verſes*, Mr. Baillet would have been juſtly criticized: but this aſſertion is falſe; for beſides what has been juſt now quoted from Du Verdier Vau-Privas, we find in la Croix du Maine, that *D'Aurat wrote ſeveral very learned Poems as well in Greek and Latin as in French.* And elſewhere (48) we find that Ronſard *gave the name of the Pleias to John Anthony de Baïf, Joachim du Bellai, Pontus de Tyard, Stephen Jodelle, Remi Belleau, Dorat, and himſelf, becauſe they were the firſt and moſt excellent perſons by whoſe diligence the* FRENCH *Poetry had riſen to the higheſt pitch of glory.* Conformably hereto Mr. Menage himſelf had ſaid in his Remarks on Malherbe, *that in imitation of the Pleias or Conſtellation of Greek Poets, Ronſard made one of the French Poets who were in his time . . . . and that theſe* FRENCH *Poets were Ronſard, du Bellai, Pontus de Tyard, Jodelle, Belleau, Baïf, and Dorat.* And in the 186 page of his Remarks on the Life of Peter Ayrault we find theſe words; *Dorat is the firſt Poet of the Pleias; for all who have ſpoken of thoſe Poets name them in this order, Daurat, Ronſard, Du Bellai, Belleau, Anthony de Baïf, Pontus de Tyard, and Jodelle.* I will not make uſe of the Authority of Thuanus, who ſays (49) that Ronſard and Daurat made the Verſes which were ſung by the Queen's maids, in the famous Interlude which was repreſented for the entertainment of the Ambaſſadors of Poland in the year 1573; for it is very poſſible that, on ſuch an occaſion, Verſes ſung by Ladies might be in Latin; and ſome Authors expreſly ſay that *d'Aurat made the Latin Verſes which were repeated in the Interlude repreſented at the Thuilleries in the year* 1573, *when the Duke of Anjou was declared King of Poland* (50). But tho' it be certain that Daurat made ſome Verſes in his mother-tongue, it muſt be acknowledged that his merit

(45) *Bibliotheq.* pag. 685.

(46) See the Judgment which Thuanus has paſſed on the Collection of Latin Poems, and Mr. Baillet, *Jugem. ſur les Poetes*, num. 1337. Thuanus ſays the Booksellers inſerted therein ſome Verſes which were not *Daurat's*; his Tranſlator has omitted this, *apud* Teiſſier.

(47) *Anti-Baillet*, tom. 2. pag. 28.

(48) In the *Life of Ronſard.*

(49) Lib. 57.

(50) Du Breul, *Antiq. de Paris*, pag. 565.

or his Muſe had been a hired mourner. From hence it came to paſs, that if his vein was not exhauſted to the very lees, it was at leaſt reduced to the condition of a low pierced veſſel [O], from which the wine, being deprived of the beſt part of its ſpirit, flows but faintly. He was ſo good a Critic, that Scaliger knew none but him and Cujacius who had abilities ſufficient to reſtore ancient Authors (p); but he has preſented the public with very little of that kind [P]. According to Scaliger, *He began to grow mean-*

(p) *Scaligerana I.* pag. m. 18. *See* Guil. Canterus *in Lycophr.* ver. 308.

merit was not ſo conſpicuous in French as in Latin Poetry. It is alſo in the quality of a Latin Poet that he has been famous in the Republic of Letters, notwithſtanding the groſs faults which ſometimes eſcaped him againſt the rules of quantity. Barthius reproaches him with this by the by, in the 1659th page of his Commentary on Statius, and adds a thing concerning him which deſerves to be related (51); which is, that he was ſo great an Admirer of this Epigram of Auſonius, (Epigr. 105,)

(51) He had related it before, pag. 94.

Dum dubitat natura, marem faceretve puellam,
Factus es, ô pulcher, pene puella puer,

" Nature, in doubt which ſex ſhe ſhould employ,
" Made thee almoſt a girl, thou lovely boy,"

that he maintained a Dæmon was the Author of it.

[We find in the 339 page of a Book intitled *Veneres Blyenburgiæ, ſive Amorum Hortus &c. Opera Damaſi Blyenburgij Batavi. Dordraci* 1600, in 8vo, the following Verſes of a Poet named *Evangeliſta*, which are an imitation of thoſe of Auſonius:

Dum dubitat, faceretne Deam, faceretne puellam
Juppiter, ecce Dea es facta, puella ſimul.
Sed Dea dum fieres, dubitat, Venus, anne Minerva,
Virgo, fores; ſubito es facta Minerva, Venus &c.

Theſe Verſes are addreſſed *ad Helenam Vendraminam, Virginem Venetam.* i. e. " To Helena Vendra-
" mina, a young Lady of Venice. CRIT. REM.]

[O] *His vein was reduced .... to the condition of a low pierced Veſſel.*] Let us quote Sammarthanus. *Nullus novus liber in lucem exibat, quin ſibi commendatricem Aurati Muſam pro Mercurio itineris duce & auſpice depoſceret. Nullus in tota Gallia paulo nobilior è vivis excedebat, quin ab Aurati lugubribus Camœnis tanquam Præficis ſolemnes funeri queſtus & lachrymæ ſufficerentur: quo fiebat ut in tanta ſimilium argumentorum multitudine beata illa quondam uberioris ingenii vena non areſceret quidem, ſed fundo propior languidius negligentiuſque flueret ac ſe traheret* (25). i. e. " No
" new Book came into the world but it demanded
" the commendatory Muſe of Daurat, for its Mercury
" to uſher it in. No perſon of conſiderable note died
" in all France, but ſolemn funeral lamentations and
" tears were ſupplied by Daurat's mournful Muſes, as
" if they had been hired mourners: by which means
" it came to paſs that in ſuch a multitude of ſimilar
" ſubjects that happy vein of a once more copious
" wit was not indeed quite dried up, but growing
" nearer the bottom flowed more languidly and more
" ſlowly." I have ſaid in the Remark [B] of the Article AFER *(Domitius)*, that Poets ſhould quit Apollo's ſervice in good time. I add that if they felt the return of a poetical fit, they ſhould take it to be a temptation of ſome evil Genius, and put up the ſame prayer to the Goddeſſes of Parnaſſus, as one of their fraternity did to the Goddeſs of Love:

(52) Sammarth. *Elogior.* lib. 3. pag. m. 55, 56.

Parce, precor, precor,
Non ſum qualis eram bonæ
Sub regno Cynaræ. Deſine, dulcium
Mater ſæva Cupidinum,
Circa luſtra decem flectere mollibus
Jam durum imperiis: abi
Quo blandæ juvenum te revocant preces (53).

(53) Horat. Od. 3, lib. 4. ver. 2.

" Oh ſpare, for pity, Venus, ſpare!
" I am not what I was
" In lovely Cynara's eaſy reign,
" When heat warm'd every vein,
" And manly beauty fill'd my face.

" Ceaſe, Queen of ſoft deſires,
" To bend my mind grown ſtiff with age,
" And fifty years engage
" To crackle in thy wanton fires:
" But youth and beauty hear." Creech.

The ſervice of the Muſes ſympathizes in many things with the ſervice of the Ladies; it is better to retire too ſoon than too late, and to ſay betimes, with a firm reſolution to keep one's word:

Vixi puellis nuper idoneus,
Et militavi non ſine gloria:
Nunc arma, defunctumque bello
Barbiton hic paries habebit (54).

(54) Horat. Od. 26. lib. 3. ver. 1.

That is,
" Once I was gay and great in charms,
" Succeſs ſtill waited on my arms,
" In Venus' battles bravely ſtout,
" I fought, and conquer'd when I fought.
" But now my arms and wanton lyre
" Whoſe tunes could ſpread harmonious fire,
" In Venus ſhrine unheeded lie,
" With all my love's artillery."
Creech.

Authors ſpeak of certain Monarchs, who gave order to ſome of their Domeſtics to tell them every day, *Remember ſuch a buſineſs* (55). If I may be allowed to compare ſmall things to great ones, Poets in the deline of their age, ſhould have ſome body to tell them every morning, *Remember how old you are.* Horace boaſts of having had ſuch a Monitor:

(55) Remember that you are mortal. *This is attributed to Philip of Macedon.* Remember the Athenians. Herodot. lib. 5. cap. 105, *concerning Darius the ſon of Hyſtaſpes.*

Eſt mihi purgatam crebro qui perſonet aurem,
Solve ſenescentem mature ſanus equum, ne
Peccet ad extremum ridendus & ilia ducat (56).

" And ſtill, methinks, ſounds thro' my well purg'd
" ear
" A little voice, Fond Horace have a care;
" And while 'tis well releaſe thy aged horſe,
" Leſt, when he runs, but with unequal force,
" And ſtretches hard to win, he break his wind,
" Derided, diſtanc'd, baſely lag behind."

(56) Horat. Epiſt. 1. lib. 1. ver. 7.

And here is what I find in the Menagiana. " Pere-
" rius formerly begged his friends to be ſo kind as
" to give him notice when his vein grew low, and he
" ſhould be no longer able to make verſes with ho-
" nour (57)." If Daurat had acted with the like precaution, he would not have out lived his own glory. But nothing has done him more injury than his voluntary ſubjecting himſelf to the drudgery of making Verſes on every Book that was printed. *What a miſerable thing is it,* ſaid Balzac (58), *to be obliged to praiſe every new Book, that is, to be in a worſe condition in proſe than* Auratus Poeta Regius *was, who did that of his own free will, which I do as a ſlave condemned to the gallies.* A French Poet (59) has been ſeen of more recent memory, who prepared Sonnets for future Books. See how he has been ridiculed in the Continuation of the *Parnaſſe réformé.*

(57) *Menagiana,* pag. m. 384.

(58) *Letter* 25 *to Chapelain,* Book 4. pag. m. 194.

(59) His name was *Pelletier.* See the *Guerre des Auteurs,* pag. m. 163.

[P] *He was .... a good Critic ....; but he has preſented the public with very little of that kind.*] Some of his Critical Remarks are to be ſeen on the Sibylline Verſes in Opſopæus's Edition. He had laboured much on that ſubject in his Lectures, as we are informed by a Letter of Stuckius to Goldaſtus (60). *Quam doleo,* ſays he, *me Jo. Aurati præceptoris mei viri ingenioſiſſimi, & in emendandis antiquis Poëtis Græcis acutiſſimi dictata, & annotationes in illa carmina ante multos annos, & ejus ore calamo exceptas cum aliis nonnullis meis Libris Lutetiæ amiſiſſe!* i. e. " What a grief is
" it to me to have loſt, among ſome other Books, at
" Paris, the *Dictata* of my Maſter John Daurat, a
" moſt ingenious man, and very acute in correcting
" the ancient Greek Authors, and his Annotations on
" thoſe Verſes which I took down in writing from
" his own mouth many years ago!"

(60) It is the 13th of the *Collection of Letters to Goldaſtus,* publiſhed at Francfort in 1688.

mean-ſpirited [Q], *and ſpent his time in endeavouring to find all the Bible in Homer.* He died at Paris the firſt of November 1588, at the age of above fourſcore [R]. The Collection which was made of his Verſes did him no honour: the Bookſellers had more regard to their Intereſt than his Reputation. They foiſted in ſome Poems which were none of his, and ſome pieces which he would not have owned for his, though they were of his compoſition (q).

(q) Thuan. *Hiſt.* lib. 89. *ſub fin.*

[Q] *He began to grow mean-ſpirited.*] Scaliger ſpeaks in the preſent tenſe, *He begins to grow mean-ſpirited*; &c. Whereon ſee the Remark [E] of this Article.

[R] *He died . . . . at the age of above fourſcore.*] La Croix du Maine makes Daurat ten years younger than others do: he places his birth in the year 1517: he muſt therefore have believed that Daurat died at the age of ſeventy one. Mr. Baillet (61) is in the right not to depend much on this opinion, in prejudice of that *of Papyrius Maſſo, Thuanus, and Scævola Sammarthanus, who were all very particularly acquainted with* Daurat, ſince it is certain that La Croix du Maine is miſtaken. Here are four Verſes of Daurat, which demonſtrate it: they were made on the death of Leodegarius à Quercu, who had lived fourſcore and five years.

(61) *Jugem. ſur les Poët.* tom. 3. pag. 403.

Octoginta annos quo natus quinque ſupraque,
Officio functus, plenus honoris obit.
At tuus Auratus pare pœnè ætate ſuperſtes,
Hos elegos tumulo donat habere tuo:

Engliſhed:

" Which duty done, with honour, at the age
" Of eighty five and more, he left the ſtage.
" Thy Daurat with this mournful verſe appears,
" To weep thy death, himſelf of almoſt equal years."

Mr. Menage makes uſe of them (62), to prove that Daurat lived to above eighty: in which he is without compariſon better grounded than when he accuſes Mr. Baillet (63) of having ſaid that Poet lived only to ſeventy one; for it is true that Mr. Baillet mentions it as a thing different from the common opinion, but he obſerves at the ſame time that the common opinion is preferable to that of la Croix du Maine. I ſhall take notice of another ſmall miſtake of Mr. Menage. He ſays that all the Poets of that time made Verſes on the death of Daurat, and, among others, Ronſard, his favourite Diſciple (64). But it is certain that Ronſard died (65) ſome years before his Maſter; and one need only caſt ones eyes on theſe Words of Papyrius Maſſo, to know that Diſciple could not render any poetical ſervice to the memory of Daurat. *O ſi hodie diſcipulus ejus Petrus Ronſardus inſignis Poëta viveret, quas ille nænias, aut quæ epitaphia ſcriberet?* i. e. " If his ſcholar the famous Poet Ronſard were now " alive, what elogies, and what epitaphs would he " write!" I chuſe to follow Papyrius Maſſo rather than Thuanus. The latter ſays Daurat died about the latter end of November, being near fourſcore years of age.

(62) *Remarques ſur la Vie d'Ayrault*, pag. 499.

(63) *Anti-Baillet*, tom. 1. pag. 266.

(64) *Remarques ſur la Vie d'Ayrault*, pag. 187.

(65) The 27th of Dec. 1585.

DAUSQUEIUS, or DAUSQUIUS, or D'AUSQUEIUS (a) (CLAUDIUS) Canon of Tournay, was born at St. Omers the 5th of December 1566 (b). He entered into the Society of the Jeſuits, but at what time I know not, and quitted it I know not when neither, nor for what reaſon. He was ſtill of it when Father Scribanius publiſhed his *Amphitheatrum honoris*, in the year 1607. He was praiſed in that Work as one of the moſt learned men of his age (c). It is certain that he was learned both in Greek and in Latin, and in whatever is comprehended under the name of Literature; but he did not write well: his ſtyle is too affected, too obſcure, and too full of antiquated phraſes. He has been commended as a good Preacher (d). ROBERT DAUSQUEIUS, his father, the fourth ſon of ANTHONY DAUSQUEIUS Bailiff of St. Omers, was killed in the King of Spain's ſervice during the war which the Duke of Alençon raiſed in the Low-Countries (e). We ſhall ſpeak of the Writings of the Canon of Tournay [A], without forgetting the fraud of a Bookſeller of Paris [B].

(a) He latinized his name (which was d'*Auſque*, ſays Swertius, *Athen. Belg.* pag. 178,) theſe three ways.

(b) Valer. Andreas, *Bibliotb. Belgicæ*, pag. 140.

(c) *Amphitheatrum honoris*, lib. 2. cap. 13.

(d) Valer. Andreas, *Bibliotb. Belg.* pag. 140.

(e) Claud. Dauſquius, *in S. Joſephi Sanctificatione*, pag. 228, 229.

☞DAWES

[A] *We ſhall ſpeak of the Writings of* Claudius Dauſqueius.] He made a Latin Tranſlation of the XL Homilies of S. Baſil of Seleucia, and publiſhed it with Notes in the year 1604, in 8vo. It is not a good one, if we refer our ſelves to the Judgment of the Dominican Combefis (1). He publiſhed ſome Notes on Quintus Calaber, in the year 1614, and Silius Italicus with an ample Commentary in the year 1618, in 4to. His *Scutum D. Mariæ Aſpricollis*, and his *Juſti Lipſii Scutum adverſus Agricolæ Thracii Satyricas Petitiones*, were printed at Doway, in the year 1616, in 8vo. The Approbation of theſe two Books, and the Epiſtle Dedicatory, being dated in the year 1616, I cannot be perſuaded but there is a fault in the paſſage where Alegambe (2), and Valerius Andreas Deſſelius (3) affirm they were printed in the year 1610. They are miſtaken alſo in ſaying that they were written *adverſus Agricolam Thracium*. This Agricola Thracius is no other than George Thomſon, a Scot, who publiſhed a Book at London in the year 1606. againſt Juſtus Lipſius. This was the Work which Dauſqueius refuted. He had a quarrel with ſome Franciſcans, who maintained that St. Paul and St. Joſeph were Saints in their mother's wombs. On which occaſion he publiſhed his *Sancti Pauli Sanctitudo in utero, extra, in ſolo, & in cœlo*, at Paris, 1627, in 8vo. and his *Sancti Joſephi Sanctificatio extra uterum, ſeu binoctium adverſus F. Marchantij Minoritæ Exprovincialis inanias, item Aplyſiarum F. Minorum Audomaropolitanorum Spongia*, at Lyons, 1631, in 8vo. His two beſt Books are thoſe which I ſhall ſpeak of in the following Remark.

(1) *See* Baillet, *Jugem. des Savans*, tom. 4. pag. 493.

(2) Alegambe, *Bibliotb. Societ. Jeſu*, pag. 81.

(3) Valer. Andreas, *Bibliotb. Belgicæ*, pag. 140.

[B] . . . . *without forgetting the fraud of a Bookſeller of Paris.*] Mr. Chevillier will inform us wherein it conſiſts. " People take too much liberty, and " play tricks with the Works of the preſs, as they pleaſe, " without any regard to ſincerity. Whatever the " Bookſeller may ſay, who from the year 1677 has " ſold Dauſquius's Book intitled *Antiqui novique Latii* " *Orthographica* (4), he ought not to have ſuppreſſed " the fine Cut wherein ten principal Latin Writers " are ingraved, and wherein we read that the Book " was printed at Tournay by Adrian Quinqué, in the " year 1632: neither ought he to have taken out " ſome other leaves, by which the date of the im- " preſſion might have been known. And it is no good " reaſon to ſay, that the King having taken Tour- " nay, Dauſquius, who was kept there, became a " Frenchman: *De Hiſpano factus jam Gallus.* On " which account he uſurps the right of ſubſtituting " a Title page, in which he puts his Cypher and his " Sign, with this Subſcription, *Pariſiis apud, &c.* " 1677. As if victory alſo exerciſed her empire " over the difference of times, and the diſtance " of places; or had the power to make the year " 1632 be the year 1677, and the city of Tournay " in the Earldom of Flanders, to be that of Paris " in the Iſle of France. I defy thoſe who have bought " his Dauſquius, and have ſeen no other copy, to " tell who was the Printer of it, and out of what " Printing-houſe it came. And yet this is what our " Kings have ordered ſhould be known (*). Theſe " are the Words of their Ordinances, *ſo that the* " *buyers of Books may eaſily know in what Printing-* " *houſe the Books have been printed.* All that he could " do, when he became poſſeſſed of the remaining " Copies of that Author, was to expoſe them to ſale " with a leaf containing theſe words, *Veneunt Pariſiis,* " *apud &c.* but without making any alteration or mu-

(4) It is a Work in two Volumes in folio.

(*) *Edicts of Francis I, at Fontainebleau, the 28th of December 1541, and of Charles IX, at Gaillon, in the month of May 1571, inſerted among the* Ordinances collected by Fontanon, pag. 468, and 474, tom. 4. of the Edition of 1611.

DAWES (Sir WILLIAM), Archbiſhop of York in the eighteenth Century, was deſcended of a good family [*A*], and ſon of Sir John Dawes Bart. by Jane the daughter and only child of Richard Hawkins of Braintree in the county of Eſſex Gent. He was born September the 12th 1671 at Lyons (a Seat, which came by his mother) near Braintree; and received the firſt rudiments of Learning at Merchant-Taylors-School in London, from the Reverend Mr. John Hartcliffe and the Reverend Mr. Ambroſe Bonwicke, ſucceſſive Maſters of that School, under whoſe care he made great proficiency in the knowledge of the Claſſics; and was a tolerable maſter of the Hebrew Tongue, even before he was fifteen years of age, which was chiefly owing to the additional care, which Dr. Kidder, afterwards Lord Biſhop of Bath and Wells, took of his education (*a*). In Act Term in the year 1687 (*b*) he was entered a Scholar of St. John's College in the Univerſity of Oxford under the tuition of Mr. Lee (*c*); and after his continuance there two years or upwards, he was made Fellow. In 1693 he publiſhed a Poem intitled, *The Anatomy of Atheiſm* [*B*]. Upon the death of his two elder brothers about the ſame time [*C*] he ſucceeded to his father's eſtate and title, and ſoon after left Oxford, and entering himſelf a Nobleman in Katherine-Hall in Cambridge, lived in his eldeſt brother's chambers there, and afterwards took the Degree of Maſter of Arts (*d*). His early piety appears from his writing his *Duties of the Cloſet* before he was twenty one years of age (*e*). As he was not yet of age ſufficient to enter into Holy Orders, he therefore thought proper to viſit his eſtate, and to make a ſhort tour into ſome other parts of the Kingdom, which he had not ſeen. But his intended progreſs was in ſome meaſure ſtoped by his happening to meet with Frances, the eldeſt daughter of Sir Thomas D'Arcey of Braxſteed Lodge in Eſſex Bart. to whom he made his addreſſes, and not long after married (*f*). Soon after his marriage he was ordained Deacon and Prieſt by Dr. Henry Compton Biſhop of London [*D*]; and within a ſhort time was preſented to the Deanery and Living of Bocking in Eſſex; and was afterwards nominated one of the Chaplains in ordinary to King William. In 1696, when he was but five and twenty, he had the Degree of Doctor of Divinity conferred upon him by a Royal Mandate [*E*], becauſe at that time he was not of ſtanding ſufficient to be admitted regularly; and this Degree qualified him for the Maſterſhip of Catherine-Hall, to which, upon the death of the Reverend Dr. Echard, he was unanimouſly elected [*F*], and in a ſhort time became Vice-Chancellor of the Univerſity. In 1698 the King gave him a Prebend of Worceſter, in which he was inſtalled on the 26th of Auguſt that year (*g*). After Queen Anne's acceſſion to the Throne

(*a*) Preface to the firſt vol. of *The Whole Works of the moſt Reverend Father in God, Sir* William Dawes *Bart. late Lord Archbiſhop of York, Primate of England and Metropolitan. In three Volumes*, pag. 5-9. edit. London 1733 in 8vo.

(*b*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 1088. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*c*) Preface, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 10.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 12, 13.

(*e*) Ibid. pag. 13, 14.

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 15, 16.

(*g*) Willis's *Survey of the Cathedrals of York, &c.* pag. 674.

" tilation in the Book; letting the Reader ſee that " it was printed at Tournay by Adrian Quinqué in " the year 1632. The moſt ſkilful Librarians have " much ado to find out all theſe tricks of the Book-" ſellers: it being a difficult matter not to be deceived " by them. The Library-keeper of the Archbiſhop of " Rheims has not ſuffered himſelf to be impoſed on " by the Dauſquius: he has ſet down the date of it in " his printed Catalogue in theſe Words, which are a " reproach to the Bookſeller; *Pariſiis* 1677, *vel potius Tornaci*, 1632, *in folio* (5)." I imagine the like fraud was made uſe of with regard to another Work which Dauſquius printed at Tournay in 4to. in the year 1633, under the Title of *Terra & aqua, ſeu terræ fluctuantes*; for the *Journal des Savans* ſpoke of that Book (6), and of the *Antiqui novique Latii Orthographica* (7), as if they had been lately printed. Let us obſerve that Salmaſius judged this *Antiqui novique Latii Orthographica* worth reading. See what he writes concerning it to Voſſius in his LXVIth Letter. See alſo the commendation which Voſſius has beſtowed on the ſame Book (8), and conſult Mr. Baillet, who believed that Work had been reprinted in the year 1676 (9).

(5) Chevillier, *Origine de l'Imprimerie de Paris*, pag. 210.

(6) *Journal des Savans* of the 2d of Auguſt 1677, pag. 233, of the Dutch Edition.

(7) *Journal des Savans* of the 15th of February 1677, pag. 55.

(8) Voſſius, *de Philologia*, pag. 29.

(9) Baillet, *Jugemens des Savans*, tom. 4. pag. 12, 13.

[*A*] *Deſcended of a good family.*] Sir Abraham Dawes, his great grandfather, was accounted one of the richeſt Commoners in his age, and in ſplendor and magnificence lived up to the port of a Nobleman. But in the time of the civil wars, the Family adhering to the Royal Cauſe ſuffered great loſſes in their fortune. But in 1663 King Charles II created Sir John, the Father of our Archbiſhop, a Baronet (1).

(1) Preface to the firſt vol. of *The whole Works of the moſt Reverend Father in God Sir* William Dawes, *Bart. late Lord Archbiſhop of York, &c.* pag. 5, 6.

[*B*] *In* 1693 *he publiſh'd a Poem intitled*, The Anatomy of Atheiſm.] In the title it is ſaid to have been printed at London 1694 in 4to; but Mr. Wood tells us (2), that it was firſt publiſhed in London in the latter end of Auguſt 1693. It is dedicated to Sir George D'Arcey Bart. " It has not indeed all the perfection " of a poetic compoſition; a luculency of fancy and " pomp of expreſſion may perhaps be thought wanting " in it. But then it has this equivalent excellence, " that the arguments both for and againſt the Exiſt-" ence of a God are urged and anſwered in a clear " method and eaſy diction, fitted for the comprehen-" ſion of every common reader, tho' not ſo well adapt-" ed to the taſte or genius of ſuch as are taken with " nothing but lofty flights and elaborate ſtrains (3)."

(2) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2, col. 1088.

(3) Preface, pag. 11, 12.

[*C*] *Upon the death of his two elder brothers about the ſame time.*] The eldeſt Sir Robert was a Nobleman of Catherine-Hall in Cambridge, where he died of a violent fever. The ſecond, John, was a Lieutenant of a ſhip, belonging to a ſquadron commanded by Sir John Narborough, and in waiting on ſome company from on board, was about the ſame time unhappily drown'd (4).

(4) Ibid. pag. 12, 13.

[*D*] *Ordained Deacon and Prieſt by Dr. Henry Compton, Biſhop of London.*] Upon this occaſion Sir William was often heard to ſay, that *when he lay aſide his lay-habit* (in which he had been as elegant as others of his quality) *he did it with the greateſt pleaſure in the world, and look'd upon holy Orders as the higheſt honour, that could be conferred upon him* (5).

(5) Ibid. pag. 17, 18.

[*E*] In 1696, *when he was but five and twenty, he had the Degree of Doctor of Divinity conferred upon him by a Royal Mandate.*] The Writer of the Preface above cited, who obſerves (6), that he had his Degree the ſame year, that Dr. Bentley held the Act at the public Commencement, which was in 1696 (7); yet has committed a ſtrange inconſiſtency in aſſerting (8), that Sir William *was not much above ſeven and twenty*, when he took that Degree, ſince he had before told us, that he was born in 1671.

(6) Pag. 21.

(7) Dr. Bentley's Sermon *of Revelation and the Meſſiah*, was preached at the Commencement, July 5, 1696.

[*F*] *Unanimouſly elected Maſter of Catherine-Hall.*] Upon his acceſſion to the Maſterſhip, he found the bare caſe of a new chapel, which Dr. Echard his Predeceſſor had begun, but did not live to finiſh; and to fit it up with wainſcot-ſeats, marble pavement, and a beautiful altar-piece, he contributed very liberally all the while the work was carrying on. This chapel was conſecrated by Dr. Simon Patrick Lord Biſhop of Ely Sept. 1. 1704 (9). By his own intereſt likewiſe, and that of Dr. Thomas Sherlock, now Lord Biſhop of Sarum, with the Queen and ſome of the chief Miniſters, he obtained an Act of Parliament for annexing the firſt Prebend of Norwich, which ſhould become vacant, to the Maſterſhip of Catherine-Hall for ever (10).

(8) Preface, pag. 20.

(9) Ibid. pag. 2

(10) Ibid. pag. 27, 28.

Throne, he was made one of her Chaplains; and though he miſſed of the See of Lincoln [G], yet upon the death of Dr. Nicholas Stratford Biſhop of Cheſter he was advanced to that See, to which he was conſecrated February the 7th 1707 (*b*); and on the 26th of February 1713 he was tranſlated to the Archbiſhopric of York in the room of Dr. John Sharp (*i*), and made one of the Privy-Council to her Majeſty. Upon the Queen's demiſe, he was conſtituted one of the Lords Juſtices or Regents of the Kingdom, until the late King's arrival in England, by whom he was again called to his Council. He died April the 30th 1724 in the fifty third year of his age, and was interred in the Chapel of Catherine-Hall in Cambridge near his Lady (by whom he had ſeven children, William, Francis, William, Elizabeth, Jane, D'Arcey, and Thomas) and who died December the 22d 1705 in the twenty ninth year of her age. We ſhall give his character in the Note [*H*].

(*b*) Idem, pag. 338.

(*i*) Idem, ibid.

[G] *Tho' he miſſed of the See of Lincoln.*] When that Biſhopric was vacant, he being appointed to preach before the Queen on the 30th of January, *was not afraid*, ſays the Writer of the *Preface* to his *Works* (11), *to utter ſome bold truths, which at that time were not ſo well reliſhed by ſome perſons, that were in power, and who took occaſion from thence to perſuade the Queen (contrary to her inclination) to give it to another* (12). *This however made no impreſſion upon Sir William; . . . and therefore when he was told by a certain Nobleman, that he had loſt a Biſhopric by his preaching, his reply was,* "that as to that he had no manner of concern "upon him, becauſe his intention was never to gain "one by preaching."

(11) Pag. 30.

(12) Dr. William Wake, the preſent Archbiſhop of Canterbury.

[H] *We ſhall give his character in the Note.*] Dr. Henry Felton tells us (13), that "he was a perfect O-"rator in his elocution, and thoſe ſacred ſtrains, "which carry their own reaſon and conviction with "them, were irreſiſtible in the charms and power of "his delivery." The Writer of the Preface to his Works obſerves (14), that his perſon was tall and graceful, his behaviour eaſy and courteous to all, his converſation lively, tho' without levity, his imagination ſprightly, his memory ſtrong, and his judgment equal to it. That his manner of preaching was plain and unaffected, though adorned with great melody of voice and decency of action. That he was a kind and loving huſband, an indulgent father, a good maſter; ſo ſtrict an obſerver of his word, that no conſideration whatever could make him break it; and ſo inviolable in his friendſhip, that without the diſcovery of ſome eſſential fault indeed, he never departed from it. That he was a lover of his country, as well as a loyal ſubject; and both as a Biſhop and a Peer of the Realm conſidered himſelf as reſponſible for the ſouls committed to his charge in one reſpect, and as intruſted with the lives and fortunes of his fellow-ſubjects in the other. That he was ſincerely affected to our preſent Conſtitution; "and therefore, if in ſome Parliamentary de-"bates (wherein he made a very conſiderable figure) "he happened to diſſent from other great men, who "might have the ſame common good in view, but "ſeemed to purſue it in a method incongruous to his "ſentiments; this ought to be accounted his honour, "and a proof of his integrity, but cannot, with any "colour of juſtice, be deemed party-prejudice, or a "ſpirit of contradiction in him; becauſe thoſe very "men, whom he ſometimes oppoſed, at other times "he adjoined himſelf to, when he perceived them in "the right (15)." That he was aſſiduous in the diſcharge of his epiſcopal functions, and behaved towards his Clergy in the moſt affectionate manner, without any reſpect of perſons. H.

(13) *Diſſertation on reading the Claſſicks and forming a juſt Style*, pag. 185. 4th edit. London 1730.

(14) Pag. 34, & *ſeqq.*

(15) Ibid. pag. 42, 43.

DECIUS (PHILIP) natural ſon of Triſtan de Dexio [*A*], who made a conſiderable figure at the Court of the Dukes of Milan, was a very famous Civilian. He was born in the year 1454, and was carefully inſtructed in polite Literature at Milan. The plague having obliged him to leave that City, he retired to his brother, who was Profeſſor of the Civil Law at Pavia [*B*]. He began to ſtudy the ſame Science at the age of ſeventeen, and by his diſputing humour gave a great deal of trouble to Jaſon Mainus and James Puteus his Maſters [*C*]: for he puzzled them more than once with his Objections. He alſo tired his brother to ſuch a degree, by propoſing difficulties to him, that the reproofs which he received from him conſtrained him to ſeek the ſolution of his doubts elſewhere. He maintained ſome Theſes in public the ſecond year of his ſtudying Law, and ſucceeded therein perfectly well. He went the next year to Piſa with his brother, who was

[A] *He was natural ſon of Triſtan de Dexio.*] His anceſtors having left the village of Dexio (1) ſettled at Milan, and took the name of the village where they were born (2). This family had ſubſiſted above 300 years (3) at Milan with ſome ſplendor, when Triſtan was born.

(1) Near Milan.

(2) Panzirolus, *de claris Legum Interpret.* lib. 2. cap. 135. pag. m. 299.

(3) *Ultra CCC annos cum dignitate vixerunt.* Idem, ibid.

[B] *He retired to his Brother, who was Profeſſor of the Civil Law at Pavia.*] He was born in lawful wedlock, and was named Lancelot. He died at Pavia in the year 1500 (4).

(4) Idem, ibid.

[C] *By his diſputing humour he gave a great deal of trouble to . . . . his Maſters.*] Here is what Panzirolus ſays of it: *Quos argumentis quandoque exagitavit, atque æſtuantes reliquit. Fratri quoque aſſiduis interrogationibus moleſtus non ſemel cum objurgatione rejectus eſt* (5). i. e. "Whom he ſometimes exerciſed "with arguments, and left ſuming. He was alſo very "troubleſome to his brother by perpetually aſking "him queſtions, for which he was more than once "turned away with reproofs." There is nothing more importunate than a young Scholar who has wit, and loves to diſpute: I do not wonder, therefore, that ours was chid for it by his brother. The reprimand in all likelihood was very ſharp, ſince the young man durſt not teize his brother any more, and did not conſult him even when he undertook to maintain Theſes in public (6). Lancelot renewed his cenſures, and called him a raſh fellow, and diſputed againſt him with intent, if I am not miſtaken, to put him to a non plus in order to humble him; but he was repulſed ſo vigorouſly, that he was ſtruck with admiration, and confeſſed before the Audience that his brother would quickly ſurpaſs him. Such an acknowledgment would not be ſo hard to a father as to an elder brother. *Impugnanti problemata Lancelloto tanto acumine argumenta rejecit, ut admiratus coram aſſantibus ſe brevi ab illo ſuperatum iri prædixerit* (7). Paul Jovius, ſpeaking as an eye-witneſs, aſſures us that our Philip diſputed with more ardour than any one elſe. *Enarrabat ſubtiliſſime & , uti ſæpe vidimus, longe omnium acerrime diſputabat* (8). Let us relate one inſtance more. Decius being Profeſſor at Piſa made Laurence Pucci (9) diſpute againſt the Theſes which Bartholomew Socinus had adviſed a Scholar to maintain in public. The day after the Diſpute, a paper was poſted up which gave notice that in eight days the ſame Theſes turned into Problems would be maintained on both ſides by Pucci among the Students, and by Decius among the Doctors. This gave an alarm, and the conſequences were apprehended; for it was perceived that ſuch a procedure tended to the diſhonour of the other Doctors who were Profeſſors. For which reaſon the Principal of the College forbade Decius to proceed on pain of impriſonment (10).

(6) *Inconſulto fratre propoſitiones publice diſputandas ediderit.* Idem, ibid.

(7) Panzirolus, *de claris Legum Interpretibus*, pag. 300.

(8) Paulus Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 88. pag. m. 207.

(9) Who was afterwards Cardinal.

(10) Panzirolus, *de claris Legum Interpret.* pag. 301, 302.

was invited thither to be Profeſſor of the Civil Law. He there gave ſo many proofs of his wit and learning, that at the age of one and twenty he obtained the Profeſſor's Chair for explaining the Inſtitutes. His Lectures drew a great number of Auditors, and made him admired, among other things, for the witty jeſts he made uſe of in his public diſputations (*a*). His reputation increaſed when he was ſome time after promoted to the place of Profeſſor extraordinary of the Civil Law; yet he was not contented, but complained of the ſmallneſs of his ſalary [*D*]. Francis Accolti, who had been alone the ordinary Profeſſor for the Evening Lectures, having been diſpenſed with by reaſon of his great age, Bartholomew Socinus was put in his room. Our Decius left no ſtone unturned to get a ſhare in that place, and had already obtained what he deſired [*E*]; but he was deprived of it, ſo ſoon as it was known that Socinus threatened to retire if ſuch a diviſion was made. To make Decius amends, they gave him the Profeſſorſhip of Canon Law. This was done by the intrigues of Socinus (*b*), who hoped that Felinus would run away with all the glory of that function; Felinus, I ſay, who had taught the Canon Law a long time, and underſtood it perfectly well. Socinus was deceived in his conjectures. Decius was more followed than Felinus, and gave him ſo much uneaſineſs by that ſuperiority of glory, that he forced him to abſent himſelf. Felinus retired abruptly (*c*). The Curators of the Univerſity, being informed of the reaſon of this retreat, were very angry with Decius, and deprived him of his places. They were reprimanded for it by Laurence of Medicis; and this was the reaſon that when he went to Florence, to demand the payment of his ſalary, they told him, in a pretty rough manner, that he muſt return to Piſa. He anſwered that he would not, becauſe he had accepted the Profeſſorſhip which thoſe of Siena had offered him; but he was obliged to renounce it, and reſume his employments at Piſa, for they threatened him with ſtopping the arrears of his penſion, and forbad him to remove his effects. They granted him ſome advantages; and promiſed to make him Socinus's Collegue at two years end. Socinus, who was at Siena, being informed of this, ſent word that he would not return to Piſa, if that promiſe was performed. This menace made ſuch an impreſſion, that they told our Philip he

(*a*) *Plura alia quæ provocatus perlepida dicteria, jocoſaque ſcommata inter diſputandum dicebat ſæpius excepto pro jucundis vulgo recitabantur.* Panzirolus, *de clar. Leg. Interpret.* pag. 301. *See alſo* Forſt. *Hiſt. Juris Civil.* lib. 3. cap. 39. pag. m. 533.

(*b*) *See* Forſterus, *Hiſt. Juris Civil.* lib. 3. cap. 39. pag. 534.

(*c*) About the year 1483.

[*D*] *He complained of the ſmallneſs of his Salary.*] This circumſtance is diſadvantageous to his memory: I own the blur would be greater, if the fault in queſtion did not appear frequently; but in ſhort, the multitude of mercenary Profeſſors, too ſelf-intereſted, and ſolliciting too eargerly for an augmentation of their Salary, does not wipe off the blame of his behaviour. However it be, our Philip, tho' loaded with glory, and honoured with the public approbation, was nevertheleſs uneaſy when he conſidered his penſion: he thought it too ſmall, and complained of it to the Curators of the Univerſity. One of them gave him very fair hopes; for, added he, I am very well perſuaded of your merit. I had rather, anſwered the Profeſſor, you ſhould have a bad opinion of me. And being aſked the reaſon of ſo extraordinary an anſwer, he replied, It is becauſe if you had a bad opinion of me, I ſhould hope for a better Salary by undeceiving you; but ſince my ſalary is very ſmall, while you eſteem me, I have no hopes left. The Latin of Panzirolus expreſſes this better; for which reaſon I ſhall tranſcribe it: "*Cum tenui ſtipendio ſe ali apud Gymnaſii "Præfectos quereretur, Alomanuſque Renutius inter illos "ſenior eum bono animo eſſe juſſiſſet, quod benè apud ſe "audiret, Philippus*, Mallem, *inquit*, ut ſiniſtram de "me opinionem haberetis. *Illis reſponſi novitatem "mirantibus, & rationem perquirentibus*, Si de me, "*reſpondit*, prava concepta eſſet opinio, detecto er"rore, amplius ſtipendium ſperare poſſem, ſed cum "benè audiens parvo adhuc digner honorario, nihil "mihi ſpei reliquum eſſe poteſt (11)." I have obſerved a thouſand and a thouſand times in the Lives of the Lawyers written by Panzirolus, that to raiſe the glory of the Profeſſors, he takes exact notice of the augmentation of their Salaries. This certainly is a proof that they were judged well qualified to make an Univerſity flouriſh; it is a ſign of their ſuperior parts therefore, and of their capacity. Self-love, always attentive on its own juſtification, and more ingenious in that reſpect than can be expreſſed, fails not to make uſe of this fair gloſs, and by that means to elude the reproaches of venality and avarice; but it cannot well ſhut the door againſt theſe two difficulties. One is, that theſe amplifications of Salaries are almoſt always the effect of the complaints and importunate ſollicitations of thoſe who are gratified therewith, or of their menaces to retire, in compliance with a more lucrative invitation (12). The other is, that theſe more lucrative invitations would not be addreſſed to people who were thought diſintereſted, and ſenſible of nothing but glory. Our Decius had not that ſenſibility, nor was it his character. He leaped like a roe-buck from place to place, from Univerſity to Univerſity, he went away, and he returned, according to the amount of the penſions which were promiſed him, and he would needs take notice himſelf in his Epitaph that his wages amounted at length to 1500 crowns of Gold. He was afraid the term *aureus* would not ſufficiently expreſs the largeneſs of the price which his Lectures had coſt; wherefore he added to it the barbarous words *in auro*. *Philippus Decius, revocatus in Italiam ab excelſa Florentinorum Rep. poſteaquam ſtipendium M. D. aureorum in auro pro lectura conſecutus fuiſſet, de morte cogitans, hoc ſepulchrum ſibi fabricari curavit* (13). i. e. "Philip Decius, being recalled into Italy by the Re"public of Florence, after he had obtained a Stipend "of 1500 crowns of gold for his Lectures, thinking "of death, cauſed this tomb to be made for himſelf." He intimates that he did not think of death till after he had attained this great penſion. *Titulo res digna ſepulchri*. A circumſtance fit to be inſcribed on a Tomb-ſtone. This Epitaph deſerves cenſure more on that account, than for the rudeneſs of the ſtyle (14). Let it not be ſaid that he refuſed the thouſand crowns of gold which the Senate of Milan, the city of Bologna, and the Republic of Venice, offered him, while he had but eight hundred at Piſa (15); for without doubt he refuſed them in hopes of being paid for that refuſal with intereſt: and we ſee, accordingly, that the Univerſy of Piſa augmented his Penſion, and made it much larger than any he could have got in other Univerſities. Take notice, by the way, that Mr. Wharton has offended a little againſt the laws of exactneſs, in ſaying that the Florentines recalled him into Italy by a penſion of 1500 crowns of gold (16).

(11) Idem, ibid. pag. 301.

(12) Compare this with what is ſaid in the Remark [*A*] of the Article ACCARISI (Francis); and in the Remark [*G*] of the Article ALCIAT (Andrew).

(13) Panzirolus, *de claris Legum Interpretibus*, pag. 309.

(14) It was turned to ridicule. *See* Paul. Jovius, *Elog.* pag. 208.

(15) *Demum Piſas cum DCCC. aureorum ſtipendio omnium ſupremus conductus eſt, ubi & à Mediolanenſi Senatu, & à Bononienſibus, Venetiſque mille aureorum annua promiſſione fruſtra ſolicitatus per multos annos perſeveravit, nec ad MD. aureorum honorarium pervenit.* Panzirolus, *de clar. Leg. Interpret.* pag. 308.

(16) Henricus Wharton, *in Appendice ad Hiſtoriam Literariam Gulielmi Cave*, pag. 202.

[*E*] *He had a mind to have a ſhare in the place of F. Accolti, and he had already obtained what he deſired.*] Some aſſert that he actually performed the functions of the place, and that it was not taken from him till after Socinus, grieved at the heart to ſee his School empty, had demanded either his own diſmiſſion, or that of Decius. *Bartholomæus Socinus Juris Cæſarei in eodem Gymnaſio Profeſſor cum ſe diſcipulis viduatum doleret, aut ſemetipſum aut Philippum munere ſuo dimitti petiit* (17). I find Panzirolus's account more probable, which is that Socinus demanded this as ſoon as he knew of the promiſe which had been made to our Philip, and before he could have obſerved that ſuch a concurrent was prejudicial to him.

(17) Idem, ibid. pag. 203.

he might retire if Socinus came to reſume his Profeſſorſhip. Accordingly, upon Socinus's return, he immediately retired to Siena, and was there Profeſſor of Canon Law, and afterwards of Civil Law. He took a Journey to Rome about the year 1490, and was appointed Auditor of the Rota by Innocent VIII. He conſecrated himſelf to the Eccleſiaſtical State, but having received the firſt Orders, he could proceed no farther by reaſon of his baſtardy. Some Authors have ſuppreſſed this obſtacle, and have rather choſen to ſay that out of complaiſance to his father, and his brother, and becauſe he was tired with repeating his Breviary every day, he left Rome and returned to Siena (*d*). He there ſaw himſelf expoſed to the envy of ſome other Profeſſors, which obliged him to go to Piſa, where he taught ſometimes the Canon Law, and ſometimes the Civil Law; not without a great many quarrels [*F*]. He was invited to Padua to fill the firſt Chair of Canon Law, in the year 1502. Lewis XII, looking on him as his ſubject, and deſigning to make him Profeſſor at Pavia, demanded him back from the Venetians, who after great oppoſition, ſubmitted at length to the King's pleaſure [*G*]. Decius arrived at Pavia towards the end of the year 1505, and there demonſtrated himſelf worthy of the earneſt deſire which Lewis XII had expreſſed to get him. Having done the duties of the Profeſſorſhip ſeven years, he obtained a ſalary of two thouſand livres, which was more than any Profeſſor had ever had in that Univerſity. The diſputes of France with the Court of Rome precipitated him into a thouſand misfortunes. Being conſulted by Lewis XII concerning the celebration of a Council, he gave his opinion that a ſmall number of Cardinals had a right to call one, and wrote a Book on that ſubject. In purſuance of this doctrine, a Council was held at Piſa, and he followed the Prelates of the French faction thither. This irritated Julius II to ſuch a degree, that he declared him excommunicate; which puniſhment was not, in all probability, ſo hard to bear, as the plundering of Decius's houſe when Pavia was taken [*H*]. Finding himſelf not ſafe in Italy, he retired into France, where he obtained the place of a Counſellor in the Parliament of Grenoble [*I*]. He went, by the King's order, to join the ſcattered remains of the Council of Piſa at

(*d*) *Alii ejus natales celantes rem aliter narrant. Cum Triſtanus pater, & Lancellotus frater factum non probarent, & ipſe in canonicis horis quotidie recitandis tædio afficeretur, relicta Roma, iterum ad Senenſes remeavit.* Panzirolus, *de claris Legum Interpretibus*, pag. 305.

[*F*] *He taught at Piſa . . . . . not without a great many quarrels.*] Socinus was not the only perſon who would not have him for an Antagoniſt, that is, who would not read his Lectures at the ſame hour that he did, and on the ſame ſubjects. It appears from the Work of Panzirolus, that in the Univerſities of Italy the Profeſſors were matched in that manner, and that thoſe who were ſo matched paſſed for the Rivals, the Antagoniſts, and the Competitors of each other. They were almoſt always at open war, and they heated themſelves ſometimes ſo furiouſly in the public Diſputations, that people went to them as to a combate of Gladiators. Our Decius had rendered himſelf ſo formidable that few Profeſſors would be matched with him. They complained of his abuſive language, and of the Artifices which he made uſe of to attract Auditors. *Ibi* (Piſis) *eum omnes concurrentem recuſare, hominem ut maledicum, maliſque artibus auditores captantem criminari* (18). Anthony Coccus had the courage to enter the liſts againſt him: the action was ſharp, and they plied one another with the loweſt ſcurrilities, and the moſt unworthy the gravity of their character: *Mox ad matutinam ejuſdem Juris* (Pontificii) *ſedem tranſlatus Antonium Coccum Florentinum ob veterem æmulationem durum adverſarium concurrentem invenit. In ea contentione ita ſe exagitarunt, ut nec fœdis ſcommatibus præter omnem gravitatem abſtinuerint* (19). Jaſon Mainus, being called to the Profeſſorſhip of the Civil Law, would not have Decius for his Antagoniſt: he repreſented that decency would not permit two Profeſſors who were natives of the ſame city to make war on one another. Whereupon it was ordered that our Philip ſhould return to profeſs the Canon Law (20). Mainus was not always ſo diſcreet: he had a terrible quarrel with Decius (21).

(18) Panzirolus, *de claris Legum Interpretibus*, pag. 305.

(19) Idem, ibid.

(20) *Ex eodem*, ibid.

(21) See the Remark [*F*] of the Article MAINUS.

[*G*] *Lewis XII . . . . demanded him back from the Venetians, who after great oppoſition ſubmitted to the King's pleaſure.*] The French Embaſſador inſiſted ſo ſtrenuouſly in the Senate of Venice to obtain Decius, that the Florentine Envoy could not help ſaying he would acquaint his maſters with it. He thought it a very remarkable ſingularity, that two ſuch powers ſhould diſpute for one man. *Ludovicus Gallorum Rex Decium, velut ſubjectum, Ticinum revocat, ſed Venetis eum dimittere recuſantibus, Regius Orator maximam in Senatu contentionem exercuit, quod admiratus Joannes Bernardi Oricellarius, qui ibi pro Florentinis Legatus aderat, ſe ingentem ob unum hominem inter Excelſos Principes ortam altercationem vidiſſe Florentinis relaturum dixit* (22). Hence we may refute a miſtake of Paul Jovius: he ſays that the French Governor cauſed our Decius to come from Piſa to Pavia (23). Mr. Wharton has committed the ſame fault (24).

(22) Panzirolus, *de claris Legum Interpretibus*, pag. 307.

[*H*] *They plundered the houſe of Decius when Pavia was taken.*] Pavia being taken, the Cardinal of Sion cauſed Decius's houſe to be pillaged; and his Library was ranſacked. They had even a mind to take that Profeſſor's daughter, who was then but ten years old, out of the Cloiſter of St. Andrew; but at the entreaty of the Nuns they left her there, having firſt ſtripped her of all ſhe had. That nothing might eſcape their vengeance, it was ordered that all Decius's effects ſhould be delivered up to the public (25). Paul Jovius tells us that the Cardinal of Sion did not ſuffer any houſe to be pillaged in Pavia except Philip Decius's (26). This happened in the year 1512. Forſterus, therefore, has been guilty of a groſs blunder; for having ſaid that this great Civilian complains that he was reduced to poverty and indigence, expelled his country, and unjuſtly ſtripped of his whole fortune, and had nothing left but hope, the ſole comfort of the miſerable; *ſe egenum, inopem, à patriâ ejectum, fortunis omnibus abſque ſua culpa ſpoliatum, præter ſpem (unicum miſerorum ſolatium) nihil habere*, he adds, *hæc autem perpeſſus eſt anno* 1498 (27), i. e. "theſe misfortunes he ſuffered in "the year 1498." Mr. Varillas ought to have mentioned this diſaſter, ſince he thought it incumbent on him to ſpeak of a leſſer. *Philip Decius*, ſays he (28), *was not exempt from the reſentment of Julius . . . . He had provoked the Court of Rome to the higheſt degree, by offering the Council of Piſa to digeſt the matters which they were to conſider of, and to furniſh the neceſſary Authorities to ſupport them. That Court was alſo afraid he would write in favour of the reſolutions which ſhould be there taken, and that his authority might make them approved wherever that was reſpected. All the thunders of the Church were fulminated againſt him; and he was put in ſuch a condition, that tho' he was univerſally beloved and eſteemed in Milan, where he ſo worthily filled the chair of the firſt Profeſſor of Civil Law, he durſt not ſtir out of his houſe but very ſeldom, and very well attended.* He is miſtaken in ſaying that Decius was Profeſſor of the Civil Law at Milan.

(23) *Ab ipſis Piſis ubi uxorem duxerat Ticinum à Gallo præſide opimis ſtipendiis evocatus.* Jovius, *Elogiorum*, pag. 207.

(24) Wharton, *in Append. ad Hiſt. Litterar. Guil. Cave*, pag. 202.

(25) Extracted from Panzirolus, *de claris Legum Interpret.* pag. 307, 308.

(26) *Unam omnium Decii domum militi diripiendam dedit.* Jovius, *Elogior.* pag. 207. Wharton, *in Append. ad Hiſt. Litterar. Guill. Cave*, pag. 302, ſays the ſame.

(27) Forſterus, *Hiſt. Juris Civilis*, pag. 505. He quotes the Epiſtle Dedicatory of *Decius's Counſels.*

(28) Varillas, *Hiſt. de Louis XII*, liv. 8. vers la fin, pag. m. 85. at the year 1512.

[*I*] *He obtained a Counſellor's place in the Parliament of Grenoble.*] This city does not belong to *Gallia Narbonenſis* as Panzirolus ſuppoſes. *In Narbonenſi Provincia*, ſays he (29), *Gratianopoli cum* CCL *aureorum honorario Senator eſt declaratus.* He does not mention the year: I do not know whether Mr. Allard fixes it right, when he ſays that Decius was honoured with that employment in the year 1514 (30); and I doubt of what Panzirolus ſays, that Decius was Profeſſor of the Civil

(29) Panzirolus, *de claris Legum Interpretibus*, pag. 308.

(30) Allard, *Bibliotb. de Dauphiné*, p. 87.

at Lyons; and afterwards he profeſſed the Civil Law in the Univerſity of Valence (*e*). After the death of Julius II. he was abſolved by Leo X, who offered him a Profeſſorſhip of Canon Law at Rome; but fearing to offend the King by accepting thoſe offers he refuſed them (*f*). After the death of Lewis XII, he was invited to Piſa, but Francis I would not permit him to go thither, and ſent him to profeſs the Canon Law at Pavia. He left that city, becauſe he was not paid his ſalary, and ſeeing Milan beſieged by the troops of the Emperor Maximilian, he returned to Piſa, where his Profeſſor's Salary amounted at firſt to 800 crowns of gold, and at laſt to 1500. He died at Siena, the 13th of October 1535, at the age of fourſcore and one, and was buried at Piſa, in the marble tomb which he had cauſed to be made for that purpoſe. He had a baſtard daughter, whom he greatly loved, and who was a very lewd woman [*K*]. His memory grew very ſhort the laſt years of his life (*g*) [*L*]. We have ſeveral Books of his writing: wherein, as has been obſerved, he tortured the Interpreters, and ſometimes made falſe quotations (*h*). His Commentaries on the Decretals are much eſteemed (*i*). We ſhall take notice of ſome miſtakes of Moreri [*M*].

(*e*) See the Remark [*I*].

(*f*) Mr. Doujat, *Præn. Canon.* pag. 617, has not rightly underſtood this; he ſuppoſes Decius accepted them.

(*g*) Extracted from Panzirolus, *de claris Legum Interpretibus*, lib. 2. cap. 135.

(*h*) Idem, ibid.

(*i*) Doujat. *Præ-not. Canon.* pag. 618.

Law at Valence, after he had been Counſellor in the Parliament of Grenoble. I ſhould rather believe that he was a Counſellor in that Parliament after having profeſſed Law in the Univerſity of Valence.

[*K*] *He had a baſtard daughter . . . who was a very lewd woman.*] It is ſaid that her irregularities were attended with imprudence: ſo that her father had the grief to be informed of them; but he feigned to be ignorant of the matter. This girl had not even the power to ſave appearances, but was ſeen to play and toy with boys in the ſtreets; which is not in Italy, as in ſome other places; an equivocal ſign of lewdneſs, but a convincing proof. Here is another diſorder: inſtead of getting money by her ill conduct, ſhe ſpent a great deal; for ſhe bought the favours of young men at a very dear rate. I ſhall cite Panzirolus. *Filiam naturalem in deliciis habuit, quæ citharam edocta, diſſimulante patre, minus honeſtam cum adoleſcentibus, quos magna etiam pecunia conducebat, vitam egiſſe dicitur, & cum illis in publico jocari non erubeſcebat* (31). Let us put Decius in the Catalogue which I have ſpoken of in another place (32). However, if we believe Paul Jovius (33), his only daughter was married to a Gentleman of Siena.

(31) Panzirol. *de claris Leg. Interpret.* pag. 308.

(32) In the Remark [*G*] of the article STILPO.

(33) Jovius, *Elogior.* pag. 207.

[*L*] *His memory grew very ſhort the laſt years of his life.*] It failed him when the degree of Doctor was to be conferred on Corraſius (34). Others ſay that he no longer remembred any paragraph, or any law, and that he could ſcarce ſpeak one word of Latin. *Sub finem vitæ adeo factus eſt oblivioſus, ut nullius Legis vel Paragraphi reminiſci, & vix Latine quid proloqui potuerit* (35). I have not found theſe words in the Author whom Freherus cites, but I have met with the whole fact a little more at large in a work of Corraſius himſelf. He ſpeaks thus (36): *Quin & noſtra hac ætate Philippus Decius, egregius Juriſconſultus, anno* 1536 (37) *(quo tempore me in Senenſi Academia Doctoratus titulo donavit) adeo ſenectute emarcuerat, ut nullius legis aut paragraphi ex jure noſtro recordaretur: imò ægre quicquam Latine proloqui poſſet. Quare quum mihi ipſa gradus inſignia conferre conaretur, alium quendam è collegis oportuerit prodire, qui verba ſolita nuncuparet.* i. e. "And in our own age Philip Decius, an excellent Civilian, in the year 1536 (at which time he conferred on me the degree of Doctor in the Univerſity of Siena) was ſo decayed by old age that he remembred no head or paragraph of our Law: nay, he could ſcarce ſpeak any Latin. For which reaſon when he ſtrove to confer the Degree on me, another of his Collegues was obliged to ſtep forth and pronounce the cuſtomary words."

(34) *Senio confectus memoriæ adeo infirmæ fuit, ut Joanni Corraſio inſignia Doctorum traditurus defecerit.* Panzirolus, *de claris Legum Interpretibus*, pag. 309.

(35) Freherus, *in Theatro*, pag. 814. He cites Forſterus, *in Hiſt. Juris Civilis Rom.* lib. 2. cap. 39.

(36) Joh. Corraſius, *Notis in Arreſtum Parlamenti Tholoſani*, pag. m. 71. I have not the French Edition; ſo I cite the Latin Verſion made by Hugh Sureau.

(57) *Panzirolus*, and all the other Biographers, place the death of *Decius* in the year 1535.

[*M*] *We ſhall take notice of ſome miſtakes of Moreri.*] I. Exactneſs does not ſuffer one to ſay that Decius lived in the beginning of the XVI Century; for he was born in the year 1454, and had acquired a great reputation before he was thirty years old. II. He ſtudied under his brother, firſt at Pavia, and afterwards at Piſa. Wherefore mention ſhould not have been made of Piſa only. III. *Jaſon, Bartholomew Socini, and Jerom Zanetini*, were not his maſters: he heard their public Lectures; but that is not what we mean when we ſay a perſon had ſuch and ſuch maſters. IV. I doubt whether he was married or not: Panzirolus ſays nothing of it, tho' he follows him ſtep by ſtep thro' the ſmalleſt circumſtances of his life, and expreſly makes him father of a natural daughter. This negative argument appears to me preferable in this caſe to the affirmation of Paul Jovius (38). V. Decius did not retire to Pavia; he was called thither by Lewis XII. VI. He did not go to Pavia when he left Piſa: for he was Profeſſor at Padua when Lewis XII ſent for him to Pavia. Paul Jovius has deceived a great many people in this particular: *ab ipſis Piſis*, ſays he (39), *ubi uxorem duxerat, Ticinum a Gallo Præſide, opimis ſtipendiis evocatus*; i. e. "Being invited from Piſa, "where he had married a wife, to Pavia, by the "French Governor, on an offer of a large ſtipend." VII. Being retired to France after the plundering of his houſe, he did not *ſtay two years at Bourges*, as Moreri aſſerts, after Paul Jovius (40). The ſilence of Panzirolus ſeems to me a demonſtration againſt this; and beſides, Chronology does not favour Moreri. He will have it that Decius, having ſtaid two years at Bourges, was called to Valence by Lewis XII, and honoured with the poſt of a Counſellor in the Parliament. This able Civilian's houſe was pillaged in the year 1512, and it is very probable he did not arrive in France till towards the end of the ſame year. Now Lewis XII died the firſt of January 1515. It is more reaſonable to believe thoſe who ſay that Decius on his arrival in the Kingdom was promoted to the place of Counſellor. Mr. Doujat is miſtaken in placing this under the year 1510 (41). VIII. Decius was not interred *at Pavia*, but at Piſa. IX. Inſtead of *nimis venuſtè*, in the Verſes of Latomus, it ſhould be read *minus venuſtè*.

(38) *Piſis ubi uxorem duxerat.* Jovius, *Elogior.* pag. 207.

(39) Jovius, ibid. Wharton, Freherus, *Theatr. Vir. ill.* pag. 814, ſay the ſame thing.

(40) *In civitate Biturigum jus divinum edocuit per duos ferme annos.* Jovius, *Elog.* pag. 207. Wharton, Freherus, &c. ſay the ſame.

(41) Doujat. *Prænotion. Canonicæ*, pag. 617.

Take notice of another fault of Paul Jovius. He ſays that Decius, being returned to Italy, entered into the ſervice of the Univerſity of Siena. It was into the ſervice of the Univerſity of Piſa. Take notice alſo of a miſtake of Mr. le Laboureur: he ſuppoſes that John James de Mêmes, Profeſſor of Law at Toulouſe, had Philip Decius for his Collegue (42). The latter never taught there.

(42) Le Laboureur, *Addit. aux Mémoir. de Caſteln.* tom. 2. pag. 835.

DEJOTARUS, one of the Tetrarchs of Galatia, gradually aggrandized himſelf in ſuch a manner that he encroached on almoſt all the rights of the other Tetrarchs, and obtained of the Roman Senate the title of King, and the leſſer Armenia (*a*). He was at laſt the ſole Tetrarch (*b*). He did the Romans conſiderable ſervices in all their wars in Aſia [*A*]; and not doubting but Pompey's cauſe was that of the Roman people, and that

(*a*) Hirtius, *de Bello Alexandr.* cap. 67.

(*b*) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 390.

[*A*] *He did the Romans conſiderable ſervices in all their Wars in Aſia.*] Cicero ſpeaks of them in a magnificent manner; here are his words (1): *Quid de patre* (Dejotaro) *dicam? cujus benevolentia in populum Romanum eſt ipſius æqualis ætati: qui non ſolum ſocius imperatorum noſtrorum fuit in bellis, verum etiam dux copiarum ſuarum. Quæ de illo viro Sulla, quæ Murena, quæ Servilius, quæ Lucullus, quam ornate, quam honorifice,*

(1) Philippica XI, cap. 13.

that Cæsar's party were the rebels, he declared for Pompey [B], and brought him a good body of forces. He was severely censured for it some time after, when Cæsar, returning from Egypt to encounter Pharnaces King of Pontus, approached Galatia. Dejotarus, in order to make him forget his attachment to Pompey, and to procure himself a support against the other Tetrarchs, had supplied him with large sums of money (c), and given the troops of Domitius Calvinus (d) quarter in his dominions. This was not unserviceable to him; for having received some sharp reprimands, he found favour with Cæsar [C]. He had asked him pardon, and to do it with more humility, he had put off the royal habit. Cæsar made him resume it, pardoned him what was past (e), and confirmed the title of King to him and his son (f); but took him along with him to the war against Pharnaces (g), and afterwards deprived him of Armenia and part of Galatia (h). Some time after Dejotarus had a very troublesome affair at Rome. He was accused there of an attempt on Cæsar's life: it was averred that when Cæsar lodged with Dejotarus, the latter had a design to kill him. Castor, the son of Dejotarus's son-in-law, carried on this accusation, and suborned the Physician (i) of his maternal grandfather, to give evidence against his master. Cicero pleaded the cause of the accused person (k), and succeeded admirably well; nevertheless, he did not carry the cause: Cæsar gave sentence on neither side [D], but chose to leave the matter undecided: those who assert the contrary

(c) Cicero, *Orat. pro Dejotaro*, cap. 5.

(d) He was Julius Cæsar's Lieutenant in Asia.

(e) Hirtius, *de Bello Alexandr.* cap. 68.

(f) Cicero, *Orat. pro Dejotaro*, cap. 3.

(g) Hirtius, *de Bello Alexandr.* cap. 68.

(b) Cicero, *de Divinat.* lib. 2. cap. 8, and 36. *and* Philipp. II, cap. 37.

(i) He was come to Rome with the Ambassadors of Dejotarus.

(k) *Vide* Orationem Ciceronis pro Rege Dejotaro, *passim.*

rifice, quam graviter sæpe in Senatu prædicaverunt? Quid de Cn. Pompeio loquar? qui unum Dejotarum in toto orbe terrarum ex animo amicum, vereque benevolum, unum fidelem populo R. judicavit. Fuimus imperatores ego, & M. Bibulus in propinquis, finitimisque provinciis: ab eodem rege adjuti sumus, & equitatu, & pedestribus copiis. i. e. "What shall I say of the father *(Dejotarus)*? whose affection to the Roman "people equals his age: who was not only the Ally "of our Generals in War, but also the leader of his "own forces. With what eloquence, with what honour, with what earnestness have Sylla, Murena, Servilius, and Lucullus, frequently extolled that man's "conduct in the Senate? What shall I say of Cn. "Pompeius? who judged Dejotarus to be of all mankind the most cordial friend, truly affectionate, and "faithful to the Roman People. My self and Bibulus "were at the head of an army in the provinces bordering on his dominions; and were assisted by the "same King with forces, both horse and foot." See also what he wrote while he commanded in Cilicia (2).

(2) Idem, Epist. 4. lib. 15. *ad Famil.*

[B] *Dejotarus declared for Pompey.*] Immediately after the Latin passage we have just now read, Cicero continues in this manner: *Secutum est hoc acerbissimum & calamitosissimum civile bellum: in quo quid faciendum Dejotaro? quid omnino rectius fuerit, dicere non est necesse, præsertim cum contra ac Dejotarus sensit, victoria belli judicârit. Quo in bello si fuit error, communis ei fuit cum Senatu: sin recta sententia, ne victa quidem caussa vituperanda est.* i. e. "Then followed that "most cruel and calamitous civil war: what did De"jotarus then? What was most right to be done, "needs not now be said, especially since the fortune of "war has decided contrary to the judgment of De"jotarus. In which war if he committed an error, "he erred with the Roman Senate: but if his opinion "was right, the cause must not be condemned though "it failed of success." These words inform us that Dejotarus thought Pompey would triumph: and therefore he had engaged in that party as much for political reasons as for reasons of justice. We shall see in the following remarks that he was always of opinion that he had declared for the right side, but he took care not to speak his thoughts before Cæsar.

[C] *Having received some sharp reprimands, he found favour with Cæsar.*] He asked pardon of Cæsar for having fought against him at the battle of Pharsalia; he represented to him the situation of his country, which made it impossible for him to be supported by Cæsar's troops: he added that it belonged not to him to judge of the differences of the Roman people; but to obey those who were possessed of the government on all occasions. To say the truth, these were false excuses; for he was strongly persuaded that the cause of Pompey was that of the Roman people, and that Cæsar was a rebellious subject. He did undertake to judge therefore of the differences of the Roman people. However we ought not to think it strange that he concealed his true thoughts; for there are hardly any but Saints of the first rank, or Philosophers who heartily despise all worldly things, who can act more ingenuously than he did. All his excuses were rejected: he was told that his imprudence was visible, and that he could not be ignorant that Cæsar was Master of Rome, that is to say, of the seat of the Senate, and the centre of the authority of the Roman people. Let this be said in favour of those who do not understand Latin; for those who do will be more pleased that I should quote the words of Hirtius. And here they are (3): *Cum propius Pontum finesque Gallogræciæ accessisset* (Cæsar), *Dejotarus, Tetrarches Gallogræciæ tunc quidem penè totius, quod ei neque legibus neque moribus concessum esse cæteri Tetrarchæ contendebant: sine dubio autem Rex Armeniæ minoris à Senatu appellatus, depositis Regiis insignibus, neque tantùm privato vestitu, sed etiam reorum habitu supplex ad Cæsarem venit oratum, ut sibi ignosceret, quòd in ea parte positus terrarum, quæ nulla præsidia Cæsaris habuisset, exercitibus imperiisque in Cn. Pompeii castris affuisset. Neque enim se debuisse judicem esse controversiarum populi Romani, sed parere præsentibus imperiis. Contra quem Cæsar, cum plurima sua commemorasset officia, quæ consul ei decretis publicis tribuisset, cumque defensionem ejus nullam posse excusationem imprudentiæ recipere coarguisset, quod homo tantæ prudentiæ ac diligentiæ scire potuisset quis urbem Italiamque teneret, ubi Senatus populusque Romanus, ubi Respublica esset, quis deinde post L. Lentulum & M. Marcellum consul esset: tamen se concedere id factum superioribus suis beneficiis, veteri hospitio & amicitiæ, ac dignitati ætatique hominis, precibus eorum qui frequentes concurrissent hospites atque amici Dejotari ad deprecandum. De controversiis Tetrarcharum postea se cogniturum esse dixit: regium vestitum ei restituit. Legionem autem unam, quam ex genere civium suorum Dejotarus natura disciplinaque nostra constitutam habebat, equitatumque omnem ad bellum gerendum adducere jussit.*

(3) Hirtius, *de Bello Alexandrino*, cap. 67.

(4) Abram. *in Cicer. Oration* tom. 2. pag. 467.

[D] *He was accused of an attempt on Cæsar's life... Cæsar gave sentence on neither side.*] On this occasion I can only cite Father Abram: *Videtur Cæsar*, says he (4), *sententiam distuliisse, dum ut statuerat primo quoque tempore proficisceretur in Orientem: certè non fuit absolutus ut constat è 2 Philippica.* i. e. "Cæsar seems "to have delayed giving sentence, till he should take "a journey into the East, as he designed speedily to "have done: it is certain he was not acquitted, as "appears from the second Philippic." I set down in the margin the words which he has quoted from the IId Philippic (5). They put me in mind of a thing I have observed elsewhere (6), which is that Advocates are very subject to contradict themselves, because they make use of the same fact, or the same reason, sometimes one way, and sometimes another, according as the causes which they have in hand require. When Cicero refuted the Accusers of Dejotarus, he said it was not at all probable that that Prince, who had lately received so many favours from Julius Cæsar, should contrive to kill him. *Quæ quidem à te in eam partem accepta sunt, C. Cæsar, ut eum amplissimo regis honore & nomine affeceris. Is igitur non modo à te periculo liberatus, sed etiam honore amplissimo ornatus arguitur domi te suæ interficere voluisse, quod tu, nisi eum furiosissimum judicas, suspicari profecto non potes. Ut enim omittam, cujus ..... tam inhumani & INGRATI animi à quo rex appellatus esset in eum tyrannum inveniri* (7). i. e. "Which "things, O Cæsar, were accepted by you so favour"ably,

(5) *Quis enim cuiquam inimicior quam Dejotaro Cæsar? ... à quo vivo nec præsens nec absens quisquam æqui bonive impetravit ... at ille nunquam (semper enim absenti affui Dejotaro) quicquam sibi quod nos pro illo postularemus, æquum dixit videri.* i. e. "For who was "ever a greater "enemy to another than "Cæsar was to "Dejotarus?... "from whom, "in his life-"time, he could "never obtain "any right or "justice, either "present or ab"sent... but he "never allowed "any thing to be "just in his opi"nion which "we asked on "the behalf of "Dejotarus, "with whom I "constantly "corresponded." Cicero, II Philipp. cap. 37.

(6) Above, in the Remarks [B] and [C] of the Article ANTONIUS (Marcus) *the* Orator.

A Contradiction of Cicero.

(7) Cicero *pro Dejotaro*, cap. 5.

trary are miſtaken [E]. Some months after he was aſſaſſinated. Dejotarus no ſooner received the news of it, than he retook all that Cæſar had diſpoſſeſſed him of (l). His great age did not hinder him from joining Brutus in Aſia (m), and by that ſtep he confirmed the proteſtations of his good intentions which had been made to the Senate (n). He was not ſo good-natured as his Orator repreſents him [F]: he put his daughter and his

(l) Cicero, Philipp. II.

(m) Dio, lib. 47. pag. 338.

(n) Cicero, Philipp. XI. cap. 3.

" ably, that you granted him the honourable title of " King. He, therefore, who had not only been by " you freed from danger, but even highly honoured, " is accuſed of a deſign to murder you in his own " houſe; which you cannot poſſibly ſuſpect, unleſs you " think him the greateſt madman in the world. For, " not to inſiſt that it would argue a moſt inhuman " and UNGRATEFUL mind, if he ſhould prove a ty- " rant with reſpect to him from whom he had " received the royal dignity &c." But when, ſome months after, he undertook to prove a Decree which had been publiſhed under the name of Julius Cæſar to be a forgery, he argued in this manner: This Decree is favourable to Dejotarus; therefore Cæſar, who was always an enemy to Dejotarus, and who never granted him either any favour or any juſtice, is not the author of it; and thereupon he particularly alledged all the hardſhips which Cæſar had put on Dejotarus even in the midſt of Galatia, that is when and where Dejotarus deſigned to deſtroy him, as his accuſers affirmed. *Compellarat hoſpitem præſens, computarat, pecuniam imperarat, in ejus tetrarchia unum ex Græcis comitibus ſuis collocarat: Armeniam abſtulerat à Senatu datam* (8). i. e. " He had ſent for his Hoſt, had made a calculation, " and had commanded him to furniſh a certain ſum " of money, and had alſo placed one of his Greek " Attendants in his Tetrarchy; and had taken Arme- " nia from him which had been given him by the Se- " nate." So that Cæſar's behaviour with regard to Dejotarus ſerved for an argument both *pro* and *con* in Cicero's hands. When it was neceſſary to prove that Dejotarus had great obligations to Cæſar, it was ſet forth as a beneficent behaviour; but when it was neceſſary to prove that Dejotarus had never any ſhare in Cæſar's friendſhip, it was repreſented as the very reverſe. What appeared in Cæſar's conduct favourable to Dejotarus ſerved for a proof againſt the Accuſers; and what appeared therein adverſe to that Prince, ſerved for evidence againſt Marc Antony. I would fain know what Cicero would have anſwered to one who ſhould have ſaid to him: *I am informed by your ſecond Philippic, that when Cæſar paſſed through Galatia, he treated Dejotarus very harſhly: it is probable therefore that Dejotarus, to revenge himſelf, conſpired againſt Cæſar: and conſequently you ought to ſtrike out of your Oration for Dejotarus the proof which you have made uſe of againſt his Accuſers, drawn from the gratitude which the great favours he had received from Julius Cæſar inſpired him with.*

(8) Idem, Philipp. II. cap. 37.

WHY Cæſar made no deciſion.

If the ſtratagems of Politicians were not well known, one would be amazed to ſee that Cæſar did not pronounce a ſentence of acquittal in the cauſe of Dejotarus; for to judge of the accuſation by the anſwer of the accuſed, never was a calumny more groſly invented than that of Dejotarus's Accuſers. Beſides that one of that King's Ambaſſadors offered Cæſar to go to priſon, and to anſwer for his Maſter's innocence body for body: *Hieras quidem cauſſam omnem ſuſcipit, & criminibus illis pro rege ſe ſupponit reum* (9). The moſt probable thing they ſaid, in my opinion, is that Dejotarus during the war of Africa was extremely inquiſitive after news from that country, and eager to hear bad news of Cæſar (10): it was of importance to him to ſtand no longer in fear of him; and nothing but that fear hindred him from taking poſſeſſion again of what he had loſt. Cæſar made no doubt of it; for which reaſon he was well pleaſed not to acquit him: he bridled him by that means, and encouraged ſpies and informers. It was his intereſt that the puniſhment of the calumny on this occaſion ſhould not free his enemies from the apprehenſion they might be in of being calumniated. This uneaſineſs is proper to be kept up, when a man is placed in ſuch a poſt as Cæſar's. What Cicero repreſented is very fine: if it be permitted to ſuborn domeſtics to give evidence againſt their maſters, and if thoſe falſe accuſers are not puniſhed, war is declared againſt all maſters of families, nobody can be ſafe in his own houſe, and by a ſtrange metamorphoſis maſters would be ſlaves to their ſervants, and ſervants would become their maſters tyrants. *Servum ſollicitare verbis, ſpe, præmiiſque corrumpere, abducere domum, contra dominum armare, hoc eſt non uni propinquo, ſed omnibus familiis bellum neſarium indicere. Nam iſta corruptela ſervi ſi non modo impunita fuerit, ſed etiam à tanta authoritate approbata, nulli parietes noſtram ſalutem, nullæ leges, nulla jura cuſtodient: ubi enim id quod intus eſt atque noſtrum impune evolare poteſt, contraque nos pugnare, fit in dominatu ſervitus, in ſervitute dominatus. O tempora, ô mores* (11). Cicero did not conſider that the terrible diſorder he repreſented will always be what tyrants and uſurpers ſeek. They would have us afraid leſt the walls and floors of our chambers ſhould ſtart up as witneſſes. Obſerve that at all times ſpies and informers have taken notice in what manner people diſcourſe about news. This was one of the crimes they objected to Dejotarus.

(9) Cicero, *pro Dejotaro, ſub fin.*

(10) *Reliqua pars accuſationis duplex fuit: una Regem ſemper in ſpeculis fuiſſe ... ſequutum eſt bellum Africanum, graves de te rumores qui etiam furioſum illum Cælium excitaverunt ... Eo, inquit, tempore ipſe Nicæam, Epheſumque mittebat qui rumores Africanos exciperent, & celeriter ad ſe referrent.* Cicero, *pro Dejotaro*, cap. 8.

(11) Cicero, *pro Dejotaro*, cap. 11.

[E] . . . . *They who aſſert the contrary are miſtaken.*] A Political Treatiſe printed in the year 1660, *wherein are ſhewn the reaſons of one of the Chambers of Accounts in France for ratifying the Letters of naturalization of Foreigners tho' Proteſtants*, contains theſe words (12): *If you had read thoſe Pamphlets, perhaps the opinion which you have brought with you from home would drop from you as eaſily as the papers of Condemnation againſt Dejotarus did from Cæſar, after he had heard the great Cicero ſpeak ſo eloquently and ſo forcibly in his defence.* One man is here taken for another; Dejotarus for Ligarius. See the Article of LIGARIUS, Remark [A].

(12) Folio 5 *verſo.*

[F] *He was not ſo good-natured as Cicero repreſents him.*] Dejotarus was reproached with having applied a Verſe to two pieces of news which he had received at the ſame time, the one good, and the other bad; one, that his friend Domitius had been ſhipwracked, and the other, that Cæſar was beſieged in a Caſtle. Cicero, to ſhew this was a calumny, ſaid, among other things, that Dejotarus was a good-natured man, and that the Verſe in queſtion is the moſt barbarous in the world. *Let our friends periſh, provided our enemies periſh likewiſe.* This is the ſenſe of that Verſe. *Quum eſſet ei nunciatum Domitium naufragio periiſſe, te in caſtello circumſideri, de Domitio dixit verſum Græcum eadem ſententia qua etiam nos habemus Latinum,* Pereant amici dum una inimici intercidant. *Quod ille ſi eſſet tibi inimiciſſimus nunquam tamen dixiſſet: ipſe enim manſuetus, verſus immanis* (13). Plutarch has repreſented Dejotarus under a quite different idea. According to Chryſippus, ſays he, God reſembles Dejotarus King of the Galatians, who having ſeveral children killed them all except him to whom he deſigned to leave his Kingdom. To underſtand this it is neceſſary to ſee ſomewhat at length what goes before and what follows. *As towns and cities, when they are too full of people, draw out or ſend colonies to diſtant places, and begin wars againſt ſome nation or other: So God,* according to Chryſippus, *ſends the beginnings of ſome mortality; and he cites for witneſſes Euripides and others, who ſay that the Trojan war was ſent by the Gods to exhauſt the too great multitude of the people. . . . Conſider how* Chryſippus *always aſcribes to God the faireſt names, and the moſt humane appellations in the world, but, on the contrary, ſavage, cruel, barbarous, and Galatian acts; for thoſe great mortalities and deſtructions of mankind, ſuch as were occaſioned by the Trojan war, or by the Median or Peloponneſian, do not properly reſemble the colonies which cities ſend forth, unleſs thoſe people know of ſome city founded and peopled under ground in hell. But Chryſippus makes God like to Dejotarus, King of Galatia, who having ſeveral children, and being deſirous of leaving his Dominions and Kingdom to one of them only, ſlew all the reſt himſelf; as if he had cut away and pruned the other branches of a vine, that the ſingle one which remained might become larger and ſtronger* (14), *tho' the vine-dreſſer does this when the branches are yet ſlender and weak. And we, to ſpare the bitch, while her puppies are yet too young to*

(13) Cicero, *pro Dejotaro*, cap. 9.

(14) Τῷ Γαλάτῃ Δηιοτάρῳ ποιῶ Χρύσιππος ὅμοιον τον Θεὸν, ὃς πλειόνων αὐτῷ παίδων γιγνότων, ἐνι βουλόμενος τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπολιπεῖν καὶ τὸν οἶκον, ἅπαντας ἐκείνους ἀπίσφαξεν, ὥσπερ ἀμπέλου βλαστοὺς ἀποτιμῶν καὶ κολούσας, ἵνα εἷς ὁ λειφθεὶς ἰσχυρὸς γένηται καὶ μέγας. *Dejotaro Galatæ ſimilem Deum Chryſippus facit. Qui cum haberet complures filios, cum vellet uni regnum domumque relinquere, cæteros omnes necavit: tanquam vitis palmites ſi præcideret, ut unus aliquis ſuperſtes, validus magnuſque fieret.* Plut. *de Stoic. Repugn.* pag. 1049. C.

his ſon-in-law to death, and demoliſhed the fortreſs where they lived. It is very likely that Caſtor eſcaped his hands [G], and that it was he who, in the year of Rome 714, obtained the territories which Dejotarus and Attalus left vacant in Galatia by their death. Dejotarus

to ſee, take ſeveral from her: whereas Jupiter not only ſuffers men to grow in ſtature and attain to perfect age, but having himſelf given them exiſtence, and forwarded their growth, plagues them afterwards by preparing for them occaſions of corruption and death, whereas he ought rather not to have given them any cauſes or principles of birth (15). Theſe words of Plutarch contain a compariſon which makes me recollect an impertinence of Vanini, which I have read in Father Garaſſe's *Doctrine Curieuſe*, page 815. "As for mankind, ſaid he, we ſhould do with them as Fellers "of Wood do yearly in large foreſts: they go and "view them, to diſcover the dead wood and the "green, and to thin the foreſt, cutting away whatever "is uſeleſs and ſuperfluous, or detrimental, to pre"ſerve only the fair trees, or young hopeful tillers. "In the ſame manner, ſaid this wicked Atheiſt, a "rigorous viſitation ſhould every year be made of all "the inhabitants of great and populous cities, and "thoſe who are uſeleſs, and hinder the reſt from "living, ſhould be put to death; ſuch as perſons "who have no trade or profeſſion uſeful to the pub"lic, decrepit old men, vagabonds and idle fellows: "nature ſhould be pruned, and cities thinned; and "a million of people ſhould be yearly put to death, "who are as briars and nettles to the reſt, and hin"der them from growing." The action which Plutarch imputes to Dejotarus does not ſeem very certain, when we compare it with the praiſes which Cicero has beſtowed on this King of Galatia, and the ſilence of his Accuſers with reſpect to ſuch a piece of cruelty. Would he have ventured to call Dejotarus a good father of a family, *optimus Pater familias* (16), if Caſtor his grandſon could have reproached him with the murder of his children? Would he have ventured to aſſert that his probity, known to all the world, was a full refutation of the calumny? *Hoc loco Dejotarum non tam ingenio & prudentia, quam fide & religione vitæ defendendum puto. Nota tibi eſt, C. Cæſar, hominis probitas, noti mores, nota conſtantia: cui porro, qui modo populi Romani nomen audivit, Dejotari probitas, integritas, gravitas, virtus, fides non ſit audita* (17)? i. e. "Here I think Dejotarus is to be defended not ſo "much from his capacity and prudence, as from "his ſincerity and integrity of life. You, O Cæſar, "are no ſtranger to the man's probity, his manners, or "his conſtancy: and who, that has ever heard the "name of the Roman people, has not heard of the "probity, integrity, gravity, virtue, and ſincerity of "Dejotarus?" Take particular notice, that at the time of the accuſation Dejotarus had but one Son. It is even true that he had no more than one when Cæſar lodged in his houſe (18). I may be told that Strabo (19) relates a thing which favours Plutarch; which is, that Dejotarus, having ſeized the capital city of his Son in Law Saocondarius, cauſed him to be maſſacred there, treated his daughter, the wife of Saocondarius, in the ſame manner, demoliſhed the fortreſs, and plundered moſt of the houſes. I anſwer, that this differs very much from the Relation of Plutarch. This was done, without doubt, in revenge of the horrid treaſon of that ſon-in-law, who, in all likelihood, had been the principal director of the accuſation of Dejotarus.

Let us obſerve, by the way, that the Capital of Saocondarius was called *Gorbeius:* but as Strabo a few pages before (20) calls the Capital of Saocondarius's grandſon *Morzeus*, it is probable thoſe names have been corrupted. This is Caſaubon's conjecture. The ſame may be conjectured concerning the Capital of Dejotarus; it was called *Blucium* (21) according to ſome Manuſcripts, and *Blubium* according to others. Who doubts but here is ſome fault, ſince Cicero (22) calls the Caſtle where Dejotarus was to receive Cæſar *Caſtellum Lucceium* (23)?

[G] *It is very probable that Caſtor eſcaped him.*] Caſtor was the promoter of the accuſation at Rome, where he ſuborned Dejotarus's Phyſician to give evidence againſt his maſter (24). Judge whether Dejotarus, who had not ſpared his daughter, would have ſpared ſuch a grandſon? We are to believe, therefore, that Caſtor did not fall into his hands. I do not know what became of the ſon of Dejotarus; but he did not ſucceed his father: he had obtained of the Senate (25), and afterwards of Cæſar (26), the title of King, and was to marry a daughter of Artavaſdes King of Armenia (27). Cicero praiſes him greatly (28). The ſucceſſor of Dejotarus was named Amyntas, if we may believe Strabo (29). Now this Amyntas had been Dejotarus's Secretary (30), and afterwards General of his troops in the army of Brutus, whoſe party he forſook (31), and went over to the camp of Antony. This, doubtleſs, was what obliged Antony to give him Pilidia in 714 (32), and Galatia, Lycaonia, and Pamphilia in 718 (33). Now ſince Dion aſſerts that in 714 the Triumvirs gave Caſtor the Dominions of Dejotarus deceaſed in Galatia, and thoſe of Attalus deceaſed in the ſame country (34), I am apt to believe that Strabo is miſtaken, when he makes Amyntas the immediate ſucceſſor of Dejotarus. I think we had better ſay, with Dion, that Caſtor ſucceeded Dejotarus, and afterwards we may make Amyntas the ſucceſſor of Caſtor. Tho' Father Noris proves by ſome examples that it is uſual with Dion to give the ſon the name of the father, he ſhall never perſuade me that this has happened with reſpect to Caſtor; and ſuppoſing it had ſo happened, yet Father Noris would nevertheleſs have committed a miſtake (35); for in that caſe Dion could not have taken Caſtor for Dejotarus, ſince Caſtor was not the ſon of Dejotarus, but only his daughter's ſon. Caſtor, who accuſed his grandfather at Rome of having attempted Cæſar's life, is in all probability the ſame perſon whom Dion has mentioned as the ſucceſſor of Dejotarus. As to Dejotarus Philadelphus King of Paphlagonia, the ſon of Caſtor (36), I own I know not whence to derive his extraction. I cannot tell whether his father be the ſame Caſtor who accuſed his grandfather; this may be: I only know that he forſook Marc Antony in the war of Actium to join Octavius (37), and that he was the laſt King of Paphlagonia (38).

I will not end this Remark without acquainting my Reader, that when I ſpoke of Saocondarius the ſon-in-law of Dejotarus, I took Strabo's words in a different ſenſe than they are commonly underſtood in. Τὸ τῦ Κάſτορ◦ βαſίλειον τῦ Σαωκονδαρίυ, ἐν ᾧ γαμβρὸς ὄν◦α τῦτον ἀπέφαξε Δηϊόταρ◦ς, καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα τὴν ἑαυτῦ. These are the words of Strabo (39): they may ſignify either, *The Capital of Caſtor Saocondarius, in which Dejotarus his father-in-law put him and his wife to death*; or, *The Capital of Caſtor the ſon of Saocondarius, in which the latter was put to death with his wife, by Dejotarus his father-in-law.* This laſt Tranſlation (40) ſeems to me preferable to the other, becauſe I am certain that Caſtor was the ſon of Dejotarus's daughter, and not knowing his father's name, I may as well call him Saocondarius as by any other name. Obſerve, by the way, an advantage our Tongue has over the Greek, which did not condemn ſuch a diſpoſition of words, whereby the ſame term might be taken as well for a man's ſurname, as for the name of his father.

Perhaps the authority of Suidas may be alledged againſt me, who has given the name of Caſtor to Dejotarus's ſon-in-law; but the authority of Suidas is of no weight here. He ſuppoſes Dejotarus was accuſed by his ſon-in-law before Cæſar. This is far from being exact. Cicero the Advocate of the accuſed perſon, and conſequently deſerving more credit than a hundred thouſand Suidas's, declares plainly and formally in ſeveral paſſages of his Oration, that Caſtor the grandſon of Dejotarus was the accuſer, and he ſpeaks but faintly, and in indirect terms, of the ſhare which the father of this Caſtor might have in the plot. I doubt not but the ſon had his father's approbation, and that Dejotarus made this the pretext for the barbarity with which he treated his ſon-in-law; but after all, exactneſs requires that we here follow the teſtimony of Cicero. Beſides, has not honeſt Suidas told us that Dejotarus was a Roman Senator? Is it not ſo groſs a piece of ignorance, that it makes him altogether unworthy of credit on this head? We ſhall ſee below whether Dejotarus's ſon-in-law was a man of learning, and the Author of ſeveral Books.

(15) Plut. *de Stoic. Repugn.* pag. 1049, C. of Amiot's Tranſlation.

(16) Cicero calls him ſo, *pro Dejotaro*, cap. 9.

(17) Idem, ibid. cap. 6.

(18) Ibid. cap. 3.

(19) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 391.

(20) Ibid. pag. 387.

(21) Ibid. pag. 390.

(22) *Pro Dejotaro*, cap. 7.

(23) Others read *Lucetium.*

(24) Cicero, *pro Dejotaro*, cap. 7.

(25) Idem, *ad Attic. Epiſt.* 17. lib. 5.

(26) Idem, *pro Dejotaro*, cap. 3.

(27) Idem, Epiſt. 21. *ad Attic.* lib. 5.

(28) Idem, Philipp. XI, cap. 8 & 36.

(29) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 390.

(30) Dio, lib. 49. pag. 469.

(31) Philipp. XI, *ubi ſupra.*

(32) Appian. *de Bello Civil.* lib. 5. pag. 715.

(33) Dio, lib. 49. pag. 469.

(34) Idem, lib. 48. pag. 430.

(35) *Poſt pugnam Philippenſem ſcribit Dio lib.* 48. Caſtori etiam cuidam Attali & Dejotari in Gallograecia defunctorum ditio tradita eſt *A. U.* 714. *debuit dicere* Dejotaro, *non* Caſtori. *Dio non ſemel filios alienos nomine videlicet patrum eorundem appellat.* i. e. "Dion writes "that after the "battle of Philippi *the dominions of Attalus and of Dejotarus who* "*died in Galatia were given* "*to one Caſtor*, in "the year of "Rome 714: "he ſhould have "ſaid *to Dejotarus*, not *to* "*Caſtor.* For "Dion more "than once "gives the fa"ther's name to "the ſon." Noris, *Cenotaph. Piſ.* pag. 209.

(36) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 387.

(37) Dio, lib. 1. pag. 488.

(38) Strabo, ibid.

(39) Lib. 12. pag. 391.

(40) Father Abram conſtantly follows it in his *Commentary on Cicero's Oration for Dejotarus.*

Dejotarus had another ſon-in-law, againſt whom he undertook a religious war [*H*]; for as he was the Patron of the Temple and Prieſts of the Goddeſs Cybele, he could not ſuffer Brogitarus his ſon-in-law to profane that ſacred place: he therefore armed againſt him, and drove him thence. He was infatuated with extreme ſuperſtition for auguries [*I*]; whereupon Cicero has made ſome very good reflections [*K*]. We cannot well diſcover at what time Brutus

[*H*] *He had a .... ſon-in-law, againſt whom he undertook a religious war.*] The abominable Clodius, having found a man in Phrygia ready to give a good ſum of money, on condition that he ſhould be inveſted with the High-prieſthood of Peſſinus, made him a grant of it. This man had married a daughter of Dejotarus, and was named Brogitarus. He was put in poſſeſſion of the Temple, and the Prieſts were expelled thence. But Dejotarus, full of zeal for the worſhip of Cybele, drove out the uſurper, who profaned all thoſe holy ceremonies. See how Cicero has diſplayed his eloquence on this occaſion. *Sed quid ego id admiror?* he addreſſes himſelf to Clodius (41), *qui accepta pecunia Peſſinuntem ipſum, ſedem, domiciliumque Matris Deorum vaſtaris, & Brogitaro* (42) *Gallo-græco impuro homini ac nefario totum illum locum fanumque vendideris: ſacerdotem ab ipſis aris pulvinaribuſque detraxeris: omnia illa quæ vetuſtas, quæ Perſæ, quæ Syri, quæ reges omnes, qui Europam Aſiamque tenuerunt, ſemper ſumma religione coluerunt, perverteris? quæ denique noſtri majores &c. Quod quum Dejotarus religione ſua caſtiſſimè tueretur, quem unum habemus in orbe terrarum fideliſſimum huic imperio atque amantiſſimum noſtri nominis, Brogitaro, ut ante dixi, addictum pecunia tradidiſti. .... Quum multa regia ſunt in Dejotaro, tum illa maxime, quod tibi nullum munus dedit: quod eam partem legis tuæ, quæ congruebat cum judicio Senatus, ut ipſe rex eſſet, non repudiavit: quod Peſſinuntem per ſcelus à te violatum, & ſacerdote ſacriſque ſpoliatum recuperavit, ut in priſtina religione ſervaret: quod ceremonias ab omni vetuſtate acceptas, à Brogitaro pollui non ſinit, mavultque generum ſuum munere tuo, quàm illud fanum antiquitate religionis carere.* i. e. "But why do I wonder at that? You, who for a ſum of money have given up to plunder Peſſinus itſelf, the ſeat and habitation of the Mother of the Gods, and have ſold the whole place and temple to an impure and wicked man, Brogitarus (42) the Galatian; who have dragged the Prieſt from the very altars; and have ſacrilegiouſly perverted all thoſe things which antiquity, and which the Perſians, Syrians, and all the Kings of Europe and Aſia, have always reſpected with the higheſt veneration? thoſe things, in ſhort, which our anceſtors &c. Which temple when Dejotarus, the moſt faithful friend on earth to this Empire, and the greateſt lover of the Roman name, religiouſly and zealouſly protected, you, as I ſaid before, delivered up to Brogitarus for money .... Tho' there are many royal qualities in Dejotarus, yet theſe things deſerve particular mention: that he never made you any preſent; that he did not reject that part of the Law propoſed by you which agreed with the judgment of the Senate, conſtituting him King: that he recovered Peſſinus which had been wickedly profaned by you, and deprived of its Prieſt and ſacred rites, to preſerve its ancient veneration; that he ſuffered not ceremonies which had been received from the utmoſt antiquity to be polluted by Brogitarus, and had rather his ſon-in-law ſhould reap no benefit from the bribe he gave you, than that Temple ſhould loſe the religious veneration which has been paid it for ſo many ages."

(41) Cicero, *Orat. de Haruſpicum reſponſis*, cap. 13.

(42) Add hereto this paſſage of the *Oration for Sextius*, cap. 26. *Lege tribunitia Matris Magnæ Peſſinuntius ille ſacerdos expulſus, & ſpoliatus ſacerdotio eſt; fanumque ſanctiſſimarum, atque antiquiſſimarum religionum venditum pecunia grandi Brogitaro, impuro homini, atque indigno illa religione, præſertim cum ea ſibi ille non colendi, ſed violandi cauſſa appetiviſſet.* i. e. "By the Tribunitian Law the Prieſt of Cybele at Peſſinus was expelled, and deprived of his office; and that moſt holy and ancient Temple was ſold for a large ſum to Brogitarus, an impure wretch, and unworthy of ſo ſacred a character, eſpecially as he had ſought it not for the ſake of religion, but of plunder."

[*I*] Dejotarus *was infatuated with extreme ſuperſtition for Auguries.*] He undertook nothing without conſulting the flight of birds, and he was ſo entirely guided by that ſort of auſpices, that he ſometimes diſcontinued his journeys, and returned home, after he had made ſeveral days march. He had no other reaſons to act in that manner, than the preſages which he met with by the way. The flight of an Eagle was once the occaſion of his interrupting a journey, and it was very lucky for him; for if he had proceeded, he would have been cruſhed under the ruins of the chamber which was deſigned him, and which fell the night following. As he was very expert in theſe matters, he was his own Prophet, and his own Soothſayer. He had not forgotten to furniſh himſelf with the moſt neceſſary qualification of the profeſſion; that is, never to be at a ſtand, never to confeſs himſelf miſtaken, and to have always ſome ſubterfuge in reſerve. He found out one full of morality when he had loſt the greateſt part of his dominions, and a great ſum of money, for having born arms againſt Cæſar: he led his troops to Pompey: the march was long, and he never met with any other than good omens by the way; for which reaſon he flattered himſelf that Cæſar would be defeated. But things put on quite another face. Cæſar was victorious, and made Dejotarus feel his reſentment in a very diſagreeable manner. What did Dejotarus? Had he ſincerity enough to acknowledge that his ſcience was deceitful? Did he ſhew any regret, any repentance for his exceſſive credulity? Not at all: he entrenched himſelf behind the fineſt Maxims of Morality; he ſaid that the auguries which had inclined him to purſue his march to Pompey's camp, were in reality good omens, ſince under their direction he had followed the ſide of juſtice. It is true, it coſt him the greateſt part of his dominions; but, ſaid he, the glory of having performed my duty is more dear to me than all the riches of the earth. Leſt I ſhould be ſuſpected of having adulterated this paſſage of Cicero, I ſhall ſet it down at length in the margin (43). Note, that this man, who ſo religiouſly revered the orders of providence with reſpect to the doctrine of auguries, made no difficulty of uſurping the dominions of his neighbours, or of putting his ſon-in-law and his daughter to death for quarrels which had been, without doubt, kindled by ambition. In all probability he would not have given his father better quarter, had he been his competitor.

[*K*] ... *Whereupon Cicero has made ſome very good reflections.*] He obſerves that the principles of the Romans in the ſcience of Auguries was ſtrangely different from thoſe of Dejotarus, and that in ſome things the oppoſition was ſo great as to be directly contrary. This obſervation makes very ſtrongly againſt the doctrine of Preſages; for ſince there is none but God who knows what will happen, it is God alone who ſends them. Now God does not contradict himſelf, he does not make uſe of the ſame things to foreſhew good and evil. *Solebat ex me Dejotarus percontari noſtri augurii diſciplinam, & ego ex illo ſui. O dii immortales quantum differebat, ut quædam eſſent etiam contraria* (44)! i. e. "Dejotarus uſed to aſk me concerning the doctrine of our Augury, and I him concerning his. Good Gods! how widely did they differ, ſo that in ſome reſpects they were even directly contrary." Here is a conſideration of more weight. What could Dejotarus ſay more frivolous, than to maintain that he did not repent his having followed the Auſpices which heaven had preſented, while he was marching to join Pompey; that he did not repent it, I ſay, becauſe he had always preferred glory before the poſſeſſion of a Kingdom? What is this to the Auſpices? Did you not know before they were preſented to you, what you owed to the friendſhip of the Roman People; what fidelity, what juſtice required of you? Was you not fully perſuaded that glory, honour, and virtue are preferable to a crown? It was not therefore to teach you theſe truths that a Crow cawed on your way: you knew them as well before as you do at preſent. Auguries do not teach moral Doctrines, but good or bad events: if they promiſed you good ſucceſs, they deceived you; you fled with Pompey, and have been ſtripped of your dominions by the conqueror. *Nam illud admodum ridiculum, quod negas Dejotarum, auſpiciorum quæ ſibi ad Pompejum proficiſcenti facta ſunt, non pœnitere, quod fidem ſecutus, amicitiamque Po. Ro. functus ſit officio. Antiquiorem enim ſibi fuiſſe laudem & gloriam quàm regnum & poſſeſſiones ſuas. Credo id quidem, ſed hoc nihil ad auſpicia. Nec enim ei cornix canere*

(43) *Quid ego hoſpitem noſtrum clariſſimum atque optimum virum Dejotarum commemorem, qui nihil unquam niſi auſpicato gerit? qui quum ex itinere quodam propoſito, & conſtituto revertiſſet, aquilæ admonitus volatu, conclave illud ubi erat manſurus ſi ire perrexiſſet, proxima nocte corruit. Itaque ut ex ipſo audiebam, perſæpe revertit ex itinere, quum jam progreſſus eſſet multorum dierum viam. Cujus quidem hoc præclariſſimum eſt, quod poſtea quàm à Cæſare tetrarchiæ regna, pecuniaque mulctatus eſt, negat, ſe tamen eorum auſpiciorum, quæ ſibi ad Pompeium proficiſcenti, ſecunda evenerunt, pœnitere. Senatus enim auctoritatem, & P. R. libertatem atque imperii dignitatem, ſuis armis eſſe defenſam, ſibique eas aves, quibus auctoribus officium, & fidem ſecutus eſſet, bene conſuluiſſe: antiquiorem enim ſibi ſuiſſe poſſeſſionibus ſuis gloriam.* Cicero, *de Divinat.* lib. 1. cap. 15.

(44) Idem, ibid. lib. 2. cap. 8, & 26.

Brutus pleaded the cauſe of Dejotarus ſo ſtrenuouſly before Cæſar [*L*]. If the women of the Old Teſtament might be compared with thoſe of Paganiſm, Sarah the wife of Abraham might be put in parallel with Stratonice the wife of Dejotarus [*M*]. That Prince returned a ſmart anſwer to Craſſus's raillery about his old age [*N*]. Moreri has given but a very ſhort Article of Dejotarus: yet he had abundance of matter, and nothing to do but to collect it. His conciſeneſs has not prevented his falling into groſs miſtakes [*O*]. I ſhall

nere poterat recte eum facere, quod Po. Ro. libertatem defendere pararet: ipſe hoc ſentiebat ſicuti ſenſit. Aves eventus ſignificant aut adverſos, aut ſecundos. Virtutis auſpiciis video eſſe uſum Dejotarum, quæ vetat ſpectare fortunam, dum præſtetur fides. Aves vero ſi proſperos eventus oſtenderunt, certe fefellerunt. Fugit è prælio cum Pompejo, grave tempus: diſceſſit ab eo, luctuoſa res: Cæſarem eodem tempore & hoſtem & hoſpitem vidit, &c (45). It is moſt certain that Dejotarus had not examined the Auſpices to learn whether, by joining Pompey, he ſhould embrace the good cauſe, but to learn whether his journey ſhould be attended with proſperous ſucceſs. He conſulted and ſtudied the Auguries only to know whether he acted prudently: he was already well ſatisfied that he acted juſtly; for ſince he remained firmly perſuaded that Pompey's ſide was that of juſtice, after he had ſeen the entire ruin of the Republican party, he was far from doubting it while Pompey's affairs were in a flouriſhing condition. It was inſincerity, therefore, and a falſe ſhame, which made him have recourſe to this evaſion; the omens have not deceived me, becauſe I had rather act like a man of probity and honour, than gain a Kingdom. This brings to my mind a ſubterfuge very common with thoſe who during religious Wars preach to their people that God promiſes them good ſucceſs, that all preſages are favourable &c. it frequently happens that all theſe fine promiſes are followed by the loſs of a battle. The Preacher is not diſconcerted at it; but finds out a hundred admirable ſhifts: if we had conquered, we ſhould have relied too much on the arm of fleſh, we ſhould have aſcribed too much to our own conduct: a defeat teaches us that we were not humble enough; the finger of God will be hereafter more viſible: ſo at the bottom the preſages were fortunate, ſince the victory will become fatal to the conqueror, and the vaniſhed party will the better learn to put their truſt in him who is the rock of all ages.

(45) Ibid.

(46) Cicero, *in Bruto*, cap. 5.

(47) *See* Fabricius, in the *Life of Cicero*, ad ann. 707.

(48) *De* (Bruto) *Cæſarem ſolitum dicere, magni refert hic quid velit: ſed quidquid volt, valde volt, idque animadverti-ſe cum pro Dejotaro Niceæ dixerit, valde vehementer eum viſum & libere dicere.* i. e. "Cæſar uſed "to ſay of Brutus, it is of "great conſequence what "affair he eſpouſes; for "whatever he "undertakes he "earneſtly proſecutes; and "this he took "notice of when "he pleaded for "Dejotarus at "Nice, it ſeeming to him that "he ſpoke with "great vehemence and "freedom." Cicero, *ad Atticum Epiſt.* 1. lib. 14.

(49) Plutarch. *in Bruto*, pag. 986.

(50) Her name was Electra.

her own, and brought them up tenderly and magnificently (51). Plutarch in another place gives the wife of Dejotarus the name of Berenice, Βερενίκη. He ſays one thing of her which the Sceptics make uſe of. He ſays that a Woman of Lacedæmon approaching Berenice, it fell out that thoſe two women turned away their heads from each other immediately and at the ſame time; Berenice, becauſe ſhe could not endure the ſmell of butter; and the other, becauſe ſhe could not bear the ſmell of perfumes. Πρὸς δὲ Βερενίκην τὴν Δημοτάρου τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων τινὲς γυναικῶν ἀφικέσθαι λέγουσιν· ὡς δὲ ἰσχὺς ἀλλήλων προσῆλθεν, ἐυθὺς ἀποστραφῆναι, τὴν μὲν τὸ μύρον, ὡς ἔοικε, τὴν δὲ τὸ βούτυρον δυσχεράνασαν. *Et ferunt Spartanam quandam mulierem acceſſiſſe Berenicem Dejotari uxorem, cumque invicem appropinquaſſent, averſas fuiſſe, quod unguentum altera, altera butyrum olfaciens averſaretur* (52). The Greek termination of Stratonice and Berenice perhaps confounded Plutarch's ideas, and might occaſion his giving the ſame Queen ſometimes the former name, and ſometimes the latter. Perhaps alſo Dejotarus had two Wives, one named Stratonice, and the other Berenice.

(51) Taken from Plutarch in his Treatiſe *de Virtutibus Mulierum*, pag. 258.

(52) Plut. *adverſus Colotem*, pag. 1109, B.

(53) Idem, *in Vita Craſſi*, pag. 553.

(54) Cicero, *pro Dejotaro*, cap. 10.

(55) See the 4th Letter of the 15th Book *ad Familiares*, and the *Oration pro Dejot.* cap. 13.

(56) Epiſt. 17. and 18. lib. 5. *ad Atticum.*

(57) Plut. *in Catone minore*, pag. 765. E. He makes uſe of the plural number παῖδας.

[*N*] *He returned a ſmart anſwer to Craſſus's raillery on his old age.*] That Roman General paſſed thro' Galatia, in his expedition againſt the Parthians, and there found *King Dejotarus who was very old, and yet was building a new city. Upon which he ſaid to him, by way of raillery, Methinks, Sir, you begin to build very late, ſince you ſet about it the laſt hour of the day. The King of Galatia anſwered him immediately, And you, O General, are not ſet out very early on your expedition againſt the Parthians. For Craſſus was then above threeſcore years old, and his face ſpoke him yet older than he was* (53). Dejotarus muſt have been then very old; for Cicero ſpeaking of a time very near it, ſays they uſed to wonder that Prince had the ſtrength to fit faſt on horſeback, after ſeveral perſons had liſted him on. *Dejotarum quum plures in equum ſuſtuliſſent, quod hærere in eo ſenex poſſet admirari ſolebamus* (54). It was when Cicero commanded in Cilicia, in the year 702. Craſſus had been defeated two years before. Cicero contracted a very ſtrict friendſhip with King Dejotarus while he was in Cilicia, and received all manner of aſſiſtance from him (55). He gave his ſon and his nephew to Dejotarus the ſon, who took them with him into Galatia (56). I have another proof of the old age of Dejotarus. He was already far advanced in years when Pompey made war on Mithridates. He recommended his children and family to Cato of Utica (57). We have ſeen above (58) that he had but one ſon at the time of the War againſt Pharnaces.

(58) In the Remark [*F*], Citation (18).

(59) *Animadv. in Euſeb.* pag. 16 and 56.

(60) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* pag. 159.

(61) *In Indice Autorum Plinij.*

(62) *In Apion.* lib. 2.

(63) *Biblioth.* lib. 2. pag. m. 75.

(64) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* pag. 132.

[*O*] *Moreri has committed ſome groſs miſtakes.*] It is not true, as he aſſerts, I, that Dejotarus *was accuſed of having put his daughter and his ſon-in-law Caſtor to death:* II, And that this *was the occaſion on which Cicero pronounced that admirable Oration in his defence, which is ſtill extant.* The true ſubject of the Accuſation and the Defence may be ſeen in the Text of this Article. III, There is very little probability that *Caſtor the Hiſtorian* was the ſon of Dejotarus's ſon-in-law. Why then does Moreri aſſert this as a certain fact?

Whether Caſtor, the Author of ſeveral Books, was the ſon-in-law of Dejotarus.

Scaliger (59), Voſſius (60), Father Hardouïn (61), and ſeveral other great men, think that Caſtor ſurnamed the Chronographer by Joſephus (62) is the ſon-in-law of Dejotarus. Three reaſons hinder me from coming into their opinion. The firſt is, that this Caſtor, as they confeſs, wrote a Book which was intitled Χρονικὰ ἀγνοήματα, *Chronological ignorances*. Now this Work has been cited by Apollodorus (63), who flouriſhed under Ptolemy Euergetes the ſecond of that name (64): therefore Caſtor muſt have flouriſhed in the ſame reign at the lateſt. How then could he be the ſon-in-law of Dejotarus? for that ſon-in-law was yet alive when Cicero pleaded for Dejotarus (65), that is to ſay, in the year of Rome 709, or thereabouts. Could a man who

(65) Cicero, *pro Dejot.* cap. 10; *where, addreſſing himſelf to Caſtor, he plainly inſinuates that his father was an accomplice in the accuſation. A little before he had ſaid that Caſtor, after the battle of Pharſalia, continued on Pompey's ſide, to pleaſe his father. You will ſee this in the following Citation.*

I ſhall take notice of them below in the laſt Remark.

who flouriſhed in the reign of Euergetes, which reached from the year of Rome 608 to the year 636, be yet living in the year 709? I draw my ſecond reaſon from Caſtor the Chronographer's having compoſed a great many Books, on ſubjects which required a man's whole time. Such an Author as he muſt have ſtudied prodigiouſly, and have done ſcarce any thing elſe. This does not at all ſuit the ſon-in-law of Dejotarus. He is ſpoken of as a man who was very active and zealous on Pompey's ſide, ſo that his ſon, out of complaiſance to him, would not diſarm after the defeat of Pharſalia, whatever pains Cicero took to perſuade him to it. *Hic vero adoleſcens . . . cum in illo noſtro exercitu equitaret cum ſuis delectis equitibus, quos una cum eo ad Pompejum pater miſerat, quos concurſus facere ſolebat? quam ſe jactare? quam ſe oſtentare? quam nemini in illa cauſſa ſtudio & cupiditate concedere? Cum vero, exercitu amiſſo, ego, qui pacis auctor ſemper, poſt Pharſalicum prælium ſuaſor fuiſſem armorum non deponendorum, ſed abjiciendorum, hunc ad meam auctoritatem non potui adducere, quod & ipſe ardebat ſtudio ipſius belli, & patri ſatisfaciendum eſſe arbitrabatur* (66). That is, "This young man . . . . when he rode in our army "with his choſen horſe which his father had ſent with "him to Pompey, what excurſions did he uſe to make? "how did he beſtir himſelf? what ardour did he ex"preſs? yielding to none in affection and zeal for the "cauſe. When the army was loſt, I, who am al"ways for promoting peace, and, after the battle of "Pharſalia, perſuaded them not only to lay down "their arms, but to caſt them away, could "not prevail on him to take my advice, becauſe "he was eagerly bent on the war himſelf, and "thought it his duty to anſwer his father's ex"pectation." Add to this that Cicero in his Defence of Dejotarus does not ſay one word which inſinuates that the ſon-in-law of that Prince was a learned man. He could not well have been ſo perfectly ſilent in the matter, if that ſon-in-law had been as illuſtrious by his Writings as Caſtor the Chronographer was. I may be told that this ſilence is one of Cicero's rhetorical artifices: he was afraid leſt the learning of the father might be a favourable preſumption in behalf of the ſon who was the Accuſer of Dejotarus; but this objection is of no force. Cicero might have aggravated the fault of the ſon a hundred ways, and even the fault of the father, on account of the learning of the latter. It may be replied, that perhaps the ſon in law of Dejotarus had not yet publiſhed his Books. But how comes it then, that he is quoted by Apollodorus? and when did he publiſh them? Did not Dejotarus, who lived not above three or four years at moſt after his cauſe was heard at Rome, put him to death (67)? Beſides this, I obſerve that Cicero takes it for granted that the Son in Law of Dejotarus was not known in the world, but by the honour Dejotarus did him to give him his daughter in marriage; before that he crawled in obſcurity. One would not ſpeak thus of a great Author. The enormous, the prodigious diſtance there is between him and Sovereign Princes, is no reaſon to ſay he is unknown, or lives in obſcurity; and nothing would ſooner perſuade me that he had acquired a very great reputation, than to ſee a Prince make choice of him for his Son in Law. I believe, therefore, that if the learned Caſtor had married the daughter of Dejotarus, he would have attained that honour by the luſtre of his Learning; and conſequently that Cicero would not have ventured to ſay what he has ſaid of him: *Rex Dejotarus veſtram familiam abjectam & obſcuram de tenebris in lucem vocavit: quis tuum patrem antea qui eſſet, quam cujus gener eſſet, audivit* (68)? i. e. "King Dejotarus called forth your family, "which was abject and obſcure, from darkneſs to "light: who ever heard of your father, till he heard "whoſe ſon in law he had the honour to be?" My third reaſon is, that tho' ſeveral ancient Writers have cited Caſtor, not one of them gives him the quality of the Son in Law of Dejotarus. Yet, qualities of this ſort are ſeldom omitted; for as they are very rare among Authors, and the luſtre which they communicate to him who poſſeſſes them reflects, in ſome degree, on the whole Republic of Letters, a Writer takes a pleaſure in ſaying, when he can ſay it, that the Author whom he quotes is Son or Son in Law to a King. If ever this rare circumſtance ought to be remembred, it is when the King who is the father in law has been ſo well known to learned men, as Dejotarus has been ſince the pronouncing of Cicero's Oration: whence ſhould it happen, therefore, that the ſon in law of Dejotarus ſhould never be mentioned under that title? Varro (69), Joſephus, Plutarch, Juſtin Martyr, Tatian, Euſebius, S. Cyril, Auſonius, and Stephanus Byzantinus, have quoted Caſtor, and none of them has thought fit to call him the ſon in law of Dejotarus. If I am not deceived there is none but Suidas who has done it. But who is there who knows not the prodigious confuſion of his Dictionary? Almoſt every thing is found there by bits and ſcraps: how often does he ſeparate what ought to be united, and join what ought to be ſeparated? We have already ſeen that Suidas took Dejotarus for a Roman Senator.

What I have ſaid concerning the continual application with which Caſtor muſt have ſtudied, will appear very probable to all thoſe who weigh the nature of his Works. It appears that he laboured to reform Chronology, and to point out the miſtakes of the ancient Hiſtorians. He is cited (70) in relation to the Kingdoms of Sicyon, Argos, and Athens, and in relation to the Aſſyrian Monarchy. He had written a Work concerning the city of Babylon; and concerning the nations which had been ſucceſſively maſters of the ſea (71). He had compoſed a Treatiſe of the Nile; and another wherein he compared the Roman cuſtoms with thoſe of the Sect of Pythagoras (72). I do not ſpeak of the Rhetorical Works which Suidas attributes to him; for perhaps they belong to another Caſtor. All who are able to judge of theſe things will readily acknowledge, that of all the productions of the pen, there are none which demand more time, more application, and more patience, than thoſe wherein it is propoſed to rectify Chronology, and to criticize Hiſtorians. This is what Caſtor employed himſelf in: witneſs his *Errata* of the Chronologers, Χρονικὰ ἀγνοήματα, and the Book hinted at by Auſonius (73).

Nothing has ſurprized me more, than to ſee that the Antonius Castor of Pliny has been confounded with the Son in Law of Dejotarus. This is what Father Hardouïn has done (74), not conſidering that Antonius Caſtor lived in Pliny's time, and to above a hundred years of age. He was an excellent Botaniſt, who cultivated in his garden a great number of plants, and diſcourſed of them learnedly. He had never been ſick, and having lived above a Century, he had his memory ſtill good, and his body very vigorous. Pliny had ſeen this garden, and received great light from our Botaniſt. *Nobis certe, exceptis admodum paucis, contigit reliquas contemplari ſcientia Antonii Caſtoris, cui ſumma auctoritas erat in ea arte noſtro ævo, viſendo hortulo ejus, in quo plurimas alebat; centeſimum ætatis annum excedens, nullum corporis malum expertus, ac ne ætate quidem memoria aut vigore concuſſis* (75). Can this be applied to the ſon in law of Dejotarus? Was he not killed with his wife by his father in law before the year of Rome 714, above fifty years before Pliny was born (76)? When Father Hardouïn, grounding himſelf on a paſſage of Pliny, conjectures that Antonius Caſtor compoſed ſome Volumes concerning Plants, he is much more in the right: yet, it may be Pliny's Words (77) ſignify only that Caſtor had ſhewn the plant in queſtion in his garden, or had made a deſcription of it to the curious who went to ſee him. What keeps me in ſuſpence as to the Conjecture of this able Commentator is, that methinks if Caſtor had publiſhed Books of Botany, Pliny would have hinted ſomething of it when he mentions the garden, and the learning of the ſame perſon (78). However it be, Father Hardouïn has gueſſed better than Voſſius: he applies the paſſage of the XXth Book of Pliny to Antonius Caſtor; but Voſſius has underſtood it of Caſtor the Chronographer cited by Apollodorus.

(66) Cicero, *pro Dejotaro*, ibid.

(67) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 391.

(68) Cicero, *pro Dejot.* cap. 11.

(69) *In Libris de vita Populi Romani.* You may find in Voſſius *de Hiſt. Græcis*, pag. 158, 159, in what places the other Authors whom I name cite *Caſtor*.

(70) Euſebius, *in Chron.*

(71) Περὶ θαλάσσης κρατούντων.

(72) Plutarch quotes it in *Quæſtion. Roman.*

(73) *Quod Caſtor cunctis de Regibus ambiguis.* Auſonius, *in Profeſſor. Burdig.* Epigr. 23. ver. 7.

(74) *In Indice Autorum Plinii.*

(75) Pliniue, lib. 25. cap. 2. Moreri quotes the 1ſt Chapter of the 15th Book.

(76) He was born in the year of Rome 774, and died at the age of about 56, in the year 831.

(77) They are at the beginning of the 17th Chapter of the 20th Book.

(78) In the 2d Chapter of the 25th Book.

DELLIUS (QUINTUS), a Greek Hiſtorian. Plutarch ſpeaks of him twice: I, When he relates that Marc Antony ſent to ſignify to Cleopatra that ſhe ſhould come

to

to him in Cilicia to juſtify her conduct (a); for ſhe was accuſed of having ſupplied Brutus and Caſſius with ſuccours: II, When he mentions the diſgrace of ſome faithful ſervants of Marc Antony (b). The firſt paſſage informs us that Dellius was ſent to Cleopatra to acquaint her with the order for her to come to Cilicia: the ſecond lets us know that Dellius retired from Marc Antony's Court, on the notice which had been given him that Cleopatra deſigned to get him killed. On the firſt occaſion, Plutarch makes him act in a very cunning manner [A]; and on the ſecond repreſents him as guilty of a great indiſcretion [B], with regard to what men call good fortune in matters of gallantry. It is in this laſt paſſage we learn that Dellius was an Hiſtorian [C], and that he acquainted the public with the reaſon why he retired from the Court of Marc Antony. He did it in a circumſtance of time very favourable to Auguſtus. It was a little before the battle of Actium; and he was both well informed of the deſigns of Marc Antony, and very capable of acquainting Auguſtus with the condition of the enemy (c). Seneca the father relates ſeveral things which do no honour to Dellius [D]. It is ſuppoſed, with good probability, that the Dellius of the 3d Ode of the 2d Book of Horace is the ſame with him whom Plutarch mentions [E], and who was ſent Embaſſador by Marc Antony more than

(a) Plutarch. *in Marc. Antonio*, pag. 926.

(b) Ibid. pag. 943.

(c) Dio, lib. 50. pag. m. 495.

[A] *Plutarch . . . . makes him act in a very cunning manner.*] As ſoon as he had ſeen and heard that beauteous Queen, he judged ſhe would ſoon become neceſſary, and that her beauty, ſeconded by a tongue well hung, would give her the aſcendant over Marc Antony in every reſpect. For which reaſon he began to make his Court to Cleopatra, and adviſed her to appear in Cilicia with all her ornaments. He aſſured her ſhe had nothing to fear from ſo polite and courteous a General as he who ſent for her. She found herſelf wonderfully confirmed by this diſcourſe in the hopes which ſhe had conceived of making herſelf beloved by Marc Antony. She reaſoned in this manner: ſince Cæſar, and the great Pompey's ſon (1), who ſaw me only when I was a young unexperienced girl, and knew nothing of the world, did notwithſtanding become my conqueſt, what ought I not to expect at preſent, when my beauty and wit are in their full perfection? Ἡ ὃ κὰ Διλλίῳ πιστεύσασα, κὰ τοῖς πρὸς Καίσαρα κὰ Γναῖον τὸν Πομπηΐου παῖδα πρότερον αὐτῇ γεγυμνασμένοις ἀφ' ὥρας συμβολαίοις τεκμαιρομένη, ῥᾴων ἤλπιζεν ὑπάξεσθαι τὸν Ἀντώνιον. ἐκεῖνοι μὲν γὰρ αὐτὴν ἔτι κόρην κὰ πραγμάτων ἄπειρον ἔγνωσαν, πρὸς ὃ τῦτον ἤμελλε φοιτήσειν, ἐν ᾧ μάλιστα καιρῷ γυναῖκες ὥραν τε λαμπροτάτην ἔχυσι κὰ τῷ φρονεῖν ἀκμάζυσι. *Illa hinc ab Dellio inducta, hinc conjecturam ducens ex prioribus ſuis formæ cum Cæſare & Cneo Pompeii filio commerciis, facile Antonium ſperavit ſe ſubacturam: quando puellam adhuc illi & rerum rudem cognoverant, ad hunc verò ventura erat quo maximè tempore ſpeciem habent fœminæ florentiſſimam & ingenio vigent* (2). This way of reaſoning is much better than thoſe imagine who talk only of girls of fifteen, and roſes half blown, and who look on twenty as the beginning of old age: impertinent people, who may eaſily know, both by what paſſes in their own time, and by the Hiſtory of paſt ages, that the Ladies who have charmed great Princes the moſt, and who have made the moſt noiſe in a Court, were of an age which had allowed them time to acquire experience in affairs, and to perfect their underſtanding; and that there are few whoſe empire is laſting, if the graces of the mind do not ſecond the charms of the body. Plutarch obſerves that Cleopatra charmed more by the agreeableneſs of her words and converſation, than by her beauty, which had nothing very extraordinary (3).

(1) This has puzzled the Critics; for one does not ſee how the ſon of Pompey could love Cleopatra before the defeat of Brutus and Caſſius. See the *Letters of Marcus Velſerus.*

(2) Plut. *in M. Antonio*, pag. 926, 927.

(3) Καὶ γὰρ ἦν (ὡς λέγουσιν) αὐτὸ μὲν καθ' αὑτὸ τὸ κάλλος αὐτῆς οὐ πάνυ δύσπαρβλητον οὐδὲ οἷον ἐκπλῆξαι τοὺς ἰδόντας. *Neque enim erat (ut perhibent) figura ejus per ſe uſque adeo incomparabilis, neque ut obſtupefaceret ſpectatores.* Ibid. p. 927. D.

[B] *He was guilty of a great indiſcretion.*] He had complained at table that they made them drink vinegar, while Sarmentus drank the moſt delicious wines at Rome. This Sarmentus was a young boy, whom Auguſtus ardently loved. The compariſon went far; and ſince it offended Cleopatra, it is a ſign Dellius had complained that the Queen provided but indifferently for thoſe who made her taſte the pleaſures of love. This is pretty extraordinary; for when a woman has wherewithal to buy the moſt ſucculent meats and the beſt liquors for ſuch people, ſhe provides them very willingly, in order to increaſe or revive their vigour. Plutarch has not taken notice whence he learned this cauſe of Cleopatra's being irritated againſt Dellius: there is no likelihood of its being found in the Hiſtory of this latter, as it was there found that a Phyſician named Glaucus gave Dellius notice that Cleopatra had a deſign to put him to death. However it be, Plutarch obſerves that Dellius was one of thoſe who forſook Marc Antony, being driven to it by the affronts and ſcurrilities of Cleopatra's flatterers. We ſhall ſee preſently a Paſſage of Seneca, which is a proof of the unlawful commerce between Dellius and that Queen. Dion (5) ſpeaks of a commerce much more criminal. Κἄιντοι τινα Δίλλιον παιδικὰ ποτὲ ἑαυτῆ γενόμενον, πέμψας. *Miſſo ad eum Q. quodam Dellio exoleto ſuo*, i. e. "Having ſent to him one Q. "Dellius his (6) Catamite."

(4) See his words in the Remark [F], in the Marg. Citation (26).

(5) Lib. 49. pag. 474.

(6) That is, Marc Antony's.

[C] *Plutarch . . . ſays that Dellius was an Hiſtorian.*] Voſſius (7) approves the conjecture of Caſaubon on a paſſage of Strabo (8), where Adelphius is cited as the Author of the Hiſtory of Marc Antony's Expedition againſt the Parthians. Strabo adds that the Author of that Hiſtory had commanded part of the troops in that expedition, and that he was a good friend of Marc Antony's. All this ſuits Dellius: ſo that as there is no Writer who makes mention of the Hiſtorian Adelphius, it is very probable, as Caſaubon gueſſes, that we ſhould read *Dellius* and not *Adelphius* in that paſſage of Strabo. When I ſay *All this ſuits Dellius*, I do not mean there are authorities to prove that he had a command in the war which Marc Antony made on the Parthians: I only mean that this is very likely. And indeed, we know Marc Antony took him along with him in the expedition of Armenia, in the year of Rome 720 (9), and ſent him twice on negotiations to Artavaſdes.

(7) Voſſ. *de Hiſt. Græcis*, pag. 477.

(8) Lib. 11. pag. 360.

(9) Dio, lib. 49. pag. m. 474.

[D] *Seneca the father relates ſeveral things which do no honour to Dellius.*] We can hardly expreſs in our tongue the name which was given to Dellius: *Quem Meſſala Corvinus* deſultorem bellorum civilium *vocat* (10). Meſſala Corvinus called him *the Vaulter of the Civil Wars*. He threw himſelf into every party, and changed ſides like a weathercock. He quitted Dolabella to join Caſſius; and his life had been promiſed him, provided he killed Dolabella. He left Caſſius to join Marc Antony; and at laſt he forſook Marc Antony, and embraced the party of Auguſtus. It is he, adds Seneca, of whom there are ſome laſcivious Letters extant written to Cleopatra (11). Seneca calls him *Deillius*. It is of him, no doubt, that Seneca the Philoſopher ſpeaks, when he ſays Auguſtus had ſo much clemency, that he choſe out of the enemy's army thoſe whom he deſigned for the future to admit to his greateſt intimacy, the Cocceius's, the Duillius's &c. (12). According to Lipſius's Remark we ſhould read, not *Duillius*, but *Deillius*, or rather *Dellius* (13). If the Reader remembers what I have ſaid in the Remark [AA] of the Article CHARLES V, he will be perſuaded that this clemency of Auguſtus was joined with the moſt refined Policy.

(10) Seneca, *Pater*, Suaſoria 1, pag. m. 12.

(11) *Hic eſt Deillius cujus Epiſtolæ laſcivæ ad Cleopatram feruntur.* Idem, ibid.

(12) *Cocceios & Duillios & totam cohortem primæ admiſſionis ex adverſariorum caſtris conſcripſit.* Seneca, *de Clementia*, lib. 1. cap. 10.

[E] *The Dellius of the III Ode . . . of Horace is the ſame with him whom Plutarch mentions.*] This is the opinion of Monſr. Dacier: but what he adds does not ſeem to me altogether ſo likely. *It is probable*, ſays he (14), *that he had ſome ſhare in the favours which he pretended to ſollicit for his maſter, and that he received from Cleopatra the ſame pleaſure which he afforded to Antony; for Seneca ſpeaks of ſome very free letters which he had written to that Princeſs.* This paſſage contains two principal facts; the one, that Dellius uſed his intereſt with Cleopatra to induce her to favour Marc Antony's love; the other, that he alſo ſpoke at the ſame time for himſelf, and not without ſucceſs. The firſt fact is not very probable: Marc

(13) Lipſius, *in Tacit. Annal.* lib. 1.

(14) Remarks on the 3d Ode of the 2d Book of Horace.

than once (*d*). I ſhall put together in one Remark ſome miſtakes which I have collected relating to this Article [*F*].

(*d*) See the Remark [*C*] at the end.

Antony had no occaſion for a ſollicitor. Cleopatra went to attend him as her judge; and as good an opinion as ſhe had of her wit and beauty, ſhe nevertheleſs conceived new hopes from what Dellius had told her of Marc Antony's humour: ſhe dreſſed herſelf in the moſt advantageous manner ſhe could, ſhe appeared in all her finery the day of the firſt interview, and omitted no artifice to make him in love with her, wherein ſhe eaſily ſucceeded; ſo that a third perſon was at all times as unneceſſary, as he would have been troubleſome to them on ſome occaſions. As to the ſecond fact, I think it very probable; and after all, I doubt not but if Dellius had acted the part of a Sollicitor for his maſter, he would have done what ſuch people generally do in the like caſe; he would have paid himſelf: and if he had not imitated thoſe who are employed as purveyors for wine, who taſte it the firſt, he would at leaſt have imitated the domeſtics of the ſecond rank, who eat what is taken from their maſter's table.

[*F*] *I ſhall put together . . . ſome faults which I have collected.*] Andrew Schottus aſſerts that Dion has given Dellius the title of Hiſtorian, and that Plutarch has reckoned him among the flatterers of Cleopatra. *Qui Δίλλιον ὁ ἱστορικὸς Dioni lib.* 50, *& Plutarcho in Antonio, inter Cleopatræ adulatores numeratur* (15). Thoſe two facts are falſe. Plutarch's words have not been well underſtood by Andrew Schottus; he has referred the relative ὧν to κόλακες, whereas it ſhould be referred to φίλων. The ſequel of the diſcourſe evidently ſhews it. Such is the trouble given by languages whoſe Grammar is not ſo rigorous as that of the French. I put the Words quoted by Schottus in the margin, and add thereto the Latin Verſion (16). It will appear from thence that Plutarch is ſo far from putting Dellius into the number of Cleopatra's flatterers, that he ſays that Queen's flatterers drove him away. Lipſius, having cited Plutarch's words, adds that Dion ſays the ſame things, *eadem Dio, quinquageſimo libro* (17). But it is not true that Dion ſays the ſame as Plutarch: he does not ſpeak of the flatterers of Cleopatra; neither does he ſay that Dellius was an Hiſtorian, or for what reaſon he withdrew.

(15) Schott. *in Senecæ Suaſor. I.* num. 39. pag. m. 19.

(16) Πολλοὺς δὲ τῶν ἄλλων φίλων οἱ Κλεοπάτρας κόλακες ἐξέβαλον, τὰς παροινίας καὶ βωμολοχίας οὐχ ὑπομένοντας, ὧν καὶ Μᾶρκος ἦν Σίλανος καὶ Δίλλιος ὁ ἱστορικός. *Complures alios illius amicos expulere Cleopatræ adulatores, quod contumelias & procacitatem eorum non ſuſtinerent: in quibus M. Syllanus fuit, & Dellius hiſtoricus*, Plutarch. *in Antonio*, p. 943.

(17) Lipſ. *in Tacit. Annal.* lib. 1.

DELPHINUS (PETER) General of the Order of Camaldoli in the beginning of the ſixteenth Century. We have ſome Letters of his, which were written before he was General, during the time which elapſed from the year 1462, to the year 1480 (*a*). They have omitted in the printed Edition a curious paſſage which is to be found in a Manuſcript Copy of thoſe Letters [*A*]. Delphinius died the 15th of January 1525, and was interred at Murano near Venice, in the Convent (*b*) of S. Michael (*c*).

(*a*) Mabillon, *Muſeum Italic.* tom. 1. pag. 202.

(*b*) It is of the Order of Camaldoli.

(*c*) Mabillon, *Muſ. Ital.* tom. 1. pag. 202.

[*A*] *They have omitted . . . a curious paſſage which is to be found in a Manuſcript copy of thoſe Letters.*] The curious and learned Father Mabillon has informed us what it is (1). The paſſage which has been omitted was in the XXXV Letter of the VII Book, and contains what follows. The inhabitants of Arezzo had thrown into a well a Lyon (2) of Stone, which was on the top of the great Church. It was taken out thence when the French entred that City under Charles VIII, and was placed in the middle of the great ſtreet, and all the inhabitants of Arezzo, who paſſed by it, were obliged to kneel down before that Lyon, and to aſk pardon for their revolt.

(1) Mabillon, *Muſ. Ital.* tom. 1. pag. 179.

(2) It was the arms of Florence.

DEMETRIUS MAGNES, a Greek Author, contemporary of Cicero [*A*], wrote ſome Books, the loſs whereof has been greatly regretted by thoſe who apply themſelves to know or to compoſe the Lives of ancient Writers. He wrote a Work concerning the Authors, and Cities, which bore the ſame name [*B*]. This Work was uſeful

[*A*] *He was contemporary with Cicero.*] This is proved by the following Words: *Memini librum tibi afferri a Demetrio Magnete (ad te miſſum ſcio) περὶ ὁμονοίας. Eum mihi velim mittas. Vides quam cauſſam mediter* (1). i. e. "I remember a Book was brought "you (for I know it was ſent) from Demetrius Mag"nes concerning Concord: I deſire you will ſend it me. "You ſee what I have in my head." What follows is a much clearer proof: *Hæc igitur videbis, &, quod ad te ante ſcripſi, Demetrii Magnetis librum quem ad te miſit de concordia, velim mihi mittas* (2). i. e. "Theſe "things therefore you will ſee: and, as I wrote you "before, I deſire you to ſend me the Treatiſe of De"metrius Magnes on Concord, which he ſent you." You ſee Demetrius had ſent his Book concerning Concord to Pomponius Atticus: he therefore lived at the ſame time with that good friend of Cicero's. If Voſſius had remembred the ſecond paſſage which I have quoted, he might have ſpared the arguments he makes uſe of (3) to prove that in the firſt paſſage we ſhould read ὁμοιοτέλευτα, and not ὁμωνύμων. The learned Mauſſacus contends for the latter reading. *Ego dico reſtituendum περὶ ὁμωνύμων, de hoc enim opere loqui voluit Cicero. De Concordia autem ſcripſiſſe Demetrium illum adhuc non legi* (4). i. e. "I am of opinion it ſhould be correct"ed περὶ ὁμωνύμων, for of that Work Cicero intend"ed to ſpeak: but I do not remember yet to have "read that this Demetrius wrote of Concord." He did not remember therefore to have read Cicero's Letter wherein the ſame Book of Demetrius is intitled *De Concordia*. Let us learn from this example how ſubject the moſt able Critics are to give us very falſe Corrections. Henry Valeſius has not taken notice of this miſtake of Mauſſacus. Let us obſerve a miſtake of Jonſius: he ſays that Cicero reckons Demetrius Magnes among thoſe who had taught him Rhetoric, and cites Cicero's *Brutus* (5). I have conſulted that Work, and do not find this in it; I only find there that Cicero frequented the School of Demetrius the Syrian, and that Dionyſius Magnes was continually with him. *Eodem tempore Athenis apud Demetrium Syrum, veterem & non ignobilem dicendi Magiſtrum, ſtudioſè exerceri ſolebam* . . . . (6), *aſſiduiſſime autem mecum fuit Dionyſius Magnes* (7). You will ſee in Plutarch (8), that one of Cicero's maſters in the Art of Rhetoric was named *Dionyſius Magnes*. It is eaſy to perceive whence Jonſius's miſtake aroſe: his memory tranſpoſed the ſurnames of the two perſons whom Cicero mentions in the ſame page. Mollerus has followed the error of Jonſius (9).

(1) Cicero, *ad Attic. Epiſt.* 11. lib. 8. pag. 787, 788. ed. Græv.

(2) Idem, *Epiſt.* 12. *ejuſdem Libri*, pag. 799.

(3) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Græcis*, lib. 1. cap. 23. pag. 149, 150.

(4) Mauſſac. *Notis ad Harpocrat.* Voce Μαθώνη.

(5) Jonſius, *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſoph.* pag. 207.

(6) Cicero, *in Bruto*, cap. 111.

(7) Idem, ibid.

(8) Plutarch. *in Cicer.* pag. 862, *E.*

(9) Moller. *de Script. Homonym.* pag. 901.

[*B*] *He wrote a Work concerning the Authors who bore the ſame name.*] Diogenes Laertius gives us the Title of it: Δημήτριος ὁ Μάγνης ἐν τοῖς περὶ ὁμωνύμων Ποιητῶν τε καὶ Συγγραφέων, *Demetrius Magneſius in libro de Poetis ac Scriptoribus æquivocis* (10). In another place (11) he obſerves that the Author had ſpoken of ſix perſons who were named Thales. I omit the other paſſages wherein he cites him. A learned Commentator (12) was of opinion that the word συνωνύμων ſhould be ſtruck out, and ὁμωνύμων inſerted in this paſſage of Plutarch (13): Οὐ μὴν ἔγημε ταύτην, ἀλλὰ Σαμίαν τινὰ συνῴκησεν, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Δημήτριος ὁ Μάγνης ἐν τοῖς περὶ Συνωνύμων. *Non duxit eam tamen uxorem* (Demoſthenes) *ſed Samiam quandam, ut tradit Demetrius Magneſius in libris de Synonymis, in matrimonio habuit.* i. e. "De"moſthenes did not marry her, but a Samian, as De"metrius Magnes aſſerts in his Treatiſe of Synony"mous Writers." The ſame Commentator obſerves that Demetrius was not the only one who wrote on that ſubject, and that the Greeks cite Dionyſius of Sinope *in ὁμωνύμοις*, and one Simareſtus *in συνωνύμοις* (14). The

(10) Diog. Laertius, lib. 1. *in Epimenide*, num. 112; *and* lib. 5. *in Ariſtotele*, num. 3.

(11) Idem, lib. 1. *in Thalete*, num. 38.

(12) Iſaac. Caſaubon. *in Diog. Laert.* lib. 1. num. 38.

(13) Plut. *in Demoſthene*, pag. 853. A. He quotes alſo pag. 858, F. without marking the Title of the Book, and pag. 859, B. without giving him the ſurname of *Magnes*.

(14) See below Citation (27).

ful and neceſſary, conſidering the great number of Poets, and Philoſophers, &c. whoſe names were alike. Plutarch, Diogenes Laertius, Stephanus Byzantinus, Harpocration, &c. have

The firſt of theſe two obſervations has been very ill comprehended by Voſſius, or rather he truſted too much to his memory, and was deceived by it. He pretends (15) Caſaubon has ſaid, that inſtead of reading in Diogenes Laertius περὶ συνωνύμων, it ſhould be read περὶ ὁμωνύμων. He adds that nothing ſhould be changed, ſince Demetrius had written Books on both thoſe ſubjects. He proves it by the words of Plutarch which I have quoted above. This is to ſuppoſe that there is περὶ συνωνύμων in Diogenes Laertius; which is falſe. It is likewiſe falſe that Caſaubon meant to introduce that term there; he only meant this with regard to the Life of Demoſthenes written by Plutarch. Monſr. Menage (16) has taken notice of theſe two faults of Voſſius, which notwithſtanding have lately occaſioned a learned man (17) to ſay that Caſaubon was in the wrong to pretend that ὁμωνύμων ſhould be inſerted in Diogenes Laertius's Life of Thales. He wrongfully accuſes Jonſius of having pretended the ſame thing. Mr. Menage might have obſerved a third miſtake of Voſſius; for under pretext that Plutarch cites the Work *de Synonymis*, it muſt not be imagined to be a different Book from that which others quote by the Title *de Homonymis*. Wherefore Caſaubon ſhould not have required any alteration to be made in the text of Plutarch. It is very probable Plutarch wrote theſe words ἐν τοῖς περὶ συνωνύμων. An Hiſtorian who quotes a great many Books does not oblige himſelf to ſpecify them preciſely by the ſame word which the Authors made choice of for the Title; but is contented to denote them by terms which ſignify the ſame thing: now it is certain that in common diſcourſe the word *Synonymous* was as much made uſe of as the word *Homonymous*, when a man intended to ſay that ſuch and ſuch Poets, ſuch and ſuch Cities, &c. had the ſame name. It was only in Logical Writings that a diſtinction was obſerved between ὁμώνυμα *homonymous*, and συνώνυμα *ſynonymous*. At this day we are by the caprice of cuſtom in another ſituation: we may not ſay indifferently *ſuch an Author has written a Treatiſe of equivocal Writers, or of ſynonymous Writers, or of Writers of the ſame name* (18). The ideas which are annexed to the word *equivocal* do not allow this liberty, and conſequently in common diſcourſe, as well as in Books of Logic, we ought to obſerve ſome diſtinction between ὁμώνυμα *equivoca*, and συνώνυμα *ſynonyma*, when he would expreſs the ſenſe of thoſe terms in our own language. Plutarch, as I have already ſaid, had no need to make any diſtinction on ſuch an occaſion. He was as free to cite the ſame Work of Demetrius, either by the term ὁμωνύμων, or by the term συνωνύμων, as we are free at this day to cite the ſame Work of Father Rapin, either by the Title of a *Compariſon between Plato and Ariſtotle*, or by the Title of a *Parallel between Plato and Ariſtotle*. Perfect accuracy would require that in citing a Book we ſhould uſe the very ſame Words which conſtitute the Title in the Editions, and not content ourſelves with making uſe of equivalent expreſſions; but moſt Authors cannot ſubject themſelves to this. Some retain things better than words; they remember, for example, that David Blondel compoſed a Work on the Euchariſt, but do not remember that the Work is intitled *Eclairciſſemens familiers de la controverſe de l'Euchariſtie*. i. e. "Familiar explications of the con-"troverſy concerning the Euchariſt." They even imagine that inſtead of the word *Euchariſt*, the Author made uſe of the words *Lord's Supper*; wherefore they will cite without any ſcruple, *Blondel in his Treatiſe of the Lord's Supper*, full as ſoon as *Blondel in his Treatiſe of the Euchariſt*, or *Blondel in his Explications of the Controverſy concerning the Euchariſt*. Some doubt whether it be in the Title *Lord's Supper*, or *Euchariſt*; but fearing to loſe ſome precious moments, if they laid down their pen to go and ſatisfy themſelves by opening the Book, they are contented with an equivalent term. Let us apply this to Plutarch with reſpect to the difference which appears between him and Diogenes Laertius in relation to the Book of Demetrius Magnes. He was more intent on the Thing than the Word; he knew that Author had compoſed a Book concerning Writers of the ſame name, and that a circumſtance of Demoſthenes's marriage was found therein; he knew that the word συνώνυμα was as good to repreſent the ſubject of the Book, as the word ὁμώνυμα; and this was enough for him: he did not think the thing worth the trouble of interrupting himſelf, even tho' he ſhould have been in doubt whether the Author's title was περὶ ὁμωνύμων, and not περὶ συνωνύμων. I ſhould not have enlarged ſo much on theſe minute matters, if I had not thought it might be of uſe to ſhew us the illuſions of Critics. How many times have they believed that certain paſſages ſhould be corrected under pretence of ſome difference in Letters? how many times, I ſay, have they believed this without any reaſon, and unjuſtly exclaimed againſt the Tranſcribers? What ſhall I ſay of ſo many Authors, and of ſo many Books which they multiply unreaſonably, under pretence that they do not find the ſame Orthography in the Ancients who quote them? O what a multitude of blunders would in purſuance of ſuch rules be committed a thouſand years hence in commenting on our Writers, who with the utmoſt negligence ſpell Authors names (19), and ſet down the Titles of Books as they think fit (20).

If the learned Mauſſacus had ſufficiently conſidered this, he would not have imagined the Work of Demetrius Magnes cited by Plutarch περὶ συνωνύμων to be different from that which others cite περὶ ὁμωνύμων (21). It is to no purpoſe for him to produce in ſupport of his opinion the paſſage of Stephanus Byzantinus where Demetrius is quoted ἐν συνωνύμοις (22). I wonder he has not quoted Harpocration (23), who obſerves that Demetrius Magnes, *in operę de urbibus ſynonymis*, ſaid there were four cities named Methone. Infer from hence that theſe two Titles ſuppoſe no difference, and that, in the notion of thoſe who have cited them, ὁμώνυμα and συνώνυμα are the ſame thing. It may alſo be alledged that if the Author made uſe of one of thoſe two words for the title of one of his Books, and of the other for the Title of the other Book, it was not with a deſign to mark any diſtinction: for it is viſible that the notion according to which an Author compoſes a Treatiſe of the ſeveral Cities named Antioch, is the ſame which is purſued in writing a Book concerning the ſeveral Authors named Thales, or Ariſtophanes; and ſo the diſtinction of the Logicians between ὁμώνυμα *æquivoca* and συνώνυμα *univoca* cannot take place on this occaſion. Mauſſacus ſhould have remembred that the Book quoted by Stephanus Byzantinus, and by Harpocration, ἐν τοῖς συνωνύμοις, treated of the Cities which bore the ſame names. Now there is no likelihood that Plutarch had that Book in view: he certainly cited the Book wherein Demetrius ſpoke of the perſons who had been named Demoſthenes. It is not, therefore, a good refutation of Caſaubon to ſay, *Stephanus Byzantinus has cited Demetrius Magnes ἐν συνωνύμοις, therefore the word συνωνύμων ought to remain unaltered in Plutarch* (24). The refutation would be ſomewhat better, if it could be made out that the Book of which Diogenes Laertius has given the Title is not the ſame with that which is mentioned by Plutarch. But this cannot be maintained without arguing againſt probability; and it is certain that Caſaubon looked on the Book quoted by Plutarch, and that quoted by Diogenes Laertius, as one and the ſame work. He ſhould have attacked him, therefore, on that ſide. Take notice of one thing which is ſingular: Berkelius had no notion of our Demetrius Magnes; for here is the Note he has made on theſe words of Stephanus Byzantinus, Δημήτριος ἐν συνωνύμοις, *Demetrius in Synonymis*. *Fortaſſis intelligendus Demetrius cognomento Ixion, qui ut Suidas auctor eſt quædam ad Grammaticam ſpectantia conſcripſit* (25). i. e. "Perhaps we are to underſtand this of "Demetrius ſurnamed Ixion, who, as Suidas informs "us, wrote ſome things relating to Grammar." It is ſurprizing that his memory could furniſh him with nothing concerning our Demetrius, of whom ſeveral ancient and modern Authors have ſaid many things; but beſides this, he deſerves cenſure for having ſuppoſed that Stephanus Byzantinus cited a Grammatical Work. It was more natural to ſay it was ſome Treatiſe which related either to Hiſtory, or Geography; for it is cited on occaſion of a name which belonged both to a city, and to a river. This ſort of *homonymous* or *ſynonymous*

(15) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* pag. 150.

(16) Menag. *in Laert.* lib. 1. num. 38.

(17) Joh. Mollerus, *de Script. Homonymis*, pag. 902.

(18) See above the Remark [F] of the Article ALLATIUS.

(19) See the *Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres*, Sept. 1685, Art. 9. pag. 1024, &c.

(20) See above, Citation (10) of the Article DAMIAN.

(21) Mauſſ. *Diſſertat. Critica de Harpocrat.* pag. m. 398.

(22) Steph. Byzant. *in* Ἀλαβών.

(23) Harpocrat. *in* Μεθώνη.

(24) *Compoſuerat & hic autor libros* περὶ συνωνύμων, *ut teſtatur Plutarchus in Vita Demoſthenis, male enim illo loco vir quidam doctiſſimus legendum cenſet* Δημήτριος Μάγνης ἐν τοῖς περὶ ὁμωνύμων, *pro* συνωνύμων, *autor Stephanus apud quem voce* Ἀλαβών, *citatur idem Demetrius* ἐν συνωνύμοις. Mauſſac. *Diſſertat. Crit. de Harpocrat.* pag. 398.

(25) Berkel. *in Steph. Byzant.* pag. 87.

have quoted this Demetrius. The fact for which Athenæus cites him is very remarkable; it is that Theotimus, who had written againſt Epicurus, was accuſed by Zeno the Epicurean, and condemned to death (*a*). There is a paſſage to be found in Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus [C], of which I ſhall ſay ſomething.

(*a*) Athen. lib. 13. pag. 611.

nymous terms does not belong to a Grammarian, as ſuch. I add this reſtriction, becauſe there is a kind of *homonymies* or *ſynonymies*, which belong merely to Grammar, and on which the Ancients publiſhed ſome Treatiſes. Mauſſacus is in the right to obſerve that after the multitude of Books compoſed by Authors of the ſame name, or on the ſame ſubject, had occaſioned one man's Writings to be confounded with another's, Criticiſm, which was before employed only in diſcerning whether a Work was ſuppoſititious or genuine, undertook a new province, that is, to diſtinguiſh the Works which reſpectively belonged to each of the *homonymous* Writers. He names three Authors who applied themſelves to this branch of Criticiſm: the firſt is our Demetrius Magnes, he calls the ſecond Simareſtus, and the third Dionyſius of Synope (27). Conſult Wowerus in the XVI Chapter of his Treatiſe *de Polymathia* (28). But let us not forget what Jonſius obſerves (29); which is, that the Work of Dionyſius of Sinope was a Comedy (30), and that of Simareſtus a Grammatical Treatiſe (31). So that Mauſſacus and Caſaubon have not well matched them with Demetrius Magnes. They would have done better if they had matched him with Agreſphon (32), of whom Suidas ſpeaks (33). They ſay nothing of him: but this omiſſion is not ſo unpardonable as their not mentioning what Aulus Gellius relates concerning a Book wherein the Author examined, among other things, *quot fuerint Pythagoræ nobiles, quot Hippocratæ* (34), i. e. "how many famous "men there were of the names of Pythagoras, and of "Hippocrates."

None among the Moderns have laboured ſo uſefully as Meurſius and Jonſius in this part of critical learning, with regard to ancient Authors of the ſame name (35). But as the conformity of names has not occaſioned fewer miſtakes among the Authors of theſe latter ages, it has been neceſſary to write ſomething on that ſubject. A learned German (36) has applied himſelf to it, and has ſucceeded very well. His deſign comprehends the homonymous Writers both ancient and modern. His Book (37) was printed at Hamburgh, in the year 1698. We find therein an infinite number of faults pointed out, which conſiſt in the attributing a Book to an Author who did not write it, and who had nothing in common with the true Author but the name, &c.

(26) Mauſſac. *Diſſert. Crit. de Harpocrat.* pag. 398.

(27) *Ita Simareſtus quidam libros* περὶ συνωνύμων *compoſuerat. Hinc etiam Dionyſii Sinopenſis* περὶ ὁμωνύμων *tractatus apud Ulpianum Demoſthenis* ἐξηγητήν. Idem, ibid.

(28) Pag. m. 126.

(29) Jonſius, *de Scriptor. Hiſtor. Philoſoph.* pag. 250.

(30) *See* Athenæus, lib. 9. cap. 7. pag. 381.

(31) Jonſius, *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſoph.* pag. 448.

(32) See above the Remark [H] of the Article APOLLONIUS of Tyana.

(33) Suidas, in Ἀπολλώνιος.

(34) Aulus Gellius, lib. 14. cap. 6.

(35) Do not forget what I have ſaid of ALLATIUS in the Remark [F] of his Article.

(36) Joannes Mollerus, *Flenſburgo Cimber.*

(37) It is intitled, *Homonymoſcopia Hiſtorico-Philologico-Critica, ſive Scbediaſma παραγωγὴν de Scriptoribus Homonymis quadripartitum, &c.* in 8vo.

[C] *There is a paſſage in Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus, of which I ſhall ſay ſomething.*] This Author, who was as good a Critic as an Hiſtorian, obſerves that Callimachus and the other Grammarians of Pergamus had written nothing but what was very imperfect concerning the Orator Dinarchus. He adds that Demetrius Magnes, who paſſed for a very learned man, and had ſpoken of the ſame Orator, and that with an air which promiſed wonders, in his Book *de Homonymis*, was notwithſtanding miſtaken (38). He tranſcribes the whole paſſage, wherein we find that Demetrius had firſt obſerved that there were four Dinarchus's, and afterwards had ſaid ſomething of each of them, beginning with the Orator. We alſo find there all he had ſaid of that Orator. The Criticiſm of Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus thereon is very good: he complains that Demetrius ſays nothing either of the Birth of Dinarchus, or of that Age he lived in, or of the country where his eloquence was employed. Theſe were things in which he might have been eaſily informed, if he had taken the pains to enquire after them. Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus proves it by producing the diſcoveries he had made concerning thoſe particulars by his inquiries. I congratulate my ſelf on having had the like taſte before I had read this paſſage of Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus: I did not know that he had taken notice of theſe defects in the Narration of our Demetrius, when I blamed thoſe who write the Elogy of a man, without ſetting down either the place, or time, of his birth, or of his death, &c (39). Theſe defects, however, cannot comfort us for the loſs of that Author's Writings: for his Narrations, tho' imperfect, would be of great ſervice to us.

(38) Δῆμος (read Δημήτριος) ὁ Μάγνης ὃς ἔδοξε πολύϊστωρ ἐν τῇ περὶ τῶν ὁμωνύμων πραγματείᾳ, &c. *Demetrius Magneſius, qui polyhiſtor fuiſſe viſus eſt, in tractatu de homonymis, &c.* Dionyſius Halicarn. *in Judicio de Dinarcho*, pag. m. 349.

(39) See the *Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lettres*, June 1684, Art. V, pag. 500 of the Edition of 1686.

DEMOCRITUS, one of the greateſt Philoſophers of Antiquity, was of Abdera in Thrace (*a*). He was educated by Magi [A], who taught him Theology and Aſtrology. He afterwards heard Leucippus, and learned from him the Syſtem of Atoms and a Vacuum. The extraordinary inclination he had for the Sciences induced him to travel into all parts of the world where he hoped to find able men. He went to viſit the Prieſts of Egypt: he conſulted the Chaldeans and the Perſian Philoſophers; and it is ſaid he penetrated even into India and Ethiopia, to confer with the Gymnoſophiſts. In theſe travels he ſpent his whole patrimony, which amounted to above a hundred Talents (*b*); after which he was obliged to be maintained by his brother: and if he had not given demonſtrations of his great underſtanding, he would have incurred a mark of infamy, for not having preſerved his eſtate [B]. The ſpirit of great Travellers reigned in him: he went to the fartheſt parts of the Indies in ſearch of the riches of learning, and cared very

(*a*) See the Remark [A].

(*b*) A Talent is worth l. 193. 15. 0 ſterling.

[A] *He was educated by Magi.*] Xerxes King of Perſia, having lodged at the houſe of Democritus's father, made him a preſent of ſome Magi, who were the Maſters of Democritus (1). But as there is an infinite difference between lodging King Xerxes, and entertaining his army, that Author is inexcuſable who has ſaid that Democritus's father was able to provide a repaſt for that Monarch's army without incommoding himſelf (2). Moreri has been caught in this ſnare; which he might have avoided, if he had minded the words of Diogenes Laertius; but he does not ſeem to have conſulted him. If he had, would he have ſaid, that Diogenes Laertius ſuppoſes Democritus was of Miletus? Laertius ſays no ſuch thing; he only ſays it was the opinion of ſome people. I obſerve, by the way, that Moreri ought not to have quoted Herodotus without ſome further addition. It was the way to perſuade his Readers that the fact he mentions is to be found in the Muſes of Herodotus. But this is falſe, and there is no likelihood that Diogenes Laertius intended to cite the Author of thoſe Muſes. I believe in that paſſage, and in ſome others, he means a different Herodotus from him whoſe Works we have.

(1) Diog. Laert. *in Vita Democriti*, lib. 9. num. 34.

(2) Valer. Max. lib. 8. cap. 7. num. 4. *Exter.*

[B] *If he had not given proofs . . . . of a great underſtanding . . . . he would have incurred a mark of infamy, for not having preſerved his Eſtate.*] It was enacted by the Laws of the country, that thoſe who had ſpent their patrimony ſhould not be interred in the ſepulchre of the Family. To avoid the reproaches of thoſe who envied him, and the uneaſineſſes they might have cauſed him in conſequence of thoſe Laws, he endeavoured to get himſelf exempted from the penalty which he might have incurred. For this purpoſe, he choſe among his Works that which ſurpaſſed all the reſt (3), and read it to the Magiſtrates. They were ſo charmed with it, that they made him a preſent of five hundred talents, and erected ſtatues to him, and decreed that after his death he ſhould be buried at the public charge; which was performed accordingly (4). Diogenes Laertius murders his Narrations in ſuch a manner, that I thought my ſelf obliged to add ſome little circumſtances to them. Athenæus relates the fact better: and he does it thus (5). He ſays Democritus

(3) It was intitled Μέγας διάκοσμος, *the great Diacoſmos.*

(4) Diog. Laert. *in Vita Democriti*, num. 39.

(5) Athen. lib. 4. cap. 19. pag. 168.

very little for the treaſures which he had almoſt at his own door. He was never at Athens (c), if we believe ſome Authors; or if he was there, as ſome others aſſert, he made himſelf known to nobody there. He gave two proofs of an extraordinary ſagacity [C], which made him admired by the great Hippocrates. But we muſt not believe all that has been ſaid on that head; we ought rather to imagine that Writers have taken a pleaſure

(c) See *Valer. Maximus* criticiſed on this head in the Remark [B] towards the end.

Democritus was formally accuſed, and forced to plead his cauſe; and that having read one of his Books (6), and repreſented that the expences he had been at in order to render himſelf capable of compoſing it, had ſwallowed up his whole patrimony, he was acquitted. Every body is acquainted with theſe verſes of Horace, which teſtify the negligence of Democritus with regard to worldly goods;

(6) It was the great *Diacoſmos*, and the *Hiſtory of Hell*, τὰ περὶ τῶν ἐν ἅιδου. Idem, ibid.

Miramur, ſi Democriti pecus edit agellos
Cultaque, dum peregre eſt animus ſine corpore velox (7)?

(7) Horat. *Epiſt.* 12. lib. 1. ver. 12.

——"Are we ſurpriz'd to ſee
"Democritus' Eſtate a Common, fed
"By other's cattle, while his ſoul is fled
"Far diſtant, and his body's left behind?"

Simon Boſius (8) has ſuppoſed, without foundation, that Horace, by a ſlip of memory, had ſaid that of Democritus which ſhould have been ſaid of Anaxagoras. It is true, Plutarch informs us that Anaxagoras left his lands uncultivated (9); but for ought any thing that appears to the contrary, Democritus might have done the ſame. Had not Cicero ſaid it before Horace? *Democritus, qui (vere falſo ne quæreremus) dicitur oculis ſe privaſſe, certè ut quam minimè animus à cogitationibus abduceretur, patrimonium neglexit, agros deſeruit inculios, quid quærens aliud niſi beatam vitam* (10)? i. e. "Democritus, who is reported (whether truly "or not is a queſtion) to have put out his own eyes, that "his mind might be as little diverted from contem-"plation as poſſible, neglected his Eſtate, and left his "fields untilled: what end could he propoſe by it, "unleſs it were to live happily?" Philo teſtifies that the Greeks ſaid Anaxagoras and Democritus left their lands uncultivated, in order to apply themſelves with leſs diſtraction of mind to the ſtudy of wiſdom (11). But how, will you ſay, can this be reconciled with the Authors who have written (12) that Democritus, when he divided the inheritance with his two brothers, choſe the leaſt lot, which conſiſted in money, and conſequently was more proper for a traveller? I anſwer that we muſt content our ſelves with knowing the different Accounts which are found of theſe things: it would be too difficult, at moſt times, to reconcile them, and to chuſe the beſt. Valerius Maximus relates that Democritus gave all his Eſtate to his country, reſerving only a very moderate ſum to himſelf. He repreſents this Patrimony as an immenſe Eſtate, and makes no mention of Democritus's brothers. This is to relate things very negligently: and there are ſome other faults in his Narrative. *Democritus, cum divitiis cenſeri poſſet, quæ tantæ fuerunt, ut pater ejus Xerxis exercitui epulum dare ex facili potuerit, quo magis vacuo animo ſtudiis literarum eſſet operatus, parva admodum ſumma retenta, patrimonium ſuum patriæ donavit. Athenis autem compluribus annis moratus, omnia temporum momenta ad percipiendam & exercendam doctrinam conferens, ignotus illi urbi vixit; quod ipſe in quodam volumine teſtatur* (13). i. e. "Democritus, "whoſe riches were ſuch that his Father was able to "furniſh an entertainment for Xerxes's army with-"out inconvenience, that he might apply himſelf to "ſtudy with the greater freedom of mind, gave his "whole patrimony to his country, reſerving only a "very ſmall ſum. He ſtaid ſeveral years at Athens, "ſpending every moment of his time in the attain-"ment and proſecution of knowledge, and lived un-"known in that city, as he himſelf teſtifies in one "of his Books." I have already cenſured the feaſting of that prodigious army. It is not probable that Democritus made ſo long a ſtay at Athens, ſince ſome Authors ſay he was never there. The great travels of Democritus, of which Valerius Maximus ſays nothing, deſerved more notice than his abode at Athens. The ſame Writer has made no mention of the moſt wonderful circumſtance of that abode. He ought principally to have reflected on the contempt which Democritus had for the glory he might have acquired, if he would have made himſelf known.

(8) *See* Lambin *on this paſſage of* Horace.

(9) Ἀναξαγόρας τὴν χώραν κατέλιπε μηλόβοτον. *Anaxagoras agrum ovibus paſcendum reliquit.* Plut. *de vitando ære alieno*, pag. 831. E. Τὴν οἰκίαν ἐκεῖνος ἐξέλιπε, καὶ τὴν χώραν ἀφῆκεν ἀργὴν καὶ μηλόβοτον ὑπ' ἐνθουσιασμοῦ καὶ μεγαλοφροσύνης. *Hic numinis afflatu & animi ductus celſitudine domum deſeruit, & agrum reliquit incultum vaſtatumque.* Idem, *in Pericle*, pag. 162, B. See the Remark [A] of the Article ANAXAGORAS.

(10) Cicero, *de Finibus*, lib. 5. cap. 29.

(11) *De vita contemplat.* pag. 891.

(12) *Apud* Laert. *in Democrito*, num. 35. *See alſo* Ælian, lib. 4. cap. 20.

(13) Val. Max. lib. 8. cap. 7. Extern. num. 4.

[C] *He gave two proofs of extraordinary ſagacity.*] Democritus going to viſit Hippocrates, the latter cauſed ſome milk to be brought. It is not ſaid whether it was done to make a trial of Democritus's ſkill; it is only ſaid that he declared it was the milk of a black ſhe-goat, which had brought forth but once. Hippocrates had brought a female with him: the firſt time Democritus ſaw her, he called her maid, but the next day he called her woman; and it was found that ſhe had been deflowered the night before. This, without doubt, argues a very penetrating wit, and I ſhould not wonder if Hippocrates was ſurprized at it. Were I aſked my opinion of this ſtory, I ſhould anſwer without heſitation that I believe it falſe. Not but that I think it poſſible for the cauſe of blackneſs in a creature, and reiterated fœcundity, to produce ſome peculiar quality in the milk. This is not at all impoſſible; and it is very poſſible, on the other hand, that it may not be ſo. The ſame thing may be ſaid of the other inſtance. It is poſſible that the loſs of virginity may produce ſome alteration in a woman's exterior; and it is poſſible it may produce none at all. Theſe two contraries being poſſible, let us ſuppoſe that in the milk of a black goat, which has brought forth but once, there is a particular quality which depends on blackneſs, and the firſt bearing: will it be poſſible for a man to diſtinguiſh this quality? I anſwer that this ſeems to me not impoſſible; but I do not believe that any man has yet attained to that degree of knowledge. It is ſaid that bees have ſo nice a diſcernment as to know, among ſeveral perſons who come near their hives, thoſe who have lately taſted the venereal pleaſure (14). There is nothing in this but what is probable; for the organs of inſects are ſo delicate, that an emanation of corpuſcles which excite no ſenſation in a man (15), may irritate the ſmell of bees and ants. But the knowledge of Democritus would exceed that of bees; ſince it is not ſaid that they can diſtinguiſh whether it be the firſt time that a perſon has done the act. I ſay, therefore, that though all that is ſaid of bees were true, and though it were certain that the loſs of virginity would make ſome change in the outward appearance, it muſt not thence be inferred that any man has ever been able to diſtinguiſh that change: and however it be, I am perſuaded that Democritus did not know the two things in queſtion. Nevertheleſs I may relate them without being guilty of a lie; for I do no more than quote what I find in Diogenes Laertius.

(14) Plutarch. *in Præc. Conjug.* pag. 144.

(15) However ſee what will be ſaid of Father Cotton, in the Article MARIANA, Remark [C].

I ſhould not be ſo clear of lying as I am, if I ventured to tell this ſtory with ſome additions which I had not found in the ancient Writers; for which reaſons I accuſe thoſe of lying and falſification, who have ſaid that Democritus knew by the eyes of the girl who accompanied Hippocrates, that ſhe had paſſed the night with a man (16). What they add, that this ſagacity is odious to one half of mankind, might paſs, if they did not deduce it from a falſe ſuppoſition; for certainly it would be a very diſagreeable thing to be in dread of people who could know by a girl's eyes whether ſhe had loſt her maidenhead or not. Thoſe who love pious frauds ought to endeavour to make the world believe there are many people who have ſuch a faculty; but there would be reaſon to fear that this error would be more vigorouſly and effectually oppoſed than any ſuperſtition. A vaſt number of people would be free-thinkers, and would dogmatize like free-thinkers in oppoſition to this pious fraud. Some ſay it was by the girl's voice that Democritus knew ſhe had been deflowered (17). He obſerved, ſay they, that her voice had not the ſame tone as it had the day before; and hereupon they tell us that Albertus Magnus diſcovered the ſlip of a maid-ſervant, without ſtirring out of his cloſet. She had been ſent to a tavern for wine, and returned ſinging: Albertus, though intent on this ſtudy, took notice however

(16) *Puellam Hippocratis comitem virginem primo, ſequenti verò die fœminam ſalutavit, quod nocturnæ deflorationis veſtigia in ejus oculis perciperet, inviſa generis humani dimidio ſagacitate.* Joan. Chryſoſt. Magnenus, *in Vita Democriti*, pag. 7.

(17) Gaſpar à Reies, *in Elyſio jucundar. Quæſtion. Campo*, Quæſt. 39. num. 7. pag. m. 474.

a pleaſure to interſperſe the Hiſtory of the Philoſophers with as many prodigious Adventures as that of the Knights Errant; and it is certain that the exploits of the famous Orlando would not be more wonderful in point of bravery, than the two diſcoveries of Democritus in point of inſight into the ſecrets of nature. Some ſay he lived 109 years [D]; and that he deferred the hour of his death for ſome days in favour of his ſiſter [E]. He compoſed a very great number of Books (d); which needs not be wondered at, even though

(d) Extracted from *Diogenes Laertius*, lib. 9. in *Vita Democriti*, num. 34, & *ſeq.*

however, that the girl's voice was not ſo clear as before, and thence concluded that ſhe had loſt her maidenhead in that ſhort journey. *Nec minus vocis mutationem ob eandem fere cauſam, quo tantum ſigno ferunt Albertum Magnum ex muſeo ſuo puellam, ex ænopolio vinum pro hero apportantem, in itinere vitiatam fuiſſe deprehendiſſe, quod in reditu ſubinde tantantis ex acuta in graviorem mutatam vocem agnoviſſet* (18). See the laſt paragraph of this Remark.

(18) Idem, ibid.

I have nothing to ſay againſt la Mothe le Vaier; for if he ſays that Democritus knew the qualities of the ſhe-goat by the ſmell of the milk, he tells us at the ſame time that according to Diogenes Laertius it was the ſight, and not the ſmell, by which Democritus made the diſcovery. So that la Mothe le Vaier does not deceive us; he gives us no room to believe that his conjecture is a fact which he took from the ancient Authors. The Reader will not be diſpleaſed to find here the foundation of his conjecture: *Democritus*, ſays he (19), *made himſelf admired in his conference with Hippocrates, judging in the ſame manner* (20) *that the milk which had been preſented to them was of a black goat, which had brought forth but once. I know very well that the Writer of his Life* (*) *ſpeaks of this diſcernment as an effect of the ſight: but what we read in Philoſtratus of a young ſhepherd, who knew by the ſmell that the milk was not pure, makes me think the ſame thing of the action of Democritus. That peaſant, who was tall and wonderfully ſtrong, was named Agathio, and had deſired the Sophiſt Herodes to get ready for him the next morning a veſſel full of milk pure in his ſenſe, that is to ſay, which had not been milked by the hand of a woman. But he perceived, ſo ſoon as it was offered him, that it was not ſuch as he had deſired, proteſting that the ſcent of her hands who had milked it offended his noſtrils. Philoſtratus thereupon calls him a Diviner.*

(19) Tom. 10. Lettre 4. pag. 31.

(20) *That is, as Pherecydes had* foretold an earthquake by the ſmell of ſome well-water.

(*) Diog. Laert.

As frivolous as the Story I have told of the diſcovery of Albertus Magnus may be, yet very able Phyſicians ſpend a good deal of time in reaſoning on the ſympathy which they ſuppoſe there is between the organs of generation and the throat; and it is common enough to ſee people, and even ſome of the meaner ſort, obſerve that a Preacher, the firſt year of his marriage, has the tone of his voice more dry, broken, and hoarſe than before. Meurſius aſſerts that anciently nurſes meaſured the necks of the girls they had under their care, with a thread, in order to know whether their virginity was gone or not (21). He proves this by a paſſage of Catullus; but I ſhould chuſe to ſay, that paſſage only ſhews that they uſed to meaſure their necks on their wedding day, and the day after. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for the month of January 1686, pag. 17. Iſaac Voſſius, in his Comment on the ſame paſſage, makes a Note wherein he ſpeaks of a pretended Book of Democritus, in which the manner of meaſuring the neck is deſcribed. This therefore belongs of right to this part of my Commentary. *In veteri ſcripto de ſympathia & antipathia, quod perperam tribuitur Democrito, ita hæc referuntur:* Λαβὼν βιβλάριον καταμάτρησον ἀπὸ ὠτίου ἐς ὠτίον. κἂν μὲν ἴσον ᾖ, παρθένος ἐστι. εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἔφθαρται. *Nempe ſi filum aut funiculum ex lino aut papyro accipias, & anterioris colli ſpatium ab aure ad aurem, & deinceps cervicem ſeu averſam metiaris colli partem ſimiliter ad aures, fuerintque hæc intervalla inæqualia, defloratam eſſe ſponſam, contra, ſi æquales fuerint iſti ſemicirculi, eſſe etiamnum virginem. Aliud quoque addit ſignum, ſcilicet ſi collum fuerit calidum & nates frigidæ, & hoc quoque amiſſæ virginitatis eſſe indicium* (22). i. e. "In an old "Treatiſe of Sympathy and Antipathy, which is "falſely attributed to Democritus, theſe things are "thus related: Take a thread or a ſmall ſtring of "linen or the papyrus, and meaſure the forepart of "the neck from ear to ear, and then the hindpart "likewiſe from ear to ear; and if thoſe diſtances be "unequal, you may conclude the bride has been de"flowered; but if, on the contrary, thoſe ſemicircles "be equal, ſhe is yet a virgin. He alſo adds an"other ſign, which is, that if the neck be warm "and the buttocks cold, this alſo is a mark of de"floration." There was another way of meaſuring; of which Severinus Pinellus ſpeaks in the 5th chapter of the 1ſt Book *de Notis Virginitatis*, and Gaſpar à Reies in his 38th Queſtion.

(21) Meurſ. Auct. *Philol.* cap. 36. *apud* Almelov. *Specim. Antiquit. e ſacris profanarum*, pag. 67.

(22) If. Voſſius, *in hæc Verba* Catulli, Epith. Pelei & Thetidis, *Non illam nutrix orienti luce reviſens Heſperno collum poterit circundare filo*, pag. 248.

[D] *Some ſay he lived* 109 *years.*] We find nothing certain, either as to the time of his birth, or the time of his death. Wherefore we ſee Scaliger has done no more than obſerved wherein Authors contradict themſelves (23). Democritus in the Chronicle of Euſebius flouriſhed at the beginning of the 70th Olympiad, and died the 2d year of the 93d (24). On this foot he muſt have lived much longer than 109 years, or elſe he muſt have flouriſhed ſo early as the 19th year of his age. Diodorus Siculus makes him die at the age of 90, the 1ſt year of the 94th Olympiad (25). Lucian aſſures us that Democritus ſuffered himſelf to die of hunger at the age of 104 (26). If we had any thing certain concerning the age of Anaxagoras, we ſhould better know the Chronology of Democritus; for the latter aſſerts in one of his Works (27), that he was forty years younger than Anaxagoras. But there is nothing but diſagreement among the Authors who ſet down the dates of Anaxagoras's life. He was 32 years old, it is ſaid (28), when Xerxes paſſed into Europe: he lived ſeventy two years, and died the 1ſt year of the 78th Olympiad. I omit ſeveral other confuſions which are no eaſier got clear of than theſe. We may boldly affirm that Ælian is miſtaken (29), in ſuppoſing that Democritus derided Alexander, on account of the uneaſineſs that Prince was in when he conſidered that he had not yet conquered one world, and that there was an infinite number of them according to Democritus. The 109 years which are given this Philoſopher cannot bring him down to the conqueſt of Alexander. The opinion of Aulus Gellius is ſolid; and he had it from good hands: he aſſerts that Socrates was younger than Democritus (30). Now Socrates died the 1ſt year of the 95th Olympiad, at the age of ſeventy (31): Democritus therefore muſt have been then eighty years old at leaſt. So that he would have been above 140, if he had been alive when Alexander aſcended the throne, the 1ſt year of the 111th Olympiad. Let us not forget the kind of death which Marcus Antoninus (32) attributes to Democritus, in oppoſition to all the other Writers. He makes him die of the lowſy diſeaſe; taking, as it ſeems, one man for another, Pherecydes for Democritus. You will ſee in the Remark [E] ſeveral authorities concerning the voluntary death of our Philoſopher. They may be joined with theſe three Verſes of Lucretius:

(23) Scalig. *in Euſeb.* num. 1616, pag. 109.

(24) Mr. Menage, *Notæ in Laert.* lib. 9. num. 41, imputes to *Euſebius* the placing the death of Democritus in the 4th year of the 94th Olympiad. *Jonſius* deceived him, who ſays this pag. 23.

(25) Diod. Sicul. lib. 14. cap. 11.

(26) Lucian. *in Macrobijs*, pag. m. 639, 640. tom. 2.

(27) *In parvo Diacoſmo*, apud *Laërtium in Democrito*, num. 41.

(28) Laert. lib. 2. num. 7.

(29) Ælian. *Hiſt. div.* lib. 4. cap. ult.

(30) Aulus Gellius, lib. 17. cap. 21.

(31) See his *Life, by Mr. Charpentier*, pag. 284.

(32) Περὶ τῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν, lib. 3. Sect. 3.

(33) Lucret. lib. 3. ver. 1052.

Denique Democritum poſtquam matura vetuſtas
Admonuit memorem motus langueſcere mentis,
Sponte ſua leto caput obvius obtulit ipſe (33).

" Democritus, perceiving age invade,
" His body weaken'd, and his mind decay'd,
" Obey'd the ſummons with a chearful face;
" Made haſte to welcome death, and met him half
" the race." Dryden.

[E] *He deferred the hour of his death for ſome days in favour of his ſiſter.*] His ſiſter was grieved, not to ſee he was going to die, but becauſe on account of his death ſhe ſhould not be able to aſſiſt at the feaſt of Ceres. To free her from this uneaſineſs, he cauſed ſome hot bread to be brought him every morning, and with nothing but the ſmell of that bread he ſupported life till the three days (34) of the feſtival were paſt: after

(34) It laſted 9 days, according to *Ovid*; 4, according to *Heſychius*; 5, according to *Ariſtophanes*. See Caſtellanus, *de Feſtis Græcorum*, pag. 173. Caſaubon, *in Laert.* lib. 9. num. 43, ſuppoſes that where Democritus lived it laſted but three days; though it was otherwiſe at Athens. Yet, in his *Notes on Athenæus*, pag. 537, he ſays it laſted but three days at Athens.

though he had not lived ſo long: for he loved retirement, and applied himſelf to ſtudy in a very ſingular manner [*F*]. Beſides, he was a man of fine parts, and of a vaſt and penetrating genius, which entered into every part of knowledge. Natural and Moral Philoſophy, the Mathematics, polite Learning, the polite Arts, were all within the ſphere of his activity. He became very ſkilful in every thing, and even ſo far as to raiſe himſelf to the glory of Invention, as Seneca informs us [*G*]. I have read in ſome modern Authors

after which he let himſelf gently fall into the arms of death. It is thus that Diogenes Laertius relates it (25). This favours very much of the invention of a mind at leiſure; but Athenæus does not relate the thing with the ſame circumſtances: for he ſays that Democritus, being weary of old age, reſolved to haſten his death, by daily leſſening his uſual allowance. The feſtival of Ceres drew near, and the women of the houſe were ſadly afraid leſt he ſhould die during the continuance of that anniverſary; for they could not have been preſent at the ceremony, if he had died then. They begged of him therefore to put off his death till after the ſolemnity, that they might celebrate it with joy: he conſented, and ordered them to bring him a pot of honey. The ſmell only of that honey kept him alive for ſome days; after which he made it be taken away, and died (36). A modern has raſhly undertaken to criticiſe Athenæus (37). He charges him with having ſaid that Democritus's ſiſter, Prieſteſs of Ceres, deſired her brother not to die during the feſtival, and that Democritus cauſed a large pot of honey to be brought, and eat nothing but honey for ſeveral days. This is not very probable, ſays our Modern, it is much more likely to ſay that this good old man being ready to expire, and incapable of taking nouriſhment, prolonged his life only by ſmelling to the honey, as my countryman Cælius Rhodiginus aſſerts. *Et hæc quidem minus probabiliter Athenæus, cum vero ſit propius moribundum ſenem omniſque alimenti incapacem non ipſo melle, ſed ſola mellis evaporatione vitam produxiſſe, ut aſſeruit Rhodiginus meus (lib. 21. c. 3.)* (38). Who would not laugh on reading this? For I, it is not true that Athenæus ſays Democritus eat honey: he affirms that this Philoſopher took only the ſmell of it. Διαζῆσαι ἡμέρας ἱκανὰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ μέλιτος ἀναφορᾷ μόνῃ χρώμενον: *In multos dies vitam prorogaſſe* ſolo *mellis odore & halitu continuatam* (39). II, It is falſe that the ſmell of honey is more proper to prolong a man's life ſeveral days than the honey itſelf. Suppoſing the man within four inches of the grave, I do not retract what I have ſaid. III, Athenæus does not even ſpeak of Democritus's ſiſter, ſo far is he from making her Prieſteſs of Ceres, a dignity which is not aſcribed to her by Diogenes Laertius. It is this laſt Hiſtorian who mentions the intreaties employed by that ſiſter. IV. Laſtly, it is ridiculous to cite a Cælius Rhodiginus concerning facts which paſſed above two thouſand years ago.

(35) *In ejus Vita*, lib. 9. num. 43.

(36) Athen. lib. 2. cap. 7. pag. m. 46.

(37) He cites *Athenæus, l. 2. cap.* 3. he ſhould have ſaid *cap.* 7.

(38) Balthaſar Bonifacius, *Hiſt. Ludicra*, lib. 1. cap. 11. pag. m. 33.

(39) Athen. lib. 2. cap. 7.

[*F*] *He applied himſelf to ſtudy in a very ſingular manner.*] He made choice of a room in a houſe ſituated in the middle of a garden, and he kept himſelf ſhut up in that room with ſo perfect an unconcern for every thing that was doing about him, that when he had notice given him one day to be preſent at a ſacrifice, he did not perceive either that the bullock which was to be ſacrificed had been tied near his chamber, or that his father had come to give orders for that ceremony (40). He muſt needs have been a lover of ſolitude, ſince he took delight in ſhutting himſelf up in the tombs. Ἤσκει δὲ καὶ ποικίλως δοκιμάζειν τὰς φαντασίας ἐρημάζων ἐνιότε καὶ τοῖς τάφοις ἐνδιατρίβων. *Nitebatur autem etiam variè probare imaginationes, ſæpe ſolitarius vivens atque etiam ſepulcra incolens* (41). He did it to ſound the ſtrength of his imagination, and to try it every way poſſible. Lucian hereupon tells a pleaſant ſtory: he ſays that Democritus ſhut himſelf up in a ſepulchre which was without the city, and there paſſed days and nights in ſtudying and compoſing. Some young people endeavoured to fright him; they diſguiſed themſelves like dead bodies, they took the moſt frightful vizards they could get, and came about him, making a hundred leaps and capers. He did not vouchſafe them a look, but only ſaid to them, ſtill keeping on writing, *Have done playing the fool.* Ὁ δὲ ὅτι ἤδεισε τὴν προσποίησιν αὐτῶν, ὅτι ὅλως ἐνέλιπε πρὸς αὐτούς. ἀλλὰ μεταξὺ γράφων, παύσασθε ἔφη παίζοντες. οὕτω βεβαίως ἐπίστευε μηδὲν εἶναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἔτι ἔξω γινομένας τῶν σωμάτων. *Hic neque ipſorum ſimulationem timuerit, neque ipſos omnino reſpexerit: ſed inter ſcribendum dixerit, deſinite inepti tire: adeo firmiter credidit animas nihil eſſe poſtquam è corporibus exierint* (42). The reaſon was, ſays Lucian, becauſe he was firmly perſuaded that the ſoul died with the body, and that whatever is ſaid of ſpectres, and ghoſts, and the return of ſpirits, is conſequently a chimæra. Nobody ſcarce has heard of Democritus, without learning at the ſame time that Hippocrates was ſent for to cure him. Some very good Critics (43) are perſuaded that the Letters which are extant concerning this among thoſe of Hippocrates are fictitious: but without doubt this fiction was very ancient. It has been feigned, therefore, long ago that the Abderites had written to Hippocrates, to deſire him to come and viſit Democritus. They were afraid he would become quite diſtracted, and that his great learning would perfectly turn his head; which they looked on as a great misfortune to the public. *Hic præ multa quæ detinet ipſum ſapientia ægrotat, ut timor ſit ne noſtra urbs Abderitarum peſſumdetur, ſi Democritus mente fuerit motus* (44). They ſaw he cared for nothing, laughed at every thing, ſaid the air was full of images, endeavoured to find out what the birds ſaid, and boaſted that he took journeys from time to time into the immenſe ſpace of things. It appears, from one of theſe Letters of Hippocrates, that the love of ſolitude had expoſed Democritus to the ill reports which were ſpread concerning him. *In veritatis regione quam ſapientia colluſtrat, non eſt pater, nec mater, uxorve, aut cognati, non liberi nec fratres neque famuli, fortunaque vel aliud ex his quæ tumultum faciunt. Democritus illuc præ ſapientia commigravit, & inſania teneri creditur ob ſolitudinis amorem* (45). i. e. "In the region "of truth, which is inlightened by wiſdom, there is "neither father, nor mother, wife, or relations, nei"ther children, brothers, nor ſervants, neither fortune, "nor any other of thoſe things which make ſo much "diſturbance in the world. Democritus out of wiſ"dom tranſported himſelf thither, and was thought "to be diſtracted by reaſon of his love for ſolitude." However, the forgery of theſe Letters would not hinder me from believing that Hippocrates was actually ſent for by the Abderites, and, in a word, that he who forged thoſe Letters built on facts ſupported by a tradition of ſome authority (46). But here is ſomething ſtronger. Dr. Drelincourt, Profeſſor of Phyſic at Leyden, one of the learneſt men of our age, has aſſured me there is no room to doubt but that the Letters concerning Democritus, among thoſe of Hippocrates, are genuine: and he ſays it is the general opinion of the Phyſicians.

(40) Diog. Laertius, lib. 9. cap. 36.

(41) Ibid. num. 38.

(42) Lucian. *in Philopſeude*, tom. 2. pag. 495.

(43) Menag. *in Laert.* lib. 9. num. 4.

(44) *Apud* Hippocrat. *in Epiſt.* num. 5. *citante* Magneno, in *Vita Democriti*, pag. 24.

(45) Magnenus, ibid. pag. 26.

(46) I do not, therefore, deſtroy here what I have ſaid above, Citation (47) of the Article ABDERA.

[*G*] *He became very ſkilful, . . . and even ſo far as to be able to raiſe himſelf to the glory of invention, as Seneca informs us.*] Here is the Elogy which his Hiſtorian has given him: Ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ πάνσοφος. τὰ γὰρ φυσικὰ, καὶ τὰ ἠθικὰ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ μαθηματικὰ, καὶ τὴν ἐγκυκλίους λόγους καὶ περὶ τεχνῶν πᾶσαν εἶχεν ἐμπειρίαν. *Erat revera in Philoſophia quinque certaminum peritus. Namque naturalia, moralia, mathematica, liberalium diſciplinarum orbem artiumque omnem peritiam callebat* (47). i. e. "He was really a perfect Maſter in all "parts of Philoſophy. For he underſtood Phyſics, "Ethics, Mathematics, and the whole circle of arts "and ſciences." As to the things which he invented, you will find that Seneca does not much commend him. *Democritus, inquit, inveniſſe dicitur fornicem, ut lapidum curvatura paulatim inclinatorum medio ſaxo alligaretur. Hoc dicam falſum eſſe. Neceſſe eſt enim ante Democritum, & pontes, & portas fuiſſe, quarum fere ſumma curvantur. Excidit porro vobis, eundem Democritum inveniſſe, quemadmodum ebur molliretur, quemadmodum decoctus calculus in ſmaragdum converteretur, qua hodieque coctura inventi lapides coctiles colorantur. Illa ſapiens licet invenerit, non qua ſapiens erat, invenit. Multa enim facit, quæ ab imprudentiſſimis aut æque fieri videmus, aut peritius, aut exercitatius* (48). i. e. "Democritus, ſaid he, is

(47) Laert. lib. 9. num. 37.

(48) Seneca, *Epiſt.* 90. pag. m. 371.

Authors that his long life was a conſequence of his chaſtity [*H*]; but I do not find this in the Ancients. If all that has been quoted as his was taken from his genuine Writings, it cannot be denied but that he fed himſelf with whimſies in ſome reſpects [*I*]; for it

" ſaid to have invented the arch in building, ſo as " the gradual inclination of the ſtones may be ſup- " ported or bound by the middle ſtone. This I ſay is " falſe. For it is certain there were bridges and gates " before Democritus, the higheſt parts of which are " generally bowed. But you have forgotten that " the ſame Democritus alſo found out a method of " ſoftening ivory, and of changing a pebble into an " emerald by boiling, by which method ſtones which " are found fit for the purpoſe are coloured at this " day. Though he was a wiſe man who invented " theſe things, yet they were not the effect of his " wiſdom: for many things which he did we ſee per- " formed by the moſt ignorant full as well, or even " more artificially and more ſkilfully."

[*H*] *I have read in ſome moderns that his long life was an effect of his chaſtity.*] An Author, whom I have already refuted (49), aſſures us that Democritus, who was indebted for his long life of above a hundred years to honey and his exact continence, deteſted the act of love as a thing which made a man to leap out of a man. He cites Pliny, in the VI Chapter of the XXVIII Book; but you will find in Pliny only theſe words: *Venerem damnavit Democritus, ut in qua homo alius exſiliret ex homine* (50). Not a word, either of the vertue of honey, or of continency, with regard to the long life of Democritus. As to the honey, our modern Author might have found a witneſs; ſince Athenæus tells us that Democritus was always a great lover of honey, and was of opinion that a man to preſerve his health ſhould apply honey inwardly, and oil outwardly (51). That Philoſopher even ſeems to have promiſed a reſurrection to bodies buried in honey; for it is very likely that theſe words of Pliny, *Similis & de aſſervandis corporibus hominum ac reviviſcendi promiſſa Democrito vanitas qui non revixit ipſe* (52); i. e. " Such another piece of folly was " the project of preſerving the dead bodies of men, " and the bringing them to life again, deviſed by De- " mocritus, who did not come to life again himſelf," refer to a paſſage of Varro, which I am going to copy. *Quare Heraclides Ponticus plus ſapit qui præcepit ut comburerent, quam Democritus qui ut in melle ſervarent: quem ſi vulgus ſecutus eſſet, peream ſi centum denariis calicem mulſi emere poſſemus* (53). i. e. " For " which reaſon Heraclides Ponticus, who directed " them to be burnt, was more in the right than De- " mocritus who would have them preſerved in honey: " and if the common people had followed his advice, " a glaſs of wine mixed with honey muſt have coſt a " conſiderable ſum." But as to the other point, I know not where our modern could meet with an authority for it. Give him leave to reaſon, and he will not attain his end: if he ſays that Democritus blamed the ſport of love for no other reaſon than becauſe he found the abſtaining from it had been of ſervice to him, he will lay down a falſe principle; ſince there are a great number of people who counſel chaſtity, becauſe they feel the ſad and miſchievous conſequences of incontinence. Another Modern goes too far, when he ſays that Democritus recommended both by reaſons, and by his own example, the approaching the fair ſex but rarely. *Morum præterea integritas pudicitiaque tanta, ut rationibus exemploque rarum Veneris uſum commendaret* (54). He cites Pliny, and the IV Chapter of the III Book of Rodericus a Caſtro *de natura Mulierum*. He does not ſay what paſſage of Pliny we are to conſult; but no doubt he had in view the words which I have quoted from the VI Chapter of the XXVIII Book, wherein there is no mention of Democritus's having ſet himſelf up for an example. Roderic de Caſtro does not ſay Democritus quoted himſelf; and if he had ſaid ſo, he would be but one blind man leading another.

I do not ſay this to detract in the leaſt from the continency of Democritus: my deſign is only to make modern Writers ſenſible of the obligation they lie under to advance nothing but what they find in Authors worthy of credit. We ſhall ſee below (55) that Tertullian does not give Democritus a good teſtimony in this reſpect.

(49) Balth. Bonifacius, *Hiſt. Ludicra*, lib. 11. cap. 5. pag. 317.

(50) Dr. Drelincourt has directed me to two paſſages very like this: one is in *Galen, Comm. III, in VI Epidemior.* pag. 478, l. 7; the other in *Tertullian de Anima*, cap. 27. pag. 330, C. *See alſo* Clem. Alexandrin. lib. 2. *Pædag.* pag. 193, D.

(51) Athen. lib. 2. cap. 7. pag. 46.

(52) Plin. lib. 7. cap. 55.

(53) Varro, *in Libro περὶ ταφῆς, apud* Nonium, *voce* Vulgus.

(54) Magnenus, *in Vita Democriti*, pag. 8.

(55) In the Remark [*K*].

[*I*] *It cannot be denied but that he ſed himſelf with whimſies in ſome reſpects.*] Columella (56) has cited the Book which Democritus had written concerning Antipathies. It was aſſerted there, that if a woman, in the time of her courſes, walked three times round every bed, with her feet bare, and her hair looſe, ſhe would kill all the caterpillars in a garden. *Sed Democritus in eo libro qui Græcè inſcribitur περὶ ἀντιπαθῶν, affirmat has ipſas beſtiolas enecari, ſi mulier, quæ in menſtruis eſt, ſolutis crinibus, & nudo pede unamquamque aream ter circumeat, poſt hoc enim decidere omnes vermiculos, & ita emori.* What can ſavour more of ſuperſtition? Democritus uſed to ſay alſo, that to make a woman confeſs the truth, the tongue of a frog ſhould be applied to her heart while ſhe ſlept (57). But this tongue was to be plucked out of a live frog, and that without holding the frog by any other part (58). The frog was alſo to be put again into the water. If you would know Pliny's judgment of this device, you need only conſult the paſſage where he mentions a like vertue which was attributed to the heart of an owl. They pretended that if it was laid on a woman's left breaſt, while ſhe was aſleep, it would make her reveal all her ſecrets. *Nec omittam in hac quoque alite* (bubone) *exemplum magicæ vanitatis: quippe præter reliqua portentoſa mendacia, cor ejus impoſitum mammæ mulieris dormientis ſiniſtræ tradunt efficere, ut omnia ſecreta pronunciet* (59). Pliny calls this a magical Romance: without doubt he paſſed the ſame judgment on Democritus's ſtory, and placed it in the liſt of thoſe Romances; for immediately after he obſerves that the Magicians add ſome other things, which, if true, would make frogs of greater uſe to mankind than the laws. That animal would furniſh a never failing expedient for the putting an end to all gallantry among the women. Pliny's words are not clear enough, either with reſpect to the application of the remedy, or with reſpect to a notable circumſtance. He does not ſay whether the expedient prevented cuckoldom, or whether it only hindred a woman's perſiſting in adultery. This is no Logical diſtinction, but a matter of conſequence: every expreſſion ought to be weighed, and even the leaſt ambiguities avoided. They ought likewiſe to be avoided as to the manner of applying the expedient: but we ſhall ſee this has not been done in the paſſage of Pliny. *Addunt etiamnum alia Magi, quæ ſi vera ſunt, multò utiliores vitæ exiſtimentur ranæ, quàm leges. Namque arundine transfixa natura per os, ſi ſurculus in menſtruis defigatur à marito, adulteriorum tædium fieri* (60). Du Pinet has tranſlated thus: *If a frog be empaled on a reed, ſpitting it through the head and the privy parts.* Father Hardouïn ſuppoſes the reed to be thruſt firſt thro' the privy parts, *arundine transfixa per ranæ pudenda ad os uſque.* Pliny is obſcure, therefore, as to the ceremonial. I ſay nothing of the other obſcurities.

Here are other whimſies of Democritus. He ſaid that by mingling together the blood of certain birds which he named, a ſerpent would be produced of ſo wonderful a property, that whoever ſhould eat it would be able to underſtand what the birds ſaid to one another. Pliny is in the right to ridicule this chimæra, as well as the ſtory of Melampus, who it is pretended came to underſtand the language of birds, by ſerpents licking his ears. *Qui credit iſta, & Melampodi profectò aures lambendo dediſſe intellectum avium ſermonis dracones non abnuet: vel quæ Democritus tradit nominando aves, quarum confuſo ſanguine ſerpens gignatur, quem quiſquis ederit, intellecturus ſit avium colloquia* (61). Since he finds him ſo credulous, that he thinks he has a right to inſult him, and to applaud himſelf for not adopting ſuch fooleries, Democritus's ſtories muſt certainly have been very ſtrange ones. The Book which that Philoſopher had written concerning the Chamæleon, was, I fancy, one of the beſt magazines of his exceſſive credulity. *Jungemus illis*, ſays Pliny (62), *ſimillima & peregrina æquè animalia: priuſque chamæleonem, peculiari volumine dignum exiſtimatum Democrito, ac per ſingula membra deſecatum, non ſine magna voluptate noſtra cognitis proditiſque mendaciis Græcæ vanitatis.* i. e. " Let us add to theſe ſome other animals, which " are

(56) *De Re Ruſtica*, lib. 11, *ſub fin.*

(57) *Democritus quidem tradit, ſi quis extrahat ranæ viventi linguam, nulla alia corporis parte adhærente, ipſaque dimiſſa in aquam, imponat ſupra cordis palpitationem mulieri dormienti, quæcunque interrogaverit, vera reſponſuram.* Plin. lib. 32. cap. 5. pag. 846.

(58) *Or rather*, without any other part adhering to it.

(59) Plin. lib. 29. cap. 4.

(60) Idem, lib. 32. cap. 5.

(61) Plin. lib. 10. cap. 49. *See alſo* lib. 29. cap. 4.

(62) Idem, lib 28. cap. 8.

it is pretended he had a receipt to attain the underſtanding of the language of birds. They would alſo perſuade us that he was much addicted to Magic [K]; I mean that ſort

" are very like the former, and altogether as ſtrange: " and firſt the Chamæleon, which Democritus judg- " ed worthy a peculiar Treatiſe, anatomizing every " part of it, and diſcovering the abſurd impertinen- " cies of the Græcian vanity, to our great diverſion." After this ſetting out, Pliny entertains us with ſome ridiculous Extracts from that Book; and then concludes thus: *Utinam eo ramo contactus eſſet Democritus, quoniam ita loquacitates immodicas promiſit inhiberi: palamque eſt virum alias ſagacem & vitæ utiliſſimum nimio juvandi mortales ſtudio prolapſum* (63). i. e. " I wiſh Democritus had himſelf been touched with " that wonderful bough, ſince he has aſſured us that " it had the vertue to ſtop immoderate loquacity: it " being manifeſt that he, who was otherwiſe a wiſe " man, and of great uſe to human ſociety, has loſt " himſelf through a too eager deſire of ſerving man- " kind." We ſhall ſee ſome other paſſages in the following Remark.

(63) Ibid.

Pliny is to be commended for having mentioned the pretended ſecret vertues of the Chamæleon in order only to explode and ridicule them: but he would have deſerved yet greater commendation if he had kept a part of his incredulity for Democritus; I mean, if he had not too lightly believed that Philoſopher to be the Author of that Work, and of ſeveral others which went injuriouſly under his name. The thought of Aulus Gellius ſeems to me very reaſonable; that Democritus was not the Author of thoſe ſtories about the Chamæleon, and the underſtanding the language of birds; but that certain mountebanks had ſkreened themſelves under the authority of that famous Philoſopher. *Librum eſſe Democriti nobiliſſimi Philoſophorum de vi & natura chamæleontis; eumque ſe legiſſe Plinius Secundus in naturalis hiſtoriæ viceſimo octavo refert; multaque vana atque intoleranda auribus deinde quaſi à Democrito ſcripta tradit. . . . . His portentis atque præſtigiis à Plinio Secundo ſcriptis non dignum eſſe cognomen Democriti puto. . . . . Multa autem videntur ab hominibus iſtis malè ſollertibus hujuſcemodi commenta in Democriti nomen data, nobilitatis auctoritatiſque ejus perfugio utentibus* (64). We cannot avoid making this judgment, when we conſider the character which Lucian has given him. He places Democritus, Epicurus, and Metrodorus, in the rank of thoſe Free-thinkers whoſe ſouls are ſteeled againſt thoſe who would perſuade them to credit prodigies. According to him, Democritus was always of opinion that miracle-mongers do nothing but by artifice: he endeavoured to diſcover the method by which they deceived, and if he failed therein, he notwithſtanding believed the whole to be nothing but impoſture. Ὥστε παῦτο τὸ μηχάνημα ἐδεῖτο Δημοκρίτου τινὸς . . . . ἀδαμαντίνην πρὸς ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα τὴν γνώμην ἔχοντος· ὡς ἀπίστησαι. *Ut res planè Democritum aliquem requireret . . . . qui adverſus hæc & ſimilia mentem haberet adamantinam ut non crederet, &c* (65).

(64) Aulus Gellius, lib. 10. cap. 12.

(65) Lucianus, *in Pſeudom.* pag. 873, tom. 1.

[K] *They would perſuade us he was much addicted to Magic.*] This does by no means agree with the Ideas of Lucian which have been juſt now mentioned. However it be, it is fit we ſhould hear Pliny (66): *Certè Pythagoras, Empedocles, Democritus, Plato ad hanc* (Magicen) *diſcendam navigavere, exſiliis verius, quam peregrinationibus, ſuſceptis. Hanc reverſi prædicavere, hanc in arcanis habuere. Democritus Apollobechem Coptiten, & Dardanum è Phœnice illuſtravit: voluminibus Dardani in ſepulchrum ejus petitis: ſuis* (67) *verò ex diſciplina eorum editis: quæ recepta ab aliis hominum, atque tranſiiſſe per memoriam, æquè ac nihil in vita, mirandum eſt. In tantum fides iſtis faſque omne deeſt, adeo ut ii qui cætera in viro illo probant, hæc ejus eſſe opera inficientur. Sed fruſtra. Hunc enim maximè affixiſſe animis eam dulcedinem conſtat. Plenumque miraculi & hoc, pariter utraſque artes efflo- ruiſſe: Medicinam dico, Magicenque, eadem ætate illam Hippocrate, hanc Democrito illuſtrantibus.* i. e. " It is " certain that Pythagoras, Empedocles, Democritus, " and Plato went into foreign parts to learn Magic; " and may rather be ſaid to have gone into voluntary " baniſhment, than to have undertaken to travel. " This was the ſcience they boaſted of at their return, " and repreſented as a great myſtery. Democritus has " explained the Writings of Apollobeches of Coptos, " and Dardanus the Phœnician; the Writings of " Dardanus being depoſited in his tomb, his own " (67) which he had compiled from their doctrine " were publiſhed: and it is ſurprizing beyond any " thing in life to me, that they have been handed " down and preſerved to us; ſince they are ſo en- " tirely deſtitute of truth or probability, that they " who approve of the man in other reſpects, deny " theſe Works to be his. But in vain. For it is cer- " tain his mind was prodigiouſly fond of thoſe agree- " able deluſions. This likewiſe is very wonder- " ful, that both arts ſhould ſhoot up at once; I mean " Phyſic, and Magic; the former being explained " by Hippocrates, and the latter by Democritus, in " the ſame age." I have ſet down the paſſage ſomewhat at length, in order to inform the Reader, 1, that the favourers of Democritus have always denied that he wrote the Books of Magic which were aſcribed to him; 2, that Pliny maintained in oppoſition to them that they were juſtly attributed to him. Let us go on to another paſſage of Pliny (68): *In promiſſo herbarum mirabilium occurrit aliqua dicere & de magicis: quæ enim mirabiliores ſunt? Primi eas in noſtro orbe celebravere Pythagoras atque Democritus conſectati magos.* i. e. " In the promiſed account of ſome won- " derful herbs ſomething may be ſaid of thoſe made " uſe of in Magical operations: for what herbs are " more wonderful? The firſt who diſcourſed of them " in our parts of the world, were Pythagoras and " Democritus, in imitation of the Magi." A little after he obſerves that ſome people would not allow certain Books aſcribed to thoſe two great men to be the production of their pens; and here is what he ſays in anſwer. *Nec me fallit hoc volumen ejus à quibuſdam Cleemporo Medico adſcribi: Pythagoræ pertinax fama antiquitaſque vindicavit. Et id ipſum auctoritatem voluminibus affert* (69), *ſi quis alius curæ ſuæ opus illo viro dignum judicavit: quod feciſſe Cleemporum cum alia ſuo & nomine ederet, quis credat? Democriti certè chirocmeta eſſe conſtat. At in his ille poſt Pythagoram magorum ſtudioſiſſimus quanto portentoſiora tradit?* i. e. " Nor am I ignorant that this Book of his is by ſome " attributed to Cleemporus the Phyſician: but con- " ſtant fame and antiquity have both adjudged it to " Pythagoras. And this very thing is a further ar- " gument the Books are genuine (69); for who can " believe that Cleemporus, when he publiſhed other " things under his own name, would not have done " the ſame by a Work of his which he judged wor- " thy of ſo great a man? The Chirocmeta is un- " doubtedly Democritus's. But how much more por- " tentous things are delivered in that Treatiſe by the " latter, who was the greateſt admirer of the Magi " next to Pythagoras?"

(68) Plin. lib. 24. cap. 17.

(69) This is a weak reaſon; for how many ſilly Books go under celebrated names, and eſpecially on the ſubject of Magic?

Before I go any farther, I ſhall dwell a little on the Title of the Work juſt now mentioned by Pliny. Salmaſius luckily diſcovered that this Book ought not to be intitled *Chirocineta:* for which reaſon he has corrected that word which was in the Editions of Pliny, and ſhewed that *Chirocmeta* ſhould be put in its place. He has at the ſame time corrected a paſſage of Vitruvius, where mention is made of the ſame Work of Democritus: *Multas res attendens*, ſays Vitruvius (70), *admiror etiam Democriti de rerum natura volumina, & ejus commentarium quod inſcribitur* χειροκμητων, *in quo utebatur annulo ſignans cera molli quæ eſſet expertus.* i. e. " In taking notice of many things, I alſo ad- " mire Democritus's Books of the nature of things, " and his Commentary intitled *Chirocmeta*, wherein " he ſealed with ſoft wax thoſe things which he had " himſelf experienced the truth of." We read before in Vitruvius χειροτονητον *in quo etiam utebatur annulo ſignans cera ex millio quæ eſſet expertus.* Salmaſius, on the ſame principle, corrects that paſſage of Diogenes Laertius, where it is ſaid that Democritus wrote χερικὰ ἢ φυσικὰ προβλήματα. It ſhould be χειρόμητα ἢ φυσικὰ προβλήματα (71). Caſaubon's Criticiſm had gone no farther than to conjecture that the fault in Diogenes Laertius might be amended by the *Chirocineta* of Pliny (72). But this would have been to expel one diſeaſe by another. They who are of opinion that the word *Chirocineta* ſhould be left in Pliny, explain it according

Some Remarks concerning the Book intitled Chirocmeta.

(70) Vitruv. lib. 9. cap. 3.

(71) *See* Salmaſ. *in Exercit. Plinianis*, pag. 1100, 1101.

(72) Caſaubon. *in Laert.* lib. 9. num. 49.

(67) Father *Hardouin* in this place quotes *Clemens Alexandrinus, l.* 1. *Stromat.* pag. 303. who ſays Democritus explained a pillar of *Acicari* a Babylonian Author, and inſerted that Explication in his Writings.

fort of Magic which is founded on a compact with the Devil. I do not think he was ſuch a viſionary as to put out his own eyes [*L*], as ſome have aſſerted. The manner in which

cording to their own fancy: ſome ſay that Title ſignified that the Work was to be handled often (73); and others think it was ſo intitled, *becauſe it was to be handled with great ceremony* (74). Heſychius wonderfully confirms the Corrections of Salmaſius; for he acquaints us that the Critics uſed to put a piece of wax on thoſe places of a Work which ſeemed to them obſcure, and to deſerve further examination. There is a ſtrong objection remaining. If the Chirocmeta of Democritus was a Work wherein he had ſet his ſeal on all the things which he had ſpoken of from experience, how came it to be ſtuffed with ſo many fables, and ſo many ridiculous and ſuperſtitious ſtories? Pliny is not ſatisfied with characterizing it in general by theſe words: *In his* Democritus *poſt Pythagoram magorum ſtudioſiſſimus quanto portentoſiora tradit?* but cites ſeveral things out of it which ſavour of the black Art.

(73) *Nec melius interpretantur ita dicta quod aſſidue manibus tractanda eſſent.* Salmaſius, *Exercit. Plinian.* pag. 1100, C.

(74) Du Pinet, in the Margin of his French Tranſlation of Pliny.

I find great perplexity in all this, and I do not ſee a better expedient than the NON LIQUET, or the ἐπέχω, i. e. the ſuſpenſion of aſſent, of the Sceptics. It may be Democritus, without examining the conſequences of his Syſtem too nearly, hoped to diſcover ſeveral occult qualities, and the art of performing a thouſand extraordinary things by the help of Magic. This being once allowed, we may imagine that he greedily read all Books of Magic, and compiled the pretended wonders he had ſeen therein, and alſo thoſe which he might have learned by word of mouth. He might have made ſome ſurprizing experiments of the vertue of certain herbs, and have marked with his ſeal the page of his *Chirocmeta*, in which he ſet down his experiments. This Book might be ſo intitled, though the greater part of the things it contained had not been approved by the Author's ſeal, and ſo nothing hinders but Pliny might have found a great many fables in it. This is one way of accounting for the matter: but it does not ſeem to me to be the beſt. I ſhould rather ſay that Democritus did not compoſe the ſuperſtitious, fabulous, and magical Writings, which went under his name. Diogenes Laertius having given a long Catalogue of the Works of this Philoſopher, adds that ſeveral others were falſly aſcribed to him (75). Columella (76) owns it with regard to a certain Book the true Author of which was named *Dolus* (77) *Mendeſius*. It ſeems Suidas gives but a ſmall number of Books for the true Works of Democritus. We have ſeen above the complaint made by Aulus Gellius. Laſtly, we may ſay that if Diogenes Laertius has not rejected more of them, this only proves that there were Forgers, who ſoon after Democritus's death, publiſhed ſeveral Treatiſes under his name: they were taken for his legitimate iſſue, and ſucceeding ages conformed to that opinion: this was enough for Pliny (78), and Diogenes Laertius (79), to receive thoſe Works as the genuine productions of Democritus. And what made people ſo eaſily impoſed on at firſt, was that the exceſſive curioſity of that Philoſopher, his love for ſolitude, his application in making experiments, and the ſucceſs of ſome of his predictions, eaſily perſuaded them he had left in writing all the ſecrets, and all the remarks, which were to be found in the Books that appeared under his name.

(75) Diog. Laert. *in ejus* Vita, *ſub fin.*

(76) Columell. *de Re Ruſtica*, lib. 7. cap. 5.

(77) Or rather *Bolus*, according to *Suidas*.

(78) *Pythagoræ pertinax fama antiquitaſque vindicant.* It is the proof which Pliny makes uſe of, lib. 24. cap. 17.

(79) The Works which he rejects are thoſe which had been rejected by common conſent, ὁμολογουμένως ἐστὶν ἀλλότρια, *omnino aliena conſenſu omnium ſunt.*

Petronius teſtifies that Democritus ſpent his life in making experiments on Vegetables and Minerals: *Omnium herbarum ſuccos Democritus expreſſit: & ne lapidum virgultorumque vis lateret, ætatem inter experimenta conſumpſit.* i. e. "Democritus extracted the "the juice of every herb; and left the vertues of "ſtones and plants ſhould lie undiſcovered, he ſpent "his whole life in experiments." They ſay, that foreſeeing it would be a bad year for olives, he bought a great quantity of oil at a low price, by which he got an immenſe profit; but he would not take advantage of it, contenting himſelf with making it appear that he could be rich if he pleaſed. They wondred that a man, who had never ſeemed to mind any thing but his ſtudies, ſhould on a ſudden concern himſelf in trade: who doubts but when the reaſon was known, a great many people took him for a Magician? Others thought him worthy of divine honours. Ὡς δὲ προειπών τινα τῶν μελλόντων εὐδοκίμησε, λοιπὸν ἐνθέου δόξης παρὰ τοῖς πλείοσι ἠξιώθη (80). *Ubi vero futura quædam prædixerat, ſequenſque rerum eventus fidem fecerat, divinis jam honoribus dignus à pleriſque judicatus eſt.* Here is the paſſage which proves this traffic, and the conſequence of it. *Ferunt Democritum, qui primus intellexit, oſtenditque cum terris cœli ſocietatem, ſpernentibus hanc curam ejus opulentiſſimis civium, præviſa olei caritate ex futuro Vergiliarum ortu, qua diximus ratione, oſtendemuſque jam plenius, magna tum vilitate propter ſpem olivæ, coëmiſſe in toto tractu omne oleum* (81), *mirantibus qui paupertatem & quietem doctrinarum ei ſciebant in primis cordi eſſe. Atque ut apparuit cauſa, & ingens divitiarum curſus, reſtituiſſe mercedem anxiæ & avidæ dominorum pœnitentiæ, contentum ita probaſſe, opes ſibi in facili, cum vellet, fore* (82). Another time he adviſed his brother Damaſus on a very hot day to employ his reapers only in carrying into the barn the corn which they had already cut down. He foreſaw a furious ſtorm, which happened quickly after. *Tradunt eundem Democritum mentente fratre ejus Damaſo ardentiſſimo æſtu oraſſe ut reliquæ ſegeti parceret, raperetque deſecta ſub tectum, paucis mox horis ſævo imbre vaticinatione approbata* (83). I have heard that a Gentleman of Normandy, knowing by the Barometer that it would rain ſoon, got his hay in while it was very fair weather. This made the country people in the neighbourhood ſay that he dealt with the Devil, ſince he could ſo ſeaſonably foretel the change of the weather for his own intereſt. Were they leſs raſh in judging ill of their neighbours in the age of Democritus? Were not the ſecrets of nature in the hands of an incomparably leſs number of people than they are at preſent? Democritus, therefore, was more liable to be ſuſpected of Magic, than he would be at this day.

(80) Diogenes Laert. lib. 9. num. 39.

(81) Cicero, lib. 1. *de Divinatione*, cap. 3. Ariſtotle, lib. 1. *Politic.* cap. 7. and Diogenes Laertius, *in Thalete*, attribute this to Thales; but with this difference, that Thales bought the oil which was to be made that year, according to *Cicero*, and the oil-preſſes according to *Ariſtotle* and *Diogenes Laertius*. See Father *Hardouin* on this paſſage of *Pliny*, and Mr. *Menage* on *Laertius*, lib. 1. num. 26.

(82) Plin. lib. 18. cap. 28.

(83) Idem, lib. 18. cap. 35.

I ſhall obſerve occaſionally, that in my opinion Salmaſius refutes Solinus but ill, concerning the conteſts of Democritus with the Magi. Solinus pretends that Philoſopher made uſe of the ſtone *Catochites* againſt them with good ſucceſs. *Accipimus Democritum Abderiten oſtentatione ſcrupuli hujus frequenter uſum ad probandam occultam naturæ potentiam in certaminibus quæ contra magos habuit* (84). i. e. "I have heard that "Democritus of Abdera frequently ſhewed the effect "of this pebble, to prove the occult power of na"ture in the diſputes he had with the Magi." Salmaſius (85) oppoſes to Solinus ſeveral paſſages of Pliny, which, as has been ſeen in this Remark, teſtify that Democritus was very much attached to the Magicians. But who told Salmaſius there is no emulation among thoſe people? Is it not very probable that they contend for reputation? Is not this confirmed by our Dæmonographical Writers? Do they not tell us there are Magicians who can undo what the others do? It is plain that Jannes and Jambres, who withſtood Moſes (86), took him for a Magician. So Democritus might for a conſiderable time be the humble follower of the Magicians, and then, when he thought he knew as much or more than the others, he might thwart thoſe he met with, in order to raiſe his own reputation above them.

(84) Solin. cap. 3. *ſub fin.*

(85) Salmaſ. *in Exercit. Plinian.* pag. 98, 99.

(86) 2 Tim. iii. 8.

[*L*] *I do not think he was ſuch a Viſionary as to put out his own eyes.*] Several Authors relate this ſilly ſtory. The reaſon which is moſt commonly given why he did ſo, is that he hoped to meditate more profoundly, when the objects of the ſight ſhould not divert the intellectual powers of his mind (87). *Democritum Philoſophum in monumentis hiſtoriæ Græcæ ſcriptum eſt . . . . luminibus oculorum ſua ſponte ſe privaſſe, quia exiſtimaret cogitationes commentationeſque animi ſui in contemplandis naturæ rationibus vegetiores & exactiores fore, ſi eas videndi illecebris, & oculorum impedimentis liberaſſet* (88). Was it not enough for him to ſhut himſelf up in a dark place, or to keep his eyes ſhut during the time of his meditation? Laberius, in a Dramatic Piece, feigns that this Philoſopher blinded himſelf, that his ſight might be no longer ſhocked by the proſperity of the wicked: Laberius, I ſay, feigns this for no other reaſon, than becauſe

(87) Cicero, *de Finit.* lib. 5. cap. 29. neither affirms the fact nor denies it: if he had owned it he would never have found out his reaſon for it.

(88) Aulus Gellius, lib. 12. cap. 17.

which he comforted Darius is ingenious enough [*M*]. He is excuſable for having laughed at human life in general [*N*]: and it was better to do that than to imitate Heraclitus, who wept eternally. He was the forerunner of Epicurus [*O*]; for the Syſtem of the latter differs from that of Democritus no otherwiſe than on account of ſome improvements. It is Democritus alſo who has furniſhed the Sceptics with all they have ſaid againſt the teſtimony of the ſenſes; for beſides that he uſed to ſay truth was hidden at the bottom of a well, he maintained there was nothing real but atoms and vacuum, and that all the reſt conſiſted only in opinion (*e*). This is what the Carteſians ſay at this day of corporeal qualities, as colour, ſmell, ſound, ſavour, heat, cold: theſe, ſay they, are only modifications of the ſoul. Democritus was nothing leſs than Orthodox concerning the divine nature [*P*], and he believed that our ultimate end is the tranquillity of the mind. Plato hated

(*e*) Laert. lib. 9. num. 44. Sext. Empiricus, *adverſ. Mathemat.* pag. 163. See above the Citation (62) of the Article of ARCESILAUS.

becauſe the Hypotheſis was convenient for him to ſupport the character he had undertaken. He even explained how Democritus deprived himſelf of ſight; it was, ſaid he, by expoſing himſelf to the light reflected by a ſhield (89). *Cauſam voluntariæ cæcitatis finxit aliam* (Laberius) (90) *vertitque in eam rem quam tum agebat, non inconcinniter. Eſt enim perſona, quæ hæc apud Laberium dicit, divitis avari & parci ſumtum plurimum aſotiamque adoleſcentis viri deplorantis.*

(89) Idem, lib. 10. cap. 17.

(90) *In mimo quem ſcripſit Reſtionem.* Idem, ibid.

Democritus Abderites phyſicus philoſophus
Clypeum conſtituit contra exortum Hyperionis,
Oculos effodere ut poſſet ſplendore æreo.
Ita radiis ſolis aciem effodit luminis,
Malis bene eſſe ne videret civibus.
Sic ego fulgentis ſplendorem pecuniæ
Volo elucificare exitum ætati meæ;
Ne in re bona eſſe videam nequam filium.

" Laberius feigned another cauſe of his voluntary " blindneſs, and turned it very ingeniouſly to the ſub- " ject he had then in hand. For he introduces a perſon " under the character of a rich miſer, who laments " the prodigality and debauchery of his ſon in theſe " words:

" When virtue griev'd and vice triumphant rode,
" Abdera's Sage with indignation glow'd:
" His honeſt heart was mov'd; with eager haſte
" Full in the ſun a beamy ſhield he plac'd;
" Then, from ſuch ſights to free his troubl'd mind,
" Catch'd the full blaze, and as he look'd grew blind.
" So ſhall my gold, the Rival of its fire,
" Pour on theſe eyes an everlaſting fire
" Till ſight be loſt; for I will never bear
" To ſee it ſquander'd by a wanton heir."

Plutarch had heard it reported that Democritus made uſe of burning Glaſſes, on which he ſtedfaſtly fixed his eyes, in order to remove an obſtacle of his meditation: Ὅθεν ἰκτῖνο μὲν ψεῦδός ἐϛι τὸ Δημόκριτον ἐκθσῖαι σβέσαι τὰς ὄψεις ἀπερειδόμενον εἰς ἔσοπτρα πυρωθέντα καὶ τὴν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀνάκλασιν δεξάμενον. *Equidem falſum eſt quod dicitur Democritum ſponte ſua oculos extinxiſſe in ignitum ſpeculum eos defigentem luminiſque reflexionem accipientem* (91). But he rejects this ſtory as a Fable. The Author of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, having mentioned the reaſon which, according to Laberius, induced that Philoſopher to blind himſelf, adds; " Others ſay that he put out his eyes to me- " ditate with leſs diſtraction. This is more probable, " though perhaps it is full as falſe; for what likeli- " hood is there that Democritus, who laughed at " every thing, ſhould make the proſperity of a wic- " ked man the ſubject of vexation? This ſhould ra- " ther be matter of ſport and diverſion for a Philo- " ſopher like him, who made it his buſineſs to turn " all the world to ridicule (92)." He might by that means have ſed himſelf with an imaginary triumph over Religion (93). Tertullian alledges another reaſon for our Philoſopher's conduct. He pretends that Democritus could neither look on a woman without wiſhing to enjoy her, nor miſs enjoying her without vexing and fretting himſelf. He could find no better remedy, therefore, againſt this perſecution, than to deprive himſelf of ſight. Tertullian draws from thence matter of great triumph for the faithful over the Pagan Sages. *Democritus excæcando ſemetipſum, quod mulieres ſine concupiſcentia aſpicere non poſſet, & doleret ſi non eſſet potitus, incontinentiam emendatione profitetur* (94). This is a very imaginary triumph; for what we moſt certainly know concerning Democritus utterly overthrows Tertullian's ſuppoſition. He was a man diſengaged from the pleaſures of ſenſe, given to meditation, who deſpiſed honours and riches, and travelled till he was fourſcore (95). But a man ſcarce thinks of travelling into far countries when he is blind; and if thoſe who are above fourſcore had any occaſion to put out their eyes, it would not be becauſe the ſight of women kindles in them the fire of love. A deſire attended with the regret of not enjoying, is not cured by the privation of ſight: the lewdneſs of the heart requires a different remedy. Clemens Alexandrinus ſays a thing which, if taken right, invincibly refutes Tertullian; I have mentioned it in the body of this Article towards the end. But here are that Father's own words: Δημόκριτος δὲ γάμου καὶ παιδοποιΐαν παραιτῆται, διὰ τὰς πολλὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀσχολίας τε καὶ ἀφολκὰς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀναγκαιοτέρων. *Democritus autem repudiat matrimonium & procreationem liberorum propter multas, quæ ex ipſis oriuntur, moleſtias, & quod abſtrahant ab iis quæ ſunt magis neceſſaria* (96). i. e. " Democritus rejected marriage and the procreation of " children, on account of the many troubles which " ariſe thence, and becauſe they take a man off from " things of greater conſequence."

(91) Plut. *de Curioſitate*, pag. 521, C.

(92) *Nouv. de la Repub. des Lettres*, for the month of Feb. 1686, pag. 155.

(93) *Quare religio pedibus ſubjecta viciſſim Obteritur, nos exæquat victoria cœlo.* i. e. " Thus by his " conqueſt we " our right re- " gain; " Religion he " ſubdu'd, and " We now " reign." Lucret. lib. 1. ver. 79.

(94) Tertullian. *in Apolog.* cap. 46.

(95) He ſays it himſelf, *apud* Clem. Alexand. Stromat. lib. 1. pag. 304, & *apud* Euſebium Præpar. lib. 10. cap. 4. pag. m. 472.

(96) Clem. Alex. *Stromat.* lib. 2. pag. 421.

[*M*] *The manner in which he comforted Darius is ingenious enough.*] I do not relate it, becauſe it may be read in Moreri, and in an Author whoſe Works are to be had every where (97). The latter has embroidered it a little. As he cites nobody, I ſhall ſupply that omiſſion. I ſay, therefore, that the ſtory is to be found only in a Letter of the Emperor Julian.

(97) La Mothe le Vayer, tom. 8. pag. 340. *See alſo Father* Garaſſe, *Doctrine Curieuſe*, pag. 297.

[*N*] *He is excuſable for having laughed at human life in general.*] On this head ſee Montagne (98), quoted by the Author of the New Letters againſt Father Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm (99).

(98) Eſſais, liv. 1. chap. 50.

(99) Letter 21. pag. 715.

[*O*] *He was the forerunner of Epicurus.*] I cannot come into the opinion of thoſe who ſay that the few innovations which were ſeen in the Syſtem of Democritus, after it had been adopted by Epicurus, were ſo many depravations (100). But I own that Epicurus did not add many things to it, and that he ſpoiled ſome. *Quid eſt in Phyſicis Epicuri non à Democrito? Nam etſi quædam commutavit, ut quod paulo ante de inclinatione atomorum dixi, tamen pleraque dicit eadem, atomos, inane, imagines, infinitatem locorum, innumerabilitatemque mundorum, eorum ortus & interitus, omnia ferè quibus naturæ ratio continetur . . . .* (101). *Democritus vir magnus in primis cujus fontibus Epicurus hortulos ſuos irrigavit* (102). i. e. " What is there " in the Natural Philoſophy of Epicurus which is not " borrowed from Democritus? For tho' he altered " ſome things, as what I mentioned before, for in- " ſtance, concerning the inclination of Atoms, yet " his ſyſtem is for the moſt part the ſame, holding " atoms, vacuum, images, infinity of ſpace, and in- " numerable worlds, their formation and diſſolution, " and almoſt every thing in the œconomy of nature " . . . Democritus, one of the greateſt men that ever " was, from whoſe ſprings Epicurus watered his own " little gardens." He did himſelf a prejudice in not acknowledging the obligations he had to Democritus, and by calling him a dotard, or dealer in trifles, λῆρόκριτον, *nugarum cenſor*. This was one of his quibbles.

(100) *See* Cicero, lib. 1. *de Finibus*, cap. 5, and 6.

(101) Cicero, *de Nat. Deor.* lib. 1. cap. 12, 26, 43.

(102) Ibid. cap. 33. *See alſo* Plutarch, *adverſus Colotem*, pag. 1108.

[*P*] *He was nothing leſs than orthodox concerning the divine nature.*] If he had only taught that God was a Spirit placed in a ſphere of fire, and the ſoul of the world (103), he would have been a hundred times more excuſable than he is; but I find other dogms much more dangerous are attributed to him in the

(103) Νοῦν μὲν γὰρ εἶναι τὸν Θεὸν ἰσχυρίζεται καὶ αὐτὸς (Δημόκριτος) πλὴν ἐν πυρὶ σφαιροειδεῖ, καὶ αὐτὸν εἶναι τὴν τοῦ κόσμου ψυχήν. *Cyrillus contra Julian.* lib. 1. This is taken from Plutarch, *de Plac. Philoſoph.* lib. 1. cap. 7. pag. 881, D. where he ſays Δημόκριτος νοῦν τὸν Θεὸν ἐμπυρειδῆ, τὴν τοῦ κόσμου ψυχήν. Democritus mentem Deum in igne globoſo, mundi animam.

hated him, and was very near burning all the Books of Democritus [Q]. This, methinks, did leſs injury than honour to the latter. The Atomical Syſtem is not near ſo abſurd

Books of Cicero. *Quid? Democritus qui tum imagines, earumque circuitus in Deorum numero refert, cum illam naturam quæ imagines fundat ac mittat, tum ſcientiam intelligentiamque noſtram, nonne in maximo errore verſatur? cumque idem omnino quia nihil ſemper ſuo ſtatu maneat, neget eſſe quicquam ſempiternum, nonne Deum ita tollit omnino ut nullam opinionem ejus reliquam faciat* (104)? i. e. "Was not Democritus in "an egregious error, who taught that the images of "objects which preſent themſelves on every ſide, and "alſo the nature which ſcatters round or emits ſuch "images, and even our own knowledge and percep"tion, were to be reckoned among the Gods? And "when the ſame Philoſopher denies any thing to be "eternal, becauſe nothing remains perpetually in the "ſame ſtate, does he not deſtroy the very idea of a "God?" Theſe are the dogms which Velleius, one of the Interlocutors in Cicero, attributes to Democritus: they are ſuch, that whoever embraces them may be truly affirmed to be in the condition of him who ſaid,

(104) Cicero, *de Natura Deor.* lib. 1. cap. 12, and 38.

O Jupiter, car de toi rien ſinon
Je ne conois ſeulement que le nom (105).

(105) *See* Amiot's Plutarch, *in the Treatiſe* of Love, chap. 12.

"O Jupiter! for thy name is all I know of thee."

For the nature which Democritus called God, had neither the unity, nor eternity, nor immutability, nor other attributes which are eſſential to the divine nature. He laviſhly beſtowed the name of God on the images and ideas of objects, and on the act of our underſtanding by which we know objects. I dare ſay that this error, as groſs as it is, will never be that of a little genius, and that none but men of great parts are able to produce it. I do not know whether any body has ever taken notice that the opinion of one of the moſt ſublime wits of this age, *That we ſee all things in the infinite Being, in God*, is no more than the doctrine of Democritus, unfolded and amended. Take notice, in particular, that Democritus taught that the images of objects, thoſe images I ſay which are ſcattered around, or which turn every way to preſent themſelves to our ſenſes, are emanations of God, and are themſelves a God; and that the actual idea of our mind, is a God. Is there any great difference between this opinion and ſaying that our ideas are in God, as Father Mallebranche aſſerts, and that they cannot be the modification of a created mind? Does it not follow thence that our ideas are God himſelf? For our ideas and our knowledge may eaſily paſs for the ſame thing. Notwithſtanding Cicero makes one of his Interlocutors inſiſt, that theſe opinions of Democritus are worthy a native of Abdera (106), that is to ſay, a fool and a blockhead; I am ſure a little genius will never form them. In order to form them a man muſt comprehend the whole extent of power, which belongs to a nature capable of painting in our mind the images of objects. The intentional ſpecies of ſchool-men are the diſgrace of the Peripatetics: a man muſt be I know not what to be able to perſuade himſelf that a tree produces its image in all the parts of the air around it, even to the brain of an infinite number of ſpectators. The cauſe which produces theſe images is quite a different thing from a tree. Search after it as much as you pleaſe; if you find it on this ſide the infinite Being, it is a ſign you do not well underſtand the matter. I do not deny but theſe dogms of Democritus are at the bottom very abſurd. St. Auguſtin has ſolidly refuted them, and ſhewn us a difference between Democritus and Epicurus which few Authors mention. He obſerves that according to Democritus there was in the Atoms either an animated or ſpiritual vertue, which made the images of objects participate of the divine nature, or at leaſt a ſoul capable of doing us good or hurt; but Epicurus acknowledged nothing but the nature of atoms or corpuſcles in its principles. *Democritus hoc diſtare in naturalibus quæſtionibus ab Epicuro dicitur, quòd iſte ſentit, ineſſe concurſioni atomorum vim quandam animalem & ſpiritalem: quâ vi eum, credo, & imaginas ipſas divinitate præditas dicere, non omnes omnium rerum, ſed deorum, & principia mentis eſſe in univerſis, quibus divinitatem tribuit; & animantes imagines, quæ vel prodeſſe nobis ſoleant, vel nocere: Epicurus verò neque aliquid in principiis rerum ponit, præter atomos* (107). I do not know whether St. Auguſtin has well underſtood the Text of Cicero which he paraphraſes. He would be excuſable if he did not underſtand him; for Cicero has not explained himſelf very clearly. However it be, here is a part of St. Auguſtin's paraphraſe: *Quanto melius ne audiſſem quidem nomen Democriti, quàm cum dolore cogitarem, neſcio quem, ſuis temporibus* magnum *putatum, qui deos eſſe arbitraretur imagines, quæ de ſolidis corporibus fluerent, ſolidæque ipſæ non eſſent, eaſque hac atque hac motu proprio circumeundo atque illabendo in animas hominum facere, ut vis divina cogitetur; cùm profectò illud corpus, unde imago flueret, quanto ſolidius eſt, tanto præſtantius quoque eſſe judicetur? Ideoque fluctuavit, ſicut iſti dicunt,* nutavitque *ſententia, ut aliquandò naturam quandam, ac qua fluerent imagines,* DEUM *eſſe diceret; qui tamen cogitari non poſſet; niſi per eas imagines, quas fundit ac emittit, id eſt, quæ de illa natura, quam, neſcio quam, corpoream & ſempiternam, ac etiam per hoc divinam, putat, quaſi vaporis ſimilitudine continuâ velut emanatione ferrentur, & venirent atque intrarent in animas noſtras, ut Deum vel Deos cogitare poſſemus* (108). i. e. "How much better would it "have been that I had never ſo much as heard the "name of Democritus, than that I ſhould with grief "reflect that a certain perſon, reputed a *great man* in "his time, ſhould fancy the images which flow from "ſolid bodies, and are not themſelves ſolid, to be "Gods, and that theſe, by a peculiar motion, wind"ing this way and that, and inſinuating themſelves "into men's minds, ſhould be taken for a divine "power; when the body from whence the image "flows, by how much the more ſolid it is, ought to "be judged by ſo much the more excellent? There"fore he fluctuated, as they ſay, and *wavered* in his "opinion, ſometimes ſaying that a certain nature, "from whence images flowed, was GOD; but after "what manner it is impoſſible to conceive, unleſs "thoſe images which it pours forth or emits, that is, "which ariſe like a vapour with a continual emana"tion from that nature, which he imagines to be "ſomething corporeal and eternal, and for that rea"ſon divine, ſhould come and enter into our minds, "and give us an idea of a God or Gods." See the margin (109).

(107) Auguſtin. Epiſt. 56. pag. m. 273.

(108) Idem, ibid.

(109) We ſhall ſee in the Remark [E] of the Article LEUCIPPUS a paſſage of *Plutarch*, which will inform us that Democritus ſeems to have attributed ſome ſenſation to Atoms.

[Q] Plato *was very near burning all the Books of Democritus.*] He collected them diligently, and was going to throw them into the fire, when two Pythagorean Philoſophers repreſented to him that it would be to no purpoſe, becauſe ſeveral perſons had already furniſhed themſelves with them. The hatred Plato bore Democritus appears from this; that having mentioned almoſt all the ancient Philoſophers, he has never cited him, not even in thoſe paſſages where his deſign was to contradict him. Diogenes Laertius, who ſays this, adds that it was an artful piece of policy; ſince it prevented people from perceiving that Plato contradicted the moſt excellent of all the Philoſophers. The Hiſtorian perhaps would have better hit the mark, if he had made uſe of the thought which Mr. Salo employed when he made the Extract of a certain Book (110). Fault has been found, ſays he (111), *with this Cardinal for diſcovering that his principal deſign is to ſhew all the faults in Fra. Paolo, and for naming that Author in almoſt every chapter of his Book. It is ſaid that Baronius acted with a great deal more policy. For tho' he had undertaken his Annals to combate the hereſies and falſhoods of the Centuriators of Magdeburgh, yet he took particular care not to contradict them openly in his Book, but has written his Hiſtory plainly and ſimply, without naming them at all, otherwiſe than by the general appellations of Heretics and Innovators. And the reaſon which induced him to act in that manner, was that he judged the leſs he ſaid of them the better; for fear of exciting the curioſity of mankind, and raiſing a deſire to ſee a Book which it is always dangerous to read. Whereas in the method Cardinal Palavicini has taken, his Book can neither be read nor underſtood without reading that of Fra. Paolo. And then there is ſome danger leſt that Hiſtory, which is extremely*

(110) The *Hiſtory of the Council of Trent*, by Cardinal Palavicini.

(111) *Journal des Savans* of the 23d of March 1665.

well

(106) *Democritus ... tum cenſet imagines divinitate præditas ineſſe univerſitati rerum: tum principia mentesque quæ ſunt in eodem univerſo Deos eſſe dicit: tum animantes imagines, quæ vel prodeſſe nobis ſolent vel nocere: tum ingentes quaſdam imagines, tantaſque ut univerſum mundum complectantur extrinſecus. Quæ quidem omnia ſunt patria Democriti quam Democrito dignior.* Cicero, *de Nat. Deorum*, lib. 1. cap. 38.

abſurd as Spinoziſm [R]: but it is pleaſant enough to ſay, with Moreri, that according to Democritus the Atoms were *infinite in magnitude*; for, on the contrary, they were of an inconceivable ſmallneſs. We ſhall obſerve in the Remark [K] that a great many Books were handed about under his name, which were none of his. We ſhould ſee clearer in this matter, if we had the Treatiſe of Callimachus (g), and the Treatiſe of Thraſyllus concerning his Works (h). I do not know whether the Sieur Peter Borel (i), who had promiſed three Volumes in folio, *De Vita & Philoſophia Democriti* (of the Life and Philoſophy of Democritus), could have given us any light. If Ælian (k) has ſaid that Protagoras was the ſon of Democritus, he is miſtaken. Democritus did not approve a man's marrying, or amuſing himſelf with getting of children. He uſed to ſay, this was engaging one's ſelf in too importunate cares, which divert a man from more neceſſary employments. See the Remark [L] towards the end. He uſed to ſay alſo that the pleaſure of love was a flight Epilepſy [S].

(g) Suidas makes mention of it.

(h) *See* Laertius, num. 41.

(i) He was a Phyſician of Caſtres in Languedoc. The Catalogue of the Books which he promiſed the Public may be ſeen before his *Antiquitez Gauloiſes*, printed at Paris in 1655. See alſo the Preface to the 2d Century of his *Obſervat. de Medecine*.

(k) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 1. cap. 23.

What

well written, ſhould be preferred before the Cardinal's, which may be more true, but is not more probable. The inconvenience which Baronius deſigned to avoid, is, methinks, the ſame with that which Plato intended to beware of. There lies all the artifice. Diogenes Laertius was not much acquainted with the military ſtratagems of Authors, ſince he did not lay his finger on this, when he was ſpeaking of Plato's conduct. It is pretended that Ariſtotle actually did what Plato deſigned to do, and that in order to be the only Philoſopher of whom poſterity ſhould have any knowledge, and to ſeize to his own uſe with impunity the treaſures of thoſe who had philoſophized before him, he burned all their Writings. A Profeſſor of Pavia has related all this as a certain fact, and pretends that Pliny ſpeaks of it plainly enough. *Quod Plato deſignaverat, exequutus eſt Alexandri ope Ariſtoteles, quaſi parum eſſet Alexandro, ſi ſe monarcham redderet Aſiæ, niſi Ariſtoteli jus in philoſophos daret, qui quod ſua tantum de tot antiquis monumenta ſupereſſe voluit, tyrannidem in ingenia videtur affectaſſe . . . . Dum itaque Regum fortunas unica vincendi libidine ductus everteret Alexander, ſuperbiſſimo furore ambitioſus nominis Ariſtoteles in philoſophorum principes eſt debacchatus, unoque incendio congeſtas triginta ſex ſeculis tot ſapientiæ divitias abſumpſit, & ſi quæ voluit ſupereſſe funeri, ea omnium ludibrio dicteriiſque laceſſenda tradidit poſteris, dum in optimorum bona invectus, abſciſſis perditiſque ſapientiæ ſtatuarum capitibus, ſuum impoſuit ſingulis: neque obſcure literarii peculatus reum facit Ariſtotelem curioſiſſimus Plinius, in Præfat. ad D. Veſpaſianum Imp.* (112). i. e. "What Plato had deſigned, Ariſtotle, by "the aſſiſtance of Alexander, executed; as if that "Prince had thought it a ſmall matter to make himſelf Monarch of Aſia, unleſs he alſo gave Ariſtotle "dominion over the Philoſophers, who ſeems to have "affected a tyranny over the learned World, by deſtroying ſo many monuments of antiquity, that "none but his own might deſcend to poſterity. . . . . "While Alexander, therefore, incited merely by the "luſt of conqueſt, was overturning the fortunes of "Kings, Ariſtotle, being immoderately ambitious of a "great name, vented his rage on the principal Philoſophers, and in one pile conſumed ſo many treaſures of wiſdom, which had been heaping up for ſix "and thirty ages; and thoſe which he ſuffered to eſcape deſtruction, he delivered down to be the ſcorn "and ridicule of poſterity; while he invaded the properties of the moſt excellent men, and cutting off and demoliſhing the heads of the ſtatues of the ancient "ſages, placed his own on every one of their "ſhoulders: neither does Pliny obſcurely accuſe Ariſtotle of plagiariſm, in his preface to the Emperor "Veſpaſian." He is miſtaken with regard to the ſecond point. Pliny ſays nothing by which we may diſcover Ariſtotle to be intended by him rather than any other plagiary; and I doubt not but he is alſo miſtaken as to the burning of the Books. See what Charles Emanuel Vizzanius has obſerved on that head, in his Commentary on Ocellus Lucanus (113). The Jews tell a ſilly ſtory, that Ariſtotle having learned all his Philoſophy from the Writings of Solomon, which were found at Jeruſalem when Alexander made himſelf Maſter of that city, burned them, *that he might arrogate to himſelf the honour of the wiſdom contained therein* (114).

(112) Joan. Chryſoſt. Magnenus, *in Prolegomenis* Democriti reviviſcentis, pag. 23.

(113) Pag. m. 144.

(114) Bartolocci, *in Bibliotb. Rabbin.* in the *Journal des Savans*, 1692, pag. 464. See above Citation (27) of the Article ARISTOTLE.

[R] *The Atomical Syſtem is not . . . . . ſo abſurd as Spinoziſm.*] For at leaſt the Atomiſts acknowledge a real diſtinction between the things which compoſe the Univerſe; which being granted, it is not incomprehenſible that while it is cold in one country, it ſhould be hot in another, and that while one man enjoys perfect health, another ſhould be very ſick. In the Syſtem of Spinoza, where the whole Univerſe is but one ſubſtance, it is a perfect contradiction; it is, I ſay, a contradiction of that nature to maintain that Peter is learned while William is ignorant; and ſo of every ſort of contrary attributes which are true at the ſame time of ſeveral perſons, ſome of one and ſome of another. By ſuppoſing an infinite number of Atoms really diſtinct from one another, and all eſſentially indued with an active principle, we may conceive action and reaction, and the continual changes which are obſerved in nature: but where there is but one principle, there can be neither action nor reaction, nor any change of the ſcene. So, by leaving the ſtrait road, which is the ſyſtem of a God the free Creator of the world, we muſt neceſſarily admit a multiplicity of principles; we muſt allow of antipathies and ſympathies among them, and ſuppoſe them independent from one another as to exiſtence and power of acting, and yet capable of mutually hurting one another by action and reaction. Aſk not why in certain caſes the effect of reaction is rather this than that; for there can be no reaſon given of the properties of a thing, unleſs it has been made freely, by a cauſe which had its reaſons and motives in producing it.

(115) Galeni *Commentar. I, in Librum III Epidemiorum Hippocratis.*

[S] *He ſaid the pleaſure of love was a ſlight Epilepſy.*] This thought was aſcribed to Democritus, if we believe Galen. Τὶς γὰρ ἀνάγκη γράφειν Δημόκριτον μὲν εἰρηκέναι μικρὰν ἐπιληψίαν εἶναι τὴν συνουσίαν (115). Clemens Alexandrinus intended to ſay the ſame thing (116); for his Sophiſt of Abdera is no other than Democritus: but he did not underſtand the meaning of that Philoſopher, ſince he charges him with having thereby taught that the venereal act is an incurable diſeaſe (117). Aulus Gellius attributes the definition in queſtion, not to Democritus, but to Hippocrates. Theſe are his words: *Hippocrates autem, divina vir ſcientia, de coïtu venereo ita exiſtimabat, partem eſſe quamdam morbi teterrimi, quem noſtri comitialem dixerunt, namque ipſius verba hæc traduntur,* τὴν συνουσίαν εἶναι μικρὰν ἐπιληψίαν (118). Macrobius (119) has copied this paſſage of Aulus Gellius word for word, according to his uſual cuſtom; ſo that we have but one witneſs for the aſcribing this thought to the great Hippocrates. This witneſs is Aulus Gellius; whoſe authority is not comparable to that of Galen with reſpect to a fact like this. Nobody knew better than Galen whether Hippocrates had ſaid ſuch a thing or not: wherefore ſince he has attributed it to Democritus, it is a ſtrong preſumption that it came from that Philoſopher, and not from the Phyſician Hippocrates. The learned man whom I have cited above (120), has done me the honour to write me word, that he makes no doubt but Aulus Gellius is miſtaken. His reaſon is, that in matters of Phyſic, it is much more probable that Galen is exact than Aulus Gellius. Moreover, theſe words are not to be found in any Book of Hippocrates; tho' it be true that he inſinuates this thought in ſome paſſages of his Works (121): and beſides, we ſee that Clemens Alexandrinus agrees with Galen, and not with Aulus Gellius. I find alſo that Monſr. Menage declares for Galen againſt Aulus Gellius. He cites Stobæus, who attributes this definition to the venereal act not only to Eryximachus, but alſo to Democritus (122).

(116) Μικρὰν ἐπιληψίαν τὴν συνουσίαν ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης ἔλεγε σοφιστής. *Parvam epilepſiam dicebat coïtum Sophiſta Abderites.* Clem. Alexand. lib. 2. *Pædagog.* pag. 193, D.

(117) Νόσον ἀνίατον ἡγούμενος. *Morbum immedicabilem exiſtimans.* Idem, ibid.

(118) Aulus Gellius, lib. 19, cap. 2.

(119) Macrob. lib. 2. Saturnal. cap. 8.

(120) Profeſſor Drelincourt. See the Remark [G] towards the end, and the Remark [H] Citation (50).

(121) *Sub initium Lib. de Genit.* pag. 27. *lin.* 35, & *Lib. de Off. nat.* pag. 62. *lin.* 19. I am as certain of the exactneſs of theſe citations, as if I had examined them my ſelf. I give them as they were ſent me in a Letter by Dr. Drelincourt.

(122) Menag. *in Laert.* lib. 9. num. 43. p. 410, 411.

What is related of the diſpleaſure cauſed him by his maid-ſervant, in telling him a thing for which he had a mind to ſeek a natural reaſon, is curious enough [T].

[T] *What is related of the diſpleaſure cauſed him by his maid-ſervant . . . is curious enough.*] I have not yet met with any Modern who has cited an ancient Author for this: Montagne tells the ſtory in the following manner. "Democritus, having eaten at his "own table ſome figs which taſted of honey, began "immediately to conſider with himſelf whence that "unuſual ſweetneſs ſhould proceed, and to be ſatis-"fied in that point, was going to riſe from table, to "view the ſituation of the place where thoſe figs had "been gathered: his maid, underſtanding the occa-"ſion of his moving, laughed, and told him that he "need not give himſelf any further trouble about the "matter, for it was ſhe herſelf who had put them "into a veſſel in which there had been ſome honey. "He was vexed that ſhe had deprived him of the "opportunity of making the inquiry, and robbed "him of a ſubject of curioſity. Get you gone, ſaid he, "you have provoked me; but however I am reſolv-"ed to inquire into the cauſe, as if it were natural. "And by his good will he would not have failed "finding ſome true reaſon for a falſe and ſuppoſed ef-"fect." Kuhnius tells the ſame ſtory (123), without quoting any Author. He might have quoted Plutarch (124).

(123) Kuhnius in *Diog. Laert.* lib. 9. num. 38. pag. 539.

(124) Plutarch. *Sympoſ.* lib. 1. cap. 10.

DEMONTJOSIUS, or DEMONTJOSUS (LEWIS). See MONT JOSIEU.

DEMPSTER (THOMAS) taught Claſſical Learning at Paris towards the beginning of the ſeventeenth Century. He was of Scotland, and when he came over to France, ſaid he had left a great Eſtate in his own country for the ſake of the Catholic Religion. He alſo pretended to be deſcended of a very noble family. Though his buſineſs was to teach ſchool, he was notwithſtanding as ready to draw his ſword, and as quarrelſome as if he had been a Duelliſt by profeſſion. He ſcarce paſſed a day but he fought, either with his ſword, or at fiſty-cuffs, ſo that he was the terror of all the Schoolmaſters. He did a couragious action at Paris in the College of Beauvais [A], which expoſed him to troubles, the conſequences of which he would not hazard. For which reaſon he retired to England, where he not only found refuge, but alſo a handſome wife whom he brought with him to Paris when he returned thither. Going one day through the ſtreets with this woman, who expoſed to view the fineſt neck and the whiteſt ſhoulders in the world [B], he ſaw himſelf ſurrounded by ſo many people that the crowd would probably have ſtifled them both, if they had not found a houſe to retreat into. A beauty diſplayed in that manner, in a country where it was not the faſhion, drew that multitude of Cits about them. He paſſed the Alps, and taught polite learning in the Univerſity of Piſa, for which he had a good ſalary. One day returning home from the College, he found that his wife had been run away with: his own ſcholars had aſſiſted the rape. He bore it like a Stoic: and perhaps he was not ſorry to be rid of a treaſure which was ſo difficult to keep. He went to Bologna, and was Profeſſor there during the remaining part of his life. He was there alſo admitted a Member of the Academy *della notte* (a). We have ſeveral Works of his Compoſition [C]. He died in the year 1625, according to Moreri's Dictionary, where you will find the names of ſeveral Univerſities in which he taught, but not all [D]. He was a man of a prodigious

(a) *Extracted from* Nicius Erythr. *Pinacoth. I.* pag. 24, 25.

[A] *He did an action of courage in the College of Beauvais.*] Grangier, Principal of that College, being obliged to take a journey, appointed Dempſter his ſubſtitute. The latter puniſhed a ſcholar who had challenged one of his ſchool-fellows to fight a duel: he made his breeches to be let down, and having cauſed a luſty fellow to horſe him, he whipped him ſoundly in a full ſchool. The ſcholar, to revenge this affront, brought three Gentlemen of his Relations, who were of the King's life-guards, into the College. Dempſter made the whole College take arms, hamſtrung the three life-guard-men's horſes before the College gate, and put himſelf in ſuch a poſture of defence, that the three ſparks were forced to aſk him quarter. He gave them their lives, but he impriſoned them in the belfrey, from whence he did not releaſe them till ſome days after. They ſought another way to revenge themſelves; they cauſed an information to be made of the life and moral behaviour of Thomas Dempſter, and got ſome witneſſes to be heard in evidence againſt him. This was what obliged him to go over to England (1).

(1) Ex Nicio Erythr. *Pinacoth. I.* pag. 24.

[B] *His wife expoſed to view the fineſt neck and the whiteſt ſhoulders in the world.*] Let us cite Nicius Erythræus, who tells the ſtory in Latin. *Ubi* (in Anglia) *non modo tutum ab inſectatoribus ſuis perfugium, verum etiam mulierem nactus eſt, forma & vultu, adeo liberali, adeo venuſto, ut nihil ſupra, quam in uxoris habuit loco. Quæ mulier, cum luce quadam, Pariſiis, quo rurſus Thomas cum ea ſe receperat, conſpecta eſſet, & quia forma præſtabat, ut diximus, & quia habitu erat dementiſſimo; nam & pectus & ſcapulas, nive ipſa candidiores, omnium oculis expoſitas habebat; tantus, viſendi gratia, hominum concurſus factus eſt, ut niſi ſe in domum cujuſdam, una cum viro, recepiſſet, nihil propius factum eſſet, quàm ut ambo à multitudine opprimerentur* (2). This ſhould teach us how neceſſary it is to conform to the cuſtoms of the place where we are, and eſpecially with regard to public decency.

(2) Idem, ibid. pag. 25.

[C] *We have ſeveral Works of his compoſition.*] His Supplements to Roſinus *de Antiquitatibus Romanis* teſtify that he was a man of great reading. He wrote Commentaries on Claudian, and on Corippus (3); four Books of Letters; ſeveral dramatical pieces, and ſome other Poems (4); ſome Books of Law; an *Apparatus* to the Hiſtory of Scotland, a Martyrology of Scotland, and a Liſt of the Scottiſh Writers (5): I very juſtly call it a *Liſt*; for he only ſets down the bare names of the Authors.

(3) Erythræus *has committed a miſtake here: inſtead of* Coripum *he ſays* Criſpum.

(4) Erythr. *Pinac. I*, pag. 26.

(5) Miræus, *de Script. Sæculi XVI*, num. 147.

[D] *You will find in Moreri ſeveral Univerſities in which he taught, but not all.*] Moreri does not mention the Univerſity of Nîmes, where Dempſter diſputed for a Profeſſor's chair, and carried it. He tells us this himſelf (6): *Quem* (locum Virgilii) *ut nodum mihi inſolubilem objecit quidam, dum profeſſionem in Regia Nemauſenſium Academia, diſputationi commiſſam, magno licet concurſu, obtinui, rejectiſque aliis, ſolus, quod inter plures dividere volebant quidam ardeliones, ſummo cum honore conſequebar, ſenatu faventiſſimo, unico Barnerio in tot egregiis viris, & omni literarum genere eminentibus, contradicente, maximo conſenſu Conſulum, Civiumque aliorum, exceptis quibuſdam, quos ſi mererentur nominarem, nunc quia indigni ſunt tanto honore, cum ſuo livore, imo & malignitate callida intermori patiar, potius quam nominibus compellatos vivere meo beneficio velim.* i. e. "Which paſſage of Virgil a certain "perſon propoſed to me as a difficulty not to be ſolv-"ed, when I obtained the Profeſſorſhip in the Royal "Univerſity

(6) Dempſt. *Paralipom. ad Cap. III Libri V Antiquit. Romanar. Roſini*, pag. m. 872.

ous memory [E], indefatigable, an utter ſtranger to diſſimulation, a warm friend, and a violent enemy (b): he had neither much judgment (c), nor much ſincerity; for he ſhamelefly publiſhed I know not how many fables [F]. Some of his Books were condemned by the Inquiſition at Rome [G]. This diſgrace was a natural conſequence of the paſſionate ſallies of his pen.

(b) *Moribus apertis & ſimulandi neſcius, ſive amore odiove quempiam proſequeretur, utrumque palam. Ut amicis obſequentiſſimus, ita inimicis maxime infenſus*, Aub. Miræus, in *Script. Sæc. XVI*, pag. 161.

(c) *Homo multæ lectionis, ſed nullius plane judicii.* Uſſerius, *Antiq. Brit. Eccleſ.* cap. 1.

" Univerſity of Nîmes, which was diſputed for by a " great number of Candidates; and which I alone " very honourably carried from the other competitors, " tho' ſome buſy people would have had it divided " among ſeveral; the Senate declaring in my favour, " and not one among ſo many excellent men, and " eminent in every part of learning, diſſenting, be- " ſides Barnier; the choice being alſo approved by " the Conſuls and the other Citizens, excepting ſome " few, whom I would name if they deſerved it; but " ſince they are unworthy ſo much honour, I ſhall " let their envy and fly malice die with them, rather " than contribute to their living by taking notice of " them." The paſſage which was propoſed to him as an indiſſoluble knot, was this:

Non ego te, menſis & Diis accepta ſecundis,
Tranſierim, Rhodia, & tumidis, Bumaſte, racemis (7).

(7) Virgil. *Georgic.* lib. 2. ver. 101.

" The Rhodian, ſacred to the ſolemn day,
" In ſecond ſervices is pour'd to Jove;
" And beſt accepted by the Gods above:
" Nor muſt Bumaſtus his old honours loſe,
" In length and largeneſs like the dugs of cows."
Dryden.

It is very likely that he paſſed at that time for a Huguenot (8); for the Univerſity of Nîmes was deſtined only for thoſe of the Proteſtant Religion.

(8) Hankius, *de Scriptor. Rom.* lib. 2. pag. 174, ſays, that Dempſter loſt his Eſtate for having preferred the Reformed Religion to the Roman Catholic: but he has miſunderſtood the words of *Nicius Erythræus*.

[E] *He was a man of a prodigious memory.*] He uſed to ſay that he knew not what it was to forget. *Mentis acumine ſatis valuit, ſed memoriæ tenacitate longe plurimum, adeo ut multoties diceret, ignorare ſe quid ſit oblivio* (9). I can ſcarce believe but this is a Romance. It is ſaid that he remembred the moſt recondite paſſages of Antiquity. *Nihil adeo abditum in antiquitatis monumentis cujus non meminiſſet, ita ut* Franciſcus Cupius *vir in literis omni comparatione major* Dempſterum *magnam Bibliothecam loquentem compellare conſueverit* (10). i. e. " There " was nothing ſo hidden in the monuments of anti- " quity, but that he remembred it; on which account " *Francis Cupius*, a man of incomparable learning, " uſed to call him the great ſpeaking Library." If this be true, he well deſerved the appellation of a ſpeaking Library, which ſome Authors have given him. As he was extremely laborious, for he uſed to read fourteen hours every day without intermiſſion (11), he muſt neceſſarily have known an infinite number of things. If this had ſuffered him to write with great politeneſs, and all the beauties of a moſt exquiſite judgment, he would have been a greater prodigy than his memory was; but to write judiciouſly and politely was not his talent (12). I recollect a paſſage of Balzac, which I cannot well produce on a better occaſion. *Si nos gens de Cour*, ſays he, *ne peuvent ſouffrir notre jeune Docteur, qui a ſacrifié aux Graces, de quelle façon traiteront-ils le farouche Heinſius, s'il lui prenoit envie de faire ſon entrée dans les Cabinets? Avec combien de huées en auroient-ils chaſſé le vilain Craſſot, & l'indécrotable Demſterus? Qui pouroit ſauver des coups d'eſpingles Federic Morel, & Theodore Marcile, ces deux célèbres Anti-Courtiſans, qui tomboient toûjours du Ciel en Terre, & parloient une langue qui n'étoit ni humaine, ni articulée, bien-loin d'être commune, & intelligible. Ces gens-là étoient rudes & ſauvages, & néanmoins, ils avoient leur prix, auſſi bien que les Diamants bruts* (13). " If our Courtiers cannot bear our young Doctor, who " has ſacrificed to the Graces, how would they treat " the wild Heinſius, if he ſhould take a fancy to enter " their cloſets? With what hoots would they have " ſent away the dirty Craſſot, and the incorrigible " ſloven Demſterus? Who could ſave from malicious " inſults Federic Morellus and Theodore Marcilius, " thoſe two famous Anti-Courtiers, who always look- " ed as if they fell from the clouds, and ſpoke a lan- " guage which was neither human nor articulate, ſo " far was it from being common and intelligible. " Theſe people were unpoliſhed and wild, and yet they " had their value, as well as rough diamonds."

(9) Miræus, *de Script. Sæc. XVI*, pag. 147.

(10) Idem, ibid.

(11) *Erat hic, uti refert* Matthæus Peregrinus, *indefeſſus in legendo, ita ut quatuordecim diei horas in librorum lectione continuare ſoleret.* Idem, ibid.

(12) *Stylus ei copioſus, confragoſus tamen.* i. e. " His ſtyle was " copious, but " rugged." *Idem, ibid.*

(13) Balzac, *Letter III to Chapelain*, liv. 1. pag. m. 209.

[F] *He ſhamelefly publiſhed I know not how many fables.*] To do honour to Scotland, he made a preſent to that country not only of the Engliſh and Iriſh Writers, but alſo of Books which never exiſted. *Dempſterus in ſuum Scriptorum Scotiæ Catalogum pro libidine ſua Anglos, Walſos, & Hibernos paſſim retulit, & ad aſſertiones ſuas firmandas finxit ſæpiſſime Authores, opera, locos, & tempora* (14). i. e. " Dempſter, in his " Catalogue of the Writers of Scotland, has frequent- " ly inſerted thoſe of England, Wales, and Ireland, " juſt according to his own fancy; and, to confirm his " own aſſertions, has very often produced Authors, " which never exiſted, and fictitious works, times, " and places." Here is what the learned Archbiſhop Uſher ſaid of Dempſter. *Commenti genus eſt illi homini non minus familiare, quam librorum qui nunquam ſcripti ſunt ex ipſius otioſo deprompta cerebro recenſio* (15). i. e. " It is a ſort of fiction no leſs familiar to that man, " than his mentioning of Books which were never writ- " ten, but were inventions of his own idle brain." Let us ſee the words of a third Witneſs: *Quod verò Demſterus* Hiſt. Scot. lib. 6. num. 536. *affirmat Faſtidium noſtrum Scotorum Chronicon ſcripſiſſe, id homini nugivendulo, & in gentis ſuæ rebus pene ſemper ineptienti condonandum eſt* (16). i. e. " What Dempſter af- " firms in his *Hiſtory of Scotland*, that our Faſtidius " wrote a Scottiſh Chronicle, muſt be pardoned in a " retailer of trifles, and one who almoſt perpetually " talks like a fool of the affairs of his own nation." Let it not be ſaid that none but Engliſh or Iriſh Authors judge diſadvantageouſly of him: for their judgment is approved even by the Catholics of other Nations. I ſhall cite only Monſr. Baillet, a French Prieſt. Thomas Dempſter, ſays he (17), *has given us an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Scotland in* 19 *Books, wherein he ſpeaks much of the learned men of that country. But tho' he was an able man in other reſpects, his underſtanding was not the more ſound, nor his judgment the more ſolid, nor his conſcience the better for it. He could have wiſhed that all learned men had been Scots; he forged Titles of Books which were never publiſhed, to raiſe the glory of his native country, and has been guilty of ſeveral cheating tricks, by which he has loſt his credit among men of learning. Theſe are nearly the complaints which have been made of him by Uſher* (*), *Ware* (†), *Father Labbe* (‡), *Sandius* (‡), *Nicholas Antonio* (**), *&c.* Father Labbe, in the paſſage quoted by Mr. Baillet, obſerves that he had never ſeen the *Judicium de omnibus omnium gentium & temporum Hiſtoricis* which is attributed to Dempſter. I believe the Title is ill quoted, and that Father Labbe meant nothing more than the judgment paſſed by Dempſter on a very great number of Authors, and that in a very few words, which is prefixed to his Roſinus.

(14) Jac. Waræus, *de Scriptor. Hiberniæ*, pag. 119. *apud* Pope Blount, *Cenſura Authorum*, pag. 643.

(15) Jacob. Uſſerius, *de Britan. Eccleſ. Primord.* pag. 463, *apud eund. ibid.*

(16) Gul. Cave, *ad ann. Chr.* 420, *apud eundem, ibid.*

(17) *Jugem. des Savans*, tom. 2. pag. 188.

(*) Jacob. Uſſerius, *de Britann. Eccleſ. Primord.* cap. 13. pag. 463.

(†) Jacob. Waræus, *Rerum Hibernic.*

(‡) Ph. Labbe, *Biblioth. Bibl.* pag. 159.

(‡) Chriſtoph. Sandius, *Animadv. in Voſſium*, pag. 175.

(**) Nicol. Anton. *Biblioth. Hiſp. Præfat.* pag. 34.

[G] *Some of his Books were condemned by the Inquiſition at Rome.*] You will find in the Decree of the 16th of March 1621, *Thomæ Dempſteri de Antiquitate Romanorum, donec corrigatur*; and in the Decree of the 17th of December 1623, *Scotia illuſtrior, ſeu Mendicabula repreſſa modeſta Parechaſi Thomæ Dempſteri.* Sir Thomas Pope Blount aſſerts (18) that there is inſerted in this laſt Decree, *Liber inſcriptus* Hiberniæ *ſive antiquioris* Scotiæ *Vindiciæ adverſus immodeſtam Parechaſim* Thomæ Dempſteri. I cannot find this in my Edition (19). We ſee in the *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum* of Father Labbe (20), that the Author of the book intitled *Hiberniæ ſive Antiquioris Scotiæ Vindiciæ* was named G. F. Federicus Hibernus, and that his Book was printed at Antwerp in the year 1621, in 8vo.

(18) *Cenſura Authorum*, pag. 643.

(19) It is that of Geneva 1667, printed from that of Rome of the ſame year.

(20) Pag. 198, Edit. Rhotomag. 1678: the paſſage is miſplaced.

☞DENHAM (JOHN) an excellent Engliſh Poet in the ſeventeenth Century, was the only ſon of Sir John Denham Knight, of Little Horſely in Eſſex (a), ſometime Chief

(a) *Account of the Engliſh Dramatick Poets. By Gerard Langbaine*, pag. 126. edit. Oxon 1691.

Chief Baron of the Exchequer in Ireland, and one of the Lords Commiſſioners of that Kingdom (*b*), by Eleanor his wife, one of the daughters of Sir Garret More Knight, Baron of Mellefont in Ireland (*c*). He was born in the City of Dublin in the year 1615; and in 1617 his father being made one of the Barons of the Exchequer in England, he was brought by him to London, and educated in Grammar Learning there. In Michaelmas Term 1631 at the age of ſixteen years he was entered a Gentleman Commoner of Trinity College in Oxford; "but being looked upon, ſays Mr. Wood (*d*), as a ſlow "and dreaming young man by his ſeniors and contemporaries, and given more to cards "and dice than his ſtudy, they could never then in the leaſt imagine, that he could "ever inrich the world with his fancy or iſſue of his brain, as he afterwards did." From this College, where he continued about three years, and had been examined in the public ſchools for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts, he went to Lincoln's-Inn [*A*], where "though "he followed his ſtudy very cloſe to the appearance of all perſons, yet he would game "much, and frequent the company of the unſanctified crew of gameſters, who rook'd "him ſometimes of all he could wrap or get (*e*)." But his father being informed of this ill conduct of his, reprimanded him in very ſevere terms, and threatened to diſinherit him, if he did not reform. Upon this he wrote a little *Eſſay againſt Gaming* (*f*), which he preſented to his father, to ſhew him his deteſtation of that practice. However, after his father's deceaſe, (who died on the 6th of January 1638, and was interred in Egham Church in Surrey,) he returned to his former ill courſes, and ſoon loſt ſeveral thouſands of pounds, which had been left him. In the latter end of the year 1641 he publiſhed a Tragedy called *The Sophy* [*B*], which was extremely admired by the beſt judges, and particularly Mr. Edmund Waller, who then ſaid of the Author, that *he broke out like the Iriſh rebellion, threeſcore thouſand ſtrong, when no body was aware, or in the leaſt ſuſpected it.* Soon after he was pricked High Sheriff of Surrey, and made Governor of Farnham-Caſtle for the King. But he being not well ſkilled in military affairs, ſoon after quitted that poſt, and retired to his Majeſty at Oxford (*g*), where he publiſhed his Poem called *Cooper's Hill* [*C*]. In 1647 he was intruſted by the Queen with a meſſage to the King, and

(*b*) Wood, *Hiſt. & Antiquitat. Univerſitatis Oxon.* lib. 2. pag. 298.

(*c*) Idem, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 422. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*d*) Ibid.

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

(*f*) It was printed at London in about three ſheets in 8vo. Wood, col. 423.

(*g*) Idem, col. 422, 423.

[*A*] *Went to Lincoln's-Inn.*] Mr. Langbaine (1) and Sir Thomas Pope-Blount (2) tell us, that *he followed the ſtudy of the Civil Law there*; but this appears to be a miſtake; for Mr. Wood aſſures us (3), that he ſtudied the *Common Law*.

(1) *Account of the Engliſh Dramatick Poets*, pag. 126. edit. Oxford 1691.

(2) *Remarks upon Poetry. With Characters and Cenſures of the moſt conſiderable Poets, whether ancient or modern*, Part 2. pag. 66. edit. London 1694.

(3) *Hiſt. & Antiq. Univerſ. Oxon.* lib. 2. pag. 298.

[*B*] *His Tragedy called*, The Sophy.] It was printed at London 1642 in 4to, and ſince publiſhed with his Poems and Tranſlations. It was acted at the *Private Houſe in Black Friars* by his Majeſty's Servants. In the Prologue we have the following lines:

But, Gentlemen, if ye diſlike the Play,
Pray make no words on't till the ſecond day,
Or third be paſt; for we would have you know it,
The loſs will fall on us, not on the Poet:
For he writes not for money, nor for praiſe,
Nor to be call'd a wit, nor to wear bays:
Cares not for frowns or ſmiles: ſo now you'll ſay
Then, why the Devil, did he write the Play?
He ſays, 'twas then with him, as now with you,
He did it when he had nothing elſe to do.

Winſtanley affirms (4), that this Tragedy is *equal to any of the chiefeſt Authors*.

(4) *Lives of the moſt famous Engliſh Poets*, pag. 185. edit. London 1687.

[*C*] *His Poem called* Cooper's Hill.] It was printed at Oxford 1643 in one ſheet and an half in 4to, and again with Additions at London 1650 and 1655 in 4to. This laſt edition is printed under this title: *Cooper's Hill, written in* 1640. *Now printed from a perfect copy, and a corrected impreſſion. By* John Denham *Eſq*; pagg. 18. In the Preface to the Reader ſigned *J. B.* the Reader is aſſured, that though there had been *five impreſſions* of this Poem, this is the only true copy; and that thoſe former were all but meer repetitions of the ſame falſe tranſcript, which ſtole into print by the Author's long abſence from London. "I had not patience, *ſays the Editor*, (hav-"ing read the original) to ſee ſo noble a piece ſo "ſavagely handled; therefore I obtained from the "Author's own papers this perfect edition. You "may know this by that excellent allegory of the "*Royal Stag* (which among others was lopt off by "the Tranſcriber) ſkilfully maintained without drag-"ging or haling in words and metaphors, as the "faſhion now is with ſome that cannot write, and "cannot but write." It was printed again at London in 1667 and 1668 in 8vo, in a Collection of his Poems (5). In the *Miſcellany Poems publiſhed by Mr. Dryden* (6) this Poem is printed as it was publiſhed in the year 1650, and as it was publiſhed after the Reſtoration. We have the following lines with relation to this Poem in *The Seſſion of the Poets* printed in theſe *Miſcellany Poems* (7):

(5) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 423. 2d edit. London 1721.

(6) Part 5. pag. 74, & *ſeqq.* 4th edit. London 1716.

(7) Part 2. pag. 94.

Then in came Denham, *that limping old bard,*
Whoſe fame on the Sophy *and* Cooper's Hill *ſtands*;
And brought many Stationers, who ſwore very hard,
That nothing ſold better, except 'twere his lands.

But Apollo adviſ'd him to write ſomething more,
To clear a ſuſpicion, which poſſeſſed the Court,
That Cooper's Hill, *ſo much bragg'd on before,*
Was writ by a Vicar, *who had forty pound for't.*

Mr. Dryden tells us (8), that it "is a Poem, which "for majeſty of the ſtyle, is, and ever will be, the "exact ſtandard of good writing." Mr. Pope alludes to it in the following lines of his *Windſor-Foreſt* (9).

(8) Epiſtle Dedicatory before his *Rival Ladies*.

(9) Ver. 257, & ſeqq. *Works of Alexander Pope, Eſq; Vol.* 1. *With Explanatory Notes and Additions never before printed*, pag. 78. edit. London 1736, in 12mo.

"Ye ſacred Nine! that all my ſoul poſſeſs
"Whoſe raptures fire me, and whoſe viſions bleſs;
"Bear me, oh bear me to ſequeſter'd ſcenes,
"The bow'ry mazes and ſurrounding greens:
"To *Thames's* banks, which flagrant breezes fill,
"Or where ye Muſes ſport on *Cooper's Hill*,
"(On *Cooper's Hill* eternal wreaths ſhall grow,
"While laſts the Mountain, or while *Thames* ſhall flow)
"I ſeem thro' conſecrated walks to rove,
"I hear ſoft muſic die along the grove:
"Led by the ſound, I roam from ſhade to ſhade,
"By god-like Poets venerable made:
"Here his firſt Lays majeſtic Denham ſung;
"There the laſt Numbers flow'd from Cowley's tongue (10).
"O early loſt! what tears the river ſhed,
"When the ſad pomp along his banks was led?
"His drooping ſwans on ev'ry note expire,
"And on his willows hung each Muſe's lyre.
"Since Fate relentleſs ſtop'd their heav'nly voice,
"No more the foreſts ring, or groves rejoice;
"Who now ſhall charm the ſhades, where Cowley ſtrung
"His living harp, and lofty Denham ſung?"

(10) Mr. Cowley died at Chertſey, on the borders of the Foreſt.

Mr. Somerville likewiſe has the following lines upon our Poet (11):

(11) *The Chace; a Poem.* By William Somerville Eſq; B. 3. verſe 366, & *ſeqq.* edit. London 1735, in 4to.

and employed in other affairs relating to his Majeſty [*D*]. In April 1648 he conveyed away James Duke of York, then under the tuition of Algernoon Earl of Northumberland, from St. James's in Weſtminſter, and carried him into France to the Prince of Wales and the Queen-mother. Not long after this he was ſent with William (afterwards Lord) Crofts, as Envoys to the King of Poland from King Charles II [*E*]. About the year 1652 he returned to England; and his circumſtances being reduced, ("for by gaming "and the war he had ſquandered away much of his eſtate at Egham, and elſewhere, "and the reſt ordered to be ſold by the Parliament the 15th of July 1651 (*b*)") he was kindly entertained by the Earl of Pembroke at Wilton; where, and ſometimes at London, he continued with that Nobleman above a year. At the Reſtoration he entered upon the Office of Surveyor-General of all his Majeſty's Royal Buildings [*F*]; and at the Coronation of the King he was created Knight of the Bath. He was greatly valued at Court for his admirable genius and writings [*G*]; but upon ſome diſcontent ariſing from a ſecond marriage, he loſt his ſenſes; however being ſoon after cured of his diſtemper, he wrote

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

. . . . Tread with reſpectful awe
Windſor's green glades, where Denham, *tuneful bard,*
Charm'd once the liſtning Dryads with his ſong
Sublimely ſweet. O! grant me, ſacred ſhade,
To glean ſubmiſs what thy full fickle leaves.

(12) Preface to the 2d edition corrected and much enlarged by the Author, London 1736, in 4to.

The noble Author of an *Eſſay on human Life* (12) obſerves, that *Cooper's Hill has met with univerſal applauſe, though its ſubject ſeems rather deſcriptive than inſtructing; but it is not the hill, the river, nor the Stag-Chace; it is the good ſenſe and the fine reflections ſo frequently interſpers'd, and as it were interwoven with the reſt, that gives it the value, and will make it, as was ſaid of true wit, everlaſting like the Sun.* It was tranſlated into Latin Verſe by Mr. Moſes Pengry of Brazen Noſe College Oxford, and publiſhed there in 1676 in 4to, under the title of, Cooper's Hill, *Latine redditum ad nobiliſſimum Dominum* Gulielmum *Dominum* Cavendiſh, *honoratiſſimi Domini* Gulielmi *Comitis* Devoniæ *filium unicum.*

[*D*] *In* 1647 *he was intruſted by the Queen with a meſſage to the King, and employed in other affairs relating to his Majeſty.*] In the *Dedication* of his Poems to King Charles II, he obſerves, that after the delivery of King Charles I into the hands of the army, he undertaking to the Queen, that he would find ſome means to get acceſs to his Majeſty, ſhe ſent him, and by the help of Hugh Peters he got admittance, and coming well inſtructed from the Queen (his Majeſty having been long kept in the dark) he was pleaſed to diſcourſe him of the whole ſtate of his affairs. "One morning, continues our Author, waiting upon "him at Cauſham, ſmiling upon me, he ſaid, he "could tell me ſome news of my ſelf, which was "that he had ſeen ſome verſes of mine the evening "before (being thoſe to Sir R. Fanſhaw (13), and aſk-"ing me when I made them, I told him two or three "years ſince. He was pleaſed to ſay that having "never ſeen them before *he was afraid I had written them ſince my return into England; and though "he liked them well, he would adviſe me to write "no more*; alledging, that when men are young, and "have little elſe to do, they might vent the over-"flowings of their fancy that way; but when they "were thought fit for more ſerious employments, if "they ſtill perſiſted in that courſe, it would look, as "if they minded not the way to any better. Where-"upon I ſtood corrected as long as I had the honour "to wait upon him; and at his departure from "Hampton Court, he was pleaſed to command me "to ſtay privately at London, to ſend to him and re-"ceive from him all letters from and to all his cor-"reſpondents at home and abroad; and I was fur-"niſhed with nine ſeveral cyphers in order to it. "Which truſt I performed with great ſafety to the "perſons, with whom we correſponded. But about "nine months after being diſcovered by their know-"ledge of Mr. Cowley's hand, I happily eſcaped "both for my ſelf, and thoſe that held correſpondence "with me." *That time was too hot and buſie for ſuch idle ſpeculations; but after I had the good fortune to wait upon your Majeſty in Holland and France, you were pleaſed ſometimes to give me arguments to divert and put off the evil hours of our baniſhment, which now and then fell not ſhort of your Majeſtie's expectation. After when your Majeſty departing from St. Germains to Jerſey, was pleaſed freely (without my aſking) to confer upon me that place, wherein I have now the honour to ſerve you, I then gave over poetical lines, and made it my buſineſs to draw ſuch others, as might be more ſerviceable to your Majeſty, and I hope more laſting.* Sir John Berkley in his *Memoirs* (14) mentions our Author's being employed in King Charles the Firſt's affairs, and obſerves (15), that Mr. *Denham during his impriſonment having contracted a great familiarity with Mr. Peters, a Preacher, and a powerful Perſon in the Army*, was diſpatched by the Queen from France with a Commiſſion to diſcover the intentions of the Army, and to promote an agreement between his Majeſty and them.

(13) Upon his *Tranſlation of Paſtor Fido.* See *Poems and Tranſlations, with the Sophy. Written by the Honourable Sir John Denham Knight of the Bath*, pag. 110. 2d edit. London 1671.

(14) *Memoirs of Sir John Berkley, containing an account of his Negotiation with Lieutenant Gen. Cromwell, Commiſſary General Ireton, and other Officers of the Army, for reſtoring King Charles the Firſt to the Exerciſe of the Government of England*, pag. 14, 37, and 93. 2d edit. London 1702, in 8vo.

[*E*] *Sent with William (afterwards Lord)* Crofts, *as Envoys to the King of Poland from King Charles II.*] This we are informed of by Mr. Wood (16). Among our Author's Poems we have one under this title (17), *On my Lord* Croft's *and my Journey into Poland, from whence we brought ten thouſand pounds for his Majeſty, by the decimation of his Scotiſh ſubjects there.*

[*F*] *Entered upon the Office of Surveyor-General of all his Majeſty's Royal Buildings.*] Mr. Wood tells us (18) that "King Charles I did grant to him the "reverſion of the place of Surveyor of his Buildings "after the deceaſe of Inigo Jones; which place he "entering upon at the Reſtoration of King Charles II "ann. 1660, (for the ſaid Jones died 21 July 1651 ..) "he enjoyed it to the time of his death, and got by "it ſeven thouſand pounds." In the paſſage quoted above from the *Preface* to his *Poems*, he tells us himſelf, that King Charles II *freely, without his aſking, conferred upon him that place.*

(15) Pag. 4.

(16) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 423.

(17) *Poems and Tranſlations &c.* pag. 67. 2d edit. 1671.

(18) Col. 423.

[*G*] *His writings.*] They are as follow: *Cato Major; a Poeme of Old Age*; London 1648 in 12mo, in four Parts, &c. (19). *The Deſtruction of Troy: or an Eſſay upon the ſecond Book of* Virgil's Æneids. London 1656 in four ſheets and an half in 4to. This was written in the year 1636. In the *Preface* to it he remarks, that "*it is a vulgar error in tranſlating Poets to affect being* Fidus Interpres. *Let that care be with them, who deal in matters of fact or matters of faith; but whoſoever aims at it in Poetry, as he attempts what is not required, ſo he ſhall never perform what he attempts; for it is not his buſineſs alone to tranſlate language into language, but poeſie into poeſie; and poeſie is of ſo ſubtile a ſpirit, that in pouring out of one language into another, it will all evaporate; and if a new ſpirit be not added in the tranſfuſion, there will remain nothing but a* Caput mortuum, *there being certain graces and happineſſes peculiar to every language, which give life and energy to the words. And whoſoever offers at verbal tranſlation, ſhall have the misfortune of that young traveller, who loſt his own language abroad, and brought home no other inſtead of it. For the grace of the Latine will be loſt by being turned into Engliſh words; and the grace of the Engliſh by being turned into the Latine phraſe. And as ſpeech is the apparel of our thoughts, ſo are there certain garbs and modes of ſpeaking, which vary with the times; the faſhion of our clothes being not more ſubject to alteration, than that of ones ſpeech. And this I think Tacitus means by that which he calls,* Sermonem temporis iſtius auribus accommodatum; *the delight of change being as due to the curioſity of the ear as of the eye.* "And therefore if Virgil muſt needs ſpeak En-"gliſh, it were fit he ſhould ſpeak not only as a man "of this nation, but as a man of this age. And if "this

(19) Wood, col. 423.

wrote a beautiful copy of verſes upon the death of Cowley, whom he ſurvived but a few months; for he died at his Office near Whitehall, which he before had built, about the 19th of (*i*) March 1668, and was interred on the 23d of the ſame month in Weſtminſter Abbey, near the graves of Chaucer, Spencer and Cowley (*k*).

(*i*) Wood, *Hiſt. & Antiq. Univ. Oxon.* pag. 299. But Langbaine, p. 127. and Sir Thomas Pope-Blount in his *Remarks upon Poetry, with Characters and Cenſures of the moſt conſiderable Poets*, Par. 2. pag. 66, ſay that he died on the 10th. (*k*) Wood, *Hiſt. & Antiq. ubi ſupra.*

" this diſguiſe I have put upon him (I wiſh I could " give it a better name) ſit not naturally and ea- " ſily on ſo grave a perſon, yet it may become him " better than a fool's coat, wherein the French and " Italian have of late preſented him: at leaſt, I hope, " it will not make him appear deformed, by making " any part enormouſly bigger or leſs than life, I " having made it my principal care to follow him, " as he made it his to follow Nature in all his pro- " portions. Neither have I any where offered ſuch " violence to his ſenſe, as to make it ſeem mine, and " not his. Where my expreſſions are not ſo full as " his, either our language, or my art were defective " (but I rather ſuſpect my ſelf;) but where mine are " fuller than his, they are but the impreſſions, which " the often reading of him hath left upon my thoughts; " ſo that if they are not his own conceptions, they " are at leaſt the reſults of them. And if (being " conſcious of making him ſpeak worſe than he did " almoſt in every line) I err in endeavouring to " make him ſpeak better, I hope it will be judged " an error on the right hand, and ſuch an one as " may deſerve pardon, if not imitation." Mr. Dryden (20) mentioning our Author's, Mr. Waller's, and Cowley's Tranſlations from Virgil, tells us, that it is the *utmoſt of his ambition to be thought their equal, or not to be much inferior to them.* But to return to the reſt of our Author's writings, he wrote a *Panegyric on his Excellency the Lord General George Monk, Commander in chief &c.* Printed at London in one ſheet in 4to in March $16\frac{59}{60}$. Though his name be not ſet to it, yet, as Mr. Wood obſerves (21), " the frequent report " was then among the Academicians, that he was the " Author of it." *A Poem on Mr.* Abraham Cowley's *Death and Burial among the ancient Poets*; printed at London in one ſheet in fol. in Auguſt 1667 (22). *A new Verſion of the Pſalms of David.* The *ſecond Impreſſion* of his *Poems and Tranſlations with the Sophy*, at London 1671 in 8vo, contains the following pieces: *Cooper's-Hill*; *The Deſtruction of Troy*; *On the Earl of* Strafford's *Tryal and Death*: *On my Lord* Croft's *and my Journey into Poland &c*; *On Mr.* Thomas Killigrew's *Return from his Embaſſy from* Venice, *and Mr.* William Murray's *from* Scotland; *To Sir* John Mennis, *being invited from* Calice *to* Bologne *to eat a Pig*; *Natura Naturata*; Sarpedon's *Speech to* Glaucus *in the XIIth Book of* Homer; *out of an Epigram of* Martial; *Friendſhip and ſingle Life againſt Love and Marriage*; *On Mr.* Abraham Cowley's *Death &c*; *A Speech againſt Peace at the Cloſe Committee*; *To the Five Members of the honourable Houſe of Commons, the humble Petition of the Poets*: *a Weſtern Wonder*; *A ſecond Weſtern Wonder*; *News from* Colcheſter &c; *A Song*; *On Mr.* John Fletcher's *Works*; *To Sir* Richard Fanſhaw, *upon his Tranſlation of* Paſtor Fido; *A Dialogue between Sir* John Pooley *and Mr.* Thomas Killigrew; *An occaſional Imitation of a modern Author* (23) *upon the Game of Cheſs*; *The Paſſion of* Dido *for* Æneas; *Of Prudence*; *Of Juſtice*; *The Progreſs of Learning*; and the *Sophy, a Tragedy.* He wrote likewiſe a *Prologue to his Majeſty at the firſt Play preſented at the* Cock-Pit *in* Whitehall, *being part of that noble Entertainment, which their Majeſties received Nov.* 19. *an.* 1660, *from his Grace the Duke of Albemarle.* This *Prologue* was printed at London 1660 on one ſide of a broad ſheet of paper (24). He had a hand in writing *Certain Verſes written by ſeveral of the Author's Friends, to be re-printed with the ſecond edition of Gondibert.* London 1653 in 8vo (25). Our Author likewiſe made an Engliſh Tranſlation in verſe of the *Book of Pſalms.* Mr. Wood informs us (26), that in 1680 there was publiſhed under his name at London in half a ſheet in fol. a piece intitled, *The true Preſbyterian without diſguiſe, or a character of a Preſbyterian's ways and actions*; but that it was then queſtioned by many whether Sir John Denham was the Author of it. The ſame Hiſtorian likewiſe obſerves, that in the year 1666 there were printed by ſtealth in 8vo certain Poems, intitled *Directions to a Painter*, in four copies or parts, each dedicated to King Charles II in verſe. They were very ſatyrical upon ſeveral perſons engaged in the war againſt the Dutch in 1665; and at the end of them is a piece intitled, *Clarendon's Houſe-warming*, and after that his *Epitaph*, both very ſevere upon Edward Lord Clarendon. To theſe *Directions* our Author's name is ſet; " yet they were thought by many, ſays Mr. Wood, to have been " written by Andrew Marvell Eſq; The Printer " that printed them, being diſcovered, ſtood in the " pillory for the ſame."

(20) *Dedication of his Tranſlation of Virgil's Æneis. Works of Virgil tranſlated &c.* vol. 2. pag. 419. edit. London 1730.

(21) Col. 423.

(22) Wood, col. 424.

(23) Sir Will. Davenant's *Gondibert.*

(24) Wood, col. 424.

(25) See the Article of DAVENANT (Sir William) Note [*D*].

(26) *Ubi ſupra.*

T

DES BARREAUX (JAMES DE VALLEE, Lord) born at Paris in the year 1602, of a very noble family [*A*], was one of the Wits of the ſeventeenth Century. He made a great progreſs in his ſtudies under the Jeſuits, who perceiving he had a genius capable of the greateſt things, endeavoured to prevail on him to enter into their Society; but neither he nor his family would give ear to the propoſal. He did not love them, and ſometimes uſed to rail at them in an agreeable manner. His intimacy with Theophile [*B*] without doubt contributed very much to this, as well as to the Libertiniſm for which he has been ſo famous. He was yet but young, when his father procured him the place of a Counſellor in the Parliament of Paris. His wit was admired there, though he

[*A*] *He was of a very noble family.*] He was ſon of JAMES DE VALLE'E, Lord Des-Barreaux, who died Maſter of Requeſts, and Preſident of the great Council, and grandſon of JAMES DE VALLE'E, Knight, Lord Des-Barreaux, of Chateauneuf, and Chenailles, Comptroller General of the Finances, a perſon of ſuch conſideration in the reign of Henry III, and the beginning of the following reign, that he had a great ſhare in the Councils, and the King often held a Council at his houſe, and frequently wrote to him with his own hand on important affairs. Mr. Des-Barreaux who is the ſubject of this Article was ſecond couſin to Monſieur de Laubeſpine Chateauneuf, Keeper of the Seals, and by his mother's ſide he was couſin german to the Counteſs de Bouteville (1), and conſequently uncle, after the mode of Britany, to the Marſhal de Luxemburgh, and the Ducheſs of Mecklemburgh. Mary de Vallée, his eldeſt ſiſter, left no children of her marriage with the Preſident Viole. Elizabeth de Vallée, his other ſiſter, was married to Mr. du Boulai-Favier, Maſter of Requeſts, who was Intendant in Normandy. The iſſue of this marriage was two daughters, one of which was married to Mr. Talon (2) and the other to the Count de Tiliere and de Carouge.

[*B*] *He was very intimate with Theophile.*] He was very handſome in his youth; and it is ſaid Theophile was in love with him, and ſometimes was even jealous of him. That Poet, ſpeaking of him ſomewhere, ſays, *Valleus noſter qui fuit olim meus*, i. e. " Our de " Vallée, who was formerly mine." Some people pretend he had abuſed him; but perſons who were intimately

(1) Mother of the Marſhal de Luxemburgh. She died, not in the month of Jan. 1695, as was publiſhed in the Gazettes, but in the month of Auguſt 1696, at the age of 92, in the 69th year of her widowhood. See the *Hiſtorical Letters* of the month of Sept. 1696, pag. 327, 328.

(2) Advocate General, and afterwards Preſident au Mortier in the Parliament of Paris.

he would never report a cauſe [C]. We ſhall ſee, in the Remarks, what obliged him to part with that place [D]. As he loved his pleaſures and his liberty extremely, he did not think himſelf very unhappy in having quitted the long Robe. He made a great number of Latin and French Verſes, and ſome very pretty Songs; but he never publiſhed any thing: for he minded nothing but good cheer, and diverſions. He was wonderfully entertaining at Table, and was known to and beloved by the greateſt Lords and the politeſt men in the Kingdom. There was no province wherein he had not his particular friends, whom he viſited frequently, taking a pleaſure in ſhifting his quarters according to the ſeaſons of the year [E]. Four or five years before his death he entirely forſook his vicious courſes: he paid his debts, and gave up the remainder of his Eſtate (a) to his ſiſters, reſerving to himſelf an Annuity for life of four thouſand livres. He then retired to Chalon on the Saone, which he ſaid was the beſt and pureſt air in France: he there hired a ſmall houſe, and was viſited by the better ſort of people, and particularly by the Biſhop, who bore him a good teſtimony. He died in that city like a good Chriſtian in the year 1674. He had made a devout Sonnet two or three years before his death, which is known to every body [F], and is a very fine one. Neither his relations

(a) He had received above 400 thouſand livres for his ſhare of his paternal and maternal Eſtates, beſides what came to him by collateral Inheritance.

intimately acquainted with Monſieur Des-Barreaux have aſſured us that he always abhorred that unnatural vice, and that *nec agens nec patiens voluit unquam inſervire præpoſteræ libidini*. See the Margin (3).

(3) *The Collection of* Theophile's Letters, *publiſhed by* Mayret, *contains two in French and ſeveral in Latin from Theophile to Des-Barreaux, and a Latin one from the latter to Theophile.*

[C] *His Father procured him a Counſellor's place in the Parliament . . . he would never report a Cauſe.*] He ſaid it was a ſordid occupation, and unworthy a man of parts, to read wrangling papers with attention, and to endeavour to underſtand them. He once undertook to report a Caſe: the Cauſe was of no great conſequence; but finding himſelf preſſed by the parties, he ſent for them, and burned the papers before their faces, paying the money that was demanded out of his own pocket.

[D] *We ſhall ſee in the Remarks what obliged him to part with that place.*] They ſay it was Cardinal Richelieu's falling in love with the famous Marion de Lorme, who was fond of our Des-Barreaux. I am going to produce my Author. "The Cardinal ſaw "Marion de Lorme without being ſeen by her, and "found her a thouſand times more beautiful than he "had imagined. He had a mind to know whether "St. Mars was loved by her, and employed Bois-"robert to diſcover it. The Abbot was not long "before he gave his Eminence the information he "wanted, and acquainted him that vanity had a "greater ſhare than love in the complaiſance which "Marion de Lorme ſhewed to the King's Favourite, "and that her affection was entirely placed on Des-"Barreaux, a Counſellor in the Parliament, a hand-"ſome young fellow, of a lively wit, and ſprightly "converſation, but exceſſively debauched and impi-"ous. The Cardinal ordered Bois-robert to propoſe "to Des-Barreaux, that if he would reſign his miſ-"treſs to him, and engage her to make a ſuitable "return to his paſſion, the ſacrifice would be ſo well "taken, that any thing ſhould be done for the raiſing "of his fortune that he ſhould deſire. Bois-robert "executed his commiſſion with a great deal of ad-"dreſs; but Des-Barreaux anſwered the propoſal no "otherwiſe than in a jeſting way, feigning all along "to believe the Cardinal incapable of ſo much weak-"neſs. That Miniſter was ſo provoked at it, that "he perſecuted Des-Barreaux as long as he lived, and "forced him to quit his place and leave the King-"dom (4)."

(4) *Galanteries des Rois de France*, tom. 2. pag. 189, of the Dutch Edition 1695.

The perſon who furniſhed me with ſome Memoirs concerning Mr. Des-Barreaux, had promiſed me the refutation of this paſſage in the *Gallantries of the Kings of France*; but a long illneſs has prevented him from ſending it me.

[E] *He took a pleaſure in ſhifting his quarters, according to the Seaſons of the year.*] He went in ſearch of the beſt fruits and the beſt wines in the climates where they excelled: but eſpecially in winter he went to ſeek the Sun on the Coaſts of Provence. He paſſed the three worſt months in the year at Marſeilles. The houſe which he called his favourite was in Languedoc: it was that of the Count de Clermont de Lodeve, where he uſed to ſay good cheer and liberty were on their throne. In Anjou he had the houſe du Lude, which was formerly the reſort of the greateſt wits and the beſt company. Sometimes he went to Mr. de Balzac (5) on the banks of the Charante; but his chief reſidence was at Chenailles on the Loire, a pleaſant houſe, and formerly a houſe of pleaſure and good cheer. It belonged to one of his uncles, and afterwards to Mr. de Chenailles his firſt couſin, a Counſellor in the Parliament of Paris (6). I muſt add, that the pleaſures of the mind were ſometimes the occaſion of his journeys; as when he went into Holland on purpoſe to ſee his good friend Mr. Des Cartes, and to improve by the inſtructions of that great genius (7).

(5) See the *Letter* which *Balzac* wrote him the 12th of October 1641: it is the 26th of the 2d Book of the 2d Part of the *Lettres Choiſies*. The Couſin he mentions to him, who would not marry again, is doubtleſs the Counteſs de Bouteville.

(6) He retired to the Hague on account of his Religion, in 1694.

(7) Baillet, *Vie de Des-Cartes*, tom. 2. pag. 176.

[F] *He had made a devout Sonnet . . . . . which is known to every body.*] I ſhall nevertheleſs inſert it here at length.

Grand Dieu, tes jugemens ſont remplis d'équité;
Toûjours tu prens plaiſir à nous être propice:
Mais j'ai tant fait de mal, que jamais ta bonté
Ne me pardonnera ſans choquer ta juſtice.
Oüy, Mon Dieu, la grandeur de mon impiété
Ne laiſſe à ton pouvoir que le choix du ſuplice:
Ton intereſt s'oppoſe à ma félicité;
Et ta clémence même attend que je périſſe.
Contente ton deſir puis qu'il t'eſt glorieux;
Offenſe toy des pleurs qui coulent de mes yeux;
Tonne, frappe, il eſt temps, rens moi guerre pour guerre:
J'adore en périſſant la raiſon qui t'aigrit:
Mais deſſus quel endroit tombera ton tonnerre,
Qui ne ſoit tout couvert du ſang de JESUS-CHRIST.

"Great God, thy judgments equitable are;
"Mercy is ſtill thy darling attribute:
"Yet ſuch a wretch, ſo full of guilt am I,
"Tho' Mercy pleads, Juſtice forbids to ſave.
"Yes, yes, my God! my great impiety
"Leaves thee the choice of puniſhment alone:
"Thy int'reſt is againſt my happineſs,
"And ev'n thy clemency awaits my fall.
"Then ſatisfy thy glory's juſt demand,
"And let my falling tears provoke thy wrath:
"Now, thunder, ſtrike, and give me war for war:
"Falling I own the juſtice of the blow:
"But, mark'd for vengeance, let me not deſpair;
"Fall where thy thunders will, the Blood of CHRIST
is there."

The Author of the Art of Speaking finds this Sonnet *admirable*. He has inſerted it in his Book as an example of the figure which the Rhetoricians call *Epiſtrophe*, or *Conſent* (8). This Sonnet is to be found in a letter of Mr. Bourſault. The Title of the Letter ſpecifies that it was written *to Mr. Des-Barreaux who believed in God only when he was ſick* (9). The Author mentions to him *the death of an unhappy woman who was the diſgrace of her ſex, and who left ſome children which were the heirs of her infamy*. He pretends that by her death God had *broken down the obſtacles which hindred* Des-Barreaux *from approaching him*. We may conclude from hence that this woman had been our Libertine's miſtreſs. He adds, that he *makes no doubt but among the ill examples* which they had *mutually ſhewn* each other, *ſhe had learned* of him *to believe in God* only when ſhe was ſick. He repreſents to him what the mercy of God had frequently done for him. *Was it not that mercy*, ſays he to him (10), *which in order to reclaim you from your vicious courſes, ſent you the laſt ſickneſs you had: during which*

(8) *Art de parler*, liv. 2. chap. 3. pag. 100. of the Dutch Edition 1679.

(9) *Lettres Nouvelles de Mr. Bourſault*, pag. 18. of the Dutch Edition, 1698.

(10) Ibid. pag. 21.

which being touched by the greatneſs of your ſins, you made that Sonnet, which has gained you as much glory as it will one day cauſe confuſion in you, for having been capable of thinking ſo well, and unhappy enough to live ſo ill? . . . . . Let us lay aſide the Chriſtian for a moment, and ſpeak only of the man of honour. Tell me, I beſeech you, whether a man who ſhould ſay that to another which you ſay to God, and ſhould break his word with him as baſely as you have done, would be a man of honour? . . . . What are you going to do, with death following within two ſteps of you, to day at the Capuchins, and to morrow at the Minims, but to ſeek what you ought to fly, and, if I may dare to ſay it, to inſult God where others go to worſhip him (11)? He ſends him the Fable of the Sick Kite; and aſſerts that *if there is any greater extravagance in the world than not to believe in God, it is having the weakneſs to invoke him without believing in him: and as he is not more God when we are ſick, than when we are well, there is neither more nor leſs reaſon to believe in him at one time than at another* (12). This he ſuppoſes to be the anſwer of the Kite's mother, and declares that *he knows none but Æſop capable of putting ſo judicious an anſwer into her mouth:* and laſtly, he moſt earneſtly exhorts Mr. Des-Barreaux not to tire out God's mercy. Note the Fable of the Kite appears in the following words in the new Edition of Phædrus.

(11) Ibid. pag. 22.

(12) Ibid. pag. 24.

Multos cum menſes ægrotaſſet milvius,
Nec jam videret eſſe vitæ ſpem ſuæ,
Matrem rogabat, ſancta circumiret loca,
Et pro ſalute vota faceret maxima.
Faciam, inquit, fili; ſed opem ne non impetrem
Vehementer vereor; ſed qui delubra omnia
Vaſtando, cuncta polluiſti altaria
Sacrificiis nullis parcens, nunc quid vis rogem (13)?

(13) See the *Phædrus* printed at Amſterdam, 1698, pag. 325 of the *Commentary of Gudius. Append. Fab. I. in Edit. P. Burm.*

" Kite had lain ill three months and more,
" And all the Quacks had giv'n him o're.
" Mamma he call'd, then thus began;
" All fleſh is graſs, and life a ſpan,
" But pray'rs, perhaps, may ſtill prevail,
" The Gods can cure when Doctors fail.
" I'd pray, my ſon, mamma reply'd,
" But fear, alas! to be deny'd:
" They'll ſay this ſudden Reformation
" Is nought but baſe diſſimulation."

I have not found this Fable among thoſe which are attributed immediately to Æſop in the Edition of Nevelet, but I have found it among thoſe which an anonymous Author has put into Latin verſe (14), and has given as the genuine Fables of Æſop. I can ſee no footſtep there of the thought produced by Mr. Bourſault, and which he ſuppoſes Æſop alone capable of ſuggeſting. This by the by.

(14) They are in the ſame Edition of *Nevelet.*

He is in the right to ſay it would be the utmoſt extravagance to addreſs prayers to a Deity whoſe exiſtence one does not believe; but I do not know whether Des-Barreaux was ever guilty of ſuch a piece of madneſs. St. Paul ſeems to ſuppoſe that an extravagance of this kind is not to be met with among men: *How,* ſays he (15), *ſhall they call on him, in whom they have not believed?* It ſeems to me poſſible enough that thoſe who have determined nothing poſitively, either as to the exiſtence, or the non-exiſtence of God, may make ſupplications and prayers to him at the view of imminent danger. Now this is the caſe of almoſt all infidels. They doubt whether there is a God; they do not clearly know that he does exiſt; but, on the other hand, they do not clearly know that he does not exiſt. The Biſhop of Tournay begins his Reflections on Religion by this thought. It is natural for ſuch people, at the approach of death, to take the ſureſt courſe, and to recommend themſelves to the divine favour and mercy *ad majorem cautelam* (16). They hope to obtain ſomething by their prayers, in caſe there is a Being who hears them, and can grant their petition; and they have nothing to fear, in caſe there is no ſuch Being. But if any man was arrived at ſuch a pitch of incredulity, as to become a downright Atheiſt by firm perſuaſion of mind, and to continue in that perſuaſion while dangerouſly ſick, I do not conceive it poſſible for him to call upon God from the bottom of his heart. Let us not therefore imagine that Des-Barreaux fell into the extravagancy imputed to him, of invoking God without believing there was a God. Let us rather ſay that his cuſtom of invoking him in his ſickneſs is a ſign, either that in the time of health he did not doubt of the exiſtence of God, as is aſſerted in the Memoirs which have been communicated to me, or that at moſt he conſidered it as a diſputable problem, the affirmative of which he embraced when he feared he ſhould die. His inclination for pleaſure made him return to his former courſe and his old language, when his health was reſtored. This does not prove him to have been an Atheiſt in reality. It only proves, either that he rejected almoſt all the peculiar doctrines of poſitive Religion, or that, from a principle of pride, he was afraid of being ridiculed as having forfeited the title of a Free-thinker, if he did not continue to talk like a Libertine. It is probable enough that thoſe who affect in company to attack the moſt common truths of Religion, ſay more than they really think. Vanity has a greater ſhare in their diſputes than conſcience. They imagine that the ſingularity and boldneſs of the opinions which they maintain, will gain them the reputation of men of great parts. This tempts them to lay open the difficulties to which the doctrines of Providence and thoſe of the Goſpel are liable, againſt the perſuaſion of their own mind. By degrees, therefore, they get a habit of holding impious diſcourſes, and if their vanity be accompanied by a voluptuous life, their progreſs in that road is the ſwifter. This ill habit, contracted on one hand under the auſpices of pride, and on the other under the auſpices of ſenſuality, takes off the edge of the impreſſions of education; I mean it ſtifles the ſenſe of thoſe truths which they learned in their childhood concerning the Deity, Heaven, and Hell; but it is not a faith quite extinguiſhed; it is only fire which lies hid under aſhes. They are ſenſible of its activity ſo ſoon as they conſider, and eſpecially at the approach of danger: then we ſee them more fearful than other men (17); and they proceed even to ſuperſtition. The remembrance of having ſhewn more contempt for holy things than they really had for them, and of having endeavoured to free their minds from that yoke, redoubles their diſquiet. It has ſcarce ever been ſeen that a grave man, averſe to pleaſures and the vanities of the world, has ſet himſelf to dogmatize in company in favour of impiety, even tho' a long ſeries of ill-guided meditations has hurried him on inwardly to reject all Religion. Such a man, far from endeavouring to root out of the minds of young people the doctrines which might preſerve them from a debauched life, far from deſiring to inſpire his own opinions into thoſe who might make an ill uſe of them, or whom they might deprive of the conſolations which the hope of a bleſſed eternity cauſes them to feel in their afflictions, would rather fortify them therein out of a principle of charity and generoſity. He keeps his own opinions either wholly to himſelf, or communicates them to ſuch perſons only as he ſuppoſes incapable of making an ill uſe of them. This is what ſpeculative Atheiſts do, who have not been ſpoiled by debauchery or the ſpirit of romancing (18). The misfortune of having been too much ſtruck with a certain principle, and of having purſued it through too many gradations of conſequences, has brought them to a certain perſuaſion. The grace of God may free them from it at the ſight of death, but otherwiſe they perſiſt in their indolence in the midſt of ſickneſs, and of ſtorms, and if they conform to the ceremonies appointed by the Church for dying perſons, it is to ſpare their friends the vexatious conſequences of their rejecting the Ritual. This inclines one to believe that Libertines like Des-Barreaux are not greatly perſuaded of the truth of what they ſay. They have made no deep examination, they have learned ſome few objections, which they are perpetually making a noiſe with; they ſpeak from a principle of oſtentation, and give themſelves the lie in time of danger (19). Mr. de Balzac has characterized them very juſtly, when he ridiculed a Grammarian of Gaſcony, who braved the Deity, and yet fell into the moſt cowardly ſuperſtition on every the leaſt occaſion. The expreſſions he has made uſe of, as well in verſe as in proſe, are ſo fine that I think my ſelf obliged to tranſcribe them. *Audiſti in quotidianis Comœdiis Pyrgopolinicis partes bellè agere. Audiſti uſurpantem crebro, ſibique affingentem Virgilianum illud:*

(15) Romans x. 14.

(16) See the Remark [E] of the Article of BION *the Boryſthenite.*

(17) See above the paſſage of CHARRON, in the Remark [I] of his Article.

(18) See the Remark [C] of the Article VAYER, at the end.

(19) See the Article of BION *the Boryſthenite,* Remark [E] and that of HENAULT.

Felix qui potuit rerum cognoſcere cauſas,
Atque metus omnes & inexorabile fatum
Subjecit pedibus, ſtrepitumque Acherontis avari.

ons nor his friends can deny he was a great Libertine [G]; but they pretend that fame has aggravated things too much [H] according to cuſtom, and that in the latter part of his life he was convinced of the truth of Religion; in other reſpects they aſſert that he always

Ne vobis imponat verborum illa magnificentia: Hiſtrio & Recitator Virgilianus eſt, non Philoſophus Virgilianus. Meticuloſiſſimum omnium animal timet etiam non timenda. Neque ignem modò, ſed ſuſpicionem quoque ignis, & fumum è longinquo volantem, & ſubluſtriorem umbram timet. . . . . .

Vilis Grammaticus, gentis pars fœda togatæ,
Impuro tantùm ore ferox, ne credite verbis,
Corde pavet gelido, quamvis verba ardua jactet
Sæpius, & tragicas effundat in aëra voces.
Non furor hic conſtans, non Numina fortiter odit,
Intrepiduſque Polos audet ridere tonantes,
Ut quondam Capaneus Thebana ad mœnia pugnans,
Cùm non arma Jovis flammaſque timeret Olympi.
Hic dubii imbellis ventura pericula caſus,
Et ſimulachra malorum, & larvas horret inanes,
Contemptor placidique Jovis Cœlique ſereni.
Quas non ille aras, humili formidine tacta
Mente petet, quos non Superos in vota vocabit,
Si videat maris iratos inſurgere fluctus,
Sentiat aut propriis ardere incendia venis,
Inſolito-ve urgeri oppreſſum pondere pectus,
Æger, inops animi, atque inſtantis victima Fati (20)?

(20) Balzac. *Epiſt. Select.* pag. m. 279.

" You have heard him daily act the part of the Bully " in the Play. You have heard him frequently re- " peating and applying to himſelf this paſſage of " Virgil:

" *Happy the man who, ſtudying Nature's laws,*
" *Thro' known effects can trace the ſecret cauſe;*
" *Who ſuperſtitious fears can bravely quell,*
" *Inexorable fate, and all the din of Hell!*"

" Let not this magnificent bravado impoſe on you: " he can mimic Virgil and repeat his verſes, but " will never be ſuch a Philoſopher as Virgil was. He " is the moſt timorous animal in the world, and " dreads even thoſe things which there is no reaſon " to fear. He is afraid not only of fire, but even " the ſuſpicion of it, and ſmoke ariſing at a diſtance, " and trembles at a ſhadow by moon-ſhine. . . . . .

" *Grammarian vile! ſcoundrel of abject race!*
" *He's bold in tongue, but truſt not to his words,*
" *His heart's a coward, tho' he talks ſo big,*
" *And vents his impious rant in tragic ſtrains.*
" *His rage is fickle, tim'rouſly profane,*
" *He dares not laugh when thunder ſhakes the poles,*
" *As Capaneus of old, who ſtorming Thebes*
" *Brav'd Jove himſelf, and fearleſs ſtood the bolt.*
" *This wretch dreads diſtant dangers, ills but dream't,*
" *And trembles at the empty forms of night,*
" *Who ſcorns a peaceful God, and ſerene ſky.*
" *But if a ſtorm excite the angry waves,*
" *Or if a fever burn within his veins,*
" *Or ſome unuſual load his breaſt oppreſs,*
" *To ev'ry ſhrine, and ev'ry ſaint he bows*
" *Submiſſive, wild with fear, of counſel void,*
" *An abject victim of impending fate.*"

Let us obſerve occaſionally, that ſeveral perſons who are fully perſuaded of the truths of Chriſtianity, forget their vows when the danger is over; which gave riſe to the proverb, *Paſſato il pericolo, gabbato il ſanto.* How many debauchees are there, tho' very orthodox in other reſpects, who fearing to be caſt away at ſea, or to die of a diſeaſe, promiſe God to live ſoberly if they eſcape? They do eſcape, and live as wickedly as they did before. Would one not think they acted in alluſion to thoſe human Laws which diſpenſe with a man's keeping his word, if it was obtained by ſuperior force, or in priſon, or made to an enemy who held a piſtol to his breaſt, or, in a word, while ſeized with a juſt fear, *metu cadente in conſtantem virum?*

[G] *His friends cannot deny he was a great Libertine.*] They ſay he did not diſapprove the truths of Chriſtianity, and wiſhed to be fully convinced of them; but he pretended nothing was ſo difficult to a man of wit as to believe. He was born a Catholic, but he had not the leaſt faith either in the worſhip or the doctrines of the Romiſh Religion; and he uſed to ſay that if the Goſpel and the Scripture are the rule of our actions and of our belief, there was no better Religion than the Proteſtant.

[H] . . . . *But they pretend that fame has aggravated things too much.*] Several people, without knowing him, have ſpoken of him as an impious perſon, and an Atheiſt; but the truth is, that excepting ſome ſallies in the heat of diſpute, which ſometimes made him puſh his arguments too far, he never diſcovered that his opinions were ſuch as to deny the exiſtence of God. He was ſometimes indeed too bold and licentious in his little rakiſh Songs. This is the import of the Memoirs which have been communicated to me. I have read in the ſecond edition of the *Menagiana* a thing which in my opinion deſerves not to be credited; for it is a ſtory which is told about every where, and attributed to a thouſand different people. However it be, here is Mr. Menage's ſtory. *One day when Mr.* Des-Barreaux *and Mr.* d'Elbene *were together, it being in Lent, they had a mind to eat meat, but could get only ſome eggs, of which they had an omelette, or pancake, made. While they were eating it, there happened ſuch a terrible ſtorm of thunder, that it ſeemed as if the Houſe they were in would have been overturned. Mr. Des-Barreaux, without any concern, took the diſh and threw it out of the window, ſaying, Here's a noiſe indeed about an omelette* (21). I give no more credit to another ſtory which I have heard. It is ſaid that Des-Barreaux, being very ſick, ſent for the Prieſts in as much haſte as if he had been an old devotee. His bed was ſurrounded with holy water, tapers, croſſes, images, and all the apparatus of the Romiſh devotion. They aſked him how he did; *Judge you,* anſwered he, *of the ill ſtate of my body and mind by the furniture which ſurrounds me.* This ſhort ſtory has been probably forged in imitation of the anſwer which Pericles returned, when he ſuffered an old woman's remedy to be hung about his neck. Ὁ γοῦν Θεόφραστος ἐν τοῖς ἠθικοῖς διαπορήσας εἰ πρὸς τὰς τύχας τρέπεται τὰ ἤθη, καὶ συμμένουσι τοῖς τῶν σωμάτων πάθεσι, ἐξίστανται τῆς ἀρετῆς, ἱστόρηκεν ὅτι νοσῶν ὁ Περικλῆς ἐπισκοπουμένῳ τινὶ τῶν φίλων δέξασθαι περίαπτον ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν τῷ τραχήλῳ περιηρτημένον, ὡς σφόδρα κακῶς ἔχων, ὁπότε καὶ ταύτῃ ὑπόμενοι τὴν ἀβελτηρίαν. *Scriptum reliquit in Ethicis Theophraſtus, ubi diſputat an mutentur cum fortuna mores, & corporis agitati affectibus deſciſcant à virtute, ægrum Periclem amico cuipiam, qui ipſum inviſebat, amuletum oſtendiſſe à mulieribus ex collo ſuo ſuſpenſum, quaſi, quum eas etiam toleraret ineptias, graviter admodum ægrotaret* (22). i. e. " Theo- " phraſtus in his Morals, having made a moot-point " whether men's manners change with their fortunes, " and their ſouls, being jogged and diſturbed by the " ailings of their bodies, do ſtart aſide from the rules " of virtue, hath left it upon record, that Pericles, " when he was ſick, ſhewed one of his friends who " came to viſit him an amulet or charm, which the " women had hung about his neck; as much as to " ſay, that he was very ſick indeed, when he would " admit of or indure ſuch a foolery as that was."

(21) *Menagiana*, pag. 240, 241, of the 2d Edition of Holland.

(22) Plutarch. *in Pericle*, pag. 173, A.

What I am going to quote is taken from the Letters of Guy Patin. " I have juſt now been informed that " the debauched Mr. Des-Barreaux is dead; a fair " ſoul in the ſight of God, if he believed in him! " At leaſt he talked pretty much like a man who had " not a great deal of faith as to the affairs of the " other world; but he has infected a great many " poor young fellows with his Libertiniſm: his con- " verſation was very dangerous, and very peſtilent to " the public: it is ſaid he had ſome tincture of it " before he went to Italy; but at his return he was " compleatly accompliſhed: a wag uſed to ſay that " he had been ſpoiled by keeping company too much " with the Monks, none of thoſe Hermits of Thebaïs, " or of our good ſouls, who ſpend their time in devo- " tion and ſtudy, but of thoſe who are ſo numerous " in the cities of Italy, and think of nothing leſs " than of God." As Patin wrote this the 28th of May 1666 (23), it plainly appears he truſted to a falſe report of the death of Des-Barreaux. He was not yet undeceived the 18th of June following; for here

(23) This *Letter* is the CCCCX. See page 203 of the 3d Volume.

ways was, according to the world, a man of probity and honour, *that he had a ſincere and honeſt heart, was civil, and ready to ſerve others, charitable, a good friend, generous and liberal* (b). He was never married, and had no brother, but only two ſiſters (c).

(b) This, and whatever in the Remarks is not ſupported by a public quotation, is taken from Memoirs which come from a good hand, the Original whereof I keep by me.

(c) See the Remark [A].

here is what he wrote in a Letter dated that day (24). "They ſay nothing of Mr. Des-Barreaux; and I "know not where he is at preſent. He lived as one "of the ſect of Cremoninus; who took no care of "their ſoul, and very little of their body, unleſs it "were to get it laid three foot under ground. He "has not failed to corrupt the minds of a great ma-"ny young people, who ſuffered themſelves to be in-"fatuated by that Libertine." What he wrote four years after about St. Pavin ſhews that he had diſcovered his news to be falſe; for he ſpeaks of Des-Barreaux as living, and a penitent. *There died here a few days ſince*, ſays he (25), *a great ſervant of God, named Mr. de St. Pavin, a great companion of Des-Barreaux, who* IS *another very illuſtrious Iſraelite*, ſi credere fas eſt. This diſcourſe, methinks, inſinuates plainly enough that both thoſe Libertines deſired to be taken for Converts; and thus the event would have quickly contradicted the predictions of Monſr. Boileau, who had put the converſion of St. Pavin in the number of moral impoſſibilities.

(24) It is the CCCCVII.

(25) *Letter DXII.* dated from Paris, the 11th of April 1670. See page 510 of the 3d Volume.

Avant qu'un tel deſſein m'entre dans la penſée,
On pourra voir la Seine à la Saint Jean glacée,
Arnaud à Charenton devenir Huguenot,
Saint Sorlin Janſéniſte, & SAINT PAVIN BIGOT (26).

(26) Boileau, Sat. 1. ver. 125.

"Er'e ſuch a thought my mind ſhall entertain,
"Ice ſhall at midſummer lock up the Seine,
"Arnauld at Charenton turn Huguenot,
"St. Sorlin Janſeniſt, and St. Pavin devout."

There is no doubt but St. Pavin was ſtill in a bad way when Mr. Boileau ſpoke of him. Whence comes it then that the learned Hadrian Valeſius places the converſion of St. Pavin on the day of Theophile's death? He is certainly miſtaken. See the *Valeſiana* (27); you will alſo meet with ſomething there concerning our Des-Barreaux: "I ſaw Meſſieurs Des-"Barreaux and Bardouville when I was young: they "were great companions, and diſciples of Theophi-"le..... As to Mr. Des-Barreaux, after he had "made himſelf the ſubject of a great deal of talk in "Paris, finding old age come on, he gave himſelf up "to devotion. Some detractor or other, who thought "his reformation did not proceed from a pure motive "of piety, made this epigram upon him at that time.

(27) Pag. 92. of the Dutch Edition.

"*Des Barreaux ce vieux débauché*
"*Affecte une Réforme auſtere:*
"*Il ne s'eſt pourtant retranché*
"*Que ce qu'il ne ſauroit plus faire* (28).

(28) Ibid. pag. 31.

"Des-Barreaux, that old worn out rake,
"Pretending ſtrictly to reform,
"Has done no more than juſt forſake
"What he no longer could perform."

DIACCETO. See JACCETIUS.

DIAGORAS, a famous Athlet or Wreſtler of the Iſle of Rhodes, reckoned one of the moſt illuſtrious men of Antiquity among his anceſtors [A]. The glory which he acquired by his victories at the public Games of Greece, became extremely remarkable by thoſe which his ſons, and the ſons of his daughters (a), obtained there. He once carried two of his ſons thither: they won the crown, and taking their father on their ſhoulders, carried him through an incredible multitude of ſpectators who threw flowers on them by handfuls, and applauded his glory and good fortune (b). Some Authors ſay he was ſo tranſported with joy on this occaſion, that he died of it [B]. But there is reaſon to

(a) See above the Remark [C] of the Article BERENICE, *the daughter, ſiſter, and mother, &c.*

(b) Extracted from *Pauſanias*, lib. 6. pag. 184.

[A] *He reckoned one of the moſt illuſtrious men of Antiquity among his anceſtors.*] I mean that he was deſcended from a daughter of Ariſtomenes, the greateſt Hero that ever was among the Meſſenians. This Ariſtomenes had beſtowed two of his daughters in marriage, and had a third left. Damagetus, King of Jalyſus in the Iſle of Rhodes, demanded her in marriage, becauſe the Oracle of Delphi had counſelled him to marry the daughter of the worthieſt man in Greece. Ariſtomenes did not only conſent to give him his daughter, but conducted her to the Iſle of Rhodes himſelf. Damagetus had by this wife a ſon named Diagoras. If Pauſanias, who ſupplies me with all this (1), meant that Diagoras the Athlet, the father and grandfather of ſo many victorious Athlets, was the ſon of Damagetus by the daughter of Ariſtomenes, he had not well conſulted Chronology. In one place he ſays (2) that death prevented Ariſtomenes from viſiting Ardys and Phraortes, the former King of Lydia, and ſon of Gyges, and the latter King of the Medes: and in another place (3) he aſſerts that Dorieus, the ſon of Diagoras the Athlet, lived in the time of Conon the Athenian General. Now the reign of Ardys reaches from the ſecond year of the 26th Olympiad to the 3d year of the 37th (4). Phraortes reigned from the ſecond year of the 31ſt Olympiad to the laſt year of the 36th; and Conon flouriſhed about the 96th Olympiad: it is therefore againſt all probability that Dorieus, the contemporary of Conon, ſhould be the ſon of a man whoſe father married in the reign of Phraortes. See below the Remark [D] and [F].

(1) Lib. 4. pag. 234.

(2) Ibid.

(3) Lib. 6. pag. 285.

(4) *See* Calviſius.

Note, when we examine the Greek of Pauſanias a little more carefully than Romulus Amaſeus, his Latin Tranſlator, did, we find that Diagoras the Wreſtler was the ſon of a Damagetus whoſe father, named Dorieus (5), was the ſon of Damagetus by the daughter of Ariſtomenes.

(5) It is τοῦ Δωρίεως in the Editions of *Pauſanias*, lib. 4; but according to the conjecture of *Camerarius*, it ſhould be read Δωριέως, as in the 6th Book.

[B] *Some Authors relate that he was ſo tranſported with joy . . . . . that he died.*] I believe this is no where to be found but in Aulus Gellius among the Ancients, and that it is he who ought in this reſpect to be deemed the original of a vaſt number of more modern Authors, who have cited this example whenever they ſpeak of joy as a thing capable of killing. When I ſay Aulus Gellius has been their original, I do not ſuppoſe that they all conſulted him: he is the immediate original with regard to ſome, and by reduction with regard to all the reſt. Here is what he ſays: he does not relate the fact ſo ſimply as Pauſanias does; but no doubt he added ſome rhetorical embelliſhments. *De Rhodio etiam Diagora celebrata hiſtoria eſt. Is Diagoras tres filios adoleſcentes habuit, unum pugilem, alterum pancratiaſtem, tertium luctatorem; eoſque omnes vidit vincere coronarique eodem Olympiæ die: & quum ibi eum tres adoleſcentes amplexi, coronis ſuis in caput patris poſitis, ſuaviarentur, quumque populus gratulabundus flores undique in eum jaceret: ibi in ſtadio, inſpectante populo, in oſculis atque in manibus filiorum animam efflavit* (6), i. e. "There is alſo a celebrated "ſtory of Diagoras the Rhodian. This Diagoras had "three young men for his ſons, one a Boxer, the ſe-"cond a Pancratiaſt, and the third a Wreſtler; all of "whom he ſaw crowned Victors in the Olympic "Games on the ſame day: and when the three young "men embraced their father, and putting their crowns "on his head, kiſſed him, while the people congra-"tulated him, and threw flowers on him from every "ſide; he expired in the ſtadium, in the ſight of the "people, amidſt the kiſſes and embraces of his ſons."

(6) Aulus Gellius, *Noct. Attic.* lib. 3. cap. 15.

to believe this is false [C]. The time in which he lived may be found in one of the Authors quoted by Moreri [D]; but those Authors do not say that the occasion of his death is differently reported. Yet this is what Moreri asserts [E].

Since the first impression of this Article, I have found in the Works of Pindar an Ode made by him in honour of Diagoras. We there learn (c) that this Athlet had twice obtained the victory in the Games of Rhodes, four times in the Isthmian Games, and twice in the Nemean; and that he had been victorious in the Games celebrated at Athens, at Argos, in Arcadia, at Thebes, in Bœotia, in the Island of Ægina, at Pellene

(c) Pindar. Ode VII Olympior.

[C] . . . . . *There is reason to believe this is false.*] The fact would have been too singular to be omitted by those who have spoken amply of Diagoras: I cannot conceive that Pausanias, who speaks of him so sedately (7), and with several digressions, could have passed over a death of this kind in silence, if he had heard it discoursed of as a certain event. Now without doubt he would have heard of it as such, if the thing had been certain. Observe, that he not only explains to us the situation of the statues which were erected to Diagoras, his sons, and his grandsons, and touches on many particular circumstances which concern that family; but he speaks also of the glorious day, on which this man saw himself honoured with so many applauses and felicitations, on account of the victories of his sons. Could he have avoided making this Remark, that Diagoras died of joy under the flowers which they threw on him, and amidst the blessings of the Assembly? Let us take the silence of Pausanias, therefore, for a proof of Aulus Gellius's bad discernment. Cicero and Plutarch furnish us with another proof. They both relate what was said to Diagoras on the day of that signal victory. A Lacedæmonian accosted him, to exhort him not to lose so glorious an opportunity of dying. Would there have been any occasion for such a remonstrance if he had actually died of joy? Would he not have prevented that Lacedæmonian's smart saying, and put it out of the power of Cicero or Plutarch, or any other Moralist, ever to have alledged the example of Diagoras in the manner they have done? They have produced him, not as a man who died of joy on the very pinnacle of his good fortune, but as a man to whom it was represented that he would do well to die at such a conjuncture. Is not this a convincing proof against Aulus Gellius? I shall observe that Cicero and Plutarch report the thought of the Lacædemonian so differently, that a negative and an affirmative are not more opposite. They agree only in the general aim, which is to prove that death ought not to be grievous to those who enjoy great felicity. *Die, Diagoras; for now wilt thou go to heaven. Secundis suis rebus volet etiam mori, non enim tam cumulus bonorum jucundus esse potest, quam molesta decessio. Hanc sententiam significare videtur Laconis illa vox, qui quum Rhodius Diagoras Olympionices nobilis uno die duos suos filios victores Olympiæ vidisset, accessit ad senem, & gratulatus, Morere, Diagora, inquit; nunc enim in cœlum ascensurus es. Magna hæc & nimium fortasse Græci putant, vel tum potius putabant. Isque qui hoc Diagoræ dixit, permagnum existimans patrem quum duobus filiis treis Olympionicas una ex domo prodire, cunctari illum diutius in vita fortunæ objectum inutile putabat ipsi* (8). i. e. "He would also wish to die in his prosperity; for the "flow of good fortune cannot be so pleasing, as the "ebb is displeasing. This seems to be the meaning "of that sentence of the Lacedæmonian, who when "Diagoras of Rhodes, a noble victor in the Olympic "Games, had seen his two sons obtain the crown at "Olympia on one day, approached the old man, and "congratulating him said, *Die, Diagoras; for now wilt "thou go to heaven.* The Grecians think, or rather "then thought, this a great, and perhaps an excessive "felicity; and he who said this to Diagoras judged "it a most extraordinary thing that three victors in "the Olympic games, a father and two sons, should "proceed from one family, and therefore deemed it "unnecessary for him to live any longer, exposed to "the caprice of fortune." This was the compliment according to Cicero; and it was as follows according to Plutarch, *Die, Diagoras; for thou canst not go to heaven.* Οὐ γὰρ (ὡς Αἴσωπος ἔφασκε) χαλεπώτατός ἐστιν ὁ τῶν εὐτυχεστάτων θάνατος, ἀλλὰ μακαριώτατος εἰς ἀσφαλῆ χώραν τὰς εὐπραξίας κατατιθέμενος τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ τύχην μεταβαλλομένας ἀπολιπών. διὸ βέλτιον ὁ Λάκων τὸν ὀλυμπιονίκην Διαγόραν ἐπιδόντα μὲν υἱοὺς στεφανηφόρους ὀλυμπιάσιν, ἐπιδόντα δ' υἱωνοὺς καὶ δυναστείας, ἀσπασάμενος, Κάτθανε (εἶπε) Διαγόρα, εἰς τὸν Ὄλυμπον οὐκ ἀναβήσῃ. *Non enim (ut Æsopus ait) mors est felicium acerbissima, verum beatissima: quæ res bonorum virorum lætas securo loco deposuit, & fortunæ declinavit conversionem. Melius ergo Lacon ille qui Olympionicen Diagoram, quum spectasset filios ille victores Olympiæ, spectasset etiam nepotes ex filiis & filiabus, salutans, Morere Diagora, inquit: non enim in cœlum ascensurus es* (9). i. e. "For, as Æsop observes, the death of the happy "men is not the most grievous, but most blessed, "since it secures their felicity, and puts it out of for-"tune's power. And that Spartan advised well, who "embracing Diagoras, who had himself been crown-"ed in the Olympian Games, and saw his sons and "grand-children victors, said, *Die, Diagoras; for thou "canst not ascend to heaven.*" This Lacedæmonian's argument is, I confess, obscure to me, which way soever it be turned, either as Cicero has done, or as Plutarch. I should understand it a little better according to the sense of the latter; I should imagine that the Lacedæmonian had argued in this manner: *You are arrived at the highest pitch of glory to which you can aspire, for you must not promise yourself that if you lived yet a long while you would mount to heaven; die therefore, that you may not run the risque of a fall.* I advise those who have nothing of greater consequence to do to examine this whole matter. Volaterranus has made an innovation in it (10). The subject may furnish many subtile and even learned observations. For my part, I will content myself with citing the Poet Terence, who makes one of his dramatical persons say:

Nunc est profecto interfici cum me perpeti possum,
Ne hoc gaudium contaminet vita ægritudine aliqua (11).

"Now could I willingly suffer my self to be killed,
"Lest a longer life should taint my joy by some displeasure."

(7) Lib. 6. pag. 184.

(8) Cicero, Tusc. 1, *circa finem, folio* 253, *D. Edit. Basil.* 1528. *Take notice that in the later Editions they have put* non enim, *instead of* nunc enim; *in which case the Spartan's words should be rendred,* Die Diagoras; for thou canst not go to heaven.

(9) Plutarch. *in* Pelopida, pag. 297, A, B.

(10) *Diagoras Rhodius cum se victorem duosque Olympionicas filios vidisset, Nunc, ait, tibi Diagora moriendum ne amplius Olympiam ascendas, quod sane præ gaudio accidit. Autores* Plin. Gellius. i. e. "Diagoras the "Rhodian, "when he saw "himself and "his two sons "Victors in the "Olympian "Games, said, "Now, Diagoras, you ought "to die, that "you may never come up "to Olympia "more; which "really happened to him thro' "excess of joy. "My Authors "are *Pliny* and "*Gellius.*" Volaterran. lib. 15, pag. 539. *Pliny says nothing of this; and Gellius does not relate it in this manner.*

(11) Terent. *Eunuch.* Act. 3. Scen. 5. ver. 3.

[D] *The time wherein he lived may be found in one of the Authors quoted by Moreri.*] It is not with precision, but in general, and in this manner. Dorieus, the third son of Diagoras, was expelled Rhodes with his brother Pisidorus. They retired to Thurium in Italy, and thence it came to pass that when they were crowned at the Games, the public crier called them Thurians. Dorieus returned to Rhodes, when the faction which had expelled him was no longer uppermost. He openly sided with the Lacedæmonians in the war of Peloponnesus, fitted out some ships at his own expence, and fought like a lyon against the Athenians. They hated him to that degree, that having taken him prisoner they resolved to treat him very ill; but his presence struck the Assembly: they were touched to see a person in captivity whose glory had been so transcendent, and they restored him his liberty (12). The Lacedæmonians were not so generous: they took him as he was on a journey near Peloponnesus, at the time that the Rhodians, by the instigation of Conon, made an alliance with the Persians and Athenians, and treated him as a State-Criminal, that is, they put him to death. Conon disengaged the Rhodians from the alliance of the Lacedæmonians (13) in the 96th Olympiad (14). Hence we may know in general the time of Diagoras.

THE History of Dorieus the son of Diagoras.

(12) Pausan. lib. 6. pag. 184, 185.

(13) Androtion, *in Commentarijs Rerum Atticar.* apud *Pausaniam,* ibid.

(14) Diod. Sicul. lib. 14.

[E] . . . *but those Authors do not say . . . . what Moreri asserts.*] If Plutarch, Pausanias, Aulus Gellius, and Cicero (15), *related somewhat differently the occasion of* Diagoras's death, as Moreri asserts, some of them must have attributed his death to one cause, and some to another; but this is what they have not done. Aulus Gellius makes him die of joy; the other three say not one word of his death.

(15) These are the four Authors whom Moreri cites.

lene (*d*), and at Megara. This Ode was made on the crown of the exerciſe of boxing, which he won at the Olympic Games celebrated the 79th Olympiad (*e*). Neither his father Damagetus, nor Tlepolemus, the founder of the Rhodians, and the ſtock of the family, were forgotten. On the contrary, it may be ſaid that Pindar's Digreſſion on the Adventures of Tlepolemus is ſomewhat prolix. However it be, we learn thence that our Diagoras was deſcended from Jupiter [*F*]. Others ſay his extraction was immediately divine [*G*]. This Ode of Pindar was placed in a Temple of Minerva in Letters of gold (*f*).

(*d*) *Six times.*

(*e*) *See* Benedictus in Pindar. ibid. pag. 123.

(*f*) See ibid.

[*F*] *Our Diagoras was deſcended from Jupiter.*] For Tlepolemus was the ſon of Hercules and Aſtydamia, the daughter of Amyntor (16). Some ſay Amyntor alſo deduced his extraction from Jupiter (17); and ſo Diagoras could have carried his pedigree up to the greateſt of the Gods, as well in the male line as in the female, beginning from Tlepolemus.

(16) Pindar Ode VII Olymp.

(17) *See* Benedictus in Pindar. ibid. pag. 129.

[*G*] *Others ſay his Extraction was immediately divine.*] An old Scholiaſt tells us there was a Tradition that Diagoras was the ſon of Mercury, and that the thing happened in this manner. His mother walking out in the fields, and finding her ſelf incommoded by the exceſſive heat of the weather, went and repoſed herſelf under the ſhade of a wood. Mercury, to whom that wood was conſecrated, laying hold on the opportunity, enjoyed the woman; and this gave birth to Diagoras. Nobody had been born in that manner ſince Hercules. Ὁ δὲ πρῶτος ἀφ' Ἡρακλέους λέγεται τοιοῦτος γένεσθαι. Theſe are the terms of the Scholiaſt (18). We may juſtly complain that Benedictus has tranſlated them obſcurely; *qui primus*, ſays he (19), *ab Hercule tantus dicitur habitus.* Note, it is very true that it has been ſaid, that after Hercules no woman was with child by Jupiter (20); but it is not true that this has been ſaid of the other Gods with regard to the whole time which paſſed from Hercules to Diagoras. The latter was yet living in the 79th Olympiad, a long while after the birth of Romulus, the fruit of the embraces of the God Mars and Rhea Silvia.

(18) See the Greek Summary of the 7th Ode of Pindar's *Olympics*, pag. 77. of the Oxford Edition, 1698.

(19) Benedictus in Pindar. pag. 123.

(20) See the Remark [*N*] of the Article HERCULES.

DIAGORAS, ſurnamed the Atheiſt (*a*), lived in the 91ſt Olympiad [*A*]. It might be ſaid that he was a Philoſopher of Athens; for he philoſophized in that city: but he was not a native of it. He was born either in the Iſle of Melos, one of the Cyclades, or in the city of Melia in Caria [*B*]. Prepoſſeſſion as an Author, and an exceſſive fondneſs for a production of his own mind, drew him into impiety [*C*]. He was one of the moſt downright and determined Atheiſts in the world: for he made uſe of no equivocations, nor any ſubterfuge; but flatly denied there were any Gods [*D*]. The Athenians ſummoned him to give an account of his doctrine, but he took to flight, whereupon they ſet

(*a*) Cicero, *de Natur. Deor.* lib. 1, & 3, cap. 6; Diodor. Sicul. lib. 13. cap. 6; Lactant. *de Ira Dei*, cap. 9; & *multi alij.*

[*A*] *He lived in the* 91*ſt Olympiad.*] It was then that he forſook the country of the Athenians, to eſcape being puniſhed for his Atheiſm (1). Euſebius, therefore, has been miſtaken, in placing him under the 74th Olympiad. Scaliger (2) has taken notice of this error, in which he found a miſcomputation of ſixty ſix years: it ſhould be ſixty ſeven; for he obſerves that in the 2d year of the 91ſt Olympiad the Athenians promiſed a reward of a talent to him who ſhould kill Diagoras, and two talents to him who ſhould bring him alive. Now Euſebius has placed Diagoras under the 3d year of the 74th Olympiad; ſo that he has committed a miſtake of ſixty ſeven years. Voſſius (3) has not avoided this error. Lactantius has been more miſtaken the other way, that is, by making Diagoras not ſo ancient as he was. He not only makes him live after Epicurus, but even after the ages wherein Philoſophy flouriſhed: for he brings him down to the times when that Science was decayed. *Verum iis poſtea temporibus quibus jam philoſophia defloruerat, extitit Athenis quidam Diagoras qui nullum eſſe omnino Deum diceret, ob eamque ſententiam nominatus eſt* ἄθεος (4). i. e. "But in ſucceeding times, "when Philoſophy no longer flouriſhed, there ap- "peared at Athens one Diagoras, who aſſerted there "was no God at all; and for that opinion he was "ſurnamed the *Atheiſt*."

(1) Diodor. Siculus, lib. 13. cap. 6.

(2) *Ad num.* 1535, pag. 101.

(3) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græcis*, pag. 436.

(4) Lactant. *de Ira Dei*, cap. 9.

[*B*] *The Iſle of Melos . . . . or the City of Melia . . . was the place of his birth.*] He is ſurnamed *Melius*; which is the Epithet given him by Cicero (5), Ælian (6), and Diogenes Laertius (7). Euſtathius (8), who calls him a Mileſian, is miſtaken: Voſſius, who makes him an Athenian, is miſtaken alſo. I ſay he makes him an Athenian; for having ſpoken of the Philoſopher Diagoras, he adds *puto eundem eſſe Diagoram Athenienſem, qui reliquit ſermones Phrygios* (9). i. e. "I take him to be the ſame with Diagoras the "Athenian, who left behind him the Phrygian Diſ- "courſes." He quotes the words of Tatian wherein he ſays that Diagoras was of Athens, Διαγόρας Ἀθηναῖος ἦν. Creſollius (10) ſpeaks only of Diagoras an Athenian, the ſame with him who is cited by Tatian; ſo that as Tatian, in all appearance, meant no other than the ſame Diagoras who was ſurnamed the Atheiſt, we muſt conclude that they were all ignorant what countryman he was. Volaterranus and Benedictus have followed the error of Euſtathius, the former in the 15th Book of his Compilation, the other in his Commentary on Pindar (11).

(5) Lib. 1. *de Natur. Deor.*

(6) Lib. 2. cap. 23. *Var. Hiſt.*

(7) *In Diogene*, lib. 6. num. 59.

(8) *In Odyſſ.* lib. 3.

(9) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* pag. 436.

(10) *Theatr. Sophiſtar.* pag. 72.

[*C*] *Prepoſſeſſion as an Author . . drew him into impiety.*] The matter happened thus. He delighted in making verſes, and had compoſed a Poem which a certain Poet ſtole from him. He ſued the thief; who ſwore he was not guilty of the crime, and ſoon after publiſhed that Work as his own, which gained him great reputation. Diagoras, conſidering that he who had injured him had not only eſcaped unpuniſhed for his theft and perjury, but had alſo acquired glory thereby, concluded there was no Providence, nor any Gods; and wrote ſome Books to prove it. It is Heſychius Illuſtrius (12) who tells this ſtory. It muſt be confeſſed that no Author was ever more enamoured of his own Works than Diagoras, nor dared to rate them at ſo high a price. What, becauſe Diagoras miſt the glory which he expected from one of his Books, muſt the whole Univerſe ſuffer, muſt Nature be deprived of her director and preſerver? What compenſation is this? Let me not be told that my Reflection is forced: I agree there is ſomething falſe and overſtrained in this turn; but I aver that Diagoras would not have argued as he did, if he had not a particular eſteem, and a very intimate affection, for the good he had loſt. I do not know whether the proſperity of a wicked man ever occaſioned thoſe to doubt a Providence who felt the good effects of that proſperity, or who at leaſt received no hurt from it. We ſhall ſee in the following Remark ſome other cauſes of Diagoras's impiety.

(11) Benedictus, *in Pindar.* Ode 7 Olymp. pag. 123.

(12) *In* Διαγόρ.

[*D*] *He flatly denied there were any Gods.*] Thus are his dogms characterized, when they are to be diſtinguiſhed from thoſe of Protagoras, who only made Religion a diſputable problem. *In hac quæſtione plerique, quod maxime veriſimile eſt, & quo omnes duce natura vehimur, deos eſſe dixerunt: dubitare ſe Protagoras:* NULLOS ESSE OMNINO *Diagoras Melius & Theodorus Cyrenaicus putaverunt* (13. i. e. "As to "this Queſtion, moſt people, according to the greater "probability, and the general guidance of nature, "have affirmed there are Gods: Protagoras declared "that he doubted; but Diagoras the Melian and "Theodorus the Cyrenæan thought there were NO "GODS AT ALL." It is very likely, therefore, that Valerius Maximus is miſtaken, when he ſays Diagoras was baniſhed from Athens for having ſaid that he

(13) Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, lib. 1. *init.* He ſays in the ſame Book: *Quid, Diagoras, Atheos qui dictus eſt, poſteaque Theodorus, nonne aperte Deorum naturam ſuſtulerunt? Nam Abderites quidem Protagoras . . . cum in principio libri ſui ſic poſuiſſet*, de Diis neque ut ſint neque ut non ſint habeo dicere, *Athenienſium juſſu urbe atque agro eſt exterminatus.* See Lactant. *de Ira Dei*, cap. 9.

set a price on his head (*b*). They publiſhed by ſound of trumpet a reward of a talent to any who ſhould kill him, and two to any who ſhould bring him alive; and they cauſed this Decree to be engraved on a pillar of braſs. Their ſeverity extended very far [*E*]; but they could not get him apprehended, for he took ſhipping and was caſt away (*c*). Tatian (*d*) tells us that he was puniſhed for having openly divulged the myſteries of the Athenians [*F*]. Some learned men gueſs that the Book he attributes to him treated of the

(*b*) Diodor. Sicul. ibid.

(*c*) Athen. lib. 13. pag. 611.

(*d*) Suidas, in Διαγόρας, *and* Melanthes, *in Libro* de Myſteriis, *apud* Scholiaſten Ariſtophanis in Avib. *folio* 139 *verſo*, *Edit. Florent.* 1525.

he knew not whether there were any Gods, and that if there were, he knew not their nature. *Athenienſes Diagoram Philoſophum pepulerunt, quia ſcribere auſus fuerat, primum ignorare ſe an Dii eſſent: deinde, ſi ſint, quales ſint* (14). This ſuits Protagoras perfectly well, but Diagoras not in the leaſt; and conſequently Valerius Maximus has taken the one for the other (15): this is uſual enough with him. Moreri copies him without miſtruſting any thing, and falls into ſeveral faults of omiſſion according to cuſtom. See above (16) the paſſage of Athenagoras, and the Remark [*G*], where we ſhall ſay ſomething of the Title of a Book of Diagoras againſt the Deity. What Sextus Empiricus obſerves merits our attention. Diagoras had been as ſuperſtitious as any perſon whatever, and had began his Poems in a devout manner: but no ſooner did he ſee the perjured fellow who had wronged him eſcape with impunity, than he maintained there were no Gods. Διαγόρας δὲ ὁ Μήλιος, διθυραμβοποιὸς, ὡς φασι, τὸ πρῶτον γενόμενος, ὡς εἴτις ἄλλος δεισιδαίμων· ὃς γε καὶ τῆς ποιήσεως ἑαυτῷ κατήρξατο τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον· κατὰ δαίμονα καὶ τύχην πάντα τελεῖται· ἀδικηθεὶς δὲ ὑπό τινος ἐπιορκήσαντος καὶ μηδὲν ἕνεκα τούτου παθόντος, μεθημόσατο εἰς τὸ λέγειν μὴ εἶναι θεούς. *Diagoras autem Melius, qui fuit, ut dicunt, primum Dithyrambicus, ut ſi quis alius ſuperſtitioſus, qui etiam poëſim ſuam inchoavit hoc modo,*

A Dæmone & fortuna fiunt omnia.

Injuria autem affectus ab aliquo qui pejeraverat, & propterea nihil paſſus fuerat, eò deductus eſt ut diceret non eſſe Deum (17). i. e. "Diagoras the Melian "was at firſt, they ſay, a Dithyrambic Poet, and as "ſuperſtitious a man as any in the world: he began "his Poem in this manner,

"By God and Fortune all things are perform'd.

"But having been injured by a perjured villain, "who ſuffered no puniſhment on that account, he "was induced to ſay there was no God." The Scholiaſt on Ariſtophanes aſſures us that Diagoras, who greatly feared God before, ran headlong into Atheiſm on loſing a depoſit by the fraud of the perſon whom he had intruſted with it. Διαγόρας ὁ Μήλιος τὸ πρότερον ὢν θεοσεβὴς, παρακαταθήκην ὑπό τινος ἀποστερηθεὶς ἐπὶ τὸ ἄθεον ἐξέβαμεν (18). This depoſit did not conſiſt in Verſes, but in effects or money (19). We read in the ſame Scholiaſt that Diagoras became an Atheiſt becauſe the Athenians had ſubdued his country (20). To this, methinks, refers what the ſame Scholiaſt relates in another place; that the Edict of proſcription which was publiſhed againſt that impious perſon, becauſe he divulged the myſteries, and diſſuaded people from initiating themſelves therein, was chiefly publiſhed at the taking of Melos, for before that time he hindred nobody from initiating themſelves. The Edict offered a talent to whoever ſhould kill him, and two to whoever ſhould apprehend him. Οὕτω γὰρ ἐκήρυξαν τὸν μὲν ἀποκτείναντα αὐτὸν τάλαντον λαμβάνειν, τὸν δὲ ἀγαγόντα δύο. ἐκηρύχθη δὲ τοῦτο διὰ τὸ ἀσεβὲς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὰ μυστήρια πᾶσι δηλοῦντος καινοποιῶν αὐτά. καὶ τοὺς βουλομένους μυεῖσθαι ἀποτρέπων καθάπερ Κρατερὸς ἱστορεῖ. ἐκκεκήρυκται δὲ μάλιστα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἅλωσιν τῆς Μήλου, διὸν γὰρ κωλύω πρότερον (21). Craterus did not forget this Edict in his Collection of the Decrees of the Athenians. We have juſt now ſeen that the Scholiaſt of Ariſtophanes quotes this Collection. He cites him alſo in his Notes on the Comedy of the Frogs, Act I, Scene VII. Conſult the 105th folio of the Edition of Florence, 1525.

(14) Val. Max. lib. 1. cap. 1, *ſub fin.*

(15) *See* Leopardus, *Emendat.* lib. 11. cap. 11.

(16) Citation (15).

(17) Sextus Empiric. *adverſ. Mathematic.* pag. 318.

(18) Scholiaſt. Ariſtoph. *in Nub.* Act. 3. Scen. 1.

(19) Ὃς χρήματα παρατεθέντος τινὶ καὶ ἀποστερηθεὶς εἰς ἄθεον ἐτράπη. Ibid.

(20) Ἢ διότι Μηλονιπολεμήσαν Ἀττικοί. Ibid.

(21) Scholiaſt. Ariſtoph. *in Avib.* folio 193 *verſo*, *Edit. Flor.* 1525.

[*E*] *The ſeverity of the Athenians extended very far.*] For beſides ſetting a price on the head of Diagoras, as we have juſt now ſaid, they perſuaded all the people of Peloponneſus to do as much. This is what may be gathered from the Scholiaſt of Ariſtophanes, in the paſſage I have cited of his Notes on the Comedy of the Frogs. He borrows this from Craterus. In another place he cites Menander, who had ſaid in his Treatiſe of Myſteries, that the proſcription regarded not only Diagoras, but alſo the Pellanians (22), becauſe they had publiſhed his Work (23). The ſame Scholiaſt relates that the indignation of the Athenians againſt Diagoras provoked them to do a great deal of miſchief to Melos the native country of that Atheiſt. Ἐφ ᾧ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἀγανακτήσαντες, τὴν Μῆλον ἐκάκωσαν (24). The Melians got ſo ill a character after the affair of Diagoras (25), that it is believed Ariſtophanes (26) gave Socrates the ſurname of Melian, only to make him paſs for an Atheiſt. "Ariſtophanes gave this name to Socrates, becauſe he "had been the diſciple of Ariſtagoras, who was of "the Iſle of Melos, and becauſe all the Melians had "the reputation of being Atheiſts ſince the Philoſopher Diagoras, who took it into his head to deny "the being of a Deity." It is Mademoiſelle le Fevre who ſays this in the 349th page of her Notes on the Clouds of Ariſtophanes. She took it from the old Scholiaſt, and conſequently it is not againſt her, but againſt him, that I am going to make an obſervation. The Decree of the Athenians againſt the impious Diagoras was publiſhed in the 1ſt year of the 91ſt Olympiad (27): it was after that time, therefore, that the Melians muſt have had this ill reputation. Now Socrates was at that time above fifty years old: therefore ſeveral years muſt have paſſed ſince the Lectures given him by Ariſtagoras: and it would have been a very ſcurvy jeſt to carry ſo high, and by ſo retroactive an effect, the ſlanders which Diagoras raiſed againſt his country. Ariſtagoras would then have been in his grave, or at leaſt very aged. Who can conceive that Ariſtophanes could have perſuaded himſelf that he ſhould do a great prejudice to Socrates, by making the people remember that Ariſtagoras the Melian had taught Socrates? I might propoſe another Objection. The Comedy of the Clouds, wherein Socrates is called a Melian, was acted before the proſcription of Diagoras (28): but if we believe the Scholiaſts (29), there are things in this Comedy which relate to facts poſterior to the proſcription; ſo I inſiſt not on this difficulty. But as neither Diogenes Laertius, nor his Commentators, know any thing at all of this Ariſtagoras the Melian, the maſter of Socrates, I ſuſpect a little that the word *Ariſtagoras* has ſlipped into the Scholia of Ariſtophanes inſtead of *Diagoras*. What fortifies my conjecture is to ſee that the Scholiaſt gives two characters to his Ariſtagoras, which ſuit Diagoras (30): he makes him a Dithyrambic Poet, and a profaner of the myſteries. In another place of thoſe Scholia (31) it is ſaid that Diagoras was contemporary with Simonides and Pindar; according to which ſuppoſition he might have taught Socrates.

[*F*] *Tatian relates that he was puniſhed for having divulged the myſteries of the Athenians.*] Here are the words of Tatian (32). Διαγόρας Ἀθηναῖος ἦν, ἀλλὰ τοῦτον ἐξορχησάμενον τὰ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις μυστήρια, μιμήματι· καὶ τοῖς φευγίοις αὐτῶν λόγοις ἐντυγχάνοντες ἡμᾶς μεμισήκατε. *Diagoras Athenienſis erat, ſed quod myſteria apud Athenienſes prophanaſſet, punitus eſt: hujus Phrygios libros cum legatis, nos odiſtis.* I do not know whether a good Rhetorician would have reaſoned thus: *You have puniſhed a man who had profaned the myſteries; and though you read his Books, yet you hate us.* Tatian's aim is to ſhew that the hatred the Gentiles bore the Chriſtians was unjuſt; and to prove it, he alledges two things to them: one, that they had puniſhed the profane Diagoras; the other that they read his Books. Methinks there was no great addreſs in calling to remembrance the ancient ſeverity of the Athenians againſt thoſe who had ridiculed the Religion of the Greeks, as the Chriſtians then did. Beſides, did not Tatian ſee that it was eaſy to anſwer him? *When you ſhall have been treated as Diagoras*

(22) Perhaps we ſhould read *Pallenians*, and underſtand them to be the inhabitants of Pallene, a Borough of Attica according to *Stephanus Byzantinus*.

(23) Ἐν ᾗ ἐκηκήρυξαν καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς ἐκδιδύντας Πελλανεῖς. Schol. Ariſtoph. *in Avib.* folio 193 *verſo*.

(24) Idem, *in Nub.* Act. 3. Sc. 1. folio 78.

(25) Διεβέβλητο δὲ ἐπὶ ἀθηναίοις οἱ Μήλιοι ἀπὸ Διαγόρου. Idem, ibid.

(26) *In Nub.* Act. 3. Scen. 1.

(27) Diod. Siculus, lib. 13. cap. 6.

(28) The firſt year of the 89th Olympiad, and afterwards reviſed the year following. *See* Samuel Petit. *Miſcell.* lib. 1. cap. 6.

(29) Samuel Petitus, ibid.

(30) Ἐπειδὴ τὸν Ἀριστοφάνης διθυραμβοποιὸς ἐξεχρήσατο τὰ ἐλεεινά. Scholiaſt. Ariſtoph. ibid.

(31) Idem, ibid. folio 105.

(32) Tatian. *contra Græcos*, pag. m. 164.

the myſteries of the Goddeſs Cybele [G]. Others ſay that Diagoras dictated very juſt Laws to the Legiſlator of the Mantineans [H]. Cicero mentions ſome profane repartees of

was, your Books will be treated as his are: there will be ſome curious people who will preſerve the Writings you compoſe againſt our Gods, you need not fear it; only ſuffer a puniſhment like that of Diagoras which you have reminded us of. I deſire to be excuſed if I ſometimes take notice of defects in reaſoning. It is of greater uſe to point out them to young Readers, than to ſhew them a falſe fact. I return to my Text.

Athenagoras and Suidas acquaint us with this ſame diſcovery of the Athenian myſteries. I put Suidas's words in the margin (33); which ſhew that this impious perſon was not contented with letting all the World know what thoſe myſteries were; he alſo laughed at them, and diſſuaded thoſe from initiating themſelves who had a mind to it. We have already cited the Scholiaſt of Ariſtophanes (34) for this fact. Let us ſee what Athenagoras ſays. Διαγόρᾳ μὲν γὰρ εἰκότως ἀθεότητα ἐπικάλων Ἀθηναῖοι, μὴ μόνον τὸν Ὀρφικὸν εἰς μέσον κατατιθέντι λόγον, καὶ τὰ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι καὶ τὰ τῶν Καβείρων δημεύοντι μυστήρια, καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους, ἵνα τοὺς γογγύλους ἕψοι, κατακόπτοντι ξόανον. ἄντικρυς δὲ ἀποφαινομένῳ μηδὲ ὅλως εἶναι Θεόν: *Diagoræ quidem ſacrilegam impietatem jure damnabant Athenienſes, qui cum arcanos Orphei ſermones vulgo exponebat, tum Eleuſinia & Cabirorum myſteria publicabat: & Herculis ſtatuam, ne ligna rapis coquendis deeſſent, diſſecabat: denique palam & diſertè Deum eſſe negabat* (35). i. e. "The Athenians very juſtly condemned "the ſacrilegious impiety of Diagoras, who not only "expoſed the ſecret Diſcourſes of Orpheus, and the "myſteries of Eleuſis and the Cabiri; but he cleft "the ſtatue of Hercules in pieces, to ſupply wood "for boiling his turneps; and moreover, he publick-"ly and flatly denied there was a God." Read the ſequel of his Diſcourſe, and you will find a ſolid argument founded on the capital difference there was between the Chriſtians and Diagoras. The latter having ridiculed the Gods, and the Grecian Myſteries, did not ſubſtitute better in their room: but the Chriſtians ſubſtituted the true Deity. I find here a thing which very few profane Authors have mentioned; I mean the treatment which Hercules met with from Diagoras: Father Garaſſe ſpeaks of it, but with too much embroidery. Here is what he ſays (36): "I expect our pretenders to wit will repreſent "to me that Diagoras the Mileſian (37), who was "called THE ATHEIST by way of eminence, was a "man of parts, and that Sardanapalus was a brave "Prince: for as to Diagoras, who publickly laughed "at the Gods, and taught that there was no other "Deity in the world than kind nature, going one "day, as it is ſaid, into an inn, made a witty repartee, "which has been admired by all antiquity (38); for "finding there was nothing to be had for his dinner "beſides lentils, and that there was no wood in the "houſe to dreſs them, he bethought himſelf of an "old ſtatue of Hercules, which was the tutelar Deity "of the houſe, and accoſting him ſaid, *Veni Hercules "tertium decimum ſubi certamen & excoque lentem.* I "muſt oblige you to undertake a thirteenth labour to "day, to dreſs theſe lentils: and another time go-"ing into a Court-yard where the Prieſts were tak-"ing an Augury from the feeding of birds, and ſee-"ing that the whole ſacred College was greatly ter-"rified becauſe the chickens did not eat, he took "them, in a ſeeming paſſion, and dipping them three "or four times in a tub full of water; *You ſhall drink,* "ſays he (39), *ſince you will not eat:* and on account "of theſe two ſayings, they maintain that this Athe-"iſt was a man of good wit, and that the introdu-"cing of Atheiſm is no mark of ſtupidity. I con-"feſs that theſe two repartees are well enough for a "ſcoundrel; but to conclude from theſe two anſwers "that Diagoras was a man of excellent wit, is what "I cannot comprehend, foraſmuch as there are at "preſent a thouſand porters and coblers who, when "they are gay and a little warmed with wine, make "better jokes than theſe, and when they have done "are as ſtupid as Diagoras was."

(33) Τὰ δὲ μυστήρια οὕτως ηὐτελίζεν, ὡς πολλοὺς ἐκτρέπειν τῆς ἀρετῆς . . . τὰ μυστήρια πᾶσι διηγγέλλετο, κοινοποιῶν αὐτὰ, καὶ μικρὰ ποιῶν, καὶ τοὺς βουλομένους μυεῖσθαι ἀποτρέπων. *Myſteria adeo contemnebat ut multos à virtute averteret . . . myſteria narrabat omnibus, ea evulgans & extenuans, & illos, qui volebant initiari, avertens.* Suidas, *in* Διαγόρας.

(34) In the Remark [D] Citation (21).

(35) Athenag. *in* Legat. pag. m. 36.

(36) *Doctrine Curieuſe*, liv. 2. Sect. 5. pag. 139.

(37) It is a miſtake; it ſhould be *Melian.*

(38) I have met with but one ſingle Author among the Heathens who relates this adventure: it is the *Scholiaſt on Ariſtophanes, in Nub.* Act. 3. Scen. 1. However, it is falſe that Antiquity has praiſed this action. *S. Epiphaniuſ*, in *Ancorato*, pag. m. 106, reproaches the Pagans with not having hearkened to the Leſſon of Diagoras; and thereupon he relates, pretty much at length, that man's action againſt the Idol of Hercules. *Clemens Alexandrinus* relates it likewiſe, *Admonit. ad Gentes*, pag. 15.

(39) I do not know this has been ſaid of Diagoras: it is of Publius Claudius that *Valerius Maximus* relates it, lib. 1. cap. 4. num. 3.

[G] *Some learned men gueſs that the Book which* Tatian *aſcribes to him treated of the myſteries of the Goddeſs Cybele.*] Voſſius believed this; for having cited the words of Tatian, he adds (40): *Phrygios ſermones fuiſſe arbitror hiſtoriam eorum quæ ad Cybelen ſive matrem Phrygiam & ejus ſacra pertinerent, atque ab eo eſſe fine hoc conſcriptam ut à ſacris illius hominеs averteret,* i. e. "The Phrygian Diſcourſes I take to be "the Hiſtory of thoſe things which related to Cy-"bele, or the Phrygian Mother, and her rites, and "to be by him written with a deſign of drawing men "away from her myſteries." Methinks Tatian ſhould have alledged the moſt impious Writings of Diagoras, and conſequently thoſe whoſe Titles we ſee in Heſychius Illuſtrius and Suidas. Thoſe two Authors tell us, that when he ſaw the proſperity of his Plagiary, he publiſhed a Work concerning his renouncing of Religion (41); that is, he publiſhed the motives of the worſt of all Apoſtaſies, or, in his way of thinking, the motives of his converſion. This Work was intitled Λόγοι ἀποπυργίζοντες. Hadrian Junius will have this to ſignify *Diſcourſes which precipitate from towers; quaſi orationes de turribus præcipitantes dicas.* Æmilius Portus, the Tranſlator of Suidas, explains this Title as if it ſignified, *Diſcourſes which overthrow towers and fortifications; turrium ac munitionum deſtructrices.* Perhaps the Author had in view to ſignify that his Work was a fortreſs ſtrengthened with good towers againſt all the aſſaults of Divines. According to the idea of Junius, this impious Writer would have boaſted of having thrown down all the Deities from heaven into the abyſs of annihilation; according to that of Æmilius Portus, he would have boaſted of having demoliſhed the ramparts with which Religion has fortified her ſelf. Perhaps he directly attacked Cybele, as Voſſius ſuppoſes; Cybele, I ſay, the mother of the Gods, the Goddeſs covered with towers:

Qualis Berecynthia mater
Invehitur curru Phrygias TURRITA *per urbes*
Læta Deûm partu, centum complexa nepotes
Omnes cœlicolas, omnes ſupera alta tenentes (42).

"High as the mother of the Gods in place,
"And proud, like her, of an immortal race;
"That when in pomp ſhe makes the Phrygian round,
"With golden TURRETS on her temples crown'd
"An hundred Gods her ſweeping train ſupply,
"Her offſpring all, and all command the ſky."
Dryden.

Perhaps he imagined that by deſtroying the mother he deſtroyed the whole family, without taking the pains to attack every God in particular. According to this conjecture, which does not appear to me very ſolid, Tatian might be eaſily reconciled with Suidas and Heſychius, as to the Title of Diagoras's Work.

[H] *Others ſay that he dictated very juſt Laws . . . to the Legiſlator of the Mantineans.*] There will be nothing in this Remark but what is worthy of attention. Ælian having ſaid (43) that the Laws of Mantinea were moſt juſt, and as good as thoſe of the Locrians, of Crete, or Lacedæmon, or thoſe of the Athenians, adds that the perſon who gave thoſe Laws to the people of Mantinea was the Athlet Nicodorus, highly renowned on account of his Victories, but who having in his latter days applied himſelf to the drawing up of Laws, had done his country a much greater ſervice than the proclaiming the prizes with which he had been honoured could have been (44). Ὀψὲ τῆς ἡλικίας, καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἄθλησιν καὶ νομοθέτης αὐτοῖς ἐγένετο, μακρῷ τούτου ἄμεινον πολιτευσάμενος τῇ πατρίδι τῶν κηρυγμάτων τῶν ἐν τοῖς σταδίοις. *Ætatis ſuæ tempore, & exacta pugilatione legiſlator eis extitit, longè utiliorem ſe patriæ in ea re præſtans, quam quum publice victor in ſtadiis proclamaretur* (45). This is not all: Ælian obſerves that according to the common opinion theſe Laws were compoſed by Diagoras, who gave them ready drawn up to his friend Nicodorus. Laſtly, Ælian declares that he could ſay a great deal of Nicodorus,

(40) *De Hiſtor. Græc.* pag. 437.

(41) Ἐπιτιθεὶς ὁ Διαγόρας λυπηθείς, ἔγραψε τοὺς ἀποπυργίζοντας λόγους, ἐκπτώσιν ἔχοντας τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον δόξης. *Quam ob rem mœſtus Diagoras* λόγους, *ſcripſit* ἀποπυργίζοντας *quæ defectionis cauſam a communi de Diis perſuaſione continebant.* Heſych. Illuſtrius, *in* Διαγόρας, *ex Verſione* Hadriani Junii. Æmilius Portus, *the Tranſlator of* Suidas, *ſays*, quæ continent refutationem opinionis de divino numine.

(42) Virg. Æn. lib. 6. ver. 785.

(43) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 2. cap. 22.

(44) The Grecian Cities thought themſelves moſt happy and glorious, when thoſe who obtained the prize in the Games were of their inhabitants.

(45) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 2. cap. 23.

of Diagoras [I]. Some ſay this impious perſon was indebted for his liberty to Democritus [K]. The blunder of Peter Gregoire of Toulouſe is a very groſs one. He imagined Diagoras was accuſed of having ſtolen the Poems of another [L]. Clemens

dorus, but that he would not, becauſe the praiſes which he ſhould give him would ſeem to belong alſo to Diagoras. This is ſomething remarkable. Here is a downright Atheiſt and without any reſerve, who gives Laws to a State, as juſt as thoſe of Solon, or of Lycurgus. On the other ſide, here is a Prieſt who ſets up for an Hiſtorian, and who ſuppreſſes the praiſes which Nicodorus has moſt juſtly deſerved; who ſuppreſſes them, I ſay, becauſe the glory of them would reflect on Diagoras. Not that Diagoras was unworthy to partake of thoſe praiſes, but he denied the Deity, and conſequently the Hiſtorian ought not to be equitable with reſpect to him; muſt the Laws of Hiſtory be prevaricated with, ſince an Atheiſt was thereby deprived of the honour due to him. We ſhould leſs wonder at ſo depraved a notion of morality, if we did not conſider that it is a Pagan Prieſt who publiſhes it. Poor wretches! you look on your ſelves as neceſſary to God, you think he ſtands in need of the politic uſe you make of your injuries and your praiſes. You would not think thus, if you had any faith in the Oracles of Job (46).

(46) Chap. xiii. ver. 7.

Let us here take notice of a ſtrange wrong-headed inference of the Civilian Baudouin. He relates what concerns the Legiſlator of Mantinea, and makes this reflection on it; that impiety is not only a great wound to the Laws, but alſo a great miſchief to States; and that it is rather to be wiſhed there were no Laws, juriſdiction, or ſociety, than that the adminiſtration of juſtice ſhould be in the hands of impious men; and that he will always maintain that the Laws of Diagoras ought to be ſuſpected. *Narrat Ælianus, quendam olim pugilem Nicodorum, apud Mantinenſes factum eſſe præſtantiſſimum Legiſlatorem: nec alio quàm Diagoræ athei hominis conſilio uſum eſſe, ab eoque leges accepiſſe, quas ferret. De Diocletiano, & ipſis adeò Romani juris auctoribus, idem dici poſſe videtur. Ego verò in ea perſto ſententia, magnam eſſe & legum labem, & civitatum perniciem, impietatem: & potiusquam hæc jus dicat, optandum eſſe, nullam planè eſſe jurisdictionem, nullam legem, civitatem nullam. Fremant licet Epicuræi hujus ætatis legulei: ego tamen Diagoræ leges ſuſpectas eſſe contendam* (47). i. e. "Ælian tells us that Nicodorus, once a Wreſtler, became an excellent Law-giver among the Mantineans; and that he adviſed with no other than Diagoras the Atheiſt, from whom he received the Laws which he eſtabliſhed. The ſame, I think, may be ſaid of Diocleſian, and the Authors of the Roman Law. But I perſiſt in this opinion, that impiety is a great ſtain in the Laws, and of pernicious conſequence to ſociety; and rather than impious perſons ſhould preſide in the tribunals, it were to be wiſhed we had no Government, no Laws, and no Society. Let the Epicurean pettifoggers of our age fume: I ſhall ſtill inſiſt that the Laws of Diagoras are to be ſuſpected." A man of accurate underſtanding would not have ſpoken thus, but would have more juſtly ſpecified what ought to be diſtinguiſhed. If they who adminiſter juſtice, either by the inſtitution of Laws, or by the execution of the Edicts and Ordinances of the Legiſlator, were at the ſame time Atheiſts by principle, and paſſionate enemies of all piety and virtue, it is certain that it would be better to live without Laws and without Tribunals, than to be ſubject to ſuch a juriſdiction; but if, notwithſtanding their Atheiſm, they were zealous for the public good, and piqued themſelves on executing to the greateſt advantage the Regulations which they ſhould judge moſt proper to reſtrain evil-doers, to prevent litigious ſuits, to maintain the rights of widows and orphans, fair dealing in trade, concord in families, &c. who doubts but it would be incomparably more advantageous to live under ſuch Law-givers, or ſuch Judges, than without any Juriſdiction at all? But the better to know what a wrong way of thinking Baudouin was in when he compoſed this part of his Work, it is ſufficient to conſider two things: one, that though he knew no more of the Laws of Diagoras, than what he had learned by reading of Ælian, he notwithſtanding ſays that he ſuſpected them; and yet Ælian, as little diſpoſed as he was to do Diagoras juſtice, had highly extolled them. The ſecond thing to be conſidered is, that Baudouin compares the Emperor Diocleſian, and the Authors of the Roman Law, with the Legiſlator of the Mantineans directed by our Diagoras. He admires the excellent Laws they made, he only wonders that impious men were able to form ſo noble a Work, and three lines after he tells us that it is better have neither Laws nor Polity, than to have them drawn up by impious perſons, that is to ſay, by the Emperors who perſecuted the Chriſtians. *Equidem cum ſæpe cogito, in rebus civilibus præſtantiſſimos fuiſſe legiſlatores, quos hactenus Eccleſiæ hoſtes acerrimos fuiſſe dixi: & eorum quotidie nomina & tituli in iis, quos ſæpe volvimus, libris Juris Civilis occurrant, ſæpe etiam attonitus obſtupeſco tam & à vera religione averſam eſſe ſapientum (ut vocantur) hominum mentem, tamque omnium propè regnorum imperiorumque omnem conſtitutionem eſſe à rectâ pietate alienam & abhorrentem: ut quos alioqui prudentiſſimos nomothetas laudare ſolemus, inſanos carnifices in hac cauſa execrari cogamur* (48). i. e. "Truly when I reflect that thoſe whom I have hitherto repreſented as the bittereſt enemies of the Church were moſt excellent Lawgivers in civil matters; and that their names and titles frequently occur in the Books of Civil Law; I am often aſtoniſhed and amazed that the minds of wiſe men (as they are called) ſhould be ſo averſe to the true Religion, and that the entire conſtitution of almoſt all Kingdoms and Empires ſhould be ſo remote from and contradictory to real piety: ſo that thoſe whom we praiſe in other reſpects, as moſt prudent Law-givers, we are forced to execrate on this account as furious and inhuman butchers." The more I read, the more I am perſuaded that it is not ſo difficult to find Writers who have fine and good thoughts, as it is to find thoſe who expreſs them without intangling themſelves in ſome falſe reaſoning: a good Logician is more rare than is commonly imagined.

(48) Idem, ibid.

(47) Franciſcus Balduinus, *ad Edicta Principum Romanorum de Chriſtianis*, pag. m. 111.

[I] *Cicero mentions ſome profane repartees of Diagoras.*] Being in Samothrace, they ſhewed him ſeveral pictures or votive tablets hung up in the Temples by perſons who had eſcaped ſhipwrack: look here, ſaid they, you who do not believe there is a Providence. I do not wonder, anſwered he, to ſee the pictures of thoſe who have eſcaped; it is the cuſtom to paint them; but no care is taken any where to repreſent thoſe who have periſhed at ſea. *Diagoras cum Samothracian veniſſet, Atheos ille qui dicitur, atque ei quidam amicus, tu qui Deos putas humana negligere, nonne animadvertis ex his tabellis pictis quàm multi votis vim tempeſtatis effugerint, in portumque ſalvi pervenerint? Ita ſit, inquit, illi enim nuſquam picti ſunt qui naufragium fecerunt, in marique perierunt* (49). Diogenes Laertius tells the ſtory much better (50): he makes one immediately perceive the point; but in the way Cicero relates it, a man muſt be almoſt a conjurer to diſcover the drift of it. What follows is better unfolded. Diagoras was on board a veſſel caught in a violent ſtorm: in the height of it they began to ſay to Diagoras that they well deſerved what they underwent, for having taken on board ſuch an impious wretch as he was; behold, anſwered he, the great number of Veſſels which are expoſed to the ſame ſtorm as ours is; do you think I am on board every one of them? *Idemque cum ei naviganti vectores adverſa tempeſtate timidi & perterriti dicerent, non injuria ſibi illud accidere qui illum in eandem navem recepiſſent, oſtendit eis in eodem curſu multas alias laborantes, quæſivitque num etiam in iis navibus Diagoram vehi crederent* (51). This ſhould teach the faithful and orthodox, that the arguments which are borrowed from the ordinary courſe of Providence are not proper to be urged to all ſorts of unbelievers.

(49) Cicero, *de Nat. Deor.* lib. 3. cap. 37.

(50) He obſerves that by ſome Authors this anſwer is attributed to *Diogenes*, and by others to *Diagoras*. Θαυμάζοντος τινὸς τὰ ἐν Σαμοθρᾴκῃ ἀναθήματα, ἔφη, πολλῷ ἂν ἦν πλείω εἰ καὶ οἱ μὴ σωθέντες ἀνέθεσαν. Admirante quodam ea quæ in Samothracia ſunt donaria, *longe*, ait, *plura eſſent ſi & qui ſervati non ſunt ea dedicaſſent*. i. e. "When one admired the votive pictures in Samothrace, *there would have been many more*, ſaid he, *if thoſe who have been loſt had dedicated them.*" Diogen. Laert. lib. 6. *in Diagora*, num. 59.

[K] *Some ſay he owed his liberty to Democritus.*] It is ſaid that that Philoſopher, ſeeing him among a great many ſlaves who were expoſed to ſale, examined him, and found in him ſo happy a diſpoſition that he bought him for ten thouſand drachms, and made him, not his ſervant, but his diſciple (52).

(51) Cicero, *de Natura Deor.* lib. 3. cap. 57.

(52) Suidas & Heſychius Illuſtrius, *in* Διαγόρας.

[L] *Peter Gregoire . . . . imagined he was accuſed of having*

Clemens Alexandrinus did not well underſtand the doctrine of this Philoſopher [*M*].

having ſtolen the Poems of another.] Let us quote his words (53): *Diagoras Teleclidis filius impius dictus, quod plagii accuſatus à Poëta quodam, de ſurrepto pæane à ſe conſcripto, ejuraſſet furto ſe non teneri, atque ille paulo poſt prolato in lucem pæane ſecunda fama hominum uteretur, quamobrem & mœſtus Diagoras orationes ſcripſit ἀποπυργίζοντας, quaſi de turribus præcipitantes ideas, quæ defectionis cauſſam à communi de Diis perſuaſione continebant, ut ſcribit Heſychius Mileſius Illuſtrius.* i. e. "Diagoras the ſon of Teleclides, ſur-"named the Impious, being accuſed by a certain "Poet of Plagiariſm, in ſtealing a Hymn which he "had written, ſwore he was not guilty of the fact, "and the other ſoon after, publiſhing that Hymn, ob-"tained a great reputation; whereat Diagoras being "vexed, wrote the Diſcourſes intitled ἀποπυργίζοντας, "that is, caſting headlong from towers, which con-"tained his motives for diſſenting from the common "perſuaſion concerning the Gods, as Heſychius Il-"luſtrius writes." Peter Gregoire did not underſtand the Author whom he cites; Diagoras was not the Accuſed, but the Accuſer. This falſhood deſerves to be taken notice of, becauſe it is capable of impoſing on a Reader. It is probable that an innocent man who calls the Gods to witneſs his innocence, and purges himſelf by oath, may be terribly provoked when he ſees his calumniator triumph over him. Wherefore the Narration of Peter Gregoire, being almoſt as likely as that of Heſychius, may eaſily lead one out of the way.

(53) Syntagm. *Juris Univerſi*, lib. 36. *ſub finem*, pag. m. 744. Thomaſius has taken notice of this miſtake, in *Tractatu de Plagio Literario*, num. 406.

[*M*] *Clemens Alexandrinus did not well underſtand the doctrine of this Philoſopher.*] He thought that Diagoras, and ſome others who have paſſed for Atheiſts, got that ill reputation for no other reaſon than becauſe they more diſtinctly knew the falſity of the Pagan Religion; and he is aſtoniſhed that men of ſuch regular lives ſhould have been defamed as impious perſons (54). They did not arrive, ſays he (55), at the knowledge of the truth; but they perceived error: and this perception is a good ſeed to produce the light of truth. This doctrine differs much from the opinion of a vaſt number of people, who imagine it eaſier to convert a ſuperſtitious Pagan to the true Religion than an Atheiſt. Muretus (56) approves that Father's ſentiment concerning the cauſe of Diagoras and ſome others paſſing for Atheiſts: but they are certainly miſtaken. Diagoras was reputed an Atheiſt, becauſe he rejected the exiſtence of the Deity abſolutely and without any reſtriction. See above the Remark [*D*]. What we find in the Scholia of Ariſtophanes ought to go for nothing: Διαγόρας μελῶν ποιητὴς ἄθεος, ὃς καὶ καινὰ δαιμόνια εἰσηγεῖτο: i. e. *The Poet Diagoras, the Atheiſt, who alſo introduced new Deities.* Such a teſtimony, oppoſed to the contrary authorities, is a fly ſet againſt an elephant.

(54) Clem. Alexand. *Admonit. ad Gentes*, pag. m. 15.

(55) Εἰναὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν αὐτὴν μὴ γνωρίζειν, ἀλλὰ τὴν πλάνην γε ὑποπτεύειν· ὅπερ ἐ σμικρὸν εἰς ἀληθείας φρονήσεως ζώπυρον ἀναφύεται σπέρμα: *Etiamſi veritatem ipſam non conſideraverint, ſed errorem quidem certè ſuſpicati ſint; quod quidem non parvum exoritur ſemen ad excitandam ſcintillam intelligentiæ veritatis.* Idem, ibid.

(56) Muret. *Var. Lect.* lib. 10. cap. 17.

DIANA (JOHN NICHOLAS DE) a Jeſuit, is known to me only by the perſecution which he ſuffered for a Sermon he had preached on St. Lucifer. The Inquiſitors of Sardinia condemned this Sermon, and ſhewed a great deal of animoſity againſt the Jeſuit. He did not acquieſce in their judgments; and employed ſo many methods of defence, that at laſt he obtained the victory in the 13th year of the proſecution. Diego Arze-Reynoſo, the Inquiſitor General, annulled all the proceedings of the Tribunal of Sardinia, and chaſtiſed ſome of the Aſſeſſors; and the better to re-eſtabliſh the reputation of Diana, he created him Qualificator of the Supreme Council of the Inquiſition, and cleared him from all blemiſh by a Decree paſſed the 19th of December 1653 (*a*). I ſhall quote a paſſage out of it [*A*] that the Reader may ſee the iniquities which are

(*a*) *Extracted from a Writing intitled*, Libellus ſupplex à Patribus Societatis Jeſu Provinciæ Toletanæ Catholico Hiſpaniarum Regi oblatus Madriti anno 1696, menſe Aprili, contra Libellum ſupplicem eidem regiæ Majeſtati oblatum à R R. P P. Carmelitis ad ſuadendum ut univerſis imponatur ſilentium circa antiquitatem Ordinis Carmelitici tenendum, poſt Decretum Inquiſitionis Toletanæ contra 14 Volumina de Actis Sanctorum.

[*A*] *He was cleared by a Decree of the 19th of December 1653. I ſhall quote a paſſage out of it.*] I take it from the Petition which the Jeſuits of the Province of Toledo preſented to the King of Spain in the year 1696 (1). They pretend that the Petition preſented by the Carmelites to the ſame Prince is unjuſt, becauſe it tends to obtain that ſilence may be kept on both ſides, after the Inquiſition of Toledo has condemned fourteen Volumes of the *Acta Sanctorum*. Theſe Jeſuits ſet forth, among other things, that, according to the Style of the Holy Office, it is allowed to provide againſt the Decrees of the Inquiſition, and that when the Inquiſition has condemned a Book, it does not intend to deprive the Author of the liberty of juſtifying his ſentiments. They ſhew that the Apology of a Book condemned by that Tribunal has been ſometimes found ſo convincing, that the Inquiſition has revoked its own ſentence (2), and they prove it by the iſſue of the long Cauſe of the Jeſuit John Nicholas de Diana. His reputation continued blemiſhed for ſeveral years; but having ſhewn the partiality of his Judges, he glorioufly obtained the diſannulling of their ſentence. *Per annos omnino duodecim & quinque menſes graviſſimè paſſus eſt optimus ille Jeſuita pro defenſa veritate: & fuit hæc quidem veritas denſis adeo paſſionum obfuſcata nebulis ut tantum non pateretur eclipſim. Fuit auctori neceſſe adverſus Sardiniæ Inquiſitores excipere velut partiales & paſſioni obnoxios. Suam autem exceptionem illam & damnatas propoſitiones eâ probavit Diana argumentorum energiâ & evidentiâ ut, &c* (3). i. e. "For twelve years and five months did that "good Jeſuit moſt grievouſly ſuffer for defending the "truth; which was ſo obſcured by the thick clouds "of paſſion, that it was very near ſuffering an eclipſe. "The Author was under a neceſſity of excepting a-"gainſt the Inquiſitors of Sardinia, as partial and "ſubject to paſſion: and Diana made good that ex-"ception and the propoſitions which had been con-"demned with ſuch clearneſs and ſtrength of argu-"ment that &c." And becauſe the proceedings of the Inquiſitors of Sardinia had cauſed ſome ſcandal, the ſupreme Council of the Inquiſition thought themſelves obliged to remove it by a Decree, part of which follows: *Ut in omni tempore præſenti perinde ac futuro conſtet, innoteſcat, atque publica fiat innocentia dicti Patris Diana; ut item illi ad quos hujus rei notitia pervenerit quique proinde ſcandalum fuerint paſſi ex proceſſibus in illa cauſa commiſſis, & in libello impreſſo ſupra relatis, publicam hanc ſatisfactionem habeant ſuper dicta præfati Patris innocentia & catholica illius in Evangelio exponenda doctrina . . . Pariter ſciant omnes quod Tribunal atque ſupremum ſacræ Inquiſitionis Concilium non ſolum convictos contra fidem caſtiget, ſed innocentiam etiam præmiet inculpatorum, addita ſatisfactione publica contra notorias iiſdem impactas injurias, ad Deum denique Dominum noſtrum omnipotentem remittente dicto P. Diana publicam ac juſtam vindictam de gravi ſibi illata injuria per delatorem, conjuratores, æmulos ac falſos teſtes, minuſque bene affectos miniſtros, ſupplicando divinæ Majeſtati ejuſque piæ clementiæ quatenus omnium talium mentibus lucem dignetur infundere, qua illuſtrati errore ſuo cognito correctoque & peculiariter in hoc caſu commiſſa culpa animas ſuas poſſint ſalvas facere &c.* (4). i. e. "To the end that in all times, "preſent as well as future, the innocency of the ſaid "Father Diana may be known and made public; "that thoſe alſo whom the knowledge of this affair "may have reached, and have therefore been ſcan-"dalized at the proceedings in that cauſe, which "are related in the abovementioned printed Caſe, "may have this public ſatisfaction concerning the "ſaid Father's innocence, and his orthodoxy in ex-"pounding the Goſpel. . . . That it may likewiſe be "known unto all perſons that the Tribunal and ſu-"preme

(1) I ſet down the Title at length in the Citation (*a*) of this Article.

(2) *Quod ita non raro factum eſt ut Inquiſitio edicta ſua revocaverit ac propoſitiones modo confixas ſuo priſtino reſtituerit ſplendori, quin & novis approbationibus ac laudibus exornarit.* Libell. Supplex, pag. 5.

(3) *Libell. Supplex*, pag. 5.

(4) *Libell. Supplex*, pag. 6.

are committed in those proceedings, but not always with impunity.

" preme Council of the Holy Inquisition does not " only chastise those who are convicted of corrupting " the Faith, but also rewards the innocence of the " blameless, making public satisfaction for the noto- " rious injuries which have been offered them. Lastly " the said Father Diana resigning to God Almighty " the public and just revenge of the great injury done " him by the Informer, the malicious conspirators, " and false witnesses, and the officers who were ill " affected towards him, beseeching the Divine Ma- " jesty and his gracious clemency that he would so " far enlighten the minds of all such, that perceiv- " ing their error and correcting it, and particularly " the fault committed in this case, they may save " their souls, &c." I assure my self that several Readers will be well pleased to find here the other like instances which the Jesuits produce in their petition. The Ist is that of Julian Archbishop of Toledo. He wrote a Book *de tribus Substantijs*, which was condemned by Pope Benedict II: he justified it by a very vigorous Apology, and his reasons were so well approved, that the Pontiff took off the prohibition and highly commended the Archbishop (5). The IId example is that of Stephen Fagundez, a Jesuit. He published a Work (6), which was prohibited to be read: but when his Apology appeared, intitled, *Apologeticus Tractatus pro suo libro in 5 præcepta Ecclesiæ ad quæstionem de lacticiniorum ovorumque esu tempore quadragesimæ*, i. e. " An Apologetical Treatise for " his Book on the five precepts of the Church as to the " question concerning the eating of milk-meats and " eggs in the time of Lent," the Book was ordered to be examined anew, and it was declared that none of the propositions which had been condemned deserved censure; so that by a new Decree of the 18th of April 1630, the Tribunal of the Inquisition permitted that Work to be read. The IIId instance is that of the great Tostatus. Some of his opinions having been condemned, he demanded to be heard, but could not obtain it: the intrigues of his enemies were the occasion of his being denied this common justice. Upon which he made such loud complaints, that they reached the ears of Pope Eugenius IV, who ordered Tostatus to appear in person at the Court of Rome, there to maintain his opinions. Tostatus appeared, and defended himself so well that he obtained a glorious victory (7).

(5) Ibid. pag. 20. *ex* Roderico *in sua* Historia, & *ex* Toletano Concilio XV.

(6) It is intitled, *Quæstiones de Christianis Officiis & Casibus Conscientiæ in 5 Præcepta Ecclesiæ.*

(7) *Libell. Supplex*, pag. 21, *ex Proœmio Apologetici Tostati, Parte 2.*

DICÆARCHUS, a scholar of Aristotle, composed a great number of Books which were much esteemed [*A*]. Cicero and his friend Pomponius Atticus valued them highly [*B*], and I think their esteem extended even to the Work wherein he attacked the

[*A*] *He composed a great number of Books, which were much esteemed.*] It is thought that his Work on Music contained not only the description of the customs and manners which concerned the exercise of that art, but also the History of the Dramatical pieces which had disputed the prize. For which reason it is supposed his Treatise περὶ μουσικῶν ἀγώνων, *de Certaminibus Musicis* (1), was but a part of the Treatise περὶ μουσικῆς, *de Musicâ* (2). It is also supposed that the Treatise περὶ Διονυσιακῶν ἀγώνων, *de Certaminibus Dionysiacis* (3), and likewise another Treatise which was intitled παναθηναϊκὸν (4), were parts of the Treatise περὶ μουσικῶν ἀγώνων, *de Certaminibus Musicis*. Jonsius speaks thus: *Liber hic Dicæarchi* περὶ μουσικῶν ἀγώνων *de quo diximus, omnino pars fuit ejusdem operis* περὶ μουσικῆς de Musica, *quo & de ipsis antiquis Musicis atque Poëtis eorumque fabulis, de saltationibus, & de certaminibus musicis eum egisse verisimile est* (5). Such a Work would be an admirable repertory for the Author of an Historical Dictionary. The Book of Dicæarchus περὶ Βίων, *de Vitis*, quoted by Diogenes Laertius (6), would be a repertory no less useful. I make the same judgment of the Work which he intitled περὶ τῆς τῆς Ἑλλάδος βίου, *de Vita Græciæ* (7), wherein he gave the description of Greece, and of the Laws and Customs of the Græcians. St. Jerom (8) has quoted this Book. I doubt not but Porphyry had the same Work in view when he put Dicæarchus into the number of those who have briefly and exactly collected what concerned the Greeks (9). See in Vossius (10) the Title of some other Works of Dicæarchus. Consult also what I am going to say.

[*B*] .... *Cicero and* .... *Pomponius Atticus valued them highly.*] Cicero makes no scruple to assert, on the word of Dicæarchus, a thing which he could hardly believe; which was, that all the cities of Peloponnesus were maritime. He consulted a learned man who was greatly surprized to read such a thing in Dicæarchus, and yet advised him not to doubt the truth of it. This learned man was a Greek (11). I shall set down the words of Cicero, which are glorious for Dicæarchus. *Peloponnesias civitates omneis maritimas esse hominis non nequam, sed etiam tuo judicio probati, Dicæarchi tabulis credidi. Is multis nominibus in Trophonia* (12) *Chæronis narratione Græcos in eo reprehendit, quod mare tam secuti sunt, nec ullum in Peloponneso locum excipit. Quum mihi autor placeret: etenim erat λεπτολογώτατος, & vixerat in Peloponneso: admirabar tamen, & vix accredens communicavi cum Dionysio. Atque is primo est commotus, deinde quod tum de isto Dicæarcho non minus bene existimabat, quàm tu de C. Vestorio, ego de M. Cluvio, non dubitabat, quin ei crederemus .... Istum itaque ego locum totidem verbis à Dicæarcho transtuli* (13). i. e. " On the credit of " the tables of Dicæarchus, a man of no ill charac- " ter, nay one who has been approved by you, I be- " lieve that all the Peloponnesian cities were situate " near the sea. He reprehends the Grecians, in " Chæron's account of the Cave of Trophonius, on " several considerations, for being so very fond of the " sea; and he excepts not any one place in Peloponnesus. Though the Author pleased me, because he " was well versed in history, and had lived in Peloponnesus; yet was I surprized, and scarce believing " what he asserted, I communicated the matter to Dionysius. He also was at the first a little surprized, " but on consideration, having no less an opinion of " Dicæarchus than you have of C. Vestorius, or I of M. " Cluvius, he made no doubt but we might depend upon " him .... This passage, therefore, I have translated " word for word from Dicæarchus." Let us strengthen this passage by the following words of the 12th Epistle of the 2d Book (14): *Dicæarchum rectè amas: luculentus homo est & civis haud paullo melior quam isti nostri* ἀδικιαταρχοι; i. e " You are in the right to love " Dicæarchus; he is a man of extensive learning, and " a much better member of Society than those *adicæ-* " *archi*, or unjust governors of ours;" and by these (15): *Nunc prorsus hoc statui ut quoniam tanta controversia est Dicæarcho familiari tuo* (16), *cum Theophrasto amico meo, ut ille tuus* τὸν πρακτικὸν *βίον longe omnibus anteponat, hic autem* θεωρητικὸν, *utrique à me mos gestus esse videatur. Puto enim me Dicæarcho affatim satisfeciisse.* i. e. " I am now come to this resolution, " that since there is such a dispute between your in- " timate acquaintance Dicæarchus and my friend The- " ophrastus, the former preferring an active life far " before all others, and the latter a theoretic, I will " keep fair with both. For I think I have given " abundant satisfaction to Dicæarchus." But Cicero no where testifies a greater esteem for Dicæarchus than in the 2d Epistle of the 2d Book (17); crying out *O magnum hominem!* See the whole passage. It has been thought very strange, and justly, that Vossius has not taken notice of it (18). He observes the same silence with regard to that of the 3d Book *de Legibus*; nor does he say any thing of the Book *de interitu hominum*. In the 3d Book *de Legibus*, Cicero informs us that this Philosopher had published some very good Discourses on Politics: *Theophrastus institutus ab Aristotele abundavit ut scitis in eo genere rerum, ab eodemque Aristotele dictus Dicæarchus huic rationi studioque non defuit.* i. e. " Theophrastus, who was " instructed by Aristotle, abounded, as you well " know, in precepts of that kind, and Dicæarchus, " who was taught by the same master, applied him- " self

(1) It is cited by the *Scholiast on Aristophanes, ad Vespas*, folio 519, *apud* Jonsium *de Scriptor. Hist. Philos.* pag. 86.

(2) It is cited by the same *Scholiast ad Nub.* folio 99, *apud* Jonsium, pag. 89.

(3) It is cited by the same *Scholiast ad Aves*, folio 606, *apud* Jonsium, pag. 88.

(4) It is cited by the same *Scholiast ad Vespas*, folio 467, *apud* Jonsium, *ibid.*

(5) Jonsius, *ibid.* pag. 89.

(6) Lib. 3. *in Platone.*

(7) Athenæus, lib. 13. pag. 595. & lib. 14. pag. 636.

(8) *Adversus Jovinianum*, lib. 2. and not, as it is in *Moreri*, lib. 11.

(9) Τῶν συντόμως τε καὶ ἀκριβῶς τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ συναγαγόντων. *Unus eorum qui res Græcanicas breviter & accuratè collegerunt.* Porphyr. lib. 4. *de Abstinent.* apud Vossium, *de Hist. Græc.* pag. 47.

(10) *De Histor. Græc.* pag. 46, 47.

(11) See the 18th Epistle of the 7th Book to *Atticus.*

(12) Athenæus, lib. 13. pag. 594, cites *Dicæarchus*, Περὶ τῆς εἰς Τροφωνίου καταβάσεως, *De descensu in antrum Trophonij.*

(13) Cicero, *Epist. II*, lib. 6 *ad Attic.*

(14) *Ad Atticum.*

(15) *Epist. XVI* lib. 2 *ad Atticum.*

(16) *See also* Epist. XXX lib. 13.

(17) *Ad Atticum.* See also the 4th *Epistle* of the 8th Book.

(18) Rupertus, *Epist. ad Reinesium*, pag. 503.

the immortality of the Soul [C]. Moreri attributes it to another Dicæarchus, who was of

" ſelf to the ſame ſtudy." In another place he relates a very curious thing; that Dicæarchus, having made a comparative calculation of all the accidents which take away mens lives, found that war deſtroyed more than any other thing. *Eſt Dicæarchi liber de interitu hominum, Peripatetici magni & copioſi, qui collectis ceteris cauſis, eluvionis, peſtilentiæ, vaſtitatis, belluarum etiam repentinæ multitudinis, quarum impetu docet quædam hominum genera eſſe conſumpta, deinde comparat quanto plures deleti ſint homines hominum impetu, id eſt bellis & ſeditionibus, quàm omni reliqua calamitate* (19). i. e. " There is alſo extant a Book of " the death of mankind, written by Dicæarchus, an " eminent and knowing Peripatetic, who having " collected the various cauſes, as inundations, plagues, " devaſtations, the ſudden irruption of wild beaſts, " by which he allows conſiderable numbers of men " to be deſtroyed, afterwards computes how many " more are taken off by the violence of their own " ſpecies, that is by wars and inſurrections, than by " all other calamities put together." All this teſtifies the eſteem which Cicero had for this Writer. I ſhall immediately quote a paſſage wherein he calls him his delight.

(19) Cicero, *de Officiis*, lib. 2. cap. 5.

[C] . . . . *And I believe their eſteem extended even to the Work wherein he attacked the immortality of the Soul.*] He had made two Treatiſes on this ſubject; each divided into three Books. *Dicæarchus in eo ſermone, quem Corinthi habitum tribus libris exponit doctorum hominum diſputantium, primo libro multos loquentes facit, duobus Pherecratem quendam Phthiotam ſenem, quem ait à Deucalione ortum, differentem inducit, nihil eſſe omnino animum, & hoc eſſe nomen totum inane, fruſtraque & animalia & animantes appellari, neque in homine ineſſe animum vel animam, nec in beſtia. Vimque omnem eam, qua vel agamus quid, vel ſentiamus, in omnibus corporibus vivis æqualiter eſſe fuſam, nec ſeparabilem à corpore eſſe, quippe quæ nulla ſit, nec ſit quicquam, niſi corpus unum & ſimplex, ita figuratum ut temperatione naturæ vigeat & ſentiat* . . . . (20). *Acerrime delitiæ meæ Dicæarchus contra hanc immortalitatem diſſeruit. Is enim tres libros ſcripſit qui Leſbiaci vocantur, quod Mitylenis ſermo habetur, in quibus vult efficere animos eſſe mortales* (21). i. e. " Dicæarchus " in that Diſcourſe held by ſome learned men diſ- " puting at Corinth, which he has given us in three " Books, introduces in the firſt Book ſeveral interlo- " cutors, and in the other two one Pherecrates, an " old man of Phthia, whom he makes to be deſcended " from Deucalion, arguing that the ſoul is nothing " more than an empty name; that the term Animal " is of no ſignificancy, ſince there is no ſoul either " in man or beaſt; and that the whole power where- " by we either do or feel any thing, is equally dif- " fuſed through all living bodies, and is not ſeparable " from body, being nothing in itſelf, nor any other " than ſimple body, ſo modified that it lives and feels " by the diſpoſition of nature . . . . Dicæarchus, who " is my delight, has argued ſtrenuouſly againſt this " immortality: for he wrote three Books which are " called Leſbian, becauſe the diſcourſe is ſuppoſed to " have been held at Mitylene, wherein he endeavours " to prove that our ſouls are mortal." Cicero declares in ſome of his Letters that he wanted thoſe two Works, and deſires Pomponius Atticus to ſend them him (22).

(20) Idem, *Tuſc.* I, cap. x, & xviii.

(21) Ibid.

(22) *Dicæarchi περὶ ψυχῆς utroſque velim mittas.* Idem, *Epiſt.* 32. lib. 13 *ad Attic.*

AN invincible Objection againſt Dicæarchus concerning the Immortality of the ſoul.

I ſhall obſerve, by the way, that this opinion of Dicæarchus is not worthy a Philoſopher: to reaſon in ſuch a manner is to have no principles, and to overturn the harmony of a ſyſtem. If you once ſuppoſe, with this Author, that the ſoul is not diſtinct from the body, and that it is no more than a power equally diſtributed through all living things, and which makes but one ſimple being with the bodies which are called living, either you no longer know what you ſay, or you are obliged to maintain that this virtue always accompanies the body: for what is not diſtinct from the body is eſſentially the body, and according to the firſt principles of reaſon it is a contradiction to ſay a being ever exiſts without its eſſence. Whence it manifeſtly follows that the faculty of feeling does not ceaſe in dead bodies, and that the parts of living bodies carry away each of them its life and ſoul with it, when they are corrupted. There is therefore no room to flatter one's ſelf that ſenſation will ceaſe after death, and that one ſhall be ſubject to no pain. If a body is capable of pain when it is ſeated in the nerves, it is equally ſuſceptible of it wherever it be, either in ſtones, or in metals, or in the air, or in the ſea. And if an atom of air was once deſtitute of thought, it ſeems very impoſſible that its converſion into that ſubſtance which we call animal ſpirits, ſhould ever render it a thinking ſubſtance. This ſeems as impoſſible as to give a local preſence to a being, which had been for ſome time without any local preſence. Wherefore, to reaſon conſequently, it muſt be laid down for certain, either that the ſubſtance which thinks is diſtinct from body, or that all bodies are ſubſtances which think, ſuppoſing it cannot be denied but that men have thoughts: whence it follows, according to the principle of Dicæarchus, that there is a certain number of bodies which think. Cicero, however, argues very ill againſt Dicæarchus (23): he pretends that according to that Philoſopher a man ſhould not ſuffer pain, becauſe he could not perceive that he had a ſoul. The Philoſopher might eaſily anſwer, I do not deny but that a man feels, and that he perceives he feels, but I deny that he knows what feels in him to be a ſoul diſtinct from his body. It is very true that he does not feel it; for he only knows it by reaſoning. Lactantius (24) makes uſe of the Paralogiſm of Cicero.

I have juſt now perceived that ſome may fall into an illuſory way of reaſoning againſt the argument I have oppoſed to the ſyſtem of Dicæarchus; which obliges me to prevent an Objection. I may be told that ſenſation may be a modification of body: whence it would follow that matter, without loſing any thing which is eſſential to it, may ceaſe to feel ſo ſoon as it ſhall be no longer ſhut up in the organs of a living machine. I anſwer that this doctrine is abſurd; for all the modalities of which we have any knowledge are of ſuch a nature, that they do not ceaſe but to give place to another modality of the ſame kind. No figure is deſtroyed but by another figure, nor is any colour driven out but by another colour (25). I grant that, according to the old Philoſophy, cold and heat, which expel one another out of the ſame ſubject, are not accidents of the ſame ſpecies; but it will be allowed me at leaſt that they belong to the ſame kind of qualities which are named *tangible*. Wherefore, to reaſon well, it muſt be ſaid that no ſenſation is driven from its ſubſtance, but by the introduction of ſome other ſenſation. Nothing hinders but that the ſenſation may be a kind which has other kinds under it, before we come at what they call *ſpecies infima*. According to this my Objection loſes nothing by the anſwer which I am refuting; and I have ſtill foundation to ſay, that if the animal ſpirits have not out of the nerves the ſenſation which they had in them, they have not loſt it but by acquiring another ſort of ſenſation. I ſhall be told, without doubt, that there are modalities which ceaſe, without being ſucceeded by another poſitive modality: the inſtance of motion will be alledged againſt me; but that of figures muſt not be ſpoken of: it is too viſibly againſt the defenders of Dicæarchus. But I reply that motion and reſt do not differ, as is ſuppoſed, in the ſame manner as poſitive modalities and privations do. Reſt and motion are both the one and the other a very real and poſitive local preſence: their difference conſiſts only in external relations, and altogether accidental. Reſt is the duration of the ſame local preſence; motion is the acquiſition of a new local preſence: and conſequently what ceaſes to move does not loſe its modality, without acquiring another of the ſame nature: it has always a poſition equal to its extenſion among the other parts of the Univerſe. When an inſtance ſhall be given us of a body which loſes one place without acquiring another, we will allow that certain bodies may loſe one ſenſation, without acquiring another: but as it is impoſſible to produce ſuch an inſtance, we have a right to maintain that every body which felt once, would feel always. Is not the converſion of a being into

(23) *Dicæarchum vero cum Ariſtoxeno æquali & condiſcipulo ſuo doctos ſane hominnes omittamus, quorum alter ne condoluiſſe quidem unquam videtur, qui animum ſe habere non ſentiat: alter ita delectatur ſuis cantibus, ut eos etiam ad hæc transferre conetur.* i. e. " But let us paſs " by Dicæarchus " and Ariſtoxe- " nus his con- " temporary and " fellow diſciple, " of whom the " one ſeems ne- " ver to have " felt pain, ſince " he perceived " not that he had " a ſoul; and the " other is ſo de- " lighted with " his own mu- " ſic, that he " endeavours to " introduce har- " mony even " into theſe " matters." Cicero, Tuſc. 1. cap. 18. *He had ſaid*, cap. X, *that Ariſtoxenus the Muſician and Philoſopher made the ſoul to conſiſt in a harmonious agreement of the organs*, hic ab artificio ſuo non receſſit. *See* Lactantius, *Inſtit.* lib. 7. cap. 13, & *de Opificio Dei*, cap. 16.

(24) Lib. 7. cap. 13.

(25) I intend to ſpeak here only of Bodies viſible to man.

of Lacedæmon [D], and a ſcholar of Ariſtarchus: but he is in the wrong in making him the Author of ſeveral Books, ſince Suidas, who is perhaps the only Author who has ſpoken of that Dicæarchus, does not aſcribe a Book to him of any ſort. This furniſhes me with a Remark againſt Meurſius [E]. There is a paſſage in Pliny which ſhews that Dicæarchus had received a Commiſſion from ſome Princes, to take the height of the mountains [F]. Geography was one of his principal ſtudies (a), and we have a Treatiſe of his ſtill extant on that ſubject (b). The Work he compoſed concerning the Republic of Lacedæmon was extremely honoured (c). He held it for a maxim, that a man ought to make himſelf beloved by every body, but that he ought to contract an intimate friendſhip with none but men of probity (d). What he cenſures in Plato deſerves reprehenſion [G]. Voſſius ought not to have attributed to him a Treatiſe on Dreams.

(a) *See* Strabo, lib. 2. pag. 71, who obſerves that *Polybius* frequently cenſured *Dicæarchus*.

(b) It was printed at Augsburgh, by the care of *Hoeſchelius*, in the year 1600.

(c) See the Remark [E].

(d) Plut. *Sympoſ.* lib. 4. *init.* pag. 659.

into nothing impoſſible in the order of nature? Would not the converſion of figure into a privation of all figure, or the converſion of local preſence into a privation of all local preſence, be a converſion of ſomething real and poſitive into nothing? They are therefore impoſſible in the order of nature: therefore the converſion of ſenſation into a privation of all ſenſation is impoſſible; for it would be a converſion of ſomething real and poſitive into nothing. To conclude, I ſay that all the modes of bodies are founded on the eſſential attributes of body, which are the three dimenſions. Which is the reaſon why the loſs of a figure, or a local preſence, is always attended with the acquiſition of another figure, or of another local preſence. Extenſion never ceaſes, nor ever loſes any thing: wherefore the corruption of one of its modes is neceſſarily the generation of another. For the ſame reaſon, no ſentiment can ceaſe but by the exiſtence of another; for in the Syſtem which I am refuting, the ſenſation would be a mode of the body, as well as figure, and ſituation. But if you would found ſenſation on any attribute of matter different from the three dimenſions, and unknown to our underſtanding, I ſhould anſwer you that the changes of this attribute ought to reſemble the changes of extenſion. Theſe can never make all figure, or all local preſence, ceaſe: and ſo the changes of this unknown attribute would never cauſe all ſenſation to ceaſe; they would be no more than the paſſage from one ſenſation to another, as the motion of extenſion is only the paſſage from one place to another.

[D] . . . . *Moreri attributes it to another Dicæarchus . . . . of Lacedæmon.*] It is unconceivable how he could commit this miſtake; for after he has quoted the paſſage of Cicero concerning the impiety of Dicæarchus with regard to the nature of the ſoul, he adds that *Tertullian alſo mentions the error of this Philoſopher*. Now here are the words of Tertullian quoted by Moreri. *Denique qui negant principale, ipſam priùs animam nihil cenſuerunt, Meſſenius aliquis Dicæarchus.* i. e. "Laſtly, they who deny the principal, were "firſt of opinion that the ſoul is nothing, as was one "Dicæarchus a Meſſenian." The Philoſopher whoſe error Tertullian takes notice of is Dicæarchus of Meſſina; why then does Moreri attribute this error to Dicæarchus of Lacedæmon? He heaps miſtake upon miſtake by referring us to a great number of Authors who have ſpoken of Dicæarchus, ſince he appropriates all their teſtimonies to a Dicæarchus of Lacedæmon, to whom Suidas aſcribes no Book, either little or great; and ſince it cannot be denied that ſome of thoſe teſtimonies concern Dicæarchus of Meſſina. A learned Critic (26) believed the Summaries of the Tragedies of Sophocles and Euripides cited by Sextus Empiricus (27) to be the production of the Grammarian Dicæarchus, of whom Athenæus makes mention in his 1ſt Book (28). I agree that ſuch a Work would better ſuit Dicæarchus the Grammarian of Lacedæmon, and Scholar of Ariſtarchus, than Dicæarchus of Meſſina, the Scholar of Ariſtotle; but notwithſtanding, when I conſider that Suidas attributes no Work to the former, and tells us that the latter was a Philoſopher, a Rhetorician, and a Geometrician, I had rather give all the Works which are quoted under the name of Dicæarchus to the Diſciple of Ariſtotle. If he of whom Athenæus ſpeaks in the 14th page of his 1ſt Book, without calling him a Grammarian, whatever Reineſius ſays, was the Dicæarchus of Lacedæmon, he would rather have attributed to his own country than to the city of Sicyon the invention of what he is diſcourſing of in that paſſage, ſince there are Authors who attribute it to the city of Lacedæmon. This invention concerned dancing, and it was probably in the Book περὶ μουσικῶν ἀγώνων, *de Certaminibus Muſicis*, that Dicæarchus ſpoke of this, as alſo of the dance named the Crane (29).

(26) Reineſius, Epiſt. 69. pag. 608.

(27) *Adv. Mathem.* cap. 19.

(28) Pag. m. 14.

[E] . . . . *to whom Suidas . . . . aſcribes no Books of any kind. This furniſhes me with a Remark againſt Meurſius.*] He pretends (30) that Dicæarchus of Lacedæmon wrote ſo excellent a Book on the Government of Sparta, that it was read every year before the youth in the Aſſembly of the Ephori, and that the Edict concerning this was executed during a very long ſpace of time. What he quotes from Suidas is very juſt, if one clauſe be excepted; which is, that Suidas there ſpeaks only of Dicæarchus of Meſſina. Ἔγραψε τὴν πολιτείαν Σπαρτιατῶν. καὶ νόμῳ ἐτέθη ἐν Λακεδαίμονι, καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τὸν λόγον εἰς τὸ τῶν Ἐφόρων ἀρχεῖον. τὰς δὲ τὴν ἡσυχὴν ἔχουσας ἡλικίαν ἀκροᾶσθαι. καὶ τοῦτο ἐκράτησε μέχρι πολλοῦ. *Scripſit Reſpublicam Spartanorum. Et Lacedæmone lex eſt lata, ut quotannis liber iſte in prætorio Ephororum legeretur, & juventus auſcultaret. Idque diu obtinuit* (31).

(29) *See* Plutarch in the *Life of Theſeus.*

(30) Meurſ. *Miſcell. Lacon.* lib. 4. pag. 334.

(31) Idem, ibid.

[F] *Pliny teſtifies that he had received a commiſſion from ſome Princes to take the height of the mountains.*] Here are the words of Pliny: *Globum tamen effici mirum eſt in tanta planitie maris camporumque. Cui ſententiæ adeſt Dicæarchus vir in primis eruditus, regum cura permenſus montes, ex quibus altiſſimum prodidit Pelion 1250 paſſuum ratione perpendiculi, nullam eſſe eam portionem univerſæ rotunditatis colligens* (32). i. e. "It is a wonder, however, that a globe ſhould "be made in ſo wide an extent of plain, of earth "and ſea. Which opinion Dicæarchus, a man of "extraordinary learning, comes into, having at the "deſire of ſome Kings meaſured the mountains, the "higheſt of which he ſays is Pelion, being 1250 "paces perpendicular, thence gathering it to bear no "proportion to the whole rotundity of the globe." I am amazed that Father Hardouïn has not taken notice that this paſſage is inconſiſtent with what he quotes from Geminus; for Geminus aſſerts (33) that, according to the calculation of Dicæarchus, mount Cyllene in Arcadia is in height 15 ſtadia or thereabouts, that is near 1900 paces. Therefore it is not true that Pelion, which is but ten ſtadia high, is the higheſt mountain which was meaſured by Dicæarchus. However it be, we have here a confirmation of what we find in Suidas, that Dicæarchus had written a Book on the meaſure of the mountains of Peloponneſus. The paſſage of Pliny has eſcaped the diligence of Voſſius.

(32) Plin. lib. 2. cap. 65.

(33) *In Element. Aſtronom.* cap. 14. pag. 55. *apud* Harduin. in Plin. tom. 2. pag. 217.

[G] *What he cenſures in Plato, deſerves reprehenſion.*] He blamed Plato for giving too much power to love: it is Cicero who acquaints us with this (34), and I believe his words will help us to underſtand thoſe of Diogenes Laertius, which ſeem to have been ill tranſlated. Here are the words of Laertius (35): Λόγον δὲ πρῶτον γράψας αὐτὸν τὸν Φαῖδρον, ᾧ γὰρ ἔχει μειρακιώδες τι τὸ προέλημμα. Δικαίαρχος δὲ καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς γραφῆς ὅλον ἐπιμέμφεται ὡς φορτικόν (36). They have been thus rendred: *Phædrum primo illum ſcripſiſſe fama eſt, habet enim quæſtio illa nonnihil juvenile. Porro Dicæarchus totum id ſcribendi genus ut grave ac moleſtum carpit.* This Tranſlation does no honour to the original: it ſuppoſes that Laertius, having ſaid there is ſomething which ſavours of the young man in the Phædrus of the Philoſopher Plato, thought to fortify what he had ſaid by quoting a man who found the manner wherein that Philoſopher had written that Treatiſe harſh and heavy. Methinks it would be better to ſuppoſe this to be the meaning of Diogenes Laertius.

(34) *Quem* (Platonem) *non injuria Dicæarchus accuſat qui amori autoritatem tribuerit nimiæ.* Cicero, Tuſcul. 4. cap. 34.

(35) Diog. Laert. lib. 3. *in Platone*, num. 38.

(36) See the Remark [B] of the Article BION *the Boryſthenite*, Citation (8) &c.

Dreams [*H*]. Lactantius knew not how to place Dicæarchus properly [*I*]. I was never more ſurprized than to ſee the ſterility of the Jeſuit Jerom Raguſa [*K*], on ſo illuſtrious a ſubject as Dicæarchus, who has done ſo much honour to Sicily his native country (*e*).

(*e*) He was of a City now called Meſſina, and formerly *Meſſana*. Suidas.

A perſon

Laertius. It is ſaid that Plato's firſt work was that which is intitled *Phædrus:* and indeed the queſtion which he there examines very much ſavours of the young man; wherefore Dicæarchus condemned the whole character of that piece, becauſe of the extravagant ſallies, and the impetuous overflowing of imagination which he obſerved in it. Cicero, as I have already ſaid, inſinuates this paraphraſe to us; for the exceſs of which he ſays Dicæarchus accuſed Plato, with reſpect to the authority of love, no doubt regarded the Phædrus. One of the Commentators on Cicero's Epiſtles (37) has made uſe of this paſſage of Laertius, to confirm a quite ingenious conjecture. He ſuppoſes that Dicæarchus wrote a Book the Title of which was, Φαίδρου περισσὰ, *The Superfluities of the Phædrus*, and that Cicero ſends to his friend Atticus for this Book. Cicero expreſſes himſelf thus: *Libros mihi de quibus ad te antea ſcripſi velim mittas, & maxime* Φαίδρου περισσῶν & Ἑλλάδος. i. e. "I deſire you to ſend me "the Books of which I wrote to you formerly, and "particularly thoſe of the Superfluities in the Phædrus, and of Greece." Here follows the note of Boſius. *Videntur his verbis duo libri Dicæarchi ſignificari, quorum primo auctor ille multa è Phædro Platonis ut ſuperflua & redundantia reſecanda eſſe docuerat: altero virorum illuſtrium quos Græcia tuliſſet vitam conſcripſerat, huncque librum vocarat* Ἑλλάδος βίον, *ut illum* Φαίδρου περισσά. *Laërtius vulgo traditum refert Platonem* (38) *omnium dialogorum totam ejus ſcripti rationem ut nimis inſolentem & faſtidioſam damnaſſe.* i. e. "By theſe words two Books of Dicæarchus's ſeem "to be ſignified, in the firſt of which that Author "had ſhewn that many things ought to be lopped off "from Plato's Phædrus as ſuperfluous and redundant: "in the other he had written the Lives of the illuſtrious men of Greece; and had intitled the one "*The Life of Greece*, and the other, *The Superfluities* "*of the Phædrus*. Laertius relates that it was a common report that Plato firſt wrote the Phædrus, and "that Dicæarchus, of all his Dialogues, condemned the "manner wherein that was written as too ſwollen and "affected." Boſius quotes the Greek of Diogenes Laertius, and cites a paſſage of Plutarch (39), wherein certain deſcriptions inſerted in the Phædrus were cenſured as ſuperfluous. See Reineſius and Monſr. Menage. The former (40) thinks that Cicero ſent for the Book of Phædrus the Epicurean Philoſopher περὶ Θεῶν, and that of Dicæarchus intitled Βίος Ἑλλάδος. He therefore partly contradicts, and partly agrees with Boſius: but he did not know that Boſius has committed a fault here; which is to confound the Work of Dicæarchus intitled Βίοι, *Lives*, with that which bore the Title of Βίος Ἑλλάδος, *The Life of Greece*. The firſt contained the Lives of illuſtrious Men: the ſecond deſcribed Greece, and the Grecian cuſtoms. Mr. Menage has taken notice of this miſtake (41).

(37) Simeon Boſius *in Epiſt. Cicer. ad Atticum XXXIX lib.* 13.

(38) I quote this paſſage according to the Edition of *Grævius*. It is viſible that the Printers have here skipped three or four words, ſuch as theſe perhaps, *primum Phædrum conſcripſiſſe, Dicæarchum vero.*

(39) In *Erotico.*

(40) Reineſius, *Var. Lect.* lib. 3. cap. 3. pag. 377.

(41) Menag. *Not. ad Diogen. Laertium*, lib. 3. num. 4. *ſub fin.*

[*H*] *Voſſius ought not to have attributed to him a Treatiſe of Dreams.*] Let us ſet down the words of Voſſius: *Nec magis ambigere licet de libro quem Tullius eum de divinatione, & ſomniis ſcripſiſſe auctor eſt* (42). i. e. "Nor is there any more reaſon to doubt of the Book "which Tully informs us he wrote of divination and "dreams." He cites nothing for this fact. In all appearance he truſted to ſome Author who ſaid the ſame thing, and who cited nobody, and he would not take the pains to ſearch where Cicero could have ſaid this. I doubt not but if this particularity be to be met with in any Book of Cicero, it is in that *de Divinatione*. Having run it over, I have found four paſſages there which concern Dicæarchus. In the firſt, it is aſſured that he rejected all ſorts of Divinations, except that of dreams, and that of furious rapture (43). Whence I infer that at the worſt it muſt be granted me that Voſſius ſhould have ſaid *de divinatione ex ſomniis*, and not *de divinatione & ſomniis*. The ſecond place is but a confirmation of the firſt, and I would not quote it if it did not furniſh me with an incidental Reflection. *Nec vero unquam animus hominis naturaliter divinat niſi quum ita ſolutus eſt & vacuus, ut ei planè nihil ſit cum corpore; quod aut vatibus contingit, aut dormientibus. Itaque ea duo genera à Dicæarcho probantur* (44). i. e. "Nor does a man's ſoul ever divine naturally, unleſs when it is ſo diſengaged and "free, that it has nothing at all to do with the body; "which happens either to raptured Prophets, or to "thoſe who ſleep." Either Cicero muſt not have underſtood Dicæarchus's doctrine, or the latter muſt have contradicted himſelf, and not have underſtood his own meaning. Can a man who allows no diſtinction between human ſouls and the body, believe that frantic people, enthuſiaſts, or dreamers, have thoughts which are not material; that is to ſay, that in that ſtate their ſoul finds itſelf perfectly diſengaged from the commerce which it had with the body? It is certain that if ſuch a man believed this, he would not know what he ſaid, and would involve himſelf in a plain contradiction. Now we have ſeen (45) that Dicæarchus admitted no diſtinction between the ſouls of living bodies, and the living bodies themſelves: if he believed, therefore, as Cicero imputes to him, that becauſe in ecſtaſies and dreams the mind of a man is diſengaged from all commerce with the body, the divinations of enthuſiaſts and dreamers are not to be rejected, he has contradicted himſelf, and demoliſhed his own Hypotheſes by an incomprehenſible piece of jargon. But let us not condemn him without a hearing. Perhaps the reaſons on which he grounded himſelf for the retaining the divinations of ecſtaſies, and dreams, while he rejected all other methods of foretelling things to come, are not well reported by Cicero. This exception in favour of dreams, and alienations of mind, was a wrong ſtep in Dicæarchus, and I ſhould be glad to know how he extricated himſelf out of the difficulty. The third paſſage ſays no more than the ſecond; for which reaſon I content my ſelf with placing it in the margin (46). The fourth is more favourable to Voſſius than all the reſt. *At noſtra intereſt ſcire ea quæ eventura ſint. Magnus Dicæarchi liber eſt neſcire ea melius eſſe quam ſcire* (47). i. e. "But it concerns us to know thoſe things which "ſhall happen. Yet Dicæarchus has ſhewn in a "large Treatiſe, that it is better not to know than "to know them." But this Book of Dicæarchus is not that which Voſſius ſpeaks of; it is not intitled, either *de divinatione & ſomniis*, or *de divinatione ex ſomniis*, and perhaps it is not different from that of the deſcent into the cave of Trophonius. In a word, this Philoſopher might have explained his ſentiment on the ſubject of Divinations in ſome of the Books of which Voſſius had already given the Title: wherefore it was not neceſſary to quote that *de divinatione & ſomniis* apart.

(42) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græcis*, pag. 47.

(43) *Dicæarchus Peripateticus cætera divinationis genera ſuſtulit, ſomniorum & furoris reliquit.* Cicero, *de Divinat.* lib. 1. cap. 3.

(44) Idem, ibid.

(45) In the Remark [*C*] Citation (20).

(46) *Me Peripateticorum ratio magis movebat & veteris Dicæarchi, & ejus qui nunc floret Cratippi, qui cenſent eſſe in mentibus hominum tanquam oraculum aliquod ex quo futura præſentiant; ſi aut furore divino concitatus animus aut ſomno relaxatus ſolute moveatur ac libere.* Cicero, *de Divinat.* lib. 2. cap. 48.

[*I*] *Lactantius knew not how to place him properly.*] He very juſtly condemns Dicæarchus on the Mortality of the Soul; but he is miſtaken when he accuſes him of having been the forerunner of Democritus with regard to that falſe doctrine: for Dicæarchus, having been one of Ariſtotle's diſciples, did not flouriſh till long after Democritus. *In eadem ſententia fuit etiam Pythagoras antea, ejuſque præceptor Pherecydes; quem Cicero tradit primum de æternitate animarum diſputaviſſe. Qui omnes licet eloquentia excellerent; tamen in hac duntaxat contentione non minus auctoritatis habuerunt, qui contra hanc ſententiam diſſerebant, Dicæarchus primo, deinde Democritus, poſtremo Epicurus* (48). i. e. "Of "the ſame opinion alſo was Pythagoras before, and "his maſter Pherecydes; the firſt, according to Cicero, "who diſputed againſt the immortality of the ſoul. "Who tho' they all excelled in eloquence, yet, in this "ſingle controverſy, thoſe who diſputed againſt this "opinion had no leſs authority, viz. Dicæarchus "firſt, then Democritus, and laſtly Epicurus."

(47) Ibid.

(48) Lactantius, *Divin. Inſtit.* lib. 7. cap. 8. *See alſo* cap. 7, & 13.

[*K*] *I have . . . . been ſurprized . . . . at the ſterility of the Jeſuit Jerom Raguſa.*] His *Elogia Siculorum qui veteri memoria floruerunt*, printed at Avignon in the year 1690, contain only the Titles of a few of Dicæarchus's Books, and an Extract of Charles Stephens. This extract imports that, according to

A perſon, who would not make himſelf known, has ſent me ſome Objections which I am going to examine. They concern the Argument which I have propoſed (*f*) againſt Dicæarchus's opinion of the nature of the ſoul [*L*]. This will afford me an occaſion

(*f*) In the Remark [*C*].

that Philoſopher, mankind had no beginning, and the ſoul periſhed with the body. The laſt Dogm ſuits his notions, and Cicero, quoted by Charles Stephens, aſcribes it to Dicæarchus, as we have ſeen above (49): but I do not know on what authority Charles Stephens imputed to him the other dogm. If the Jeſuit had been ſatisfied with copying Charles Stephens, he would not have committed a great blunder: he would not have charged him with ſuppoſing that the Dicæarchus who held theſe ill opinions was not the Meſſenian (50); for to that Dicæarchus does Charles Stephens plainly impute them. It is true he fancies, by a very groſs miſtake, that Dicæarchus native of Meſſana, and the diſciple of Ariſtotle, is not Dicæarchus the Meſſenian. This is what the Jeſuit ſhould have cenſured him for.

(49) Remark [*C*].

(50) *Qui tamen Dicæarchum talia opinantem alium fuiſſe à Dicæarcho noſtro opinatur.* Hier. Raguſa, pag. 94.

[*L*] *I am going to examine ſome Objections . . . with regard to his opinion concerning the nature of the ſoul.*] The Author of theſe Objections begins by unfolding our Philoſopher's Syſtem. He pretends that Dicæarchus meant that living bodies differ from a dead body only in that their parts are ſhaped and put together in a certain manner. He compares this opinion with that of Des Cartes, in the following manner. If a dog differs from a ſtone, it is not becauſe he is compoſed of a body and ſoul, and the ſtone is a body only: it is ſolely becauſe he is compoſed of parts ſo put together that they make a machine, which the ranging of the corpuſcles of a ſtone does not. This is the opinion of Des Cartes. This idea is very proper to make us underſtand the opinion of Dicæarchus: we need only ſuppoſe that he extended to all living bodies what the Carteſians ſay only with regard to beaſts: we need only ſuppoſe that he reduced man to the condition of a machine; whence it will follow that the human ſoul is not diſtinct from the body, but that it is only a conſtruction, a mechanical diſpoſition of ſeveral parts of matter. This being ſuppoſed, the Author of the Objections pretends that I do not weaken the Syſtem of Dicæarchus, ſo far am I from being able to conſider the difficulty which I have propoſed as an invincible one. I have aſſerted that Dicæarchus either did not know what he ſaid or was obliged to maintain that the power in which he made the ſoul to conſiſt, always accompanied the body; and it is anſwered, that he is only obliged to maintain that it always accompanied the living body: they add, that if I had always joined together theſe two terms *body* and *living*, my conſequence might have been entirely admitted by Dicæarchus, and therefore would have done no damage to his Syſtem. It is pretended, therefore, that he may deny that becauſe the ſoul is a power of living bodies, it thence follows, that it is found in dead carcaſes; for if it only conſiſts in the mechanical diſpoſition of certain bodies, as he ſuppoſes, it manifeſtly follows that it ought to ceaſe ſo ſoon as that diſpoſition ceaſes, ſo ſoon as the machine ſubſiſts no longer. It is thus, continue they, that a Carteſian would anſwer to thoſe who ſhould maintain that, according to his Hypotheſis, the ſoul of beaſts ſubſiſts even after they are killed. You are miſtaken, would he anſwer; for ſince I ſuppoſe it conſiſts only in a certain diſpoſition of the organs, I ought neceſſarily to ſuppoſe that it periſhes ſo ſoon as that diſpoſition is deſtroyed. The Author of the Objections ſuppoſes, *that it has never been concluded againſt the* Carteſians, *that the faculty of feeling does not ceaſe in dead bodies, and that the parts of living bodies carry away each of them its life and ſoul when they are corrupted.* It is certain, that this conſequence is not objected to the Carteſians; but it is becauſe they do not attribute any ſenſation to the ſoul of beaſts: for if they made it to be ſenſitive, the ſame difficulties which I have objected againſt Dicæarchus would fall upon them, and they would be obliged to give a ſolution of them as well as he. Laſtly it is objected to me that the Remarks which I have made on all modalities which are known to us not ceaſing to be ſuch but by giving place to other modalities of the ſame kind; whence it follows that a body which had ſenſation on ſome occaſions, would never ceaſe having it: it is objected to me, I ſay, that this little concerns Dicæarchus; for *he never attributed life to matter till after the modification requiſite to make it a living body, that is to ſay, by the different diſpoſition of its parts. I had no right, therefore, to oblige him to give life to any part of the matter after its diſſolution, tho' before and after it be really a body, but not a living body.* This is the concluſion of the Author of the Objections. Take notice that he has not entred the Liſts for Dicæarchus's doctrine itſelf; he having acknowledged the falſity and impiety of it: he only deſigned to ſhew that I was in the wrong to accuſe him of inconſiſtency, and that that Syſtem does not loſe its connection and regularity, tho' our Philoſopher had not admitted a ſenſation, and an imperiſhable life in bodies which have been once alive.

You clearly ſee here the whole ſtate of the Queſtion: the only point is to know whether a Philoſopher who believes there are bodies which think, and bodies which do not think, reaſons conſequently. I maintain that he does not, and that whoever once admits, for example, that a combination of bones, and nerves, feels and reaſons, ought to maintain, on pain of being declared guilty of not knowing what he ſays, that every other combination of matter thinks, and that the thought which ſubſiſted in ſuch a combination, ſubſiſts under other modifications in the diſunited parts, after the diſſipation of that combination. I do not repeat the proof I have already produced on this ſubject, nor is it neceſſary for me to give them any new ſtrength: for the Author of the Obſervations has not attacked them. He has only obſerved that Dicæarchus needs not give himſelf any trouble about the matter, conſidering he has declared, that matter does not begin to live till after a certain diſpoſition of its parts. But it is in this point principally that I would charge him with not knowing what he ſaid. By life he did not underſtand merely breathing, eating, walking: he underſtood all the operations of the man, the action of the five external ſenſes, imagination, reflection, reaſoning &c. I maintain that he ſuppoſes what has hitherto been inconceivable to all mankind, if he ſuppoſes that the ſole diſpoſition of the organs of the human body makes a ſubſtance which never had thought before to become a thinking ſubſtance. All that the diſpoſition of theſe organs can do, is confined, as in a clock, to local motion diverſly modified. The difference can lie only in the greater or leſs degree of motion. But as the diſpoſition of the ſeveral wheels which compoſe a clock, would be of no ſervice to produce the effects of that machine, if every wheel, before it was placed in a certain manner, was not actually indued with an impenetrable extenſion, a neceſſary cauſe of motion ſo ſoon as it is puſhed forward with a certain degree of force; I ſay likewiſe, that the diſpoſition of the organs of a man's body would be of no ſervice to produce thought, if every organ, before it was put in its place, was not actually indued with the faculty of thinking. Now this faculty is quite a different thing from impenetrable extenſion; for all that you can do to this extenſion, by pulling, ſtriking, or puſhing it all imaginable ways, is a change of ſituation, the whole nature and eſſence whereof you fully conceive, without having occaſion to ſuppoſe any ſenſation, and even when you deny there is any ſenſation in it. Some great Genius's have ſhewed themſelves a little too *ſlow of heart in believing* with regard to the diſtinction between the ſoul of a man and the body; but no one, that I know of, has yet ventured to ſay he conceived clearly, that in order to make a ſubſtance paſs from the privation of all thought to actual thought, it was ſufficient to put it in motion (51), ſo that this change of ſituation ſhould be, for inſtance, a ſenſe of joy, an affirmation, an idea of moral vertue, &c. and even tho' ſome ſhould boaſt that they conceived this clearly, they would not deſerve credit, and we might apply to them a paſſage of Ariſtotle which I have quoted in another place (52). What an abſurdity would it be to maintain that there are two ſpecies of colour, one the object of the ſight, and nothing more; and the other the object of the ſight, and of the ſmell alſo? It is ſtill more abſurd to maintain that there are two ſpecies of roundneſs, one which conſiſts merely in that the parts of the circumference of a body are equidiſtant from the centre, and

(51) *Note that the Peripatetics, when they aſcribe thought to brutes, do not give this faculty to matter, but to a ſubſtantial form, which, according to them, is neither matter nor body, and which is produced anew in matter, without being compoſed of matter. So that they agree matter never acquires ſenſation or knowledge.*

(52) Above, in the Article ARRIAGA, Citation (8).

occaſion of ſaying a word concerning a Diſpute which has made a great noiſe in England [*M*].

the other, which, beſides this, is alſo an act whereby the round body perceives that it exiſts, and ſees ſeveral other bodies round about it. The ſame abſurdity recurrs in maintaining that there are two ſorts of circular motion, one which is nothing elſe but the change of ſituation on a line whoſe parts are equidiſtant from the centre, the other which, beſides this, is alſo an act of love towards God, a fear, a hope &c. What I have ſaid of roundneſs with reſpect to viſion, may be applied to all ſorts of figures with reſpect to all ſorts of thoughts; and what I have ſaid of circular motion has no leſs force with regard to all the other lines on which a body may move either ſlowly or ſwiftly. And therefore we ought to conclude that thought is diſtinct from all the modifications of body which have come to our knowledge, ſince it is diſtinct from all figure, and all change of ſituation: but that not being the queſtion here, let us content ourſelves with concluding that Dicæarchus, to reaſon conſiſtently, ought to admit every kind of matter to be endued with the faculty of thinking; for otherwiſe it was abſurd to pretend, that in caſe ſeveral veins, arteries, &c. were placed one by another as the different parts of a machine, this combination would produce the ſenſations of colour, taſte, ſound, ſmell, cold, heat, love, hatred, affirmation, negation, &c. See the margin (53).

(53) *He believed that the ſoul was the harmony of the four elements.* Plut. *de Placit. Phil.* lib. 4. cap. 2. *He ought, therefore, to have believed that all mixed Bodies have a Soul, for the four elements, muſt neceſſarily be there reduced to harmony. But is it not as abſurd to ſuppoſe that the harmony of the four elements produces thought, as to ſuppoſe that a certain concert of Muſic would be a ſound which ſhould be indued with conſciouſneſs, and know the neighbouring objects?*

[*M*] *This will afford me occaſion of ſaying a Word concerning a Diſpute which has made a great noiſe in England.*] I imagine that if I had ſimply and abſolutely aſſerted that no body has hitherto boaſted of having a clear idea of a modification of matter which is an act of ſenſation, I ſhould not have proceeded too raſhly; for I have juſt now read in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, that Mr. Locke, one of the profoundeſt Metaphyſicians in the world, ingenuouſly acknowledges that a body indued with thought is an incomprehenſible thing. And take notice that he makes this confeſſion while he is anſwering an Objection founded on this incomprehenſibility. It was therefore greatly his intereſt to deny the foundation of that objection; for which reaſon we ought to conclude his confeſſion to be very ſincere, and an effect of the force of truth, and a proof that all his utmoſt efforts to comprehend the union of the materiality of a ſubſtance with thought were ineffectual. Now ſince a man of ſuch ſuperior underſtanding confeſſes this, is it not probable that no perſon ever boaſted of having comprehended ſuch an union? This would be too vague, if I did not add ſomething to it. Let me add then that the queſtion, whether the ſoul of man is diſtinct from matter, makes a part of the famous diſpute between Dr. Stillingfleet (54) and Mr. Locke. The firſt maintained that matter is incapable of thought, and thereby became the Defender of a fundamental Article of philoſophical Orthodoxy. He made uſe of this argument among others, *that we cannot conceive how matter can think.* Mr. Locke admits this principle to be true, and contents himſelf with denying the conſequence; for he aſſerts that God can do things which are incomprehenſible to human underſtanding, and therefore, becauſe man cannot comprehend how a portion of matter ſhould acquire the faculty of thinking, it does not thence follow that God, who is almighty, *cannot, if he pleaſe, give ſome degrees of ſenſation, perception, and thought, to certain Collections of created matter combined together as he thinks proper* . . . . (56). *All the difficulties which are formed,* ſays he (57), *againſt the poſſibility of there being matter which thinks, drawn from our ignorance, or the narrow limits of our conception, do not any ways affect the power of God, if he pleaſes to communicate to matter the faculty of thinking, and they do not prove that he has not actually communicated it to certain parts of matter diſpoſed as he thinks proper, till it can be ſhewn that it is a contradiction to ſuppoſe ſuch a thing.* Here is a formal confeſſion of the incomprehenſibility of the thing, and a recourſe to the extent of God's power with regard to effects which are beyond the limits of our underſtanding. It is much after the ſame manner that the ſchoolmen ſuppoſe there is in creatures an *obediential* power, by which God might raiſe them, if he pleaſed, to any ſtate whatever: a ſtone might become capable of the beatific Viſion, and a drop of water might become capable of waſhing away all the pollution of original ſin. Take notice that to refute this *obediential* power in matter, with reſpect to knowledge, we may urge a proof which it does not appear (58) Dr. Stillingfleet has made uſe of. It has always ſeemed to me very proper to ſhew the impoſſibility of joining together the three dimenſions and thought in the ſame ſubject. You will find the ſubſtance of this proof in the Book which I cite (59). A Divine who ſhewed a great deal of paſſion againſt the Abbot de Dangeau, who had made uſe of this argument, criticized him as well as he could; but he has produced nothing but impertinencies.

(56) Ibid. pag. 497.

(57) Ibid. pag. 506.

(58) In the Extracts of the *Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres*, Nov. 1699, Art. 1.

(59) *Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres*, Auguſt 1684, Art. 6.

Mark well the expreſſion of *Philoſophical Orthodoxy* which I have made uſe of; for I do not pretend that with regard to Theological, Evangelical, or Chriſtian Orthodoxy, Dr. Stillingfleet is ſuperior to Mr. Locke. To inſiſt that becauſe the ſoul of man thinks, it is therefore immaterial, is, in my opinion, good reaſoning, and, beſides, eſtabliſhes a very ſolid foundation of the immortality of our ſouls, a doctrine which ought to be conſidered as one of the moſt important Articles of true Philoſophy; but this truth, ſo far as it is grounded on ſuch a principle, does not belong to the faithful, nor to Chriſtian Theology. A Chriſtian Divine, and every Chriſtian in general, as a Chriſtian, believes the immortality of the ſoul, Heaven, Hell, &c. becauſe theſe are truths which God has revealed to us. It is in this reſpect only that his faith is a true act of Religion, a meritorious act (61), acceptable to God, a ſtate of a child of God, and a diſciple of Jeſus Chriſt; and thoſe who ſhould believe the immortality of the ſoul only on account of the philoſophical ideas which reaſon furniſhes them with, would be no further advanced in the Kingdom of God, than thoſe who believe that the whole is greater than a part. Since Mr. Locke, therefore, grounds his belief of the immortality of the ſoul on Scripture, he has as much Chriſtian, Evangelical, and Theological Orthodoxy as any one can have. What he ſays on this ſubject is admirable (62). I may probably cite it in ſome other place (63).

(60) See the ſame *Nouvelles*, &c. Jan. 1685, pag. 12.

(61) I ſpeak here according to the hypotheſis of the merit of Works.

(62) See the *Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres*, Novemb. 1699, p. 510, and the Book intitled, *Parrhaſiana*, pag. 388, &c.

(63) In the laſt Remark of the Article PERROT (Nicholas) Sieur d'Ablancourt.

(54) One of the moſt learned men in Europe. He died Biſhop of Worceſter, in the year 1699.

(55) *Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres*, Nov. 1699, pag. 500.

DICÆARCHUS, Commander of the Fleet which Philip, the laſt King of Macedon but one, fitted out to attack the Iſlands Cyclades againſt all right and equity, began that unjuſt enterprize by a moſt abominable action; for, as if he would at the ſame time have terrified both Gods and men, he no ſooner ſaw himſelf in a condition to ſet ſail, than he erected two Altars, one to Impiety, and the other to Injuſtice, upon which he celebrated the whole Divine Service, neither more nor leſs than as if he had deſigned to pay his homage to thoſe two Crimes in the ſame manner as he would have done to Gods. Polybius, if we had him entire, would have acquainted us with the ſucceſs of that war, and the ſequel of Dicæarchus's actions: the fragments which we have remaining of that Writer only inform us that this impious wretch, engaging in a conſpiracy, expired under the torture (*a*).

(*a*) Extracted from Polybius, *Hiſt.* lib. 17. cap. 35. pag. 705.

DIEU (LEWIS DE), Miniſter of Leyden, and Profeſſor in the Walloon College in that City, was a man of great abilities, and well verſed in the Oriental Languages. He was born the 7th of April 1590, at Fluſhing, where his father DANIEL DE DIEU, a man

a man of merit and quality [*A*], exerciſed the holy Miniſtry. He ſtudied under Daniel Colonius, his maternal uncle, who was Profeſſor at Leyden in the Walloon College. He was four years Miniſter of the French Church at Middleburgh [*B*]. He might have ſucceeded Uyttenbogard, who had been the Court-Miniſter at the Hague [*C*]: but his natural averſion to the manners of a Court did not permit him to comply with the deſire of Prince Maurice in that particular. He was called to Leyden in the year 1619, to teach with his uncle Colonius in the Walloon College; and he diſcharged the duty of that employ with great diligence till his death, which happened in the year 1642. He publiſhed a Commentary on the four Goſpels [*D*], and Notes on the Acts of the Apoſtles,

[*A*] *His father*, DANIEL DE DIEU, *was a man of merit and quality.*] He was a native of Bruſſels, and had been a Miniſter there two and twenty years. He removed thence to ſerve the Church at Fluſhing, after the Duke of Parma had taken Bruſſels (1). He underſtood Greek and the Oriental Languages, and he could preach, with the applauſe of his Auditors, in German, Italian, French, and Engliſh. He was much beloved by the Sieur de Sainte Aldegonde. The Churches of the Netherlands ſent him in 1588, with ſome other Miniſters, to Queen Elizabeth, to inform her of the deſigns of the Duke of Parma, who ſecretly made her propoſals of peace, tho' the King of Spain was equipping a formidable fleet againſt England. LEWIS DE DIEU, the father of Daniel, was for a long time a domeſtic to Charles V, and obtained a Patent for the ennobling of himſelf and all his poſterity, as a recompence for his ſervices. He embraced the Reformation, and died in that perſuaſion; ſo that his friends were obliged to conceal his body at Bruſſels for ſix weeks, and to convey it to Antwerp, where it was interred by night. He had married the daughter of Peter van Ceulen, better known by the name of Colonius which his Schoolmaſter gave him. This Colonius (2) inſinuated himſelf very much into the favour of Robert Stephens, who adviſed him to go to Geneva. He was there recommended to Calvin, who inſtructed him in his opinions, and exhorted him to ſtudy Divinity. He dedicated himſelf to the Miniſtry, and performed the firſt functions of it at Metz, where the Baron de Clervant had procured a Church to be erected. Francis de Beaucaire, Biſhop of Metz, had written a very abuſive book, reflecting on the doctrine and perſons of the Miniſters. Colonius returned a ſharp anſwer to it, and in a few words: this anſwer was publiſhed at Geneva, in the year 1566. He was perſecuted by the Catholics of Metz, and detained in priſon for ſome time; and when that Church was ruined by the perſecution, and the Temple demoliſhed in the King's preſence, he retired into the Palatinate with John Taffin his Collegue. They were both Miniſters at Heidelberg; Taffin preached in French, and Colonius in German. The latter died young, and left a ſon named Daniel Colonius, who was Miniſter and Principal of the Walloon College at Leiden (3). I have already ſaid that the ſiſter of Daniel Colonius was the mother of Lewis de Dieu. A Book (4) has lately fallen into my hands, which obliges me to lengthen this Remark. I find there that Lewis de Dieu, the grandfather of him who is the ſubject of this Article, attended his maſter Charles V in his expeditions into Africa and Germany, and that he made no ſecret to him of his being a Proteſtant. The Emperor only adviſed him to take ſpecial care of himſelf, becauſe it would not be in his power to ſave him from the hands of the Inquiſition (5). Lewis de Dieu was obliged to conceal himſelf ſoon after the abdication of Charles V; for that Prince could no longer ſcreen him from the hatred of the Jeſuits (6). It is ſaid that this worthy man was inſtructed by Calvin himſelf. He was going over into England with ſome other young men: Calvin, who was going over in the ſame veſſel (7), repreſented to them that they ought not to ſwear when they plaid at cards. None but Lewis de Dieu ſubmitted to this reproof: all the reſt laughed at it: wherefore Calvin, finding him alone, ſpoke to him of God, and made ſo real a convert of him, that the young man wrote to his friends that nothing ſhould ever ſeparate him from the faith of John Calvin (8). He dedicated his ſon Daniel to the Miniſtry. They alſo relate the following circumſtance; that a certain Jeſuit gave this Daniel notice that thoſe of his order were ſearching after the dead body of Lewis de Dieu, and deſigned to hang it on a gibbet: upon which Daniel dug it up, and hid it. The Jeſuit who gave him this information of the affair, offered to aſſiſt him in taking up and concealing the body (9).

(1) It was in 1585.

(2) See his Article, under the word COLOGNE.

(3) *Ex Oratione funebri Lud. de Dieu.*

(4) *Aphoriſmi Theologici Ludovici de Dieu*, cum Præfatione *Melchioris Leydeckeri.*

(5) *Melchior Leydeckerus*, Præfatione *Aphoriſmorum Theologic. Lud. de Dieu*, ex *Concione funebri Lud. de Dieu*, habitâ Belgicè ab *Abrahamo Heidano.*

(6) Leydecker. ibid.

(7) This is a ſingular fact, and unknown, as I imagine, to all thoſe who have written of Calvin; no body, that I know of, having obſerved that Calvin ever made a voyage to England.

(8) *Leydecker.* Præfatione *Aphoriſm. Theologic. Lud. de Dieu*, ex *Concione fun. Lud. de Dieu.*

(9) Idem, ibid.

[*B*] *He was four years Miniſter . . . . . at Middleburgh.*] Mr. Leydecker, Profeſſor of Divinity at Utrecht (10), aſſures us that Lewis de Dieu, having been Miniſter only at Fluſhing for two years, went thence to Leyden in the year 1619. I have followed Polyander, the Author of the funeral Oration: but I here give my Reader notice that it appears by the ſequel of Polyander's diſcourſe, that Lewis de Dieu was Miniſter of the Church of Fluſhing, and not of that of Middleburgh.

(10) Ibid.

[* *That Profeſſor Leydecker ſpeaks the truth we have the teſtimony of de Dieu himſelf, who, in his Epiſtle Dedicatory of Xavier's Life of Chriſt addreſſed to the Magiſtrates of Fluſhing, has theſe words:* Quæ *(Urbs veſtra)* me non tantum in lucem edidit, ſed & in ſtudiis, publicis ſumptibus, benignè aluit, tandemque Eccleſiæ Paſtorem vocavit; ac per biennium tenuit atque amavit, donec a Lugduno-Batava Eccleſia vocatum, veſter in publicum Eccleſiæ bonum amor dimittendum eo judicaret. ADD. REM.]

[*C*] *He might have ſucceeded Uyttenbogard, who had been the Court Miniſter at the Hague.*] Mr. Leydecker acquaints us with ſome circumſtances of this affair which deſerve to be read. Prince Maurice being in Zeland heard Lewis de Dieu preach, who was yet but a Student, and ſome time after ſent for him to Court. The young man modeſtly excuſed himſelf, declaring that he deſigned to ſatisfy his conſcience in the exerciſe of his Miniſtry, and to cenſure freely what he ſhould find deſerved cenſure; a liberty which Courts did not care to allow. Beſides, he thought the poſt which was offered him more proper for a man in years than a Student. His modeſty and prudence were commended by Prince Maurice.

[*D*] *He publiſhed a Commentary on the four Goſpels.*] This was in 1631. His firſt care had been to examine the Latin Verſions of the Syriac New Teſtament made by Tremellius and Guy le Fevre de la Boderie †, and that of St. Matthew's Goſpel in Hebrew, made by Munſter and Mercerus. He found a great many faults in thoſe Verſions; which put him upon examining the vulgar Tranſlation, thoſe of Eraſmus, and Theodore Beza, the Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic. He compared them with one another, and all of them with the Greek Text. He made no ſcruple to cenſure Beza in thoſe particulars which he thought deſerved cenſure, and did a great deal of juſtice to the Author of the Vulgate. *Magnus vir fuit Beza*, ſays he (11), *eximiæ eruditionis, acerrimi judicii; quique ſuis in Novum Teſtamentum laboribus nunquam laudatam ſatis operam Eccleſiis navavit, æternumque & ſupra invidiam nomen comparavit. Verum ſi Vulgatum quoque Interpretem, quiſquis is tandem fuerit, doctum imo doctiſſimum virum fuiſſe aſſeram, non me peccaſſe judicavero. Suos habet, fateor, nævos, habet & ſuos barbariſmos. Sed quin paſſim ejus fidem judiciumque admirer, etiam ubi barbarus videtur, negare non poſſum.* i. e. "Beza "was a man of great abilities, of excellent learning, "and acute judgment, who by his labours on the "New Teſtament has done a ſervice to the Church "which can never be ſufficiently commended, and "gained immortal honour above the reach of envy; "but if I ſhould likewiſe pronounce the Author of "the Vulgate, whoever he was, to be a very learned man, I ſhould not think myſelf in the wrong. "I own he has his blemiſhes, and is ſometimes guilty "of Barbariſms; but I cannot help frequently admiring his fidelity and judgment even where he "appears barbarous." Father Simon ſpeaks advantageouſly of the Writings of Lewis de Dieu, in the XXXV Chapter of his *Critical Hiſtory of the Commentators on the New Teſtament.*

† In Latin *Guido Fabricius Boderianus.*

(11) *In Præfatione.*

ſtles, and the Apocalypſe of St. John, which he printed in Hebrew and Syriac [*E*], with a Latin Verſion of his own (*a*). I ſhall acquaint the Reader what other Books we have of his in the Remarks [*F*]. He refuſed the poſt which was offered him of Divinity-Profeſſor in the new Univerſity of Utrecht; and if he had lived long enough, he would have had the ſame poſt in that of Leyden (*b*). He married the daughter of Henry Bogard, Counſellor of Fluſhing, by whom he had eleven children, one of whom practiſed Phyſic at Leyden (*c*), and afterwards at Amſterdam; and another ſtudied Divinity, and was Miniſter at Woubrugge. The Phyſician left two ſons, one of whom follows his father's profeſſion at Amſterdam, and the other ſtudies the Civil Law (*d*).

(*a*) *Ex Epiſtolâ Dedicatoriâ & Præfatione novæ Editionis* 1693.

(*b*) Leydeckerius, *Præf.* Aphoriſm. Lud. de Dieu.

(*c*) *Ex Orat. funebri.*

(*d*) *Ex Epiſtola Dedicat. novæ Edition.* 1693.

[*E*] *He printed the* Apocalypſe *in Hebrew and Syriac.*] This wants explanation. It muſt not be imagined that he publiſhed two Apocalypſes, one in the Hebrew language, and the other in the Syriac. Lewis de Dieu publiſhed the Apocalypſe in Syriac only, but he cauſed one impreſſion to be made in the Syriac Character, and another in the Hebrew Character. I received this information from Mr. de la Roque, a French Miniſter at London (12).

(12) See above Citation (30) of the Article COLOMIES.

[*F*] *I ſhall acquaint the Reader what other Books we have of his.*] He publiſhed the Hiſtory of the Life of Jeſus Chriſt, written in the Perſian tongue by the Jeſuit Jerom Xavier, with learned Notes; and he joined to the Original a Latin Tranſlation. The Hiſtory of St. Peter written in the Perſian language was alſo publiſhed by him with [a Latin Tranſlation and] Notes. As to the two firſt Chapters of Geneſis tranſlated into Perſian by Jacobus Tawuſus (*α*), he only publiſhed them with an Advertiſement to the Reader. I ſay nothing of the Rudiments which he publiſhed of the Hebrew and Perſian tongues, nor of his Parallel of the Grammar of the Oriental Languages (13). Since his death they have printed his Commentary on the Epiſtle to the Romans, with a Collection of Obſervations on all the other Epiſtles of the Apoſtles, and a Commentary on the Old Teſtament (14). His Treatiſe *de Avaritia*, his *Rhetorica ſacra*, and his *Aphoriſmi Theologici* (15), owe their appearance abroad to the care of Mr. Leydecker. His Obſervations on the Scripture have been reprinted at Amſterdam *in folio*, in 1693, corrected and enlarged, together with the Apocalypſe in Syriac. Take notice Alegambe acknowledges that Lewis de Dieu has faithfully tranſlated the Book of Jerom Xavier; but he accuſes him of having tacked to it Heretical Obſervations which deſerve to be burnt; *additis Animadverſionibus hæreticis & rogo dignis. Cæterum non infideliter textum interpretatus eſt, ſi nonnulla demas quæ fortaſſe Codex ipſius vitiata habuit.* Thus he expreſſes himſelf in the 189th page of his Library of the Writers of his Order.

(13) Extracted from his *Funeral Oration* pronounced by *Polyander*

(14) Witte, *in Diario Biograph.*

(15) Theſe *Aphoriſms* were printed at Utrecht, in the year 1693.

[*α* § Jacobus Tawuſus, Tawoſus, or Tuſius, as he is ſometimes called, was a Jew of Tûs in Khoraſan. His Tranſlation of the Pentateuch is inſerted in the fourth Volume of the London Polyglott, and was firſt publiſhed at Conſtantinople in the year 1551, together with the Targum of Onkelos, the Arabic Verſion of Saadias, and the Commentaries of Solomon Jarhi, all in the Hebrew Character. This Perſian Tranſlation of the Pentateuch, tho' uſeful in other reſpects, and alſo Xavier's Hiſtory of Chriſt, which the Author tells us was tranſlated from his Original by a native of Perſia, are both condemned by the learned Mr. John Greaves, a competent judge, as written in a very barbarous ſtyle, and therefore not to be imitated. *Quæ adhuc* [Perſice] *edita ſunt*, ſays he (16), *ſive* Pentateuchus *a* Tawuſhio Judæo, *ſive* Xaverii Hiſtoria a Cl. Viro D. Ludovico de Dieu: *ea adeò barbarè ſcripta ſunt, ut expers planè venuſtatis omnis ſit habendus, quiſquis eorum ſolœciſmos judicaverit imitandos.* ADD. REM.]

(16) *In Præfatione Aſtronom. Shah Cholgij.*

DIGBY (Sir KENELM) became very illuſtrious in the preſent age for his Virtue and Learning. He was deſcended of a very ancient Family in England. His great-grandfather was Everard Digby, who accompanied by ſix of his brothers, fought valiantly at Boſworth Field on the ſide of Henry VII againſt the Uſurper Richard III. His father, who was alſo named Everard, did not imitate this noble example of Loyalty; for he ſuffered himſelf to be engaged in the Gunpowder-plot againſt James I, and for that crime had his head ſtruck off. His ſon, of whom we are now ſpeaking, glorioufly wiped out this ſtain, and immediately rendred himſelf ſo worthy that Monarch's eſteem, that he reſtored him to his Eſtate. He afterwards appeared with ſplendor at Court, and was not leſs beloved by Charles than he had been by King James. Charles I made him Gentleman of his Bed-Chamber, Commiſſioner of the Navy, and Governor of the Trinity-Houſe. He granted him Letters of Repriſal againſt the Venetians, by vertue whereof he took ſeveral prizes from them, and with a ſmall Fleet which he commanded fought that of the Venetians near the Port of Scanderoon, and made his way through it with his booty. As he had been all his life a lover of learning, he acquired an extraordinary ſkill in Languages, and the Sciences, and became a good Philoſopher. He tranſlated ſeveral Authors into his mother-tongue, and in his Treatiſe of the Nature of Bodies, and the Immortality of the Soul, he has diſcovered great penetration, and an extenſive knowledge. His cloſe application to the Mathematics did not hinder him from ſearching eagerly into the ſecrets of Chymiſtry, by means whereof he found out ſome excellent Medicines which he freely gave away to people of all ſorts, and eſpecially to the poor. He pronounced a Diſcourſe in public at Montpellier on the Sympathetic Powder, which was printed, and ſold in great numbers. In the year 1651 he publiſhed his Treatiſe of the Immortality of the Soul, on the ſubject of which he had had long conferences with Monſieur Des-Cartes. Theſe two Philoſophers appointed to meet at the College of Boncourt at Paris. The nature and ſtate of the ſoul was the principal ſubject of their converſation: and tho' they could not agree as to ſeveral points, they parted full of eſteem for each other. Theſe were the leaſt conſiderable qualities of Sir Kenelm Digby: his attachment to the Royal Family, which had been driven from the Throne of England, his two Embaſſies to Innocent X from the Queen, widow of the unfortunate Charles I, whoſe Chancellor he was, the firmneſs with which he owned before the Parliament that he was a Catholic, and the conſtancy with which he bore the confiſcation of his Eſtate and the baniſhment which he drew on himſelf by that confeſſion, render him yet more illuſtrious. He retired into France, and there gained the affection of all perſons of wit and honour. On the reſtoration of Charles II Sir Kenelm Digby returned to London, where he abode till having

having been long troubled with the ſtone, and perceiving his kidneys ulcerated, he had a mind to go over to France. He cauſed himſelf to be carried towards the ſea in a litter; but his illneſs increaſed upon him to that degree that they were obliged to bring him back to London, where he died on the 11th of March (his birth-day) 1665, being near ſixty years old. He married the only daughter of Sir Edward Stanley, ſon of the Earl of Derby, by a daughter of the Duke of Norfolk, and had three ſons by her, the eldeſt of whom was killed near Brentford, in an engagement with the Rebels, and left no iſſue. The youngeſt died in his infancy; and the other ſon left only two daughters (*a*).

(*a*) Bullart, *Academ. des Sciences*, tom. 2. pag. 137, &c. N.B. *This Article not being of the number of thoſe which I have given a Liſt of, in the 134th, and following pages of the 8th Volume of the* Journal Literaire de la Haye, *in order to prevent all cavil on account thereof, I here add the following Letter written to the Bookſeller the 17th of March 1719:* Sir, Having accidentally found this Article of Mr. Bayle's Dictionary in my Copy, I ſend it you. I am ſorry it is come ſo late; but you may add it at the end of the firſt Volume, and this will the better ſhew that nothing has been inſerted but what was Mr. Bayle's own. I am, Sir, Your &c. BASNAGE.

☞DIGBY (Sir KENELM). We ſhall endeavour to ſupply the defects of the preceding Article of him. He was ſon and heir of Sir Everard Digby [*A*] of Dryſtoke in Rutlandſhire Knight, by Mary, daughter and ſole heir of William Mulſho of Gothurſt in Buckinghamſhire. He was born at Gothurſt on the 11th of July 1603 [*B*]. About the year 1618 he was ſent to Glouceſter Hall in the Univerſity of Oxford, after he had been educated in the Proteſtant Religion, and was committed to the care of Mr. Thomas Allen, though placed under another Tutor (*a*). He continued here in the quality of a Gentleman Commoner for more than two years, and afterwards travelled in foreign countries for ſome time. October the 28th 1623 he received the honour of Knighthood from King James I at Hinchingbrook, who had before reſtored to him the eſtate forfeited by his father. In 1628 he was Admiral of a Fleet going into the Levant, and gained great honour by his brave conduct at Algiers in reſcuing many Engliſh ſlaves, and by attacking the Venetian Fleet in the Bay of Scanderoon [*C*]. In the years 1638 and 1639 he had a correſpondence by Letters with the Lord George Digby, afterwards Earl of Briſtol, relating to the authority of the Fathers and other diſputes between the Popiſh and Proteſtant Religions; the former of which Sir Kenelm had about two years before embraced [*D*]. Theſe Letters were afterwards publiſhed [*E*]. In 1639 he with Mr. Walter Mountague was employed by the Queen to engage the Papiſts to a liberal contribution to the King, which they

(*a*) Wood, *Hiſt. & Antiquit. Univerſit. Oxon.* lib. 2. pag. 383. and *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 351. 2d edit. London 1721.

[*A*] *Son and heir of Sir Everard Digby.*] Sir Everard was eſteemed the handſomeſt man of his time (1); but being unhappily engaged in the Gun-powder-plot, upon his trial he confeſſed the indictment, and was hang'd, drawn and quarter'd at the Weſt-end of St. Paul's in London, on Jan. 30, 160$\frac{4}{5}$ (2), aged twenty four (3). At his execution, when the Executioner plucked out his heart, and according to cuſtom held it up ſaying, *Here is the heart of a Traitor*, Sir Everard made anſwer, *Thou lieſt*. This is related by Francis Lord Bacon (4), tho' without mentioning Sir Everard's name. That Gentleman was ſon of Everard Digby of Dryſtoke in Rutlandſhire Eſq; who was Maſter of Arts and Fellow of St. John's College in Cambridge in 1579, and publiſhed ſeveral books, particularly *Theoria Analytica viam ad Monarchiam ſcientiarum demonſtrans*. London 1579 in 4to. *De duplici Methodo Libri duo, Rami Methodum refutantes*, London 1580 in 8vo. *De Arte Natandi Libri duo*, London 1587, (5), and *A Diſſuaſive from taking away the Goods and Livings of the Church, &c.* London in 4to (6). He died at Dryſtoke about the year 1592 (7).

(1) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 354. 2d edit. London 1721.

(2) *A true and perfect Relation of the whole Proceedings againſt the late Traitors &c.* edit. London 1606, in 4to.

(3) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(4) In his *Hiſtoria Vitæ & Mortis*, apud *Wood*, col. 354.

(5) Hyde, *Catalog. impreſſor. Libror. Bibliotheca Bodleianæ*, pag. 220.

(6) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(7) Idem, ibid.

[*B*] *Born at Gothurſt on the 11th of July* 1603.] This we are informed of in the *Book of Nativities* collected by Dr. Richard Napier of Buckinghamſhire, a MS. in the Aſhmolean Muſeum at Oxford; and in an Almanack for 1673 publiſhed by John Gadbury; and in Mr. Wood's *Hiſtoria & Antiquitates Univerſitatis Oxonienſis* (8), & *Athen. Oxonienſ.* (9), But Ben Johnſon will have it to be *June* in theſe verſes (10);

"Witneſs thy action done at Scanderoon
"Upon thy birth-day the eleventh of *June*."

(8) Lib. 2. pag. 383.

(9) Vol. 2. col. 351.

(10) In his *Underwoods*, pag. 243.

[*C*] *Attacking the Venetian Fleet in the Bay of Scanderoon.*] Ben Johnſon in the lines above quoted tells us, that this battle was fought on the eleventh of June; but a Pamphlet publiſhed the ſame year giving an account of that fight, and written very probably by Sir Kenelm himſelf, fixes it on the 16th of that month.

[*D*] *Sir Kenelm had about two years before embraced the Popiſh Religion.*] In ſome of Archbiſhop Laud's Letters at the end of Mr. Henry Wharton's *Hiſtory of the Trial and Troubles of the moſt Reverend Father in God Dr.* William Laud *Archbiſhop of Canterbury* (11), there is a Letter of that Prelate to Sir Kenelm dated at Lambeth 27th March 1636, wherein it appears, that he had then newly changed his Religion for that of Rome; which being done unknown to the Archbiſhop, the latter was highly diſpleaſed, and endeavoured to regain him to the Proteſtant Religion, but in vain. In 1638 there was printed at Paris *a Conference with a Lady about the choice of Religion*, written by our Author, and reprinted at London 1654 in 8vo. It was anſwered by Dr. William Twiſſe, Prolocutor of the *Aſſembly of Divines* at Weſtminſter in 1642; but that Anſwer was never publiſhed (12).

(11) Pag. 610. edit. London 1695, in fol.

(12) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 81 and 352.

[*E*] *Theſe two Letters were afterwards publiſhed.*] They were printed at London 1651 in 12mo, under the following title: *Letters between the Lord George Digby, and Sir Kenelm Digby Knight, concerning Religion.* In the firſt Letter written by the Lord Digby, and dated at Sherburn November the 2d 1638, he tells Sir Kenelm (13), that he "thought himſelf as "happy to bear the name of his friend, and pro-"miſed to himſelf as much eternity by the relation, "as he (14), who engraved Sir Philip Sidney's friend-"ſhip on his monument." He then obſerves (15), that though Sir Kenelm's example and advice had ever been his prime directory in the way of his ſtudies, *and in the ſeveral judgments of what I read*, ſays he, *yours muſt be ever with me of ſingular authority; yet in the particular concerning the* Fathers, *I muſt confeſs, as I came unto them perhaps with different preparations, ſo I have likewiſe peruſed many of them with reflections upon their uſefulneſs farre differing from thoſe you ſpecifie. I am ſo farre from receiving them as judges, that in many caſes I cannot admit them as witneſſes authentick enough, whereon to paſs a verdict in Religion. I diſcover methinkes too prone a biaſs in moſt of their evidence, either to the eſtabliſhing of their own private opinions, or to the deſtruction of their adverſaries; and this even in the moſt primitive of them; faction, it ſeems, and a kind of ſectary-paſſion having had as ſtrong, though not ſo various a current, even neer to the very ſprings of verity, as afterward in the remoter channels, as you can much better inſtance (if you pleaſe) then I, out of* Euſebius, Epiphanius, *and St.* Auguſtine, *who themſelves alſo, as they ſeem to adhere to the Catholick Church, and as the Roman glories in them, may well be by both ſides allowed an Expurgator.* With regard

(13) Pag. 2.

(14) Fulk Greville, Lord Brooke.

(15) Pag. 2, 3.

they effected; and thereupon ſome ſtiled the forces then raiſed for his Majeſty *The Poſh Army* (c). In the beginning of the civil wars he exerted himſelf very vigorouſly in the King's cauſe; but was afterwards impriſoned by the Parliament's order in Winchester Houſe, and had leave to depart thence in July 1643 at the deſire of the Queen of France, and to travel into that country. He compounded for his eſtate in 1649; and the Parliament then voted, that he ſhould depart the Nation, and not return without leave from the Houſe under pain of death and confiſcation of his eſtate. However he afterwards returned for a time; "and as it is ſaid, *continues Mr. Wood* (d), cringed to Oli- "ver; but in what ſenſe, whether in order for the good of the Roman Catholics, or for "the carrying on of ſome public deſign, I cannot now tell." About the ſame time he being Chancellor to Henrietta the Queen-mother of England, ſhe ſent him as her Envoy from France to the Pope; and at his firſt coming to Rome he was highly eſteemed by all perſons, on account of his admirable parts and learning, as well as majeſtic port and behaviour.

(c) Whitelocke's *Memorials of the Engliſh Affairs*, pag. 32. edit. London 1732.

(d) *Athen. Oxon.* col. 352.

to what Sir Kenelm had ſaid, that he relied more upon the Fathers for what they tell us they were taught, than upon what they teach, the Lord Digby profeſſes (16), that he ſhould do ſo too, could he but be half ſo well aſſured of the firſt part of Sir Kenelm's reaſon, namely, that the former was derived from an infallible authority, as he was of the other, that their own reaſons were liable to error. But as his Lordſhip could yet find no reaſon to make him acknowledge, that there is *any infallible authority but only the Scriptures*, which he conceived is not what Sir Kenelm meant; ſo he found as little that the Fathers (eſpecially thoſe before the firſt Nicene Council) were perſuaded of any ſuch. And granting they had, he could leaſt of all diſcern which of the various doctrines they deliver, were rightly delivered to them from that unerring authority; ſince it is apparent, that they teach many uncertainties and errors, as dogmatically, and with as ſolemn confirmations, as they do the moſt authentic truths. "Hardly ſhall you find Scripture "alledged more frankly by them, or the Church. "Tradition proclaimed more lowdly in any point of "faith, than by Juſtin and Tertullian in the rigid "cenſure of the uſe of images, and in the ſame "Tertullian in affirming Chriſt's deſcent to free the "Patriarchs; and in theſe two and diverſe others, "the groſs aſſertion of the Angels copulation with "the women, and laſtly, then in all the Millenaries "moſt confident authorizing of their Judaic Doctrine. "Theſe are perhaps of the ſlighter inſtances, ſuch as "flow eaſieſt into a Letter from a bad memory; and "yet I pray you reſolve me which of them I ſhall "let paſs, as derived from infallibilitie? Whether "that, which our Church approves, and the *Roman* "condemnes, as the firſt; or that which the Roman "agrees to, and we diſallow, as the ſecond; or the "ſecond laſt, which both ſides reject? I profeſs I "am as yet to diſtinguiſh which of them theſe Fa- "thers meant we ſhould ſwallow as delivered to them, "and which chew and conſider as only delivered by "them. Theſe and many more irreconcileable paſ- "ſages in them have rendered me much alike affected "both to what you ſay they tell us they were taught, "and to what they teach; that is, to have my rea- "ſon, as much as I can, cleared and enlightened by "both, but to ſuffer it to be hood-winked and led "implicitly by neither. I reverence theſe holy Fa- "thers as divine eſtabliſhers of faith in things, where "they all concur, and where not, as happy aiders of "the underſtanding, as it were ſacred bellowes of the "ſoul, whether to make it glow unto contrition and "fervor of zeal, or to ſubtilize and exalt it into flames "of contemplation (17)." Sir Kenelm in his anſwer dated at London December the 26th 1638, begins (18) with complaining to his Lordſhip in behalf of the *Fathers*, and repreſenting their grievances to him, that his Lordſhip was ſo rigorous as to exclude them from being *Witneſſes in matters of Religion. Their humility, as well of underſtanding, as of manners, will not let them be troubled when they are recuſed as judges. They never pronounce any thing out of their own breaſts, unto which they will confine other men's aſſents. But when they tell you plainly what they were taught, and what they finde believed and practiſed generally throughout the whole Church, have they not reaſon to take it unkindly to be rejected? If you will examine their veracity by all thoſe circumſtances, that are uſually conſidered in taking men's depoſitions, you will find them ſtrong on their ſide. They were right honeſt men, not onley believed, but known to be ſuch by all the world. They are acknowledged on all hands to be ſo judicious, as would more blemiſh one's own judgment then theirs, but to call it in queſtion. What they wrote of are matters belonging to their own art and trade, in which ſurely they would have great care and attention not to miſtake, ſince their own and their poſteritye's eternal ſalvation depended on it. Since then there is will and ability to inform us of truth, why ſhould we ſuſpect them? . . . . . Their private opinions (for the eſtabliſhing of which your Lordſhip ſaith, you diſcover too prone a bias in moſt of their evidence) doe not intereſt our beliefs; in ſuch points we are as free as they . . . . The* Faction *and* Sectary-paſſion *that your Lordſhip remarketh even near the ſprings of verity, belongeth only to their adverſaries; their warmth is juſt and due zeale.* With regard to the three Fathers, of whom his Lordſhip had ſaid, the Papiſts as well as Proteſtants allow them an Expurgator, Sir Kenelm profeſſes (19), that he never met in his reading with any doctrine of faith in them, which he did not entirely aſſent to. He afterwards obſerves (20), that to ſum up as ſhortly and plainly as he can, the uſe, which he conceives is to be made of reading the Fathers, and "letting paſs what "they wrote as Commentators upon the Scriptures, "and as Philoſophers, and all which is but as Divines "and Scholars, we are generally to take hold of "what they deliver us as Paſtors of the Church, "which appeareth chiefly by what they writ againſt "thoſe they brand with hereſies, which they could "not doe, were not thoſe poynts which they cenſure, "againſt the known and generall tradition of the "Church: and next when they deliver us dogmati- "cally and profeſſedly any doctrine in ſuch part as "we may reaſonably conceive they intended we "ſhould take it as a matter of faith, not giving it as "conceptions of their own, which they bring onely "learned arguments on texts of Scripture to main- "tain; in all which a free and good judgment will "eaſily diſcern by reading them, which way to in- "cline." With reſpect to the four inſtances urged by his Lordſhip, he declares, that as to the *firſt, the uſe of images*, he does not conceive it to be *a precept given by Chriſt, but ſince introduced by the Governors of the Church as a thing convenient to raiſe devotion in the people* (21). As to the *ſecond*, viz. Tertullian's *affirming Chriſt's deſcent to hell to free the Patriarchs*, that "not only he, but all the Fathers, that ever ſpake of "that particular, deliver it as a matter of faith, and "ſo hath been held by the Church (22)." As to the *third* inſtance; *the aſſertion of the angels copulation with women*, that "it is a queſtion of Philoſophy, and not "of faith; for many, or rather moſt of the Fathers "were of opinion, that they were not pure ſpirits, "but had very ſubtle and immortal bodies (the con- "trary of which was never yet delivered as matter "of faith; howbeit by force of argument now the "corporeity of angels is exploded out of the ſchools;) "and thus ſuppoſing that opinion, the way is ob- "vious enough in commenting ſome texts of Scrip- "ture to fall into that error, which ſo becometh an "error in Philoſophy, and in no wiſe concerning "faith (23)." As to the laſt inſtance, the notion of the *Millennium*, it *appeareth plainly to have grown among ſome of the Fathers (with whom the authority of*

(16) Pag. 3, 4.

(17) Pag. 4, 5.

(18) Pag. 8.

(19) Pag. 10.

(20) Pag. 13.

(21) Pag. 15.

(22) Pag. 15, 16.

(23) Pag. 16.

behaviour. " But at length growing high, ſays the Hiſtorian abovementioned (e), and " huffing his Holineſs, he was in a manner neglected; and eſpecially for this reaſon, " that having made a collection for the afflicted Catholics in England, he was found to " be no faithful ſteward in that matter." Having read the writings of Des Cartes, he went to Holland to ſee him, and found him in his retirement at Egmond; and having diſcourſed with him a long time without making himſelf known, Mr. Des Cartes, who had ſeen ſome of his works, told him, he did not doubt but he was the famous Sir Kenelm Digby; and if you, Sir, *reply'd the Knight*, were not the illuſtrious Mr. Des Cartes, I ſhould not have come over from England on purpoſe to ſee you (f). He wrote ſeveral works, which procured him a great reputation [F]. He died at his houſe in Covent-Garden on the 11th of June 1665, and was interred in a vault built at his

(e) Ibid.

(f) *See* Mr. Des-Maizeaux's *Life of M. de St. Evremond*, prefixed to the firſt volume of the *Works* of that Author, pag. 41. 2d edit. London 1728 in 8vo, and the Article of DES CARTES, in this *Dictionary*, Vol. 4. Note [BB], pag. 147.

" of Papias weighed much) by literally interpreting a " text of the *Apocalyps*; but never any of them urged " the generally received opinion of the Church, nor " publick tradition from Chriſt and his Apoſtles. " And beſides, the Church has never yet to this day " condemned as an hereſie that part of the Millena- " ries Beliefe, which ſome of the Fathers held, " (which is, of the Saints reigning with Chriſt a " thouſand years upon earth after their reſurrection, " and enjoying onely ſpirituall delights,) but only " other foul extremities, which went under the name " of the Millenaries Hereſies. Now by what I have " ſaid to thoſe inſtances in particular, and bringing " that ſpirit that I ſaid before was required to the " reading of the Fathers, I conceive it will be no " hard matter to determine which of them, as your " Lordſhip ſayes, we are to ſwallow as deliver'd to them, " and which to chew and conſider as onely delivered " by them." In the Poſtſcript he obſerves (27), that though his Lordſhip was pleaſed to have called his inſtances *ſlight ones, and ſuch as flow eaſieſt into a Letter from a bad memory, yet* " you muſt give me " leave, *continues he*, to believe them the ſtrongeſt and " ſharpeſt that can be urged upon this ſubject, and " the flower and quinteſſence of what Mr. Chilling- " worth (28), and the beſt Wits have produced againſt " the tradition of the Church and the authority of " the Fathers." The Lord Digby wrote an excellent and elaborate Anſwer to this Letter, dated at Sherburn March 29th, 1639; in which in the firſt place he joins with Sir Kenelm in full admiration of the piety, learning, and integrity of thoſe reverend Fathers of the Church, whoſe lives, whoſe zeals, whoſe deaths abundantly merited that title with everlaſting celebrations of their Memories (29). *Their veracity*, ſays he (30), *I attribute infinitely unto from a due conſideration of all theſe happy circumſtances, wherewith your eloquence authorizes it.* And he obſerves, that in many caſes he holds their teſtimonials moſt ſacred and unqueſtionable; ſuch are the grand fundamentals of Chriſtianity, the doctrine of believing in one God, of the Incarnation, the Paſſion, the Reſurrection, and ſome other the conſtitutive Articles of Chriſtian Faith. But that on the other ſide there are many caſes, in which he can in no wiſe venture to give ſentence upon their evidence. " Such, *ſays he* (31), are moſt, if " not all the now converted poynts between the Ro- " miſh Church, and ours; and as in my former Letter, " levelling at theſe, I could not admit the Fathers " for witneſſes authentical enough whereon to paſs " a verdict in many caſes of Religion; ſo likewiſe " I muſt again profeſs in this, that I am as far as ever " from allowing them in theſe ſuch a determining " and convincing authority. Witneſſes of ſuch an " overruling teſtimony, though they bear the name of " Witneſſes, are judges in effect, and they do give " the law, tho' another pronounce it. Now to be " judges, I could cite you many paſſages, wherein " they themſelves do utterly renounce the pretenſion; " and you ſay yourſelf, that their moderation will not " let them be troubled when they are recuſed for ſuch. " Neither will I wrong that vertue of theirs ſo much, " as to embrace their teſtimonies with any cloſer ad- " herence than itſelf deſires. For be they what they " will in point of interpreting to us the doctrines of " the Church and Scripture, I am ſure they are the " beſt declarers and limiters of their own, both for " their proper ſenſe, and the degrees of our receiving " them." He then remarks (32), that the reaſons prevalent with him of the *Uncertainty*, or rather in his opinion *Impoſſibility* of drawing out of the Fathers any ſuch proofs either way in our controverſies, whereon an inquiring and judicious perſon ſhould be obliged to rely and acquieſce, *are ſo amply and learnedly*, ſays he, *ſet down by Mr.* Daillé *in* Emploi des Peres (33), *I think little of material or weighty can be ſaid on this ſubject, that his rare and piercing obſervation hath not anticipated. But becauſe you will expect from me ſomewhat more than a bare reference, take in ſhort the chief inducements I will ſet down as briefly and perſpicuouſly as I can. Not to inſiſt upon the more frequent ones, namely, the few writings extant of the primitive Doctors of the firſt, ſecond, and third ages of Chriſt; the many ſuppoſititious children, that bear the name of Fathers, they do not ſo much as* ore *refer; the alterations, raſures, and inſertions, which through ignorance, fraud, or maliciouſneſs, have defaced, maimed, and corrupted even thoſe few monuments that remain of venerable antiquity; I ſay . . . . thoſe, which ſeem of the greateſt force with me to invalidate that authority in our queſtions, are theſe four: I. Their contradictions to one another. II. Their variance from themſelves. III. Their repugnances both to Papiſts and Proteſtants. IV. Laſtly, Their want of ability in many points of their controverſies; in moſt of will to decide them.* He afterwards (34) conſiders Sir Kenelm's three grounds, whereon he builds the pretended certainty of this method in reſolving differences out of the Fathers declarations; 1. That they were faithful collectors of the general Traditions of the Church in their times: 2. That they are ſincere conveyers of them to us: 3. That the Traditions collected and conveyed by them are infallible. He then confutes Sir Kenelm's argument to ſhew, that all doctrines of faith whatſoever admitted in the preſent Church were ſo taught by Chriſt to the Church, which he planted himſelf; viz. That *the reaſon why the preſent Church believes any propoſition to be of faith, is, becauſe the immediate preceding Church of the Age before, delivered it unto her for ſuch; and ſo we may carry it from Age to Age untill we come to the Apoſtles and Chriſt.* " An eaſie progreſs, *ſays his Lord-* " *ſhip* (35), and which, if you remember, Mr. White " (36) much inſiſted upon at that time, when Mr. Chil- " lingworth did me the favour to give him a meeting " for conference at your lodging. Although I ſet a " great value upon that Gentleman's learning and " faire way of diſputation; yet I confeſſe his argu- " ment hath often made me ſmile, it did ſo bring in- " to my head that gallant conſequence of Charles " Thynne's, wherewithall you once made me very " merry, by which he undertook to demonſtrate, that " ſurely in the world there might be a man ſo diſpoſed, " as (having a good riſe, and with a convenient career) " to leap at once from England to Rome; for, ſaid " he, bring me the beſt Jumper you know; and is " it not likely, that there may be another, that you " know not, ſo active as to out-jump him a foot? Let " him be brought; I hope, you will not deny but " he may out-jump an inch; and ſo by inches and " ſtraw-breadths of out-leaping one another, why not " to a thouſand miles? I dare ſay, that Mr. Hooper " was better ſatisfied of the corruption of times in " his pedegree from King Peppin, then I was by " that Logick of the Incorruption of times in his " deduction of all Romiſh Doctrines from Chriſt; nor " am I yet better ſatisfied."

(27) Pag. 21.

(28) Mr. Chillingworth's *Religion of Proteſtants a ſafe way to ſalvation &c.* was publiſhed in the latter end of the year 1637.

(29) Pag. 24.

(30) Pag. 25.

(31) Pag. 26.

(32) Pag. 27, 28.

(33) This Book was publiſhed in 1631. The Title is *Traicté de l'Employ des Sainctes Peres &c.*

(34) Pag. 69.

(35) Pag. 85.

(36) Mr. Tho. White, Author of a Book intitled, *The Dialogues of William Richworth; or the Judgment of Common Senſe in the Choiſe of Religion*, Paris 1640 in 12mo, and reprinted in 1654, in 12mo.

[F] *He wrote ſeveral works.*] Beſides thoſe already mentioned, he wrote, I. *Obſervations upon* Religio Medici, *occaſionally written by Sir* Kenelm Digby, *Knight.* London 1643, 1644 in 12mo. Theſe *Obſervations* were written in one night, and addreſſed to Edward Earl of Dorſet, and dated from Wincheſter-

his own charge in the choir of Chriſt-Church within Newgate London, near the body of his wife Venetia, daughter and coheir of Sir Edward Stanley of Tongue-Caſtle in Shropſhire, to whoſe memory he had ſome years before his death, erected over the ſaid vault a noble monument of black marble, with a buſt of his Lady made of copper gilt. But this monument was deſtroyed in the Fire of London in 1666. His excellent Library, which he had conveyed to France during the time of the confuſion, fell, after his death, for want of his being naturalized, to the King of France, of whom it being begged by a certain Gentleman, was ſold for ten thouſand crowns (*g*). Mr. Edward Leigh (*b*) ſtiles him an *ingenious learned Gentleman*, and an *ornament of this Nation*. And Mr. Wood tells us (*i*), that he was maſter of a *good*, *graceful*, *and judicious ſtyle*; that his perſon was handſome and large, and that nothing was wanting to make him a compleat Gentleman; that he had a graceful elocution and noble addreſs; and "that had he been "dropt out of the clouds in any part of the world, he would have made himſelf re- "ſpected." He had a great faculty, (which proceeded from his copious wit and invention) of propoſing and reporting matters to the *Virtuoſi*, eſpecially to the Philoſophical Aſſembly at Montpellier, and the Royal Society at home (*k*). But Mr. Henry Stubbe (*l*) ſtiles him the *Pliny of our age for lying*; which ſevere character of him was chiefly grounded on an account, which Sir Kenelm gave of a city in Barbary under the King of Tripoli, which was ſaid to be turned into ſtone in a very few hours by a petrifying vapour; that is, men, beaſts, trees, houſes, utenſils, &c. every thing remaining in the ſame poſture, as children at their mothers breaſts, &c. This account Sir Kenelm had from Mr. Fitton, an Engliſhman reſiding in Florence, as Library-Keeper to the Grand Duke of Tuſcany, in a Letter dated July the 2d 1656, and Mr. Fitton from the Grand Duke, who a little before had written to the Baſſa of Tripoli to know the truth. The account was inſerted in the *Mercurius Politicus* of that time as ſent by Sir Kenelm, then at Thouloufe in France, in a Letter to a friend of his in England in September following. There is a beautiful Portrait of him by Vandyke in the Royal Palace at Kenſington. He had a ſon *John*, who died not long before Mr. Wood publiſhed his *Hiſtoria & Antiquitates Univerſitatis Oxonienſis* (*m*); and a younger brother called Sir John Digby, who was a Colonel in

(*g*) Idem, ibid. pag. 353, 354.

(*b*) *Fœlix Conſortium*: or a fit Conjunction of Religion and Learning, lib. 3. cap. 15. pag. 180. edit. London 1663 in fol.

(*i*) Col. 351.

(*k*) Idem, ibid.

(*l*) *Animadverſions upon the* Plus ultra *of Mr. Glanvill*, pag. 161.

(*m*) See lib. 2. pag. 383.

(36) Our Author was confined there by order of the Parliament, as we have obſerved in the Text of this Article.

(37) In the Article of BROWN (Sir Thomas) Note [*A*] vol. 3. pag. 610, 611.

(38) It is in 12mo. But the place and date of the impreſſion do not appear.

Houſe (36) the 22d of December 1642. We have given ſome paſſages of this piece in another place (37). II. *A Treatiſe, of the Nature of Bodies*. Paris 1644 in fol. London 1658, 1665, and 1669, in 4to. It was attacked by Alexander Roſſe in a Book intitled, *The Philoſophical Touch-ſtone: or, Obſervations on Sir* Ken. Digby's Diſcourſes of the Nature of Bodies and of the reaſonable Soul, &c. *in which his erroneous Paradoxes are refuted* &c. London 1645 in 4to. III. *Treatiſe of the Nature of Man's Soul*. Paris 1644 in fol. London 1645, 1658, 1669 in 4to. This Book, which was likewiſe anſwered by Mr. Roſſe, with the *Treatiſe of the Nature of Bodies*, was tranſlated into Latin by J. L. and had a Preface put to them by Thomas White, who wrote himſelf *Thomas Anglus ex Albiis Eaſt-Saxonum*: and the Tranſlation was printed at Paris 1651 in fol. IV. *Obſervations on the XXIId Stanza in the IXth Canto of the IId Book of* Spencer's Fairy Queen. London 1644 in 8vo. V. *Inſtitutionum Peripateticarum Libri quinque, cum Appendice Theologicâ de Origine Mundi*. Paris 1651 fol. ſubjoined to the Tranſlations of his two *Treatiſes of the Nature of Bodies* and *of the Soul* by J. L. It was tranſlated into Engliſh by Thomas White abovementioned. London 1656 in 8vo. This Mr. White had printed at Lyons in 1646 a Syſtem of the Peripatetic Philoſophy according to the Hypotheſis of our Author under the following title; *Inſtitutiones Peripateticæ ad mentem ſummi clariſſimique Philoſophi Kenelmi Equitis Digbæi*. In the Preface he tells us, that he uſed the words *ad mentem Digbæi*, becauſe Sir Kenelm in his *Treatiſe of the Soul* had examined into the whole compoſition of nature from the firſt principles of body to the inviſible properties, and explained them in ſo juſt a manner, that he was neither able nor willing to proceed in any other method; and therefore had made uſe of Sir Kenelm's Book. He publiſhed alſo a piece intitled, *Quæſtio Theologica, quomodo ſecundum Principia Peripatetices* Digbæanæ, *ſive ſecundum Rationem, & abſtrahendo, quantum materia patitur, ab authoritate* humani Arbitrii *libertas ſit explicanda, & cum* Gratia efficaci *conciliandâ* (38). i. e. "A Theological "Queſtion, in what manner, according to Sir *Kenelm* "*Digby*'s Principles of the Peripatetic Philoſophy, or "according to Reaſon, and abſtracting, as much as "the ſubject will permit, from authority, the *free-* "*dom of man's will* may be explained and reconcil- "ed with efficacious Grace." He printed likewiſe in 1652 *Inſtitutiones Theologicæ ſuper Fundamentis in Peripateticâ* Digbæana *jactis extructæ*: i. e. "Inſti- "tutions of Divinity built upon the Foundations laid "down in Sir Kenelm Digby's Hypotheſis of the Pe- "ripatetic Philoſophy." VI. *Of the Cure of Wounds by the Powder of Sympathy*. London 1658 in 8vo. This Diſcourſe was read in French to a Society of Virtuoſi at Monpelier in France in 1657, and tranſlated into Engliſh by Richard White. London 1660. It was reprinted at London with the *Treatiſe of Bodies* in 1669, and tranſlated into Latin by Laurence Stranſius of Darmſtad in Heſſia. It is alſo printed in a Book intitled, *Theatrum Sympatheticum*, publiſhed by John Andreas Endter at Nuremberg 1662 in 4to. It was likewiſe printed in High-Dutch. VII. *Diſcourſe concerning the Vegetation of Plants*. London 1661 in 8vo, and 1669 in 4to. It was read to the Royal Society at Greſham-College on the 23d of January 1660. It was printed in Latin at Amſterdam 1663, and 1669 in 12mo under this title, *Diſſertatio de Plantarum Vegetatione*. VIII. *Choice and experimental Receipts in Phyſic and Chirurgery:* and *Cordial and diſtilled Waters and Spirits, Perfumes, and other Curioſities*. Theſe two pieces were tranſlated out of ſeveral Languages by George Hartman, ſometime Steward to Sir Kenelm Digby the collector of them, and printed at London 1668 in 8vo. The firſt was printed afterwards at Francfort 1677 in 8vo under this title: *Medicina experimentalis &c.* IX. *Sir* Kenelm Digby's *Cloſet opened, whereby is diſcovered ſeveral ways of making metheglin, ſider, cherry-wine, &c.* London 1669, 1677 in 8vo. X. *Excellent Directions for Cookery, &c.* London 1669, 1677 in 8vo. XI. *Choice Collection of rare chymical Secrets and Experiments in Philoſophy. As alſo rare and unheard-of medicines, menſtruums, and alkaheſts, with the true Secret of volatilizing the fixt Salt of Tartar, &c.* London 1682 in 8vo &c. Publiſhed by G. Hartman abovementioned. Mr. Wood tells us (39), that ſome aſcribe to him, tho' very improbably, the *Letter to Dr.* Sam. Turner *concerning the Church and the Revenues thereof*. London 1647 in 8vo, which was reprinted at London 1683 in 4to with this title: *A Diſcourſe of Epiſcopacy and Sacriledge, by way of Letter, written in* 1646; which Letter was written, according to Mr. Wood (40), by John Fountain lately a Royaliſt, but then of the other party; and was anſwered by Dr. Richard Stewart in a piece printed in 1647 in five ſheets and an half in 4to, with this title, *An Anſwer to a Letter written at Oxford, and ſuperſcribed to Dr.* Sam. Turner *concerning the Church and Revenues thereof*. Sir Kenelm tranſlated into Engliſh, *A Treatiſe of adhering to God*. London 1654 in 8vo, written in Latin by *Albertus Magnus*, Biſhop of Ratiſbon.

(39) *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 353.

(40) Ibid. col. 147.

T

in King Charles I's Army, and afterwards a Major General in the Weſt of England. He was wounded at Taunton, and died at Bridgwater (*n*).

(*n*) Idem, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 354.

DINANT, a City in the Netherlands, ſeated on the Meuſe, between Charlemont and Namur. Its ſituation in the neighbourhood of ſeveral mines of iron and copper, and ſeveral quarries of black marble, and other ſorts of ſtone, occaſioned the inhabitants to eſtabliſh a Trade which conſiderably enriched them (*a*); but the miſeries of war reduced them at divers times to a deplorable condition. They felt this grievous calamity the moſt ſeverely in the year 1466, as I have ſaid elſewhere (*b*). An Italian Author has committed a fault which may miſlead a ſpeculative Reader [*A*]. This city was very ill treated by the French in the year 1554. The Count de Souches, General of the Imperial forces, made himſelf maſter of it in the year 1674. The French took it the year following. It was agreed by the Treaty of Nimeguen, that if they reſtored it, Spain ſhould yield them up Charlemont; and that if Spain choſe rather to keep Charlemont, ſhe ſhould prevail on the Biſhop of Liege to yield them Dinant (*c*). This Ceſſion not being obtained, France got Charlemont delivered up to her, and continued in poſſeſſion of Dinant till the peace of Reſwick, by vertue of which that City was reſtored to its firſt maſter, the Biſhop of Liege.

(*a*) Lewis Guicciardin, *Deſcript. Belgij*, pag. m. 507.

(*b*) In the Article BURGUNDY (Charles Duke of) Remark [*C*].

(*c*) See the 13th Article of the Peace concluded at Nimeguen between France and Spain, the 17th of Sept. 1678.

[*A*] *An Italian Author has committed a fault which may miſlead a ſpeculative Reader.*] A Monk named Remigio Fiorentino has written a political Diſcourſe on the miſchiefs which may happen from the inſolence of people who offer indignities to a Prince's effigies. He mentions, among other inſtances, what Charles Duke of Burgundy did to the inhabitants of Dinant. *Carlo Duca di Borgogna ultimo non uſo tanta e ſi memorabil crudeltà contra di Nantes, ſe non perche i Nanteſi havevon fatto la ſtatua ſua e d'alcuni altri Gentilhuomini ſuoi amici, e l'havevono appiccate per la gola alle forche* (1). i. e. "Charles, the laſt Duke of Burgundy, "practiſed ſuch great and remarkable cruelty againſt "Nantes for no other reaſon than becauſe the inhabitants had dreſt up the effigies of himſelf and of "ſome other Gentlemen his friends, and hanged "them by the neck on the gallows." It is plain that he names Nantes for the city which did this, and was chaſtiſed for it. His miſtake proceeded from his having taken the firſt ſyllable of Dinant for an Article. Now as there is a city called Nantes, it is evident that this error is likely enough to miſlead: for if the ſtate of learning ſhould a thouſand years hence be in the ſame condition it was in the XVth Century, there would be Critics who would inſiſt that it was at Nantes in Britany, and not at Dinant on the Meuſe, where the Burgundian ſhewed himſelf ſo revengeful; and they would boaſt of a diſcovery, which nobody had ſpoken of before, I mean of an expedition of the laſt Duke of Burgundy againſt the Bretons. They would ſearch for the time, the occaſion, and the circumſtances of this war, and they would find a great many things to ſupport their conjectures. In a word, this would furniſh out a fine long chapter of their *Adverſaria, variæ Lectiones & Emendationes, ſive Racemationes.* They who have read Works of this ſort will grant me that I argue from what is paſt to what may be hereafter. But not to pry into future Ages, let us content ourſelves with the preſent. I am ſure ſeveral perſons have already been deceived by Remigio Fiorentino, or by thoſe who deceived him. I make no doubt but more compilations than one will put Nantes among the cities which have been laid deſolate for having inſulted the ſtatues of a ſovereign Prince.

(1) Remigio Fiorentino, *Conſideratione Civili ſopra l'Hiſtoire di Guicciardini e d'altri Hiſtorici*, cap. 43. fol. m. 59.

(2) He has put in the Margin, *Carlo Duca di Borgogna gaſtica con ſeverità la città di Nantes.* i. e. "Charles "Duke of Burgundy ſeverely "chaſtiſes the "city of Nantes." *The ſame is to be found in the Table of Contents.*

DINOTH (RICHARD) was of Coutances in Normandy, and lived in the ſixteenth Century. He publiſhed, among other Latin Books, the Hiſtory of the Civil Wars raiſed on account of Religion in France and the Netherlands [*A*]. There is no queſtion but he was of the Proteſtant Communion, and I believe he ſettled at Montbelliard no otherwiſe than as a Refugee. He had before that time made ſome ſtay at Straſburgh (*a*). He does not write with much paſſion.

(*a*) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his *Hiſtory of the Civil Wars in the Netherlands.*

[*A*] *He publiſhed, among other Latin Books, the Hiſtory of the Civil Wars . . . . in France and the Netherlands.*] The Epitome of Geſner's *Bibliotheca* (1) informs me that they printed at Baſil, in 4to, in the year 1582, *Richardi Dinothi de Bello Civili Gallico Religionis cauſa ſuſcepto libri VI.* The Oxford Catalogue mentions three other Books of Richard Dinoth, which are *de Bello Civili Belgico libri VI*, in 4to, at Baſil 1580; *Adverſaria Hiſtorica*, in 4to, at Baſil, 1581; *de Rebus & Factis memorabilibus Loci communes Hiſtorici, & Sententiæ Hiſtoricorum*, in 8vo, at Baſil, 1580. I do not know whether this date of the Hiſtory of the Civil Wars of the Low Countries is right; for the Edition I make uſe of is of the year 1586, and I have obſerved nothing in it to induce one to believe it is the ſecond. The Author dedicates it to the Senate and Univerſity of Straſburgh, and dates the Epiſtle Dedicatory from Montbelliard the 18th of Auguſt 1586.

(1) *Epitome Geſneri*, pag. m. 724.

DIOGENES the Cynic was one of thoſe extraordinary men who run every thing to extremity, without excepting reaſon itſelf, and who verify the maxim, *That there is no great genius without ſome little mixture of madneſs.* He was born at Sinope, a City of Pontus, and was expelled thence for the crime of coining falſe money (*a*). His father (*b*), who was a Banker, was baniſhed for the ſame crime. Diogenes retired to Athens, and by his great perſeverance prevailed on the Philoſopher Antiſthenes to become his maſter (*c*) [*A*]. He

(*a*) Diog. Laertius, lib. 6. *in ejus* Vita, *init.*

(*b*) His name was Iceſius. Some ſay he died in priſon, and that his ſon made his eſcape, without waiting till the Judges gave ſentence. Diog. Laert. *ibid.*

(*c*) Idem, ibid. num. 21. Ælianus, *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 10. cap. 16.

[*A*] *By his great perſeverance he prevailed on the Philoſopher Antiſthenes to become his maſter.*] A very able man, in ſpeaking of this, has committed a groſs miſtake in Chronology. His words are theſe (1): "It is related of the ſame Diogenes, that when the "Philoſopher Antiſthenes, Author of the Sect of the "Cynics, his maſter, became Socrates's Diſciple, "and on that account diſmiſſed all his Scholars, Diogenes would not leave him, at which Antiſthenes "being angry, took up a cudgel to chaſtiſe him: but "this did not fright Diogenes, who bowed his head "to receive the blow, and ſaid; *There is no cudgel "ſo hard but I can indure it, to learn ſomething good "of you.*" Socrates died the firſt year of the 95th Olympiad, and the death of Diogenes muſt be placed in the ſame year with that of Alexander the Great, or within a few years after (2). Now that Prince died the laſt year of the 113th Olympiad, according to Euſebius, or the firſt year of the 114th, according to Petavius. We may ſuppoſe, therefore, that Diogenes

(1) Mr. Joly, *Avis Chretiens & Moraux pour l'Inſtitution des Enfans*, pag. 4, 5. He cites no body, but he might have cited Ælian, *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 10. cap. 16. as to Diogenes's anſwer after the blow of the cudgel.

(2) See the Remark [*H*].

He not only chearfully ſubmitted to the kind of life which was peculiar to the followers of that Founder of the Cynics, but he alſo added thereto new degrees of auſterity; ſo that there never was a Philoſopher who contemned the conveniencies of life ſo much as he. We ſhould be deceived if we imagined that with his ſtaff and his wallet, and the tub which ſerved him for a dwelling [*B*], he was more humble than thoſe who live deliciouſly [*C*]: he looked down on all the world with ſcorn; he magiſterially cenſured all mankind, and thought himſelf, no doubt, much ſuperior to all other Philoſophers. One cannot help finding ſomething great in his behaviour, when conſidered in a certain light; and ſince Alexander, who was ſo good a judge of the matter, found a grandeur in

died the 3d year of the 114th Olympiad: and ſince he died at about ninety years of age, he was born the firſt year of the 92d Olympiad: he was therefore but about 12 years old when Socrates died; and conſequently was not excluded the School of Antiſthenes for the reaſon alledged by Mr. Joly. A few years may be got, if we were to ſtick rigorouſly to the account of thoſe who ſay Alexander and Diogenes died the ſame day: but this will not mend the matter; for we muſt remember that the proceedings againſt Socrates laſted ſome time; and it is inconteſtable that during thoſe proceedings Antiſthenes did not ſhut up his ſchool to go to that of Socrates. Beſides, Diogenes did not come to Athens till after he had coined falſe money in his own country, and even borne an office in the Mint (3), and after he had been at Delphi to conſult the Oracle (4). If ſo, can it be ſaid, with any ſhew of probability, that he was but fifteen or ſixteen years old when he began to ſollicit a place among the Scholars of Antiſthenes at Athens?

(3) Diog. Laert. lib. 6. num. 20.

(4) Ibid. num. 21.

[*B*] *A tub ſerved him for a dwelling.*] He had ordered ſomebody to provide him a cell, but as that order was not ſpeedily executed, he grew impatient, and lodged himſelf in a tub which was in the Temple of the Mother of the Gods. This is what he himſelf related in one of his Letters (5). I wiſh the Commentators on Diogenes Laertius had inquired how he obtained permiſſion to appropriate to himſelf a thing which belonged to a Temple. He had not always the ſame Tub: an inſolent young fellow broke the firſt in pieces, and was for that act of inſolence condemned to be whipped. The Athenians, who inflicted that puniſhment on him, gave Diogenes another Tub (6). This Tub, no doubt, was different from that which he had at Corinth, where he dwelt when Philip King of Macedon deſigned to attack that place. All the inhabitants laboured with extreme diligence in fortifying the city: and Diogenes, unwilling to be the only idle perſon, buſied himſelf in rolling his Tub about (7). Monſr. Menage infers from hence that this Tub was not of clay; tho' he acknowledges, at the ſame time, there are ways to roll a Tub of clay without breaking it, as on ſoft or even ground, for inſtance. *Teſtaceum non fuiſſe Diogenis dolium, ſed ligneum, illud convicerit, quòd illæſum, ne otioſus eſſet, ſæpe verſaret; de quo eſt apud Lucianum in libello Quomodo conſcribenda ſit hiſtoria. Quamquam teſtaceum dolium verſari & circumagi potuit; in ſimeto, vel ſolo ſubacto, vel reſtibilibus agris, vel in æquato etiam pavimento; cùm præſertim ampla illa & capacia dolia pro amplitudinis modo ſolida fuiſſe & ſpiſſa credibile ſit* (8). He does not make this Remark to no purpoſe: he had an eye to the Verſes of a Latin Poet (9), who aſſures us Diogenes's Tub was of clay:

(5) Ibid. num. 23.

(6) Ibid. num. 43.

(7) Lucianus, *de conſcrib. Hiſtoriâ*, tom. 1. pag. m. 659.

(8) Menag. *Not. ad Diogen. Laert.* lib. 6. num. 23. pag. 234.

Dolia nudi
Non ardent Cynici: ſi fregeris, altera fiet
Cras domus, aut eadem plumbo commiſſa manebit.
Senſit Alexander, TESTA *cum vidit in illa*
Magnum habitatorem, quanto felicior (10) *hic, qui*
Nil cuperet, quam qui totum ſibi poſceret orbem.

(9) Juven. Sat. 14. ver. 308.

(10) *Moreri reads* feliciter, *and ſays* it is thought Juvenal intended to praiſe Diogenes in theſe verſes. *The thing is clearly paſt doubt; ſo that his* it is thought *is worth nothing.*

" The naked Cynic's jar ne'er flames; if broken
" 'Tis quickly ſodder'd, *or* a new beſpoken.
" When Alexander firſt beheld the face
" Of the great Cynic, in that narrow ſpace;
" His own condition thus did he lament:
" How much more happy thou, that art content
" To live within this little hole, than I,
" Who after empire, that vain quarry, fly!"
Dryden.

I ſhould not think it ſtrange that any one ſhould condemn Diogenes's exceſſive affectation of poverty, in chooſing no other habitation than a tub; but to infer thence that he was a drunkard, is moſt ridiculous. We ſhall immediately ſee a long train of impertinences, which will not be near ſo tedious a paſſage as the remaining part of this Article. " As to Dio-
" genes the Cynic, his name is his Elogy; for it is
" as much as to ſay, Diogenes with the inclinations
" of a Dog. This ſpark ſet up for a Philoſopher,
" and his principal actions are theſe. 1. He lived
" night and day in a caſk: thus Æneas's companions when they had eaten their meat fell on board
" their trenchers, *menſas conſumimus, inquit Iulus;*
" *(lib. VII. Æn. vſ.* 116.), and he, after he had
" drank out the Wine, make uſe of the Caſk, that
" is, he loved it ſo well that he would needs live in it.
" Thus the good old dame in Ariſtophanes ordered
" her body to be buried in the cellar under the Caſk,
" to moiſten her bones: thus tipplers in a tavern,
" when they have emptied the bottle, make uſe of
" the neck as a candleſtick, to game by after ſupper:
" thus Buchanan in his laſt illneſs cauſed a hogſhead
" of Bourdeaux Wine to be ſet at his bed's head, that
" as he expired he might enjoy the ſmell of that de-
" licious liquor (11): thus Bettheau the fiſherman,
" ſays Ronſard, would needs be buried in his boat.
" Thus Diogenes lived night and day in his Caſk,
" very ſorry, you may think, that it was empty:
" and thus our pretenders to Wit live night and day
" in a tavern (12)." Never did any man deſerve leſs to be charged with being a good fellow than Diogenes. He thought it very ſtrange that thoſe who are thirſty do not drink at the firſt ſpring they meet with, inſtead of hunting after choice wines: he thought them more unreaſonable than brutes; and for his own part he deſired no other liquor to quench his thirſt than what nature provided for him in a river. Ἥδιον ἔπινε τοῦ ῥέοντος ὕδατος, ἢ οἱ ἄλλοι τὸν Θάσιον οἶνον. Κατεγίλα δὲ τῶν ὑπότε ὀλίγων τὰς μὲν κρήνας παρερχομένων. Ζητούντων δὲ ὁπόθεν πάντως ὠνήσαιντο χίον ἢ λέσβιον. καὶ πολὺ ἔφασκεν ἀφρονεστέρους εἶναι τῶν βοσκημάτων. *Jucundius bibit fluentem aquam quam alii vinum Thaſium. Deridebat autem eos qui quum ſitirent, præterirent fontes, quærerentque unde omnino emerent Chium vel Leſbium, & multo hos dicebat eſſe inſipientiores jumentis* (13). But after all, it is not certain that he had no other habitation than a Tub. They aſked him one day, *Who will bury you when you are dead, ſince you have neither man nor maid? He who wants a houſe,* anſwered he (14). This ſuppoſes he had a houſe.

(11) See above the Remark [*D*] of the Article BUCHANAN.

(12) Garaſſe, *Doctrine Curieuſe*, pag. 134, 135.

(13) Dio Chryſoſt. *Orat. VI*, pag. m. 89.

(14) Diog. Laert. lib. 6. num. 52.

[*C*] *It muſt not be imagined he was more humble than thoſe who live deliciouſly.*] He uſed to ſay that all the curſes of the Stage were fallen on him; ſince he was a vagabond, had neither houſe nor country, was obliged to beg, was ill cloathed, and lived from hand to mouth. And yet, adds the Hiſtorian, he took as much pride in thoſe things as Alexander could do in the conqueſt of the whole World. Διογένης ὁ Σινωπεὺς συνεχῶς ἐπίλεγεν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ, ὅτι τὰς ἐκ τῆς τραγῳδίας ἀρὰς αὐτὸς ἐκπλήροι, καὶ ὑπομένει. εἶναι γὰρ πλάνης, ἄοικος, πατρίδος ἐστερημένος, πλωχὸς, δυσείμων, βίον ἔχων τὸν ἐφήμερον, καὶ ὅμως ἐπὶ τούτοις μεγα ἐφρόνει ὑδὲν ἧττον, ἢ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐπὶ τῇ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀρχῇ, ὅτε καὶ Ἰνδῶν ἐλὼν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα ὑπέστρεψεν. *Diogenes Sinopenſis de ſeipſo dicere ſolitus eſt, ſe implere & ferre tragicas execrationes. Nam erronem ſe eſſe, domo & patria carere, mendicum agere, male veſtiri, & in diem vivere. Nihilominus tamen in his ſibi non minus placebat, quàm Alexander in terrarum orbis imperio, quum ſubactis Indis in Babylonem reverteretur* (15).

(15) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 3. cap. 29.

in it [*D*], there must needs have been some. Let us not trust those who have criticized Alexander on this account [*E*], nor those who have blamed our Philosopher's conduct towards that Prince [*F*]. They who find contradictions in what is related of Diogenes

[*D*] *Alexander the Great found a grandeur in his behaviour.*] He must needs have done it, since he declared that if he was not Alexander, he would choose to be Diogenes (16). I do not wonder that he admired a man who, tho' he might have obtained any favours from him, would ask him nothing, and even bade him, without complement or ceremony, to stand away, and not intercept the Sun (17). Could a Prince who sees himself continually beset with gaping wolves, and tho' his power be ever so great is not able to content every importunate craver, forbear admiring a private person who refuses riches which are offered him? Alexander had seen Statesmen and Philophers flock to him from all parts (18); and every body was eager to make his court to him. Diogenes was the only man who did not stir from his place: Alexander, finding he did not come to him, as he expected, was obliged to make him a visit. If this indifference appeared to him somewhat very uncommon, he admired the greatness of soul which shone in that Philosopher's Answer (19). It has been justly said that on this occasion Alexander was surpassed by a private man. *Eadem re gloriari Socrates potuit, eadem Diogenes à quo victus est* (Alexander). *Quid ni victus sit illo die quo homo supra mensuram humanæ superbiæ tumens, vidit aliquem cui nec dare quidquam posset nec eripere* (20). "In the same thing "might Socrates glory, and likewise Diogenes by "whom Alexander was overcome. For must he not "be overcome on that day, when swelling with "more than human pride, he saw one to whom he "could give nothing, and from whom he could take "nothing?" These words plainly shew that Seneca thought Diogenes had not this discourse with Alexander till after the conquest of Persia, and at the time when this Prince, dazzled with the splendor of his good fortune, would be called a God. But if any one should think that from these words it does not clearly appear that this was Seneca's opinion, I shall desire him to read what follows: *Necesse est à Socrate beneficio vincar: necesse est à Diogene, qui per medias Macedonum gazas nudus incessit, calcatis regiis opibus. Nonne ille tunc merito & sibi & cæteris, quibus ad dispiciendam veritatem non erat offusa caligo, supra eum eminere visus est, infra quem omnia jacebant? Multo potentior, multo locupletior fuit, omnia tunc possidente Alexandro. Plus enim erat, quod hic nollet accipere, quam quod ille posset dare* (21). i.e. "I must neces-"sarily yield in point of generosity to Socrates, and "likewise to Diogenes, who walked naked thro' the "midst of the Macedonian wealth, and trod the royal "treasures under foot. Did not he then seem justly "both to himself and to others, whose eyes were not "so far blinded as to be incapable of perceiving the "truth, superior to him to whom all things were "subject? He was much more powerful, and "much richer, than Alexander, who then possessed "all: for what the one would have refused, was "more than the other could have given." We have here an instance of those mistakes which are fallen into for want of attention. All the World knows, I, that Alexander never returned to Greece after he went over into Asia; II, that Diogenes never stirred out of Greece while Alexander was subduing Asia: it is therefore for want of attention, and by being too much set upon Antitheses, that Seneca has here confounded the times. It is certain that the conversation between Alexander and Diogenes was prior to the Persian war. Alexander saw that Cynic at Corinth, when he was declared Captain General of all Greece, to make war on Darius (22). Diogenes Laertius is very near, if not quite, guilty of the Anachronism of Seneca (23).

[*E*] . . . . *Let us not trust those who have criticised Alexander on this account.*] "If Alexander had not "been Alexander, he would have been Diogenes: so "much does virtuous poverty command the esteem "of royalty and greatness." These words are to be found in a Sermon which Balzac has criticised; and he censures them in the following terms (24). "The "Preacher imagined this to be an extreme good say-"ing, and I think it an extreme bad one: for, in your "opinion, and in real truth, what is it to be Diogenes? I am going to tell you, by only translating "the Greek Text, without any addition of my own, "To be Diogenes, is to violate the established customs "and received Laws; it is to have neither modesty, "nor decency; it is to know neither relation, guest, "nor friend; it is to be either barking or biting "continually; it is to eat a raw sole, or bloody meat, "in a full market; it is to offend the eyes of the "people by actions yet more filthy, actions which can-"not be performed with too great secrecy, or in too "remote a retirement. This it is to be Diogenes, "and what Alexander wished to be, if he had not "been Alexander. A worse saying could not have "been uttered by the disciple of Aristotle, and the "Preacher could not have said a more disobliging "thing to those whom he designed to praise than by "making use of a comparison so odious, at least "to every body who is not a stranger to good books." Two persons are here criticized, Alexander and the Preacher. The latter, in my opinion, deserves the censure which is let fly at him; for when one praises the poverty of the Mendicant Friars, all possible care should be taken to prevent the Reader's reflecting on that of the Cynic Philosophers. But as to Alexander, I maintain he is unjustly censured, and as a proof of it I produce the following words of Costar (25): *Do you think, Sir, that Balzac has fully entred into Alexander's meaning? That Conqueror was not acquainted with this definition of Diogenes, and desired to resemble him only in what he had just discovered and observed in him; an extreme contempt of whatever seemed most shining and pompous in life. He had offered him his riches, and his interest; and all the favour that ragged wise man asked of him, was to stand out of his Sun; as if he had said, Do not deprive me of the benefits of nature, and I leave you those of Fortune, which I think beneath me. Alexander perfectly comprehended the vigour and firmness of so elevated a soul; and turning himself to the Lords of his Court: Do not laugh, said he, at this man; for were I not what I am, I would be what he is; that is, were I not in possession of wealth and honour of all sorts, I should think my self happy in despising them as this Philosopher does. Let Balzac say what he will to the contrary, this is a delicate and fine thought, and not at all unworthy of a disciple of Aristotle.* A man of ever so little judgment cannot but perceive that Costar has hit the mark, and that Balzac's criticism is built on a very false foundation. Plutarch has paraphrased this saying of Alexander in a manner which deserves to be read (26).

[*F*] . . . . *nor those who have blamed our Philosopher's conduct towards that Prince.*] "He was so bru-"tish, that being asked a question by Alexander, "who went to see him one day in his tub that he "might lose no part of the diversion, he answered "him just in the same way as Brusquet (27) used to "speak to the King, and having made a wry face "at him, and thouing him in a familiar manner, "said to him, Art thou not afraid, Alexander, that "I should bite thee? for I am a mad dog, that is, I "am enraged at thy luxury, thy excesses, and thy "over-insolent Majesty; and afterwards, being asked "by some of Alexander's attendants, who diverted "themselves with him as if he had been the fool in "a play, whether he had ever seen any good and "wise Princes, with a Sardonian laugh, he said, in "a drolling way, ὡς κολοιῶν πιτνομένων, I have seen "as many as crows and may-bugs in the Spring. "Such was the wit and civility of the man, who "richly deserved an exemplary chastisement (28)." There are many things to be censured in this passage, besides that which the Prior Ogier has censured (29). I. Alexander did not go to see Diogenes to divert himself; it was a serious Visit. II. When a man acts sincerely, he does not relate matters as he finds them in Authors of no authority; but borrows them from Writers more worthy of credit, as those are, with regard to this Visit of Alexander, who have written either the Life of that great Prince, or the Life of Diogenes. What has Father Garasse done? He has suppressed

(16) Plut. *in Alexandr.* pag. 671.

(17) Idem, ibid. Val. Maximus, lib. 4. cap. 3, *sub fin.* Dieg. Laertius, lib. 6. num. 38.

(18) Plut. *in Alexand.* pag. 671.

(19) Λέγεται τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον οὕτω διατεθῆναι καὶ θαυμάσαι καταφρονηθέντα τὴν ὑπεροψίαν, καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ὧσαι. *Perhibitur in tantum permotus Alexander fuisse & obstupuisse contemptus despicientiam hominis & animi celsitudinem ut &c.* Plut. *in Alexandr.* pag. 671: *item* de Fortun. vel Virtute Alexandri, pag. 331.

(20) Seneca, *de Benefic.* lib. 5. cap. 6.

(21) Idem, ibid. cap. 4.

(22) Plut. *in Alexand.* pag. 671.

(23) He tells us, lib. 6. num. 60, that Alexander made Diogenes an unexpected Visit, and said to him, *I am the great King Alexander.* Ἐγὼ εἰμι Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ μέγας βασιλεύς. And I, *answered the other*, am Diogenes the Dog. κἀγὼ φησὶ Διογένης ὁ κύων. This is to suppose that Alexander had already conquered Darius; for when he saw Diogenes he was no more than King of Macedon, and he had no pretension to stile himself the Great King.

(24) Balzac, *Socrate Chrestien*, pag. 243.

(25) Costar, *Suite de la Defense de Voiture*, pag. 39.

(26) Plut. *de Fortuna vel Virtute Alex.* Orat. 1, circa fin. pag. m. 331, 332.

(27) He was a famed Jester at Court.

(28) Garasse, *Doctrine Curieuse*, pag. 135.

(29) He ridiculed *Garasse* for his ignorance, in not knowing that every body was thou'd in Greek, and that therefore Diogenes did not thou Alexander out of incivility. *Censure de la Doctrine Curieuse*, pag. 175.

Diogenes [G], ſhould conſider that a man of his humour could not fail being ſubject to remarkable inequalities in his behaviour. He had a great preſence of mind; as appears from his ſmart ſayings, and quick repartees, which generally contained a good deal of poignant wit. He paſſed no ill judgment on him, who called him a mad Socrates (d). Diogenes ſpent a conſiderable part of his life at Corinth, and died there in a very advanced age. Authors do not agree either as to the manner, or time of his death [H]. He cared very little whether he was buried or not; however, he had an honourable funeral [I]. The reaſon of his living at Corinth, was his being bought by a man

(d) It was *Plato* who called him ſo. *See* Ælian, *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 14. cap. 33.

preſſed the Narratives of Plutarch and Diogenes Laertius, and has given a quite different one, without acquainting us whence he had it (30). III. Nothing is more abſurd than to have recourſe to this Viſit of Alexander, when one has a mind to caſt infamy on the memory of Diogenes: for where are the Readers who are unacquainted with the admiration which that Prince conceived for him? and will not the conſideration of his having had ſuch an admirer much rather incline one to admire Diogenes than to deſpiſe him? And therefore though Garaſſe has taken particular care not to mention what Alexander declared on that occaſion, he has nevertheleſs plaid the part of a very bad Orator, by putting his Readers in the way to remember a thing which fruſtrates his deſign.

(30) *Dion Chryſoſtome* has made an entire Oration on this Conference between Alexander and Diogenes, wherein he has inſerted, no doubt, a hundred things of his own invention; but I do not find what *Garaſſe* ſays there.

If any one deſires to ſee an anſwer to Garaſſe's invectives againſt our Diogenes, let him conſult la Mothe le Vayer. *One of our own Writers*, ſays he (31), *has ſhewn ſo little equity (I will not uſe a harſher expreſſion) that he has made no ſcruple to compare Diogenes and Democritus to Bruſquet and Maitre Guillaume* (32), *whom he aſſerts to have been at leaſt as wiſe as thoſe Philoſophers. Good God! is it poſſible that a man can allow himſelf to talk in this manner! He ſays Plutarch and Laertius might very well have ſpared themſelves the trouble of tranſmitting to us the fooleries of thoſe two ſcoundrels, one of whom, namely Democritus, deſerves no other title than that of a Merry-Andrew, and the other that of a ſturdy Beggar. In a word, continues he, all the difference there was between them amounted to no more than there is between Maitre Guillaume and Jack Pudding, or Bruſquet and Pantalon. Diogenes was a perfect fool and a madman, and Democritus a perpetual buffoon: theſe are his very words. In reality, there is no man of tolerable ſenſe, or ever ſo little converſant in the nature of things, but muſt be ſcandalized at them, and feel his indignation riſe at ſuch extravagant compariſons.*

(31) *Traité de la Vertu des Païens*, in the 5th Volume of his Works, edit. in 12mo, pag. 133, 134. He has not named the Writer whom he refutes; but you are to know it was Father Garaſſe.

(32) A famous Buffoon at Court.

Note, it is ſaid (33) that Alexander finding Diogenes aſleep, repeated to him the 24th Verſe of the 2d Book of the Iliad,

Οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εὕδειν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα.
Stertere perpetuam non dignum eſt principe noctem.

"Ill fits a chief whole nights in ſleep to ſpend."

(33) Theo, *in Progymn.* cap. 5. pag. m. 71.

And that Diogenes immediately repeated to him what follows in the ſame paſſage of Homer,

Ὧι λαοί τ' ἐπιτετράφαται κὴ τόσσα μέμηλε.
Cui populique ſalus, & tanta negotia curæ.

"On whom his people, and their hopes depend."

He could not have anſwered with greater preſence of mind or more to the purpoſe. Diogenes juſtified himſelf, and ſignified at the ſame time what was Alexander's duty. He ſhewed that if it be a fault to ſleep all night, it is when a man is intruſted with the government of a people.

(34) Hieronymus, lib. 2. *contra Jovinianum*: This is taken from *Diogenes Laertius*, who ſays, lib. 6. num. 37. Θεασάμενος ποτὲ παιδίον ταῖς χερσὶ πῖνον, ἐξέῤῥιψε τῆς πήρας τὴν κοτύλην, εἰπὼν παιδίον με νενικηκεν εὐτελείᾳ. Intuitus aliquando puerum manibus bibentem, cotylam pera productam abjecit dicens, puer me vilitate ſuperavit. *See alſo* Seneca, Epiſt. 90.

(35) Diog. Laert. lib. 6. num. 52.

[G] *Some contradictions have been found in what is related of Diogenes.*] We are told, on one hand, that he had no other lodging than a Tub, and that he threw away his wooden bowl, when he perceived that he could drink out of the hollow of his hand. *Quodam vero tempore habens ad potandum cavum ligneum vidit puerum manu concava bibere, & eliſiſſe illud fertur ad terram dicens, neſciebam quod natura haberet poculum* (34). i. e. "He had once a wooden bowl to drink "out of, but ſeeing a boy drinking out of the hollow "of his hand, he daſhed it againſt the ground, ſay-"ing, I knew not that nature had ſupplied me with "a cup." It is even expreſly aſſerted that he had neither man-ſervant, nor maid-ſervant (35). But, on the other hand, they tell us his man ran away from him. Some might ſuſpect a little invention in this particular, I mean, that his ſlave's deſerting him was feigned on purpoſe to have an occaſion of attributing a witty ſaying to Diogenes. They ſay he anſwered thoſe who adviſed him to ſeek after the fugitive: *Would it not be ridiculous that Menades could live without Diogenes, and that Diogenes could not live without Menades* (36)? For my part, I do not find theſe ſtories contradictory. Could a man of ſo croſs-grained a way of thinking, be uniform in all his actions? There is no doubt to be made but he liked at one time what he rejected at another. His life was long enough to allow of years during which he kept ſervants, and years during which he had no other cup than the hollow of his hand. This is what might be ſaid, if we had no other account of our Cynic left than his Life given us by Diogenes Laertius; but we have a Chapter in Ælian which makes it needleſs for us to have recourſe to ſuch a ſolution. Ælian acquaints us, that Diogenes was not yet a Philoſopher, when his ſervant left him. It was when he retired from Sinope that he took one of his ſlaves with him, who forſook him. He had then ſome taſte of Philoſophy, which made him ſay; *Would it not be a ſhame that Manes could do without Diogenes, and that Diogenes could not do without Manes* (37)? but he was not a Cynic, nor did he renounce all ſuperfluities, till a long while after. Ælian adds, that this ſervant wandred about from place to place, till he was torn in pieces by dogs at Delphi.

(36) Idem, ibid. num. 53.

(37) Οὐκ αἰσχρὸν, Μάνην μὲν μὴ δύνασθαι Διογένους, Διογένην δὲ Μάνους; *An non turpe eſſet quum Manes Diogenis non egeat, Diogenem Manis indigere?* Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 13. cap. 28. Seneca relates the ſame thing, *de Tranquill.* cap. 8.

[H] *Authors do not agree as to the manner . . . . of his death.*] Some ſay (38) he died of an overflowing of the gall, occaſioned by his eating a neat's foot (39) raw: others, that he ſuffocated himſelf by holding his breath (40): others, that he died of the bite of a dog (41): others, that he threw himſelf down a precipice (42); others, that he ſtrangled himſelf. The laſt opinion is reported by St. Jerom as the true one, and with circumſtances which it may be of ſome uſe to know. His death, ſays he, is a teſtimony of his temperance and virtue; for as he was going to the Olympic Games, a fever ſeized him by the way: he lay down under a tree, and refuſed the aſſiſtance of thoſe who accompanied him, and offered him either a horſe or a chariot. Do you go to the Games, ſaid he to them; this night will determine my illneſs: if I get the better of it, I will go to morrow to the Olympic Games; if that gets the better of me, I ſhall go to the ſhades below. He ſtrangled himſelf that very night, pretending he was going to loſe his fever, rather than his life *Abite quæſo, & ſpectatum pergite. Hæc me nox aut victorem probabit aut victum. Si febrem vicero, ad agonem: ſi me vicerit ad inferna deſcendam: ibique per noctem eliſo gutture, non tam mori ſe ait quam febrem excludere* (43). Some Authors (44) have ſaid that he died the ſame day as Alexander the Great did, in the 113th Olympiad. He was near ninety years old (45). But if he had not lived after Alexander, could he have been ſent for by Perdiccas, and threatened with death if he failed coming (46)? Could Craterus have defired a viſit from him (47)?

(38) Diog. Laert. lib. 6. num. 76.

(39) Βοὸς πόδα. It is certainly a fault, and ought to be corrected by πολύποδα; for a great number of Authors quoted by Menage, *in hunc locum*, agree that Diogenes's death was occaſioned by his eating a raw Polypus.

(40) Ἀλλ' ἀνίβα χεῖλος ποτ' ἐδόντας ἐρίσας καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα συνδαμάσαι, *Tandem qui ſublatus eſt cum labris dentes obfirmaſſet, & ſpiritum continuiſſet.* Cercidas, *apud* Diog. Laert. lib. 6. num. 77.

(41) Diog. Laert. *ibid.* Suidas.

(42) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 8. cap. 14.

(43) Hieronym. lib. 2. *adv. Jovinianum.*

(44) Demetrius *in Æquivocis*, *apud* Laertium, num. 79. Plutarch. *Sympoſ.* lib. 8. cap. 1. Suidas.

[I] *He cared very little whether he was buried or not; however, he had an honourable funeral.*] It is ſaid that as he was dying he gave orders that his corps ſhould not be buried at all, or only covered with a little duſt in a ditch. He wiſhed he might ſerve for food to all ſorts of animals (48). We further find in Diogenes Laertius, that he deſired to be thrown into the Iliſſus, for the uſe of his brethren; but theſe words have, no doubt, been foiſted into the Hiſtorian's Text: for what Writer can be ſo abſurd as to ſay this Philoſopher deſired to be thrown into a river, that he might be of ſome uſe to the dogs? It is not likely, therefore, that theſe words ſhould proceed from Laertius: they might be firſt written in the margin, to mark Ælian's opinion (49), which was that our Cynic ordered

(45) Laertius, lib. 6. num. 76.

(46) Idem, num. 44.

(47) Idem, num. 57.

(48) Idem, num. 79.

(49) *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 8. cap. 14.

man of that City [*K*], who made him Tutor to his ſons. Notwithſtanding he was a ſlave, he perfectly kept up his character (*e*). The moſt ſhameleſs and inexcuſable circumſtance of his life, was his brutiſhly plunging himſelf in acts of impurity in the open view of the world [*L*]; for which he alledged very bad reaſons.

(*e*) See the Remark [*K*].

dered his body to be thrown into the Iliſſus; and then ſome Tranſcriber inſerted them impertinently in the text. Note, that the Iliſſus is a river of Attica, and that Diogenes died in a ſuburbs of Corinth (50); whence we may conclude that Ælian has committed a miſtake. Mr. Menage has made a very learned Note on this (51). There is a paſſage in Cicero which deſerves to be tranſcribed: we there learn that Diogenes, upon his friends aſking him whether the deſire he had to lie unburied tended to the advantage of the wild beaſts, or of the birds, anſwered them, that he would have a ſtaff put into his hand, that he might drive them away; *how will you be able to do that*, ſaid they, *ſince you will feel nothing? What is it to me then*, replied he, *if I am torn by wild beaſts? Durior Diogenes, & idem quidem ſentiens, ſed ut Cynicus aſperius, projici ſe juſſit inhumatum. Tum amici, volucribuſne an feris? Minime vero, inquit, ſed bacillum prope me quo abigam, ponitote. Qui poteris? illi, non enim ſenties. Quid igitur mihi ferarum laniatus oberit nihil ſentienti* (52)?

(50) Ἐν τῷ Κρανείῳ τῷ πρὸ τῆς Κορίνθου γυμνασίῳ. *In Cranio: id erat Gymnaſium ante Corinthum*. Diog. Laert. num. 77.

(51) *In Laertium*, lib. 6. num. 79.

(52) Cicero, *Tuſcul.* 1. cap. 43.

No regard was had to this great indifference of Diogenes for burial. His friends, finding him dead, made no doubt but he had put an end to his life by holding his breath. They diſputed with ſo much eagerneſs who ſhould bury him, that they had like to have come to blows. Some perſons of authority came to compoſe the difference. Diogenes was interred near the gate of the Iſthmus: his tomb was adorned with a column, on which they placed a dog of marble (53). Pauſanias mentions this tomb (54). The inhabitants of Sinope erected ſtatues of braſs to the honour of our Philoſopher, their countryman (55). I had forgot to obſerve, that there is an opinion which imports that he was interred by the ſons of Xeniades, whoſe tutor he had been (56). They add that Xeniades aſked him how he would be buried, and that he anſwered, *With my face downwards*; *for*, replied he, on being aſked the reaſon of that fancy, *there will ſoon be a ſubverſion, which will turn things upſide down*. He meant, if we believe his Hiſtorian, that Macedon from an inconſiderable Kingdom ſhould become a great one. Διὰ τὸ ἐπικρατεῖν ἤδη τῆς Μακεδόνας ἢ ἐκ ταπεινῶν ὑψηλὰς γίνεσθαι. *Quia Macedones jam potentia majore dominarentur, atque ex humilibus ſublimes fierent* (57). This explication is not juſt, ſince Diogenes died when the Macedonians were arrived at the higheſt pitch of their power. He died, as ſome will have it, on the ſame day with Alexander; ſo that he had ſeen the glory of that nation prodigiouſly exalted. According to others, we are to believe he outlived that Prince, and ſaw the diviſions of his ſucceſſors. He ſhould, therefore, have rather foretold the declenſion of the Macedonians, than their future grandeur. The expreſſion of Diogenes Laertius is not right, unleſs we ſuppoſe it to relate to the time of Philip King of Macedon: for it was under Philip that that nation, which had before made but a mean figure, began to grow formidable.

(53) Diog. Laert. lib. 6. num. 77, 78.

(54) Pauſan. lib. 2. pag. 45.

(55) Diog. Laert. num. 78.

(56) Idem, num. 31.

(57) Idem, num. 32.

[*K*] *He was bought by a Corinthian.*] As he was going over to the Iſland of Ægina, he was taken by Pirates, who carried him into Crete, and there expoſed him to ſale. He anſwered the Crier, who aſked him, *What he could do*, that he knew how to command men (58); and perceiving a Corinthian who was going by, he ſhewed him to the Crier, and ſaid, *Sell me to that Gentleman, for he wants a maſter* (59). This Corinthian was named Xeniades. He bought Diogenes, and carried him with him to Corinth, and gave him for a Tutor to his children. He alſo intruſted him with the management of his houſe. Diogenes acquitted himſelf ſo well of all theſe employments that Xeniades could not forbear ſaying, whereever he went, *a good genius has come into my houſe*. Diogenes's friends were deſirous of redeeming him. *You are a pack of fools*, ſaid he to them (60): *lyons are not ſlaves to thoſe who feed them, but the latter are ſervants to the lyons*. He plainly told Xeniades; *You muſt obey me; for Governors and Phyſicians, though ſervants, yet require obedience from thoſe whoſe Governors and Phyſicians they are* (61). He educated Xeniades's children exceedingly well, and indeared himſelf to them ſo much that they recommended him very earneſtly to their father and mother. He grew old in that family, and ſome ſay he died in it, and that he was buried by his pupils (62). The ſale of Diogenes ſerved ſome Authors for a ſubject: Menippus and Eubulus wrote ſome Treatiſes intitled, Διογένους πρᾶσις, *Diogenis Auctio* (63). Suidas obſerves that Diogenes was already advanced in years, when the Pirates took him: but if he ſpent the remainder of his life in the ſervice of Xeniades, how can what Dion Chryſoſtome aſſerts be true, that Diogenes paſſed the Winter at Athens, and the Summer at Corinth? We ſhall not need to wonder that he ſucceeded ſo well in the education of Xeniades's children, if we conſider the perſuaſive eloquence aſcribed to him by his Hiſtorian (64), and the effects of that eloquence. Oneſicritus had ſent one of his ſons to Athens: this young man having heard Diogenes, ſettled in that city; and his eldeſt brother did the ſame, ſo ſoon as Oneſicritus ſent him thither. Oneſicritus himſelf having had the curioſity to hear that Philoſopher, became his ſcholar; ſuch were the charms of Diogenes's eloquence (65). Oneſicritus was a man of ſome conſideration: he was much eſteemed by Alexander (66), and followed him in his wars, where he had ſome employment of diſtinction conferred on him; and he wrote a Hiſtory. Phocion, who was yet more illuſtrious than he, was the diſciple of Diogenes (67): and ſo was Stilpo of Megara (68).

(58) Philo relates this with other circumſtances. See his Treatiſe *quòd omnis probus liber*, pag. 883.

(59) Laertius, who ſays this, num. 74. had ſaid, num. 30. that Diogenes had preſſed the Cryer to ſay, *Who will buy his Maſter?*

(60) Taken from Diogenes Laertius, lib. 6. num. 74, 75.

(61) Idem, Diogen. num. 30.

(62) Idem, num. 31.

(63) Idem, num. 29, 30.

(64) Idem, num. 75.

(65) Τοιαύτη τις πρᾳότης ἰυγξ Διογένους τοῖς λόγοις. *Tanta Diogenis ſermonibus illecebra inerat*. Idem, num. 76.

(66) Plutarch, *in Alexandro*, pag. 701, & *de Fort. aut Virt. Alexandri*, pag. 331, aſſerts that Oneſicritus, who was one of Alexander's Court, had been Diogenes's ſcholar.

(67) Diog. Laert. lib. 6. num. 76.

(68) Idem, ibid.

[*L*] *He brutiſhly plunged himſelf into acts of impurity.*] This was his way of arguing: it is no ſin to dine; therefore it is no ſin to dine in the ſtreets (69). On this foundation he eat any where, and pretended his principle was to be extended to all natural wants; ſo that as he thought it was allowable to lie with a woman, he concluded there was no harm in lying with her publickly (70). This was calling in reaſon to the aſſiſtance of his paſſions: it was ſtraining it too far, and not underſtanding it by too much ſubtilizing in order to underſtand it: it was in a manner *recta cum ratione inſanire*, i. e. *running mad with reaſon*. We may apply this verſe of Terence to the Cynics,

Faciunt næ intelligendo ut nihil intelligant (71).

" By over-ſtretching their knowledge, they come to know nothing at all."

Diogenes, an enemy to all ſuperfluity, and ſeeking as much as poſſible to be independent, committed ſelf-pollution in public, impudently ſaying, that he wiſhed he could by the ſame method appeaſe the cravings of his ſtomach. Χειμερῶν τε ἐν τῷ μέσῳ συνεχὲς, ὅθεν ἦν, ἔλεγε, κὴ τὴν κοιλίαν παρατριψάμενον τῇ λιμῷ παύσασθαι. *Cumque ante ora omnium turpiter ſæpe operaretur, utinam liceret, ajebat, perfricato ventre à fame conquieſcere* (72). He gloried in this impudence, pretending to find within himſelf, and without any charge, what incites other men to a thouſand expences, and a thouſand devaſtations. He added that if all the world had been like him, Troy had not been taken, nor Priam ſlain upon the altar of Jupiter. Οὐ γὰρ ἴδιὰ αὐτὸν ὑδαμόσε ἐλθεῖν ἀφροδισίων ἕνεκεν, ἀλλὰ παίζων ἔλεγεν, ἀπανταχῇ παρεῖναι αὐτῷ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην πρόχα. *Neque enim uſquam illi* (*72) *eundem erat ob rem veneream, ſed jocans dicebat ubique ſibi adeſſe venerem gratis* (73). He ſought reaſons in nature and mythology for his juſtification; and he alledged the example of certain fiſhes. Ἔφη δὲ τοὺς ἰχθῦας σχεδόν τι φρονιμωτέρους φαίνεσθαι τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ὅταν γὰρ θέωνται τὸ σπέρμα ἀποβαλεῖν ἐλθόντας ἔξω προσκνᾶσθαι πρὸς τὸ τραχύ. *Dicebat autem & piſces nonnihil prudentiores apparere quam homines. Quum enim*

(69) Idem, num. 99.

(70) Διὸ ἔτυ δὲ πάντα ποιεῖν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ καὶ τὰ Δήμητρος καὶ τὰ Ἀφροδίτης. *Soleat autem omnia palam facere & quæ ad Cererem & quæ ad Venerem pertinent*. Idem, ibid.

(71) Terent. *in Prologo* Andriæ, ver. 16.

(72) Diog. Laert. lib. 6. num. 69, *item* 46.

(*72) La Mothe le Vayer ſays that *Zeno and ſome others approved this filthy action, probably becauſe of the independance on another which it ſeems to procure us: and Diogenes acting the ſhepherd Menalcas, and uſing that pretty manual operation, wiſhed he could as eaſily ſatisfy his hungry belly*. Dextra mihi Deus, & telum quod miſſile libro, *ſaid one on this ſubject*. Dial. Sceptiques *d'Oraſius Tubero*, pag. m. 143, 144.

(73) Dio Chryſoſt. *Orat. VI*, pag. m. 90.

reaſons [*M*]. He had ſome illuſtrious Diſciples (*f*), and wrote ſeveral books (*g*); but it is a queſtion whether the Tragedies which went under his name were really his. It cannot certainly be ſaid whether he was an Atheiſt or not [*N*]; but it is certain that in

(*f*) See the Remark [*K*], at the end.

(*g*) Diog. Laert. lib. 6. num. 80.

enim illis opus eſt ut ſemen emittant, egredi & ſeſe affricare ad aſpera (74). He alſo alledged the example of Pan. He ſaid that Mercury pitying his ſon Pan, who ran night and day up and down the mountains mad for the love of a miſtreſs whom he could not embrace (it was the Echo,) taught him this way of relieving himſelf, which Pan afterwards taught to the ſhepherds (75). Martial, as diſſolute as he was, underſtood the voice of nature better than this Philoſopher:

(74) Idem, ibid.

(75) Idem, ibid.

Ipſam crede tibi NATURAM *dicere rerum,*
Iſtud quod digitis, Pontice, perdis, homo eſt.

Thus he ſpeaks in the 42d Epigram of the 9th Book, to a man who followed the maxims of Diogenes. This turpitude is to be found not only in the Authors whom I have quoted, but alſo in Athenæus (76), in Plutarch (77), in St. Chryſoſtom's Homily on the Martyr Babylas, in the 34th Homily of the ſame Father on St. Matthew, in the Anthology, in Galen, &c. It is therefore ſurprizing that Eraſmus, who had ſo often peruſed St. Chryſoſtom's Babylas (78), ſhould be ſo groſly miſtaken on occaſion of the paſſage where Diogenes Laertius ſpeaks of the impure manual Operation of our Cynic. It is ſcarce to be imagined, if our own eyes did not acquaint us with it, that Eraſmus could have been guilty of ſo groſs a blunder. He thought that Diogenes, having applied himſelf to bodily labour, and gotten a good ſtomach at it, wiſhed he could ſatisfy his belly by rubbing it. Eraſmus has diſcovered herein the humour of thoſe ſtudious perſons, who are ſorry that the neceſſities of nature take them off from their Books, and he has placed this ſaying among the Apophthegms of Diogenes. He has been cruelly cenſured for it by Robortellus, and very ill defended by Nannius. The words of Eraſmus follow (79): *Quum in foro in conſpectu omnium fuiſſet operatus, utinam quoque liceat (inquit) ſic perfricto ventre à fame eſſe quietum, ſentiens agitatione corporis acui ſtomachi orexim, à qua neceſſitate cupiebat eſſe liber. Itidem ſtudioſi graviter ferunt, à literis naturæ neceſſitatibus avocari.* Here is a paſſage of the Anthology:

(76) Athenæus, lib. 4. cap. 15. pag. 158.

(77) Plut. *de Stoicor. Repugn.* pag. 1044.

(78) See above the Remark [*C*] of the Article BABYLAS.

(79) See the *Miſcellanea Petri Nannij Alcmariani*, lib. 8. pag. m. 251.

Πάντ' ἄρα Διογένης ἔφυγεν τάδε· τὸν δ' ὑμέναιον
Ἥιδιν παλάμη Λαίδος ἡ χαρίεν.
Omnia ſane Diogenes effugit hæc: nuptias verò
Perfecit dextra, Laïde nihil opus habens.

It is the concluſion of an Epigram (80), wherein Agathias gives a Liſt of ſeveral inconveniences to which a man is expoſed, when he dedicates himſelf to the ſervice of the fair-ſex, and which Diogenes freed himſelf from. I am amazed that Galen ſhould take pains rather to extenuate this crime, than to condemn it. He ſays that this Cynic Philoſopher, the firmeſt of all men againſt ſenſual pleaſure, taſted that of love, not through the allurements of voluptuouſneſs, but the better to prevent the miſchiefs which a retention of the ſeed uſually occaſions. A lady of pleaſure had appointed him a meeting, but becauſe ſhe ſtaid too long, he could not have patience, but... himſelf; and afterwards when ſhe came, he ſent her back, telling her that he had no further occaſion for her, his buſineſs being already done. Βραδυνούσης αὐτῆς, ἀπετρίψατο τὸ σπέρμα προσαπτόμενος τῇ χειρὶ τὸ αἰδοῖον· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα παραγινομένην ἀπέπεμψεν, εἰπὼν τὴν χεῖρα φθάσαι τὸν ὑμέναιον ἆσαι. *Cum diutius ceſſaret, ipſe manu pudendis admota ſemen excuſſit, ac venientem deinde mulierculam remiſit, inquiens, manus hymenæum celebrando prævenit te* (81). He did not treat the celebrated curtezan Laïs after that manner. The ſcandalous Chronicle ſays that this woman, who by her charms attracted ſo many of the genteel part of the world, and who rated her favours at ſo high a price, beſtowed them freely on our Cynic, notwithſtanding he was ſuch a ſloven, and had ſuch duſty feet (82). She ſuffered him to enjoy her for nothing: Σὺ μὲν

(80) The 80th of the 7th Book, pag. m. 972.

(81) Galenus, *de Locis affectis*, lib. 6. Juvenal, Sat. 6. ver. 236, ſpeaks of a like impatience. *Abditus interea latet ſecretus adulter, Impatienſque moræ ſilet & præputia ducit.*

(82) He always went barefoot. Dio Chryſoſt. *Orat. VI*, pag. 89.

ταύτῃ τοσοῦτον ἀργύριον δίδως, ἡ δὲ προῖκα Διογένει τῷ κυνὶ συγκυλίεται. *You give her ſo much money,* ſaid Ariſtippus's ſervant to him, *and ſhe tumbles with that Dog Diogenes, without receiving a doit from him* (83). We ſhall ſee Ariſtippus's Anſwer in the Article LAIS (84).

(83) Athen. lib. 13. cap. 6. pag. 588.

[*M*] ... *For which he alledged very bad reaſons.*] I have mentioned them in the beginning of the preceding Remark, and ſhall ſpeak more amply of them in the Remarks of the article HIPPARCHIA.

(84) Remark [*F*].

[*N*] *It cannot certainly be ſaid whether he was an Atheiſt or not.*] For all the proofs which are alledged are equivocal. Father Garaſſe produces two: one that *he laughed at the Gods which were commonly adored by the populace*; the other, that *he taught that we ought not to be aſhamed of doing whatever nature dictates to us* (85). The firſt of theſe proofs is impertinent; for there is nothing more worthy of a Philoſopher, who is thoroughly perſuaded of the being of a God, than to laugh at the Pagan ſuperſtitions. The ſecond proof is not concluſive, becauſe it is poſſible to believe a God, and to be perſuaded at the ſame time that ſhame is founded only on a poſitive inſtitution. Did not the Adamites maintain their errors by paſſages of Scripture miſunderſtood? Therefore they were not Atheiſts. Here follow other proofs of Diogenes's Atheiſm. I, When he ſaw Tutors, Phyſicians, and Philoſophers, he ſaid man was the wiſeſt of all animals; but when he ſaw interpreters of dreams (86), diviners, and thoſe who gave credit to ſuch people, the covetous, and the ambitious, he thought man was the maddeſt of all beings (87). II. He refuſed to be initiated: and when they told him that thoſe who had had that advantage in this world, reigned in the other; he replied that nothing would be more ridiculous than to ſee Ageſilaus and Epaminondas in the mire, while a parcel of ſcoundrels, who been initiated, ſat on the throne of the bleſſed (88). They attribute to him the piece of Raillery which I have mentioned in the article DIAGORAS (89), that there are more people who periſh, notwithſtanding their vows, than there are whoſe prayers are heard (90). IV. He ſaid that the long proſperity of Harpalus bore teſtimony againſt the exiſtence of God (91). *Diogenes quidem Cynicus dicere ſolebat Harpalum, qui temporibus illis prædo fælix habebatur, contra Deos teſtimonium dicere, quod in illa fortuna tamdiu viveret..... Improborum igitur proſperitates ſecundæque res redarguunt, ut Diogenes dicebat, vim omnem Deorum ac poteſtatem* (92). Of theſe four proofs the two firſt are ſo weak that they do not deſerve to be examined. The third is a little ſtronger, but yet not convincing: for how many people are there at this day, who, without ceaſing to be Papiſts, may both think and ſay, when they ſee the *Ex voto's* of our Lady of Loretto, the ſame that Diogenes is reputed to have ſaid on occaſion of the *Ex voto's* of Samothrace? There are ſo many other proofs of the exiſtence of God, beſides that which is drawn from the efficacy of prayers, that a man who rejects that may yet remain fully perſuaded that there is a God who governs all things. If the fourth proof were convincing, we muſt reckon Claudian among the Atheiſts, who has ſaid the very ſame thing of Rufinus, that Diogenes had ſaid of Harpalus (93). He ſaid the puniſhment of Rufinus had been a ſentence of abſolution for the Gods: he thought, therefore, that Rufinus, during his proſperity, bore teſtimony againſt the Gods. Malherbe, a Chriſtian Poet, has had the ſame thought with relation to the Marſhal d'Ancre (94). If all thoſe who have ſaid that the long proſperity of the wicked is a reaſon to doubt of Providence, were Atheiſts, there would be a great many Atheiſts among Authors. But they are two very different things to ſay, *Such a fact furniſhes a ſtrong objection againſt the being of God*, and to ſay, *this objection convinces me that there is no God.*

(85) Garaſſe, *Doctrine Curieuſe*, pag. 137.

(86) See in *Diog. Laert.* num. 43, what he ſaid againſt thoſe who are affrighted at their dreams. You care very little, ſaid he to them, what you do when awake; and yet you are mightily concerned at what you dream of when aſleep.

(87) Diog. Laert. lib. 6. num. 24.

(88) Idem, num. 39.

(89) Remark [*I*], Citation (49) and (50).

(90) Diog. Laert. lib. 6. num. 58.

(91) See the Article of HARPALUS, Remark [*I*].

(92) Cicero, *de Natura Deor.* lib. 3. cap. 34.

(93) *Abſtulit hunc tandem Rufini pœna tumultum,* ABSOLVITQUE DEOS.

(94) See the Article CONCINI, Remark [*F*].

The whole of this may be confirmed by three Obſervations. I. The Ancients, who have ſpoken of Atheiſts, have not put Diogenes the Cynic into the liſt of

in some things his moral precepts were very good [O], and that they seemed so to several Fathers of the Church. His manner of confuting the Philosopher who denied the existence of motion, has been admired [P]; but we shall shew that his Answer was incomparably more sophistical than that Philosopher's Arguments.

(95) *See* Ælian, *Var. Hist.* lib. 2. cap. 31; *item* Petri Petiti Observationes Miscellan. lib. 1. cap. 1.

(96) See above Remark [H], Citation (43).

(97) Diog. Laert. num. 42.

(98) Idem. num. 37.

(99) To Theodorus; see *Laertius*, lib. 6. num. 42.

(100) See what the *Journal de Trevoux*, of July 1702, Edit. of France, pag. 46. says of Mr. du Tot.

(101) Remark [I] of the Article BION *the Borysthenite*.

(102) *De la Vertue des Paiens*, pag. 134. of the 5th Volume of his Works.

of those people (95), as far as I can remember. II. S. Jerom attributes to this Philosopher a Discourse which seems to infer that he believed the immortality of the Soul (96). II. Among the witty sayings of Diogenes, there are some which seem to prove that he believed there was a God. He was asked one day, whether he believed there were any Gods? *How can I doubt it,* replied he to the person who put the question to him, *since I am persuaded they hate thee* (97)? Another time, perceiving that a woman transported with devotion had prostrated herself before the Gods in a very indecent posture, he ran to her and told her that God is present in all places, and that she ought to take care not to behave immodestly. Θεασάμενός ποτὲ γυναῖκα ἀσχημονέστερον τοῖς θεοῖς προσπίπτουσαν, βαλόμενος αὐτῆς περιελεῖν τὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν, καθά φησι Ζωΐλος ὁ Περγαῖος, προσελθὼν εἶπεν, οὐκ εὐλαβῇ ὦ γύναι μή ποτε θεῷ ὄπισθεν ἐφῇ; (πάντα γὰρ ἐστιν αὐτῷ πλήρη) ἀσχημονήσῃς. *Inspexerat mulierem inhonestius coram diis procidentem, ejus superstitionem auferre volens, ut Zoilus Pergæus ait, accurrit dicens, non vereris mulier ne forte stante post tergum Deo, (cuncta enim plena ipso sunt) inhoneste te habeas* (98). It must be ingenuously acknowledged, that the last of these three Remarks has no great strength: for these two notable sayings of Diogenes may be nothing but pure raillery; and, indeed, the first is ascribed to a professed Atheist (99). Generally speaking, it cannot be concluded from a person's witty sayings, whether he has inwardly any Religion or not: for the desire of saying a smart thing is usually so strong, that a man had rather gratify it than preserve a friend, or prevent a grievous misfortune. Rather than lose a jest, a bantering wit, who believes in God, will speak like a profane wretch (100), and a profane wretch will speak like one who believes in God. For which reason I do not rely on our Cynic's Hypothesis, *that all things are full of God*; for he made no other use of it than to ground a jest on it. The principle from which he endeavoured to prove that all things belong to the wise, would not prevent me from believing him an Atheist. *All things belong to the Gods,* said he; *now wise men are friends of the Gods, and all things are common among friends: therefore all things belong to the wise.* In the mouth of such a scoffer as Diogenes, this argument is no better a warrant of his Religion, than if Bion the Borysthenite should urge the Dilemma which I have spoken of above (101).

Let us conclude with the Text of this Remark; *it cannot certainly be said whether* Diogenes *was an Atheist or not.* La Mothe le Vayer stops here in his Apology for that Cynic. *I would not assert,* says he (102), *that Diogenes was not as great an Atheist as this Writer makes him, nothing obliging me to suspend my belief in that respect, but the authority of the Fathers who have spoken so favourably of him; but to insist that he was such, because he ridiculed the Gods of the populace, is a very false consequence.* Take special notice that this man, whose faith with regard to the existence of God is so very uncertain, did nevertheless lay down some very excellent precepts of Morality: which shall be the subject of the following Remark.

[O] *In some things his moral precepts were very good.*] They were abominable in some points, as we have seen above (103); but it cannot be denied that in others they were very excellent. He preached against luxury, avarice, ambition, and the spirit of revenge, with all possible strength. He shewed the vanity of human occupations from this reason principally, that we neglect the regulation of our interior faculties and passions, while we make external things our chief business. For instance, he censured the Grammarians, who made diligent inquiry after the misfortunes of Ulysses (104), while they were ignorant of their own disorders. Let us adopt the words of a celebrated Writer. *With regard to his Philosophical System,* says he (105), *which concerned . . . . Morality only, nothing can better clear the Professors of it from all the impurities which have been charged upon them, than the single approbation of the Stoics, allowed to be the most austere of all Philosophers, and who would have been very far from giving their suffrages in favour of persons whose lives were so full of filthiness. Now every body knows that they lived in very good intelligence with the Cynics, as having both one and the same end, that is, to live virtuously, wherein they placed the Supreme Good: for which reason the Stoics called the shortest way of attaining that exalted virtue, Cynism* † . . . . *As to the person of Diogenes, the greatest men of antiquity had him in admiration: Alexander conceived such an esteem for him, that at the conclusion of a conversation they had together, he protested that if he had not been Alexander, he would have chosen to be Diogenes. Seneca is never tired with praising him in a thousand passages, and having called him* virum ingentis animi; *in his Book of the Tranquillity of Life, he adds this noble elogy to the rest, that if any one doubts of the felicity of Diogenes, he may call in question the state and blessedness of the immortal Gods. S. John Chrysostom proposes him as a pattern of many religious vertues, in the second Book written by him against those who despised a monastic life. S. Jerome* ‡ *speaks very honourably of him, he terms him greater and more powerful than Alexander; and displays all his vertues before Jovinian, in order to shame him thereby* (106). I shall add but one thing to this passage; which is, that Dion Chrysostom, in some of his Orations, has given his most rigid precepts of Morality under the name of Diogenes.

(103) In the Remark [L].

(104) *He laughed at the Grammarians,* says Moreri, *who inquire after the Errors of Ulysses, and neglect their own.* The word *Errors* is not here properly used. It was not the faults of Ulysses which the Grammarians inquired into, but his wandrings from place to place.

(105) La Mothe le Vayer, pag. 127, 128. of the 5th Volume.

† Σύντομον ἐπ' ἀρετὴν ὁδόν. Diog. Laert. *in Mened. in Zenone.*

‡ Lib. 2 *contra Jovinian.* cap. 9.

(106) La Mothe le Vayer, tom. 5. pag. 129.

[P] *His way of confuting the Philosopher who denied the existence of motion, has been admired.*] Having patiently heard that Philosopher's Lecture, he took two or three turns in the Auditory (107). See the Remark [K] of the Article ZENO of Elea, where we shall shew that this was neither to remove the difficulty, nor to understand it.

(107) Consult *Diogenes Laertius*, lib. 6. num. 39. *compared with* Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhon. Hypotypos.* lib. 2. cap. 22. & lib. 3. cap. 8.

DIOGENES, a Native of Apollonia in the Isle of Crete [A], held a considerable rank among the Natural Philosophers who flourished in Ionia before Socrates philosophized at Athens. He was the scholar of Anaximenes, and it may be supposed, with some

[A] *He was a native of Apollonia in the Isle of Crete.*] We should not have known this, if we had not what remains of Stephanus Byzantinus; for he is the only Author who can be cited. He mentions five and twenty cities named Apollonia, and says the twenty third was in the Isle of Crete, that it was anciently called *Eleutheria*, and that Diogenes the Natural Philosopher was born there (1). Meursius did not remember this particularity, when he made a List of the illustrious men of the Island of Crete (2); for he has not inserted our Diogenes therein; and yet he has made use of this passage of Stephanus Byzantinus in a Chapter of the same Book (3). This omission is much more excusable than the mistake we find in the Jesuit Lescalopier. He pretends that the *Diogenes Apolloniates* of Cicero, is Diogenes of Apollonia in Illyria, *ex Apollonia, urbe Illyrica, hodie Aulona* (4). Monsr. Menage falsly imagined that certain Authors have said this Diogenes was of Smyrna. He puts Diogenes Laertius among those Authors; and supposes that we ought to read, in the Life of Anaxarchus, not ἔτω διήκουσε Διομύνου τοῦ Σμυρναίου (5), as the printed Editions have it, but ἔτω διήκουσε Διογένους τοῦ Σμυρναίου; *hic* (Anaxarchus) *Diogenis Smyrnæi auditor fuit.* Thus far he is in the right, and the proofs he alledges are solid. He quotes a passage of Clemens Alexandrinus (6), and a passage of Eusebius, wherein it is said that Anaxarchus was the disciple of Diogenes of Smyrna (7). But when he adds that the Diogenes, who is surnamed Σμυρναῖος in the Life of Anaxarchus, is the same with him who in the preceding chapter has the surname Ἀπολλωνιάτης, he is mistaken. *Notandum*

(1) Steph. Byzant. *in* Ἀπολλωνία.

(2) It is in the 235th and following pages of his Treatise *of the Isle of Crete.*

(3) Ibid. pag. 19.

(4) Lescalop. *in Cicer. de Nat. Deor.* pag. 46.

(5) Diog. Laert. lib. 9. num. 58.

(6) Clem. Alexand. *Strom.* lib. 1.

(7) Euseb. *Præparat. Evang.* lib. 14. cap. 17.

(a) See above, the Remark [A] of the Article ARCHELAUS *the Philoſopher.*

ſome probability, that he taught after him in the Ionic ſchool (a). He rectified in ſome meaſure his Profeſſor's opinion concerning the firſt Cauſe [B] : for he taught that air was the matter of all beings ; he acknowledged likewiſe that nothing could be produced from that matter without the divine power which he attributed to the air. Anaximenes had

(8) Menag. *in Diog. Laertium*, lib. 9. num. 58. pag. 423.

tandum autem, ſays he (8), *Diogenem Smyrnæum à Laertio hoc loco appellari qui ſupra Apolloniates eidem dictus fuit, non enim diverſi ſunt Smyrnæus & Apolloniates.* To comprehend the fallacy of this, we muſt obſerve two things, I, Diogenes Laertius had taken notice that Diogenes of Apollonia was the Scholar of Anaximenes, and contemporary with Anaxagoras (9). Is it credible that a few lines after he ſhould give him Anaxarchus for a diſciple, who, as he expreſly ſays, had ſome converſations with Alexander ? From the death of Anaxagoras to the reign of Alexander, there were three philoſophic ſucceſſions at Athens ; Archelaüs, who had been the diſciple of Anaxagoras, left his chair to Socrates, who having kept it a long while, left it Plato, and he had Alexander's maſter for his diſciple. Chronology will not allow, without being ſtrained, that a diſciple of the diſciple of Anaximenes ſhould follow the Court of that King of Macedon. In the ſecond place, we ſee that the ſame Clemens Alexandrinus, who plainly inſinuates that Diogenes of Apollonia was the ſcholar of Anaximenes (10), and conſequently one of the Members of the Ionic Sect, obſerves expreſly that Diogenes of Smyrna, the diſciple of Metrodorus, who had been the diſciple of Protagoras, was of the Eleatic Sect, and taught Anaxarchus (11). How can one conceive that the ſame Philoſopher ſhould be the diſciple of Anaximenes, and alſo of the diſciple of Protagoras ?

(9) Diogen. Laert. ibid. num. 57.

(10) Clem. Alexand. *in Protrept.* pag. 42. C.

(11) Clemens Alex. *Stromat.* lib. 1. pag. 301.

[B] *He rectified in ſome meaſure the opinion of his Profeſſor concerning the firſt Cauſe.*] I have not met with ſo particular a detail of this in any Author as in a Work of S. Auguſtin. *Iſte* (Anaximander) *Anaximenem diſcipulum, & ſucceſſorem reliquit : qui omnes rerum cauſas infinito aeri dedit, nec Deos negavit, aut tacuit : non tamen ab ipſis aerem factum, ſed ipſos ex aere ortos credidit. Anaxagoras verò ejus auditor, harum rerum omnium, quas videmus, effectorem, divinum animum ſenſit : & dixit, ex infinita materia, quæ conſtaret diſſimilibus inter ſe particulis, rerum omnium genera pro modulis & ſpeciebus propriis ſingula fieri, ſed animo faciente divino. Diogenes quoque, Anaximenis alter auditor, aerem quidem dixit, rerum eſſe materiam, de qua omnia fierent : ſed eum eſſe compotem divinæ rationis, ſine qua nihil ex eo fieri poſſet* (12). i. e. " Anaximander left Anaximenes his ſcholar and ſucceſſor ; who aſcribed the cauſes of all things to infinite Air : the being of Gods he neither denied, nor ſuppreſſed ; yet he thought the air was not made by them, but that they owed their origin to the Air. Anaxagoras, his diſciple, was of opinion that a divine Mind was the Author of all viſible things : and he ſaid that all the ſeveral kinds of things, according to their reſpective modes and ſpecies, were made out of infinite matter, which conſiſted of diſſimilar particles, but were formed by that divine Mind. Diogenes, another Scholar of Anaximenes, ſaid likewiſe that Air was the matter from which all things were produced ; but that it was indued with divine Reaſon, without which nothing could be effected by it." Cicero has repreſented this Dogm of Diogenes in a much more ſuccinct manner. *Quid ? aer*, ſays he (13), *quo Diogenes Apolloniates utitur Deo, quem ſenſum habere poteſt, aut quam formam Dei ?* i. e. " What ſhall we ſay " of air, which Diogenes of Apollonia ſuppoſed to " be God ? What ſenſe, or what form of God can " it have ?" The Jeſuit Leſcalopier finds a great deal of unfair dealing in theſe words of Velleius the Epicurean, one of Cicero's Interlocutors ; and ſee with what an air he addreſſes him (14). *Quandiu impones, Vellei, extinctis, ſepultiſque philoſophis, qui reclamare non poſſunt, & illis errores affinges in quos nunquam impegerunt ? ecce hic quoque aerem Diogenis Apolloniatæ Deum facis, quem ille pro Deo nunquam habuit : nam dixit quidem libro nono Laertii, aerem eſſe* στοιχεῖον, *i. e.* elementum, *non autem* Deum, *& libro octavo de Civitate Dei, capite ſecundo,* aerem eſſe materiem rerum de qua omnia fierent ; ſed eum eſſe compotem divinæ rationis, ſine qua nihil fieret. *Jam verò in altiſſimâ illâ, divinaque ratione fruſtra ſenſum, fruſtra figuram requiris, quæ, niſi in corporeâ naturâ, non inveniri, opinor, intelligis : eſt enim illa ratio divina merè ſpiritalis.* i. e. " How long, Velleius, will you injure Philoſophers who are dead and buried, and " cannot now anſwer for themſelves, by falſly imputing to them errors into which they never fell ? " Lo here likewiſe you make the Air to be the God " of Diogenes of Apollonia, which he never held to " be God : it is true, he has ſaid, in the ninth Book " of Laertius, that the air is an *element*, but not a " *God*, and in the ſecond chapter of the eighth Book " *de Civitate Dei*, that *the air is the matter from which* " *all things were produced ; but that it is indued with* " *a divine reaſon, without which nothing could be ef-* " *fected.* But in that moſt high and divine reaſon " you in vain look for ſenſe, or figure, which are " not to be found, as I ſuppoſe you well know, elſe- " where than in a corporeal nature : for that divine " reaſon is merely ſpiritual." This Jeſuit's complaint is unjuſt ; for it is certain that the paſſage of Cicero contains the whole ſubſtance and force of that of S. Auguſtin, and amounts to the ſame ſenſe, which is, that according to the Hypotheſes of Diogenes the air was God. He taught, if we believe S. Auguſtin, that there were two things in the air ; firſt, a matter, from which all the bodies in the univerſe might be produced, ſecondly, a divine virtue, without which nothing could be produced from that matter. Is not this making one entire being or compoſition of the air and that divine virtue, wherein, if the air was the matter, the divine virtue was the ſoul or form ? Now as it is the form which ſpecifies the compoſition, and gives it its name, it follows that the air, animated by a divine virtue or a divine nature, ought to be called God : and conſequently when Cicero ſuppoſes that the air, was God according to Diogenes, he only ſuppoſes what neceſſarily reſults from the expoſition which St. Auguſtin has given of that Philoſopher's doctrine. The objection which the Jeſuit grounds on the word στοιχεῖον is of no force ; for, as I have already ſaid, our Diogenes admitted two things in the air, matter and an efficient cauſe, and he united them intimately together (15) : on this ſuppoſition, the air, as matter, was the element or στοιχεῖον of the different bodies of the Univerſe (16) ; yet this did not hinder but that the ſame air conſidered jointly with the divine virtue with which it was indued, was God. This may be fortified by a new obſervation : the words of S. Auguſtin may induce us to judge that this reaſon or divine virtue which Diogenes joined to the air, was rather an attribute than a form, or a ſoul diſtinct from air ; that is to ſay, that, according to Diogenes, there was but one ſubſtance in the air, which was both the material principle of all things, and the reaſon, wiſdom, or intelligence, which, as the efficient cauſe, directed the production of all things. It is therefore with all imaginable juſtice, that Cicero's Vellejus charges Diogenes with having taught that the air is God. Ariſtotle will wonderfully countenance thoſe who ſhall underſtand S. Auguſtin's phraſe in this manner. He acquaints us that the ſoul of man was of air according to Diogenes, and that it knew and moved itſelf as being of an aerial nature. Its knowledge was founded on the air's being the principle of all things, its motive power proceeded from the air's being the moſt ſubtil of all beings. Διογένης δ' ὥσπερ καὶ ἕτεροί τινες, ἀέρα τοῦτον οἰηθεὶς πάντων λεπτομερέστατον εἶναι, καὶ ἀρχήν· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο γινώσκειν τε καὶ κινεῖν τὴν ψυχήν, ἢ μὲν πρῶτόν ἐστι, καὶ ἐκ τούτου τὰ λοιπὰ γινώσκειν· ἢ δὲ λεπτομερέστατον, κινητικὸν εἶναι. *Diogenes autem, ſicut & alii quidam, aerem ipſam cenſuit eſſe : hunc ſubtiliſſimæ ſubſtantiæ, rerumque principium eſſe putans. Idcirco cognoſcere atque movere, animam dixit : hoc quidem cognoſcere, quo primum eſt, & ex hoc ipſo cætera conſtant ; hoc autem eſſe motivum, quo ſubtiliſſimum eſt* (17). Theſe words of Ariſtotle clearly ſhew that Diogenes gave to the air the nature of a firſt principle, that of a firſt mover, knowledge, and ſubtilty in the higheſt degree, as attributes which conſtituted *per modum unius* one ſole and identical ſubſtance, which was God. The reſult of which is, that

(12) Auguſtin. *de Civit. Dei*, lib. 8. cap. 2. pag. m. 711.

(13) Cicero, *de Nat. Deorum*, lib. 1. cap. 12.

(14) Leſcalop. *in Ciceron. de Nat. Deor.* lib. 1. pag. 48, 49.

(15) *Aerem compotem divinæ rationis.* Auguſt. *de Civit. Dei*, lib. 8. cap. 2. pag. 711.

(16) Note that according to Diogenes there was no difference between ἀρχὴ *principle*, and στοιχεῖον, *element* : for he acknowledged no more than one Element. See Citation (22).

(17) Ariſtoteles, lib. 1. *de Anima*, cap. 2. pag. 479, E. tom. 1. *Oper.*

had not explained the generation of things in this manner: the air was, according to his doctrine, the sole and universal cause; and the Gods themselves were produced by it [C]. Cicero has been unjustly accused of not having faithfully reported this dogm of Diogenes (b). It is not to be doubted but Plutarch has sometimes alledged the opinions of this Natural Philosopher [D], when he simply tells us that Diogenes taught this or that: but this is a very bad way of quoting, since there were several illustrious Philosophers named Diogenes. He who is the subject of this Article was master of great eloquence (c). His merit dangerously exposed him to the jealousy of some persons in Athens (d); so that he ran the risque of his life. The beginning of his Work has been preserved to us; and it is a setting out which gives an advantageous idea of his understanding. We there find he was of opinion that a Teacher should first lay down an incontestable principle, and should make use of a style which might be both grave and simple at the same time (e). I do not mention the opinions which Diogenes Laertius ascribes to him; since they may be seen in Moreri. His opinion as to the origin and distribution of the winds is to be

(b) See the Remark [B] Citation (14).

(c) Diogenes Laertius, lib. 9. num. 57.

(d) Idem, ibid.

(e) Idem, ibid. & lib. 6. num. 81.

that his System differed scarce at all from Spinozism: God was thereby at the same time the material cause, and the efficient cause of all things; he was the immanent cause of all beings; he produced in himself all the bodies of the Universe, that infinity of worlds which Diogenes acknowledged (18). Let us observe, by the way, that the verses of Sidonius Apollinaris, which I have quoted elsewhere (19), suit the doctrine of Diogenes infinitely better than the doctrine of Archelaus to whom Savaron has applied them. Justus Lipsius had a great deal of reason to take them for the description of the opinion of Diogenes (20).

It is worth while to see in what manner he philosophized as to the production of the World: his thoughts are in some respects, and in general, conformable enough to the Hypothesis of Mr. Des-Cartes. All things being in motion, said he, some became condensed, and others rarified; in those places where condensation prevailed, a whirling motion or vortex was formed, which by its revolution drew in the rest: what was most subtil and light flew upwards, and formed the Sun in the superior region. For my warrant, I shall transcribe his Greek. Διογένης ὁ Ἀπολλωνιάτης, ἀέρα ὑφίστασθαι στοιχεῖον· κινεῖσθαι δὲ τὰ πάντα, ἀπείρους τε εἶναι τοὺς κόσμους· κοσμοποιεῖσθαι δὲ ὅταν· ὅτι τῷ παντὸς κινουμένου, καὶ ἢ μὲν ἀραιοῦ, ἢ δὲ πυκνοῦ γινομένου, ὅπου συνεκύρησε τὸ πυκνὸν, συστροφὴν ποιῆσαι, καὶ ὅταν τὰ λοιπὰ, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον, τὰ κυφότατα τὴν ἄνω τάξιν λαβόντα, τὸν ἥλιον ἀποτελέσαι. *Diogenes Apolloniata, Aërem elementum ponit, moveri autem universa, & infinitos esse mundos affirmat. Cæterum ejusmodi somniat eorum molitionem: scilicet cùm universum ita moveretur, ut rarius hic, alibi densius fieret, ubicunque major densitas contingeret, ibi convolutionem quandam effeciſſe, tùm similem in modum cætera: quæ autem omnium leviſſimæ partes essent, eas regione superiori occupatâ Solem produxiſſe* (21). It does not seem easy to reconcile this Hypothesis with what Aristotle, as we have seen above, says of the opinions of this natural Philosopher. He imputes to him the having taught that the Air is the most subtile of all beings. How then could it be said, after this, that at the beginning of the World there were bodies which became condensed, and others which became rarefied? That which is subtile and fine in the highest degree is not susceptible of rarefaction. I can perceive but one way to solve the difficulty; which is, to suppose that at the first shock the Air received it thickened, as we see Wine grows foul when the vessel is shaken. The motion continued, and in this progress of agitation some parts grew yet thicker, and others grew clear. The latter did not acquire a degree of rarefaction superior to the essential subtilty of the first principle, but superior only to the density to which the whole mass of the air was reduced by the first motion. If we had the Writings of Diogenes, we should doubtless see that he had obviated or explained all such difficulties as these; but as his system is known to us only by a very small number of loose particulars, we can only grope our way in the dark, when we attempt to put the incoherent fragments together. Take notice that Aristotle (22) praises him for having acknowledged that if all things were not made of one sole principle, there could be no action and reaction; for cold and heat cannot be transformed into one another; wherefore they require a common subject, which may be successively cold and hot. Aristotle found his account in this general notion; for he stripped the four elements of the nature of a first material principle, to bestow it on one single being, which he called the first matter.

(18) Diogen. Laert. lib. 9. num. 57.

(19) Above, Citation (9) of the Article ARCHELAUS *the Philosopher*.

(20) Lipsius, *Manuduct. ad Philosoph. Stoic.* lib. 1. Dissert. 8. pag. m. 645.

(21) Euseb. *Præparat. Evang.* lib. 1. cap. 8. pag. 25, B.

(22) Aristot. *de Generat. & Corrupt.* lib. 1. cap. 6.

I fancy Diogenes Laertius is mistaken, when he says that Diogenes of Apollonia admitted an infinite Vacuum (23). I chuse rather to follow Plutarch, who assures us that all the Natural Philosophers from Thales down to Plato rejected a Vacuum (24).

(23) Diog. Laert. lib. 9. num. 57.

(24) Plutarch. *de Placitis Philos.* lib. 1. cap. 18. pag. 883.

[C] *The air was.... the only cause;.... the Gods themselves were produced from it.*] It is a very strange thing that there should ever have been Philosophers blind enough to give God so low an original. Right order required that they should assert that God produced bodies; and some of them, on the contrary, have asserted that bodies had produced God. Can the cause be less perfect than its effect? An intelligent nature, therefore, cannot have brute matter for its cause. I do not know whether the experience of the human species may not have obscured the notions of common sense. They saw the Heroes, the wise men, and the greatest men, proceed from whence? scarce can the eyes, or the imagination, bear so filthy, so loathsome, so hideous an object. Yet it is there that you must find the principles of the greatest souls, unless God reveals to us that it is he who creates a spirit to be united to the machine of the human body. We shall see elsewhere (25) whether what passes in the propagation of the rational animal may have led those into error who have advanced so many whimsies concerning the original of the Gods.

(25) In the Remark [G] of the Article JUPITER.

[D] *There is no doubt but Plutarch has sometimes alledged the opinions of this Natural Philosopher.*] I only consider here his Books of the Opinions of the Philosophers. The places where he mentions the sentiments of Diogenes, as far as I have been able to find, are these; the 1st, 8th, and 13th Chapters of the 2d Book: the 5th, and 16th Chapters of the 4th Book: the 15th, 20th, and 23d Chapters of the 5th Book. I am persuaded that he almost always means Diogenes of Apollonia, and I should be of that opinion without any exception, if Monsieur du Rondel had not written to me that the passage which will be seen below (26) more probably relates to Diogenes the Cynic. This passage is in the 20th Chapter of the 5th Book of Plutarch, and seems to signify that the Diogenes there cited deprived brute animals of sensation. There is a circumstance which strongly tempts one to imagine that it is Diogenes of Apollonia who is there intended. We have seen above (27) that he said the soul was of air: now the Diogenes of this passage of Plutarch taught that animals participate of understanding and the air (28). It was the language which Diogenes of Apollonia ought to make use of, when he designed only to strip brute animals of actual understanding and sensation, and not of the soul or principle of understanding and sensation. This plainly appears to have been his aim: he admitted the soul in brutes; but he thought the thickness and humidity of their organs blunted its activity. Francis de Fougerolles, who translated into French and paraphrased Diogenes Laertius, attributes this opinion to Diogenes of Apollonia. *He thought*, says he (29),... *that all sorts of animals have indeed understanding, but the greater part of them, being of a gross constitution, have not the free use of reason, no more than madmen, by reason of some impediment.* He manifestly had this passage of Plutarch in view; but he represents it very unfaithfully.

(26) In the Remark [E] of the Article PEREIRA.

(27) In the Remark (B) Citation (17).

(28) Μετέχειν μὲν αὐτὰ τοῦ νοητοῦ καὶ ἀέρος. *Rationis & aëris participes eas esse.* Plut. *de Placit. Philos.* lib. 5. cap. 20. pag. 909.

(29) François de Fougerolles, *Addit. à Diogene Laerce*, pag. 655.

be found in Ariſtotle (*f*). What he ſaid concerning the nature of ſeed, from whence he drew the etymology of the word Ἀφροδίσια, that is *Venereal affairs*, may be ſeen in Clemens Alexandrinus (*g*). There is ſome conformity between the Doctrine of this Philoſopher, and that of Mr. Des-Cartes, with relation to the generation of the World (*h*).

(*f*) Ariſtot. *Hiſt. Anim.* lib. 3. cap. 2.

(*g*) Clem. Alexand. *Pædag.* lib. 1. pag. 105.

(*h*) See the Remark [*B*].

DIOGENES, a Philoſopher of the Sect of the Stoics, was ſurnamed the Babylonian (*a*), though he was not of Babylon, but of Seleucia on the Tigris. The nearneſs of theſe two Cities was the occaſion of this ſurname (*b*); beſides that the name of the former has been ſometimes given to the latter (*c*). This Philoſopher was the ſcholar of Chryſippus (*d*), and wrote ſeveral Works [*A*]. His reputation muſt needs have been great, ſince the Athenians deputed him Ambaſſador to Rome, with Carneades the chief of the Academics, and Critolaüs the chief of the Peripatetic ſchool. I have ſpoken of this Embaſſy elſewhere (*e*). Our Diogenes lived fourſcore and eight years (*f*), and philoſophized to the end of his life (*g*). He ſhewed an example of great moderation [*B*], when a moſt inſolent young fellow ſpat in his face. I do not think he ought to be confounded with him whom Athenæus has ſpoken ill of [*C*]; but I do not diſtinguiſh him from

(*a*) Diog. Laert. lib. 6, num. 81. *See alſo* Strabo, lib. 16. pag. 512.

(*b*) Idem Diog. ibid.

(*c*) *See* Bochart, *Geogr. Sacr.* lib. 1. cap. 8.

(*d*) Cicero, *De Divinat.* lib. 1. cap. 3.

(*e*) In the Article CARNEADES, Remark [*F*].

(*f*) Lucian. *in Macrob.* pag. 641. tom. 2.

(*g*) Cicero, *de Senect.* cap. 7.

[*A*] *He wrote ſeveral Works.*] A Treatiſe of Divination (1), another of Nobility (2), another of Laws (3), another of Minerva. In this laſt he explained phyſically what was ſaid of the extraordinary birth of that Goddeſs. *Quem* (Chryſippum) *Diogenes Babylonius conſequens in eo libro qui inſcribitur de Minerva partum Jovis ortumque virginis ad phyſiologiam traducens, disjungit à fabula* (4). I cannot tell in what Work it was that he taught what Cicero mentions. It relates to uprightneſs in dealing: his Morality in that point was ſomewhat leſs rigid than that of Antipater his diſciple. *In hujuſmodi cauſis aliud Diogeni Babylonio videri ſolet, magno & gravi Stoico, aliud Antipatro, diſcipulo ejus, homini acutiſſimo. Antipatro omnia patefacienda, ut ne quid omnino, quod venditor norit, emtor ignoret: Diogeni venditorem quatenus jure civili conſtitutum ſit, dicere vitia oportere, cetera ſine inſidiis agere, & quoniam vendat, velle quam optime vendere* (5). i. e. "In caſes of this kind Diogenes the Babylonian, a Stoic of great authority, taught one thing, and his ſcholar Antipater, a moſt acute man, taught another. Antipater was of opinion every thing ought to be laid open, that nothing which the ſeller knew might be concealed from the buyer: Diogenes taught that the ſeller ought to diſcover the faults of the commodity ſo far as was injoined by the Civil Law; that he ſhould in other reſpects deal without tricking, and ſince he did ſell, might endeavour to ſell to the beſt advantage." Here is another paſſage: *Quærit etiam* (Hecaton in libro ſexto de Officiis) *ſi ſapiens adulterinos nummos acceperit imprudens pro bonis: cum id reſcierit, ſoluturuſne ſit eos, ſi cui debeat, pro bonis. Diogenes ait, Antipater negat, cui potius aſſentior. Qui vinum fugiens vendat ſciens, debeatne dicere. Non neceſſe putat Diogenes: Antipater viri boni exiſtimat. Hæc ſunt quaſi controverſa jura Stoicorum* (6). i. e. "Hecato alſo, in his ſixth Book of Offices, inquires whether in caſe a wiſe man ſhould ignorantly receive falſe money inſtead of good, he may, when he comes to know it, pay ſuch money to his creditor for good. Diogenes allows he may; but Antipater, whoſe opinion I prefer, ſays he may not. Whether a man who knowingly ſells wine which is upon the decay, ought to diſcover it. Diogenes thinks it not neceſſary; but Antipater thinks it the duty of an honeſt man. Theſe are as it were the controverted caſes of juſtice among the Stoics." I ſhould imagine that Diogenes ſpoke of theſe things in his Treatiſe of Laws.

(1) Cicero, lib. 1. *de Divinat.* cap. 3.

(2) Athen. lib. 4. cap. 19. pag. 168.

(3) Idem, lib. 12. cap. 6. pag. 526.

(4) Cicero, *de Nat. Deor.* lib. 1. cap. 15.

(5) Idem, *de Officijs*, lib. 3. cap. 12.

(6) Idem, ibid. cap. 23.

[*B*] *He ſhewed an example of great moderation.*] The following words of Seneca will acquaint us with the fact: *Contumeliam tibi fecit aliquis. Num quid majorem quam Diogeni, Philoſopho Stoico? cui de ira cum maxime differenti adoleſcens protervus inſpuit. Tulit hoc ille leniter ac ſapienter, non quidem, inquit, iraſcor: ſed dubito tamen an iraſci oporteat* (7). i. e. "Suppoſe ſomebody has offered you an affront. Was it a greater than was offered to Diogenes, the Stoic Philoſopher? whom an inſolent young fellow ſpat upon, as he was earneſtly diſcourſing on Anger. He bore it patiently and wiſely: I am not angry, ſaid he; but yet I doubt whether I ought not to be angry." This was preaching by example: he was reading a Lecture on anger; he was combating that paſſion in the chair, than which nothing is more eaſy. He had an opportunity given him of practiſing what he adviſed; an enormous affront was offered him in the midſt of his Sermon on patience, and he was not angry. Here was a Stoic in practice: however a word eſcaped him which did not perfectly tally with the doctrine of his ſect. He ought to have been certain, as a Stoic, that he ought not to be angry.

(7) Seneca, *de Ira*, lib. 3. cap. 38. pag. m. 580.

[*C*] *I do not think he ought to be confounded with him whom Athenæus has ſpoken ill of.*] He ſpeaks (8) of one Diogenes an Epicurean Philoſopher, a native of Seleucia near Babylon: he ſpeaks of him, I ſay, as of a man of tolerable eloquence and learning, but of bad morals, envious, and ſatyrical, not ſparing even Kings themſelves, when occaſions of joking preſented themſelves (9). He made himſelf agreeable to a King of Syria, who was notwitſtanding prepoſſeſſed in favour of the maxims of the Stoics (10): Ἀναδοχῆς δ' ἐτύγχανε παρὰ τῷ βασιλέως καί τοι τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς στοᾶς λόγοις χαίροντι (11): *acceptus gratuſque regi fuit quamvis Stoicorum placitis gaudenti.* It was Alexander Bala: the Philoſopher, with a boldneſs which ill ſuited his character, one day aſked that Prince's leave to put on a purple robe and a crown of gold, in the midſt of which there appeared the image of vertue. The Prince made him a preſent of both; and the Philoſopher made a preſent of them to a woman he was in love with. Alexander, being acquainted with this, invited ſome Philoſophers and other illuſtrious perſons to dinner, and ordered Diogenes to ſit down at the table with the purple robe and crown of gold. The Philoſopher excuſed himſelf, alledging it would be a piece of indecency: whereupon the King made a ſign for his Muſic to enter, and among the reſt of them Diogenes's miſtreſs appeared adorned with the robe and crown which he had preſented her with. Every body fell a laughing: Diogenes waited till it was over, and then made a long encomium on that woman. Antiochus, who ſucceeded Alexander (12), could not bear this Philoſopher's abuſive tongue, and therefore commanded him to be put to death (13). Several things convince me that this relation does not concern our Diogenes. In the firſt place, Athenæus ſays expreſly that he who was beloved by Alexander King of Syria was of the Sect of Epicurus, and that that Prince's prepoſſeſſion in favour of the Stoical doctrines did not prevent his liking him. This ſhews that he does not ſpeak of a Philoſopher who was a Stoic in theory, and an Epicurean in practice; wherefore he does not ſpeak of the Scholar of Chryſippus, and the Collegue of Carneades in the Embaſſy to Rome. In the ſecond place, Cicero aſſures us that Diogenes the Stoic philoſophized all his life, that is to ſay, he read Lectures in the Portico at Athens till his death: *Num Philoſophorum principes, Pythagoram, Democritum, num Platonem, num Xenocratem, num poſtea Zenonem, Cleanthem, aut eum, quem vos etiam Romæ vidiſtis, Diogenem Stoicum, coegit in ſuis ſtudiis obmuteſcere ſenectus? an non in omnibus iis ſtudiorum agitatio vitæ æqualis fuit* (14)? i. e. "Were the principal Philoſophers, Pythagoras, Democritus, Plato, Xenocrates, or after them, Zeno, Cleanthes, or Diogenes the Stoic, whom you have alſo ſeen at Rome, conſtrained to bury their talents in ſilence by old age? Was not their application to ſtudy of equal duration with their lives?" Could he ſpeak thus of a Philoſopher

(8) Athen. lib. 5. cap. 13. pag. 211.

(9) Τοῦ γελοίε μηδὲ τῶν βασιλέων ἀπεχόμενον. *Dum riſum captabat ne regibus quidem parcentem.* Idem, ibid.

(10) Idem, ibid.

(11) Thus we muſt read, as Mr. *Menage* obſerves *in Diog. Laert.* lib. 6. num. 8. and not χαίροντι, as it is in the Editions of *Athenæus*.

(12) Ὁ μεταλαβὼν τὴν βασιλείαν Ἀντίοχος. *Qui Alexandro ſucceſſit in regno Antiochus.* Idem, ibid. This is not exact; for there was a King between Alexander and Antiochus.

(13) Taken from *Athenæus*, lib. 5. cap. 13. pag. 211.

(14) Cicero, *de Senectute*, cap. 7.

from the perſon who taught Carneades Logic [*D*]. I ſhall take notice of an Error of Moreri [*E*]. See below in the laſt Remark.

loſopher who, after his Embaſſy to Rome, had paſt the reſt of his days at the Court of the Kings of Syria? In the third place, the Diogenes of Athenæus was living in the year of Rome 610; for Antiochus, who put him to death, did not begin his reign before that time. Now Diogenes the Stoic was dead when Cato ſaid of him what I have juſt now quoted from the Treatiſe *de Senectute*; and it is certain that the Epoch of that Work is prior by ſome years to the year of Rome 610 (15). Laſtly, it is highly improbable that if the famous Philoſopher whom the Republic of Athens ſent to the Roman Senate, had obſcured his reputation by a ſhameful old age, and by a violent death which he juſtly deſerved, no Author ſhould have taken notice of it. Let us conclude, therefore, that he is not the perſon whom Athenæus means, and conſequently that Jonſius is miſtaken (16) in placing his death under the 159th Olympiad: for this Chronology has no other foundation than the narrative of Athenæus.

(15) Since Cato ſays, *cap.* 10, that he is in his 84th year, it muſt be in the year of Rome 603.

(16) Jonſius, *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſ* pag. 115, 190.

Note, I am a little diffident of the third reaſon, when I conſider, on one hand, that Diogenes lived fourſcore and eight years according to Lucian, and, on the other, that his Embaſſy was in the year of Rome 598. It follows from thence that, if he died before the time Cato is ſuppoſed to have ſaid what we read in the Book *de Senectute*, he came Embaſſador to Rome at the age of eighty three at leaſt. Now, as nobody has obſerved this circumſtance, and Cicero himſelf, who might have taken advantage of it, does not ſuppoſe that Cato had taken notice of it, I think it may be ſaid that this Philoſopher was not ſo old when he came to Rome on the Athenians affairs. Let us not imagine that Cicero has obſerved Chronology ſo exactly in his Dialogues, as never to have made a ſlip in that reſpect. Nothing is more difficult than ſuch an exactneſs when we bring in a man ſpeaking who lived before our time. We make him ſpeak ſometimes according to our own ideas; and what he ſays of people's death or old age is falſe for no other reaſon than becauſe inſtead of putting our ſelves in his place, we put him in ours. Cicero might have added Diogenes to the number of Philoſophers who had not given over their ſtudies before an end was put to their life: but Cato could not make this addition; for, if I am not miſtaken, he died before Diogenes. And yet, in the Dialogue *de Senectute*, he is introduced diſcourſing as one who ſurvived that Philoſopher.

[*D*] *I do not diſtinguiſh him from the perſon who taught Carneades Logic.*] The paſſage wherein Cicero obſerves this is curious; for which reaſon I ſhall quote it. When Carneades fell into any ſubtle or perplexed diſpute, he uſed this piece of pleaſantry: if my conſequence be good, I have got the better; if it be not, let Diogenes return me my money. *Cum aliquid ejuſmodi incideret, ſic ludere Carneades ſolebat: ſi recte concluſi, teneo, ſin vitioſe, minam Diogenes reddat, ab eo enim Stoico Dialecticam didicerat; hæc autem merces erat Dialecticorum* (17).

(17) Cicero, *Academ. Quæſt.* lib. 4. cap. 30.

[*E*] *I ſhall take notice of an error of Moreri.*] He pretends that our Diogenes was ſent to Rome, with Carneades and Critolaüs, *under the Conſulſhip of P. Scipio and M. Marcellus, during the time of the ſecond Punic War.* Nobody doubts this, ſays he: yet it is certain that ſeveral do doubt it, and the Jeſuit Leſcalopier condemns thoſe who do not diſtinguiſh this Diogenes from him who was ſent to Rome on the affairs of the Athenians. *Cave tamen hunc* (Diogenem Babylonium, Chryſippi diſcipulum, Stoicum) *confundas cum altero Diogene Stoico qui cum Carneade Academico ab Athenienſibus legatus Romam de maximis rebus miſſus eſſe dicitur libro ſecundo de Orat. quippe quos docti viri ſcitè diſtinctos volunt* (18). i. e. "But take care "you do not confound this *Diogenes the Babylonian, the* "*Stoic Philoſopher, and the Scholar of Chryſippus*, with "the other Diogenes a Stoic, who Cicero tells us was "ſent Embaſſador to Rome with Carneades the Aca- "demic by the Athenians on very weighty affairs; "ſince ſome learned men are of opinion they ought "to be particularly diſtinguiſhed." If Moreri had ſaid, *There is no reaſon to doubt* &c. I ſhould not have blamed him in the leaſt: for, whatever the Jeſuit may ſay to the contrary, it is certain that we have here but one and the ſame Diogenes. But this is not the fault I intend principally to ſpeak of. He is much more to be blamed in another reſpect, ſince there was no year during the ſecond Punic War wherein a Scipio and a Marcellus were Conſuls, and the Embaſſy of the three Philoſophers was after the end of the ſecond Punic War. This I have proved to demonſtration in the article of CARNEADES (19). Note, that Voſſius has led Moreri into this miſtake (20). I ſay nothing of a few ſmall faults, ſome whereof have been corrected in the Dutch edition (21). It had been neceſſary to have taken notice what Sect Diogenes was of; for thereby one omiſſion would have been ſupplied.

(18) Leſcalopier in Ciceron. *de Natura Deor.* pag. 65.

(19) Remark [*N*].

(20) Voſſius, *de Philoſ. Sectis*, pag. 103.

(21) Some faults in language have been corrected in it, but not the falſe quotations; for inſtance, that of the 6th Book of *Cicero de Finibus*, which Work contains but five Books. This quotation and all the others were taken from Voſſius, *de Philoſ. Sectis*, pag. 103.

DIONYSIUS, Tyrant of Heraclea, a City of Pontus, took advantage of the decline of the Perſians, after they had loſt the Battle of Granicus againſt Alexander. He had not dared to aggrandize himſelf while he ſtood in awe of them; but he was freed from any apprehenſions from that quarter when he ſaw them engaged in a war wherein fortune declared for the Macedonians: however he ſoon found himſelf diſappointed in the hopes he had built on the growing weakneſs of the Perſian Monarchy. He had more reaſon to dread the Conqueror, than he had ever had to fear the Court of Perſia. Thoſe who had been baniſhed from Heraclea had recourſe to Alexander for protection, and found him ſo diſpoſed to favour their intereſt, that for their ſakes he was very near dethroning Dionyſius. The thing would have infallibly happened, if Dionyſius had not avoided the blow by a thouſand politic wiles [*A*], among which we muſt reckon his ſtudying to obtain the good will of Cleopatra. He ſaw himſelf delivered from all his uneaſineſs

(1) Ἐξέπεσεν ἂν εἰ μὴ συνῆσε πολλῇ καὶ ἀγχινοίᾳ, καὶ τῇ τῶν ὑπηκόων εὐνοίᾳ, καὶ θεραπείᾳ Κλεοπάτρας, τοὺς ἀπειλημένους αὐτῷ πολέμους διέφυγε. *Et excidiſſet ſane, niſi prudentia & ſagacitate mentis, & ſtudiis civium, & ſuis erga Cleopatram obſequiis, bella, cum minis ſibi denuntiata, effugiſſet.* Photius, *Biblioth.* p. 709, num. 224.

(2) Juſtin, lib. 9. cap. 7. & lib. 13. cap. 6.

(3) Plutarch. *in Alexand.* p. 702.

[*A*] *Alexander would have dethroned him . . . if he had not avoided the blow by a thouſand politic wiles.*] One of theſe wiles was making his court to Cleopatra (1): this is the ordinary way; nothing is to be done without the fair ſex, and there are in all countries ſome women whom a man muſt engage in his intereſt, if he would ſucceed in his deſigns. But I ſhould be glad to know who this Cleopatra was: was ſhe the ſiſter of Alexander, whom Philip gave in marriage to the King of Epirus (2), and who ſeized on Macedonia upon a falſe report that Alexander had been ſlain (3)? She ſeems moſt probably to have been the perſon. Her intereſt, no doubt, was very great, both with Olympias her mother, and Alexander her brother. It was very conſiderable after that Prince's death: for we ſee Eumenes went to viſit her at Sardis, to authorize his proceedings by this Princeſs's name. *Inde Sardis profectus eſt ad Cleopatram ſororem Alexandri Magni, ut ejus voce centuriones principeſque confirmaret, exiſtimaturos ibi majeſtatem regiam verti unde ſoror Alexandri ſtaret. Tanta veneratio magnitudinis Alexandri erat, ut etiam per veſtigia mulierum favor ſacrati ejus nominis quæreretur* (4). i. e. "From thence "he went to Sardis to Cleopatra the ſiſter of Alex- "ander the Great, that the Officers and Chiefs might "from her mouth be confirmed in their ſubmiſſion to "his orders, not doubting but they would think the "Royal Majeſty preſent on that ſide which ſhould "be countenanced by the ſiſter of Alexander. So "great was the veneration paid to Alexander's me- "mory, that they imagined the ſacred authority of "his name might be derived even through the wo- "men

(4) Juſtin, lib. 14. cap. 1.

uneaſineſs when he heard of the death of Alexander. This news was ſo extreamly acceptable to him, that it had like to have turned his brain [*B*]. Perdiccas, after the death of Alexander, was no leſs inclined to favour the Exiles of Heraclea; ſo that Dionyſius found himſelf again obliged to have recourſe to a thouſand artifices, in order to lay the ſtorm which threatened him. But this perplexity was of ſhort duration, becauſe Perdiccas was ſoon killed. From thenceforward the affairs of Dionyſius always went on proſperouſly, to which his marriage with AMASTRIS greatly contributed [*C*]. The voluptuous Life he led made him grow ſo fat, that he hardly did any thing but ſleep; and his lethargy was ſo deep, that they had no other way to wake him than by thruſting long needles into his body; and they could ſcarce compaſs it by that method. He died at the age of fifty five years, whereof he had reigned thirty. His ſubjects greatly regretted his loſs; for he had treated them with lenity. He left his wife guardian to his children, and

" men who bore any relation to him." The Hiſtorian whoſe words I have borrowed, had already ſaid that Perdiccas ſought her in marriage, with a view of becoming King (5). Caſſander, Lyſimachus, Antigonus, Ptolemy, and every one of the other Heads of parties were deſirous of having her to wife: for they thought the Macedonians would chooſe him for their Maſter whom ſhe ſhould marry; and thus each of them hoped to obtain the Empire provided he was her huſband. Antigonus kept her under a guard in Sardis; and ſhe, not loving him, and deſiring to join Ptolemy, endeavoured to make her eſcape. The Governor of the city prevented her; and at length, by Antigonus's order, he employed ſome women to put her to death. Antigonus, to avoid the infamy of ſuch a murder, commanded ſome of thoſe women to be executed, and cauſed the Princeſs to be interred in a magnificent manner (6). Thus is the public impoſed upon: Princes deſerve the name of Players better than thoſe who act on the ſtage.

(5) *Ut viribus auctoritatem regiam acquireret.* Juſtin. lib. 13. cap. 6. *See alſo* Diodorus Siculus, lib. 18. cap. 23.

(6) Taken from *Diodorus Siculus*, lib. 20. cap. 38, *ad ann.* 1 Olymp. 118.

[*B*] *The death of Alexander was ſo extreamly acceptable to him, that the news of it had like to have turned his brain.*] Here is a very ſingular effect of joy, and, if I am not deceived, more rare than that of cauſing death. Several perſons are reckoned up who have died of joy (7); but I do not remember to have read that many have loſt their ſenſes by it. This obliges me to tranſcribe Photius's own words: Εὐθυμίας μὲν ὁ Διονύσιος ἄγαλμα τὴν ἀγγελίαν ἀκούσας ἱδρυσατο· παθὼν τῇ πρώτῃ προσβολῇ τῆς φήμης ὑπὸ τῆς πολλῆς χαρᾶς, ὅσα ἂν ἡ σφοδρα λύπη θράσειε· μικρῷ γαρ περιτραπεὶς, εἰς τὸ πεσεῖν ὑπήχθη κ᾽ ἄνους ὤφθη γενόμενος. *Lætitiæ ſtatuam conſecravit: & ad primum famæ adventum eo affectus eſt modo præ exuberanti gaudio quo repentina hominem conſternatio adfecerit. Nam prope erat ut vertigine correptus prolaberetur, & à ſana mente conſpiceretur alienus* (8). i. e. " Dionyſius, when he received " intelligence of it, conſecrated a ſtatue to Joy; and " he was affected in the ſame manner by the firſt " tranſport which the news raiſed in him, as another " would have been by exceſſive grief: for he was ſeiz- " ed with ſuch a dizzineſs that he had like to have " fallen down, and ſeemed to be perfectly beſides " himſelf." What can reſiſt the machinal paſſions? Reaſon required that at the firſt news of the great Alexander's death, his moſt violent enemies ſhould ſeriouſly reflect on the inconſtancy of human things, not without admiring the prodigious qualities of that Prince. But our Dionyſius found himſelf ſo little in a condition to reflect gravely on the homage due on theſe occaſions to the deſtinies of Heroes, that he had almoſt loſt his reaſon; ſo violently was he hurried away by the firſt motions which were perfectly involuntary.

(7) *See* Valerius Maximus, lib. 9. cap. 12. & *Pliny*, lib. 7. cap. 53.

(8) Photius, *Bibliotb.* pag. 709. num. 224.

THE Hiſtory of AMASTRIS.

[*C*] *His marriage with* AMASTRIS *was of great ſervice to him.*] He married her after the death of his firſt wife. Amaſtris was the daughter of Oxathres, brother to the laſt Darius; ſhe was therefore couſin german to Statira, the daughter of that Darius and wife of Alexander the Great. They had been brought up together, and loved each other extremely. When Alexander married Statira, he would have Amaſtris married to one of his moſt intimate favourites. This was Craterus. He lived very well with her, till his intereſt, and perhaps his inclination alſo, after Alexander's death, induced him to marry Phila, the daughter of Antipater. Then Amaſtris, by Craterus's own conſent, married Dionyſius. She brought him a very great fortune; and as he had an opportunity of buying the furniture of Dionyſius, Tyrant of Sicily, his houſe appeared very ſplendid; and with the riches he was poſſeſſed of, being alſo ſupported by the affection of his ſubjects, he made ſome conqueſts, and ſent a powerful ſuccour to Antigonus during the war of Cyprus (9). In acknowledgment for this aſſiſtance, Antigonus married Ptolemy his nephew, Governor of the Helleſpont, to a daughter of Dionyſius by his firſt wife. Dionyſius had three children by Amaſtris, two ſons and a daughter. The daughter had the ſame name as her mother; one of the ſons was named Clearchus, and the other Oxathres. All things went well under the guardianſhip and regency of Amaſtris: for Antigonus became the protector of Heraclea and the Pupils; and when he ceaſed to be ſo, Lyſimachus took his place, and even married the widow of Dionyſius. He loved her paſſionately, till he became enamoured of Arſinoe the daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus. This new amour occaſioned a rupture between Lyſimachus and Amaſtris; upon which that Lady governed alone in Heraclea till Clearchus, her eldeſt ſon, came of age. This Prince and Oxathres his brother were ſo wicked, that they cauſed their mother to periſh at ſea, for very ſlight reaſons. Εἰς ἔκθετον δὲ κ᾽ μιαρώτατον ἔργον ἐξέπεσον. τὴν γὰρ μητέρα μηδὲν περὶ αὐτὺς μέγα πλημμελήσασαν μηχανῇ δεινῇ καὶ κακουργίᾳ ἐπιβᾶσαι νηὸς θαλάσσῃ ἀποπνιγῆναι κατειργάσαντο. *Ad nefarium & exſecrabile facinus ſunt delapſi. Matrem enim quæ nihil in eos grande peccaverat cum navi ſe commiſiſſet, inſigni commento & flagitio mari ſuffocandam curaverunt* (10). Lyſimachus, who then reigned in Macedonia, felt his former paſſion revive on hearing the news of this horrid crime, and reſolved to puniſh thoſe who had committed it. He diſſembled his deſign, which he knew how to do better than any man living; Κρύψαι τὸ βυλόμενον δεινότατος ἀνθρώπων γεγονέναι λέγεται. *Occultare enim quæ vellet ingenioſiſſimus mortalium fuiſſe perhibetur* (11); and having expreſſed the ſame affection to Clearchus as before, he was received into Heraclea as a friend. He put to death the two unnatural Princes, who had made away with their mother, and ſeizing on all their treaſure, reſtored the inhabitants of Heraclea to their liberty. They did not keep it long: for Lyſimachus, being returned home, deſcribed the flouriſhing condition into which the prudent management of Amaſtris had put Heraclea and two other cities in ſo lively a manner, that his wife Arſinoe begged them of him as a preſent. He denied her at firſt; but as ſhe was an artful woman, and his great age made him the more eaſy to be wrought upon (12), ſhe at length obtained that valuable preſent, and ſent a Governor to Heraclea, by whom the city was very hardly treated (13). It muſt not be forgotten that Amaſtris had a ſon by Lyſimachus, named Alexander: this we learn from Polyænus (14); but the paſſage is ſo corrupted that the true reading was not found out till after ſeveral conjectures. In Caſaubon's Manuſcript it was, Ἀλέξανδρον Λυσιμαχε κ᾽ Μηριῶδ᾽ υἱὸς. That great Critic corrected Μηριῶδ᾽ by Μηκίδης. Palmerius has gueſſed more happily than he; for he thinks it ſhould be read Ἀμάσριδος. Another learned man (15), who in the main is of the ſame opinion, chooſes rather to read Ἀμήσριος or Ἀμάσριος. He ſhews (16) from a medal of our Amaſtris, that the genitive of this name was Ἀμάσριος as well as Ἀμάσριως; and he quotes Herodotus, who has written Ἀμήσριος in the genitive. He obſerves that Salmaſius (17) and Triſtan (18) are miſtaken in ſuppoſing that Amaſtris was the ſiſter of Darius.

(9) Ἀντιγόνῳ τὴν Ἀσίαν κατέχοντι λαμπρῶς συμμαχήσας. Antigono Aſiam tenenti, magnifice ſuppetias tulit. *I chuſe to tranſlate it thus, rather than as it is in pag.* 709 *of my edition of* Photius, *which is that of Roan*, 1653, Antigono etiam, jam magnifice Aſiam tenenti, ſuppetias tulit.

(10) Phot. pag. 712.

(11) Idem, ibid.

(12) Ἦν γὰρ δεινὴ περιπλῆξαι ἡ Ἀρσινόη, καὶ τὸ γῆρας ἥδη Λυσίμαχον εἶχεν εὐεπιχείρητον. *Ingenioſa enim ad circumveniendum fuit Arſinoë, & jam ſenectus ipſa manſuefactum dederat Lyſimachum.* Photius, *Bibliotb.* pag. 713.

(13) The whole of this is extracted from *Memnon*, in *Photius*, num. 224.

(14) Lib. 6. pag. 443. *apud* Ezech. Spanhemium, *de Præſt. Numiſmat.* pag. 466.

(15) Spanhem. ibid.

(16) Ibid. pag. 465.

(17) *Ad Solinum*, pag. 889.

(18) *Comment.* tom. 1. pag. 683.

and Regent of the State (*a*). It was ſhe who built the city of Amaſtris [*D*]. I had forgotten to ſay that our Dionyſius was aſhamed of his corpulency; for which reaſon when he gave audience, or adminiſtred juſtice, he ſat in a cheſt, ſo that no part of him was ſeen but his face (*b*). Some Exiles of Heraclea call him the fat hog, in one of Menander's Plays (*c*).

(*a*) Extracted from the *Hiſtory of the Tyrants of Heraclea*, written by *Memnon*. The Extracts of it are to be found in Photius, *Biblioth.* num. 224, pag. m. 708, &c.

(*b*) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 9. cap. 13; *Athen.* lib. 12. cap. 12. pag. 549. They alſo mention the needles which they ran into his body to wake him.

(*c*) *Apud* Athenæum, ibid.

[*D*]. . . . *It was ſhe who built the city of Amaſtris.*] This city was one of the three which Lyſimachus extolled to his wife. Stephanus Byzantinus allows indeed that this city took its name from Amaſtris, the niece of the laſt Darius, and wife of Dionyſius Tyrant of Heraclea (19); but he ſays that it was before called Cromna. He would have done better if he had ſcrupulouſly followed Strabo, who tells us (20) that Amaſtris the daughter of Oxyathres, &c. joined four towns together, and formed a City of them which was called Amaſtris. Theſe four towns were called Seſamus, Cromna, Cytorus, and Teïus; and were in Paphlagonia. It is amazing that Mela (21) ſhould mention Seſamus, Cromna, Cytorus, and Tius, without ſaying one word of Amaſtris. It cannot be anſwered that thoſe four places continued united only during the life of Queen Amaſtris, and that afterwards each of them recovered its independency, and its former name; for if this had been true, Strabo would not have aſſured us that none of them except Teius broke the union. The three others, adds he (22), continued their community, and one of them, namely Seſamus, was the fortreſs of Amaſtris. We find in Pliny ſuch another fault as that of Stephanus Byzantinus. *Seſamum oppidum*, ſays he (23), *quod nunc Amaſtris.* i. e. "The town of Seſamus, which is "now called Amaſtris." One might excuſe theſe two Authors, by ſaying that Amaſtris, with reſpect to ſome parts of it, was formerly named Cromna and Seſamus. There is a fault in the Scholiaſt of Apollonius on the 943d verſe of the 2d Book (24). It ſhould be read that Seſamus changed its name, not into that of Damatris, on account of Darius's niece, but into that of Amaſtris. This city has been famous. The Kings of Bithynia got poſſeſſion of it (25). The younger Pliny commends it highly. *Amaſtrianorum*, ſays he (26), *civitas & elegans & ornata habet inter præcipua opera pulcherrimam eandemque longiſſimam plateam.* i. e. "Amaſtris, a fine and well-"built city, has, among other principal works of "ornament, a very long and beautiful ſtreet." He begs of Trajan to defray the neceſſary expences of covering in the common ſewers which paſſed through the fine ſquare of that city; and he received a favourable anſwer. Lucian (27) teſtifies that he found there many Philoſophers, the diſciples of Timocrates. The medals of Homer which were ſtruck by the inhabitants of Amaſtris are a proof of their application to polite literature (28).

(19) Catanæus *in Plin.* Epiſt. 99. lib. 10. falſly charges *Stephanus* with having ſaid that Amaſtris was wife to Dionyſius Tyrant of Sicily.

(20) Lib. 12. pag. 375.

(21) Lib. 1. cap. 19. Father Hardouin, *in Plinium*, lib. 6. cap. 2. pag. 650. pretends that Mela ſays the Fortreſs of Amaſtris is called *Seſamus*. He does not ſay ſo.

(22) Strabo, lib. 1. cap. 19.

(23) Plinius, lib. 6. cap. 2. pag. m. 650.

(24) *Baron* Spanheim, *de Præſt. Num.* pag. 465. obſerves that *Holſtenius* has corrected this fault in his *Notes* on *Apollonius*.

(25) Photius, *Bibl.* pag. 720.

(26) Epiſt. 99. lib. 10.

(27) *In* Pſeudomanti.

(28) *See* Spanheim, *de Præſt. Num.* pag. 490.

DIONYSIUS of Heraclea, a debauched Philoſopher. See HERACLEOTES.

DIOSCORIDES, in Latin *Dioſcoridu* (*a*), an Iſland in the Red Sea, according to Stephanus Byzantinus. It is ſuppoſed to be now called Zocotora. If it be the ſame with that which Montagne ſpeaks of, there muſt have been very different accounts given of it: for, according to Moreri (*b*), the inhabitants of Zocotora *have no other Religion than the Mahometan, and tolerate the exerciſe of no other*, and are naturally deceitful. But, according to the Author quoted by Montagne, they are Chriſtians, and the honeſteſt people in the world, having no other fault than that of underſtanding nothing of the Religion they profeſs. This is a more common thing than one would imagine, and may agree in ſome reſpect with the principles of the Quietiſts [*A*], whoſe pretended devotion is incumbred with ſo many myſterious follies, that there is hardly any extravagancy, or blaſphemy, on which they do not border in ſome part or other. But let us ſee what Montagne ſays [*B*].

(*a*) So Pinedo, *in Steph. Byzant.* pag. 239. maintains it ſhould be called.

(*b*) He quotes *Daviti* and *Linſchot*.

[*A*] *This may agree in ſome reſpect with the principles of the Quietiſts.*] Thoſe wretched Doctors teach (1) that *the perfection of contemplation does not conſiſt in knowing God more perfectly than others, but in not knowing him.* That (2) *the truly contemplative perſon forms to himſelf no idea of God at all; that he has no diſtinct knowledge of his attributes; that he does not know them by ideas, by reflections, and by reaſoning, but by an obſcure, general, and confuſed faith, without diſtinction of perfections, attributes, or perſons.* That *the true and perfect contemplation has for its ſole object the Eſſence of God, conſidered under the moſt abſtracted idea poſſible.* That "(3) the ſoul ought to be perſuaded that creatures are too groſs to ſerve her for a maſter and "guide in the knowledge of God. Love, therefore, "muſt go before, and leave the underſtanding behind. "The ſoul muſt love God as he is in himſelf, and "not as the imagination repreſents him to her. But "if ſhe cannot know him as he is, ſhe muſt love "him without knowing him, under the obſcure vail "of faith, almoſt in the ſame manner as a child, "who has never ſeen his father, and depending on "thoſe who ſpeak of him, loves him as much as if "he had ſeen him." That all the holy Scriptures ſay of God (4) *can paſs only for florid deſcriptions; and to ſtop at them, would be to ſtop at the ſuperficies, becauſe as God cannot be comprehended by the mind, ſo neither can he be made known by words; and when we ſeek to raiſe our ſelves to him by that means, we fall the lower.* That (5) *God has cauſed thoſe Books to be written only to give us a high opinion of his greatneſs, that if we love him in what is ſaid of him, we might love him yet more in himſelf* (6). *But if the ſoul ſhould love God as he is repreſented in the Scriptures, ſhe would love nothing but a phantom, or the maſk of God, and not God as he really is.* That "(7) God is "nothing of what reaſon conceives, becauſe what-"ever we know may be comprehended, and God is "incomprehenſible. When we would know God, "we change the creature into God, like idolaters, "and bring down God to the creature. (8) *That ſo "long as the ſoul knows any thing by images or ſimili-"tudes, of what nature ſoever they be, even infuſed "and ſupernatural, ſhe conceives not God.*" That the idea which St. Paul gave of God to the Athenians, who adored an unknown God (9), *is falſe, in that it does not repreſent God as he is; for he can neither be comprehended nor known.* That *we are obliged, in ſpeaking of him, to make uſe of terms proportioned to our weakneſs: but theſe expreſſions have nothing worthy of him, and the ideas which they form in us are not the true idea of God.* That *it may be ſaid of God* that he is juſt, beneficent, a rewarder, an avenger, almighty &c; (10) *but all this is not God. Faith does not behold him in this manner, having no other object than an unknown God every where preſent.* See at the end of the following Remark a paſſage of the falſe Dionyſius the Areopagite.

(1) See the *Dialogues of Monſ. de la Bruyere on Quietiſm*, pag. 307.

(2) Ibid. pag. 308.

(3) Molinos, *Introd. a la Guide Spirituelle*, Sect. 1. num. 3 & 4. quoted by *la Bruyere*, pag. 310.

(4) Malaval, *Pratique facile*, quoted by the ſame, pag. 313.

(5) Ibid. quoted by the ſame, pag. 314.

(6) *Dialog. de la Bruyere*, p. 314.

(7) Malaval, *Pratique facile*, quoted by the ſame, pag. 315.

(8) *Dialog. de la Bruyere*, pag. 315, 316.

(9) Ibid. pag. 321.

(10) Ibid. pag. 322.

[*B*] *Let us ſee what Montagne ſays* (11).] "A Biſhop has left in writing that at the other end of the "world there is an Iſland, which the ancient inhabi-"tants called Dioſcorides, happy in abundance of "all ſorts of trees, and fruits, and a wholeſome air: "the people whereof are Chriſtians, and have Churches "and Altars, which are adorned with Croſſes only, "without any other Images: they are great obſervers "of faſts and feſtivals, exact payers of tythes to the "Prieſts; and ſo chaſte, that none of them can know

(11) Montagne, *Eſſais*, liv. 1. chap. 56. pag. m. 545.

DIOSCURIAS

DIOSCURIAS, a City of Colchis, was a place of such considerable commerce, that three hundred nations, which understood not one another's language, traded thither [A]; and the Merchants of Rome maintained there a hundred and thirty Interpreters. Pliny, who asserts this on the credit of Timosthenes, observes that in his time this city was uninhabited (a). But Ammianus Marcellinus testifies that it still made a figure in his time (b). Some ascribed the founding of it to Castor and Pollux, and others to the two charioteers of those Heroes [B]. Arrian, an eye-witness, tells us it was then called Sebastopolis; and that it was a Colony of the Milesians, 2260 Stadia from Trapezus (c).

(a) Plin. lib. 6. cap. 5.

(b) *Dioscurias nunc usque nota.* Ammian. Marcellin. lib. 22. cap. 8, pag. m. 313.

(c) *In Periplo Ponti Euxini.*

DIYLLUS

" more than one woman in his whole life-time: and " besides, so contented with their condition, that " though they lie in the midst of the sea, they are " ignorant of the use of ships; and so simple, that " they understand not one word of the religion which " they so carefully observe. An incredible thing to " those who do not know that the Pagans, who were " such devout idolaters, were absolutely unacquainted " with any thing more of their Gods, than their " names and statues. An ancient Tragedy of Euri- " pides, intitled Menalippe, began thus:

" *O Jove, of whom we here below*
" *Nothing besides the name do know* (12)!"

(12) See the Remark [P] of the Article DEMOCRITUS.

What Montagne observes of the old Pagans is very true: the idea which they annexed to the word *God* bore no manner of resemblance to the divine nature, and was infinitely remote from it; so that the Athenians were not the only people to whom St. Paul might have said that they had raised an Altar to an unknown God (13). All their Altars deserved the same inscription, and I cannot think of the distinction which they made at Athens between the known Gods and the unknown (14), without calling to mind the distinction which is made in the Aristotelian Schools, between occult qualities and manifest qualities. There is no other difference among the Peripatetics between manifest qualities and occult qualities, than that they have a word to denote the manifest qualities, *calor, frigus, humiditas, siccitas, &c.* and have none to denote the qualities of the load-stone. In the same manner among the Athenians there was no other difference between the unknown Gods, and the known, than that they had a name to give to the one, as *Jupiter, Mars, Mercury, Venus*, &c. and knew not what to call the others. If the divine nature which they worshiped was not like the Quintessence of Aristotle (15), as destitute of a name as of an idea, it was at least as little known. The inhabitants of Marseilles made open profession of worshipping the unknown Gods, and they even found that this inspired them with a greater dread for their Deities (16). They adored them afar off; and did not approach the place where their statues were. The Priest did not approach them without trembling, and was afraid lest they should appear to him, that is, he was afraid to know them. Lucian imagines, that because in other places the Gods were worshipped under figures exposed to the eyes of the public, there was a great difference between the Massilians and other nations; for, says he, the Massilians, not knowing their Gods, dread them the more. He fancied, therefore, that they knew the Deity better in Greece and Italy than at Marseilles: but he was greatly deceived; he should only have said that they better knew under what figure the Statuaries and Painters represented it.

IGNORANCE of the Pagans with respect to their Gods.

(13) Acts xvii. 23.

(14) The entire Inscription which St. Paul had seen was, *Diis Asiæ, & Europæ, & Africæ, Dijs ignotis & peregrinis*, if we believe St. Jerom, *Comment. in Epist. ad Titum*, cap. 1.

(15) *Quinta illa non nominata magis quam non intellecta natura*, Cicero, *Tuscul.* 1. cap. 17.

(16) Apply here what Tacitus says; *Arcebantur aspectu quo venerationis plus inesset.* i. e. " They " were kept from " seeing in order " to raise their " veneration." *Hist.* lib. 4. cap. 65.

Simulacraque mœsta Deorum
Arte carent, cæsisque extant informia truncis.
Ipse situs, putrique facit jam robore pallor
Attonitos: non vulgatis sacrata figuris
Numina sic metuunt: tantum terroribus addit
Quos timeant non nosse Deos.
. . . . . .
Non illum cultu populi propiore frequentant
Sed cessere Deis. Medio cum Phœbus in axe est,
Aut cælum nox atra tenet, pavet ipse sacerdos
Accessus, dominumque timet deprendere luci (17).

(17) Lucan. *Pharsal.* lib. 3. ver. 412.

" Old Images of forms mis-shapen stand,
" Rude and unknowing of the Artist's hand;
" With hoary filth begrim'd each ghastly head
" Strikes the astonish'd gazer's soul with dread.
" No Gods, who long in common shapes appear'd,
" Were e're with such religious awe rever'd:
" But zealous crowds in ignorance adore,
" And still the less they know, they fear the more.
. . . . . .
" The pious worshippers approach not near,
" But shun their Gods, and kneel with distant fear:
" The Priest himself, when, or the day, or night,
" Rolling have reach'd their full meridian height,
" Refrains the gloomy path with wary feet,
" Dreading the *Dæmon* of the grove to meet;
" Who, terrible to fight, at that fix'd hour,
" Still treads the round about his dreary bow'r."

Mr. Rowe.

The Pagans could not retort this Animadversion on Christianity, under pretence that it is therein recommended to captivate our understanding to the obedience of Faith, that Faith is said to be better defined by ignorance than by knowledge, that we are to conduct our selves not by the way of examination, but by the way of authority, and that we are to adore mysteries without comprehending them: this retorsion, I say, would be unjust on Christianity in general, since the Protestant Communions do not reject the way of examination, and are not afraid, as the Priest of Marseilles was, lest the objects of their faith should appear manifest.

We have seen in the preceding Remark the maxims of the modern Mystics; but it must be observed here, that they pretend they are as ancient as Mystical Divinity: for they quote these words of St. Dionysius: " (18) As for you, my dear Timothy, apply your " self seriously to mystical contemplations, abandon " your senses, the operations of your mind, all sensi- " ble and intelligible objects, and generally all things " which are, and which are not; to the end that you " may raise your self, as much as man is able, and " unite your self, in an unknown and inexpressible " manner, to him who is above every being, and all " knowledge." Note, there are some Philosophers who are of opinion that what the Quietists say of the falsity of the notions under which the Deity is usually conceived, is very reasonable, and that the images which the sacred Writers have employed to make him known to us, want to be rectified. See what I shall quote from Charron, in one of the Remarks of the Article SIMONIDES (19).

(18) Molinos, *Introd. à la Guide Spirit.* num. 14. cited by *La Bruyere, Dialogue* 8. pag. 316.

(19) In the Remark [G].

[A] *Three hundred nations . . . . . traded thither.*] Strabo relates the same thing (1). It is true he says some Authors instead of 300 nations reckoned but 70. He attributes such a multitude of languages to the savage manner in which the people of those countries lived; for having no society with one another, each nation preserved their own language without learning that of their neighbours.

(1) Strabo, lib. 11. pag. 343.

(2) Lib. 1. cap. 19.

(3) Lib. 6. cap. 5.

(4) Cap. 15.

(5) Lib. 22. cap. 8. pag. m. 313.

(6) Lib. 11. pag. 342.

(7) Lib. 42. cap. 3.

[B] *Some ascribed the founding of it to Castor and Pollux, and others to the two Charioteers of those Heroes.*] The first opinion, which is that of Pomponius Mela (2), is confirmed by the name which this city bore. Yet Pliny (3), Solinus (4), Ammianus Marcellinus (5), &c. speak only of the two charioteers. Pliny calls them Amphitus and Telchius: according to Strabo (6) their names were Rheca and Amphistratus; but Ammianus Marcellinus calls them Amphitus and Cercius. In some Editions of Justin (7) they are named Frudius and Amphistratus.

DIYLLUS, a Greek Hiſtorian, born at Athens. I ſpeak of him only to obſerve a miſtake of Moreri [*A*].

[*A*] *I ſpeak of him only to obſerve a miſtake of Moreri.*] He affirms that *Diyllus began* his Hiſtory *where Ephorus ended his*: he is miſtaken (1); but if this circumſtance were true, he would nevertheleſs deſerve blame, ſince he has left his Reader to the trouble of ſeeking where Ephorus's Hiſtory ended. It would be in vain to look for this where one might naturally expect to find it, that is, in the place where Moreri ſpeaks of Ephorus; for he has forgotten to inform us of this particular there, as well as here. But to ſay no more of his omiſſions; let us only take notice of his fault of commiſſion. It is the more inexcuſable, for that it has been committed, as it were, under the eye of Voſſius, who ſo plainly pointed out what ought to have been ſaid. Voſſius (2) has quoted two paſſages, in one of which it is aſſerted (3) that Diyllus had compoſed a Hiſtory divided into XXVII Books, which began at the taking of the Temple of Delphi, and comprized the actions of thoſe times in Greece and Sicily. The other paſſage imports that Ephorus ended his Hiſtory at the ſiege of Perinthus, and that Diyllus began the other part of his work at that ſiege (4), and ended it at the death of King Philip, the father of Alexander. It is therefore inconteſtable that Diyllus's Hiſtory reached from the invaſion of Delphi to the death of Philip, that is, it began at the time that Philomelus, General of the Phocæans, made himſelf maſter of Delphi, towards the end of the CVth Olympiad, about the year of Rome 397. The ſiege of Perinthus coincides with the 2d year of the CIXth Olympiad, and the 410th of Rome. Moreri's quotations are falſe (5); and if he had well weighed what the paſſage of Athenæus cited by Voſſius informed him of, he would not have advanced ſo wrong a conjecture. Diyllus, according to the paſſage of Athenæus, made mention of Demetrius Phalereus: therefore he ought not to be placed, as he is by Moreri, in the year of Rome 410; ſince that Demetrius flouriſhed after the death of Alexander. Caſaubon has happily reſtored the quotation from Diyllus in Athenæus (6), and enabled Mauſſacus to rectify it in the Dictionary of Harpocration (7).

(1) The learned *Reineſius* has fallen into the ſame error. See the paſſage wherein he ſpeaks of *Diyllus*, in his *Variæ Lectiones*.

(2) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* pag. 360.

(3) Diodor. Sicul. lib. 16. cap. 14. pag. m. 747.

(4) Δίυλλος δ' ὁ Ἀθηναῖος τῆς δυναστείας συντάξεως ἀρχὴν ποιούμενος τῆς Ἐφόρου ἰσταται τὴν τελευτὴν *Diyllus verò Athenienſis alterum opus exordiatur inde ubi Ephorus Hiſtoriam finierat.* Idem, ibid. cap. 77. pag. 795.

(5) He quotes *Diodorus Siculus*, lib. 10. and *Voſſius*, pag. 30.

(6) Caſaub. *in Athen.* lib. 4. cap. 14. pag. 281.

(7) *In voce* Ἀμφικτ.

☞DODWELL (HENRY), a moſt learned Engliſh Writer in the latter end of the 17th Century, was deſcended of a good family [*A*], and by both his parents was of Engliſh extraction. He was born in the pariſh of St. Warburgh (*a*) in the City of Dublin in Ireland in the latter end of October 1641 (*b*). In 1648 his parents, being deprived of all advantage from their eſtate in Connaught, which was poſſeſſed by the Rebels, brought him to England; and he was educated in the Free-ſchool at York from 1649 to 1654. During this interval he had the misfortune to loſe both his parents, and was reduced to ſuch neceſſity, that he had not money enough to buy pen, ink, and paper (*c*). But in 1654 his uncle Mr. Henry Dodwell, who was Miniſter of Hemley and Newbourn in Suffolk, ſent for him to his houſe, where he aſſiſted him in his ſtudies for two years (*d*). In 1656 he was admitted a Student of Trinity-College in Dublin (*e*), under the tuition of Dr. John Stearn, and diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his application to his ſtudies, his piety, and charity (*f*). When he had taken the Degree of Bachelor he became Fellow of the College (*g*); and after he had proceeded Maſter of Arts, he left his Fellowſhip in 1666, to avoid going into holy Orders [*B*], according to the Statutes of the College. Dr. Jeremy Taylor, Biſhop of Down and Connor, who had a particular kindneſs for him, offered to uſe his intereſt to procure him a Diſpenſation, to continue in his Fellowſhip. But he refuſed to accept of that offer, becauſe it might become an ill precedent, and of bad conſequence afterwards to the College (*h*). He came over to England the ſame year, and reſided at Oxford for the ſake of the public Library [*C*]. Thence he returned to his native country for a time, and in 1672 publiſhed a poſthumous Treatiſe of Dr. John Stearn *de Obſtinatione*, with *Prolegomena* of his own writing [*D*]. His next Work was *Two Letters of Advice: I. For the Suſception of Holy Orders*; II. *For Studies Theological &c.* [*E*]; to the ſecond and third editions of which is added *A Diſcourſe concerning the*

(*a*) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 232. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*b*) *Life of Mr.* Henry Dodwell; *with an Account of his Works, and an Abridgment of them, that are publiſhed, and of ſeveral of his Manuſcripts. By* Francis Brokesby, B. D. vol. 1. cap. 2. pag. 11. edit. London 1715, in 8vo.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 13, 14, 15.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 16, 17.

(*e*) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(*f*) *Life of Dodwell*, cap. 3. pag. 18.

(*g*) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(*h*) *Life of Dodwell*, cap. 4. pag. 23.

[*A*] *Deſcended of a good family.*] His grandfather Henry Dodwell was of the city of Oxford (1), and a Clergyman (2), and ſon of *William Dodwell*, ſuppoſed to be brother of Alderman *Henry Dodwell*, Mayor of that City in the 34th of Queen Elizabeth 1592 (3). Our Author's father *William Dodwell* betook himſelf to a military life, and was Corporal of the Field; which poſt was equal to that of a Captain of Horſe (4). Mr. Dodwell's mother was daughter to Sir *Francis Slingſby*, who was uncle to that Sir *Henry Slingſby*, who was put to death with Dr. Hewet for a conſpiracy againſt Cromwell the Protector in the year 1658 (5).

(1) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 232. 2d edit. London 1721.

(2) *Life of Mr. Henry Dodwell. By Francis Brokeſby B. D.* cap. 1. pag. 7.

(3) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(4) *Life of Dodwell*, pag. 8.

(5) Ibid.

[*B*] *Left his Fellowſhip in* 1666, *to avoid going into holy Orders.*] The reaſons why he declined that function were, the great weight of it; his natural baſhfulneſs, and the too mean thoughts, which he had of his own abilities; and becauſe he believed, that he could in one reſpect be more ſerviceable to the Church, and to Religion, whilſt he continued in a lay-ſtation, than if he took orders; "in that whilſt he "continued a laick, *ſays Mr. Brokeſby* (6), and as "ſuch, vindicated the ſacred Miniſtry, and became "the Champion of Religion and the Prieſthood, the "wicked adverſaries of both could have no ſhadow "to object that againſt him, which they (ridiculouſly "enough) object againſt Clergymen, when they ap"pear as Advocates for God and Religion, and aſ"ſert the dignity of their office, and the rights of the "Chriſtian Church, of which they are Paſtors, and "Miniſters of Chriſt its Head, viz. that they plead "their own cauſe, and are biaſſed by ſelf-intereſt. "Mr. Dodwell was ſenſible, that what theſe de"bauchees ſlanderouſly and impiouſly object againſt "Clergymen, (as forſooth) a piece of Prieſtcraft, there "could not be the leaſt pretence againſt himſelf, "whilſt he continued among the laity, and in that "ſtation appeared in the cauſe of Chriſt, his Church, "and his Miniſters."

(6) Ibid. pag. 24, 25.

[*C*] *He came over to England the ſame year, and reſided at Oxford for the ſake of the public Library.*] This we are informed of by Mr. Wood (7); but Mr. Brokeſby makes no mention of this circumſtance.

(7) *Ubi ſupra.*

[*D*] *Publiſhed a poſthumous Treatiſe of Dr. John Stearn* de Obſtinatione, *with* Prolegomena *of his writing.*] This Treatiſe was printed at Dublin 1672 in 8vo under this title: *De Obſtinatione: Opus poſthumum pietatem Chriſtianam Scholaſtico more ſuadens.* Mr. Dodwell in his *Prolegomena Apologetica, de Uſu Dogmatum Philoſophicorum &c.* vindicates Dr. Stearn, who in this Book from his high commendations of the Stoick Philoſophy, and his frequent quotations from the Heathen Writers, might ſeem to depretiate the Holy Scriptures.

[*E*] *His next work was* Two Letters of Advice &c.] Theſe Letters were printed firſt at Dublin, and afterwards twice at London. One of them was written for the ſake of a ſon of Biſhop Leſley, a brother of Mr. Charles Leſley famous for polemic writings.

the Phœnician History of Sanchoniathon, in which he is of opinion, that after the History of Moſes had been tranſlated into Greek, and ſo made common to the learned men of the neighbouring Nations, they endeavoured to rival it by pretended Antiquities of their own, that ſo they might not ſeem to come behind a people, who till then had been ſo obſcure. Dr. William Wotton thinks * that this notion of Mr. Dodwell may help to give a very probable account of thoſe vaſt Antiquities of the Egyptians pretended to by *Manetho*. In 1673 he wrote a Preface, without his name, to *An Introduction to a Devout Life* by Francis De Sales, printed at Dublin. In 1674 he came over again to England, and ſettled at London, and ſoon became acquainted with the learned men there, eſpecially Dr. William Lloyd, ſucceſſively Biſhop of St. Aſaph and Worceſter, whom he attended to Holland, when that Divine was appointed Chaplain to the Princeſs of Orange (*i*). In 1675 and the following years he publiſhed ſeveral works [*F*]; and particularly his *Diſſertationes Cyprianicæ* [*G*]. His *Diſſertatio de Ripa Striga ad Lactantium de*

* *Reflections upon antient and modern Learning*, cap. 9. pag. 109. edit. London 1694, in 8vo.

(*i*) Ibid. cap. 7. pag. 38, 39.

[*F*] *In 1675 and the following years he publiſhed ſeveral works.*] In 1675 he publiſhed in 8vo *Conſiderations of preſent Concern, how far the Romaniſts may be truſted by Princes of another Communion.* This was written on occaſion of the *Controverſial Letters* and the *Iriſh Remonſtrance* (8). The chief adverſary our Author had in reſpect to this Treatiſe was Father Walſh, whom he wrote againſt with all imaginable candour, in hopes that as he was caſt out of communion with the Church of Rome, he might be induced to embrace that of the Church of England. Mr. Dodwell told Mr. Brokeſby (9), that all the reaſon Father Walſh gave why he would not embrace the Communion of the Church of England, but choſe to be reconciled to that of Rome, was, becauſe of the latter's putting up *Prayers for the Dead*; "which, ſaid he, "can do me no harm, and they may do me good." In 1676 Mr. Dodwell publiſh'd at London in 8vo, *Two ſhort Diſcourſes againſt the Romaniſts: 1. An Account of the fundamental Principles of Popery, and of the Inſufficiency of the Proofs, which they have for it. 2. An Anſwer to ſix Queries propoſed to a Gentlewoman of the Church of England by an Emiſſary of the Church of Rome.* This was reprinted at London in 1688 in 4to with *A new Preface relating to the Biſhop of* Meaux, *and other modern Complainers of Miſrepreſentation.* In 1679 he publiſhed at London in 4to a Tract intitled, *Separation of Churches from Epiſcopal Government, as practiſed by the preſent Nonconformiſts, proved ſchiſmatical from ſuch principles as are leaſt controverted, and do withal moſt popularly explain the ſinfulneſs and miſchief of ſchiſm.* In the latter end of the Introduction to this Book he mentions a deſign of his to write an Hiſtory of the firſt Schiſms in the Chriſtian Church, as a *ſecond* part of this work, which he ſtiles the *Hiſtorical* Part, as the former the *Rational*. In the latter he intended to ſhew, that "by the notion of "ſchiſm, which was condemned for ſuch in the firſt "and pureſt Ages, our ſeparating brethren cannot be "excuſed from guilt; and alſo, that the ſeveral prin-"ciples, on which he grounds it, were alſo owned "by, and are certainly agreeable to the ſenſe of the "Apoſtles." This Tract he began, writing it in Latin, that it might be beneficial to foreigners as well as to our own nation. But he never finiſhed it, being diverted by other undertakings (10). His *Separation of Churches* being animadverted upon by Mr. Richard Baxter in his *True and only Way of Concord of all the Chriſtian Churches*, printed at London 1680 in 8vo, our Author publiſhed at London 1681 in 8vo, *A Reply to Mr.* Baxter's *pretended Confutation of a Book intitled*, Separation of Churches from Epiſcopal Government &c. To this *Reply* are added *Three Letters* written to Mr. Baxter in the year 1673 *concerning the Poſſibility of Diſcipline under a Dioceſan Government.* In 1683 Mr. Dodwell publiſhed at London in 8vo, *A Diſcourſe concerning the one Altar, and the one Prieſthood, inſiſted on by the ancients in their diſputes againſt ſchiſm.* Dr. Grabe valued this Treatiſe ſo highly, that he had thoughts of tranſlating it into Latin for the uſe of foreign Churches (11).

(8) *Life of Dodwell*, pag. 40.

(9) Ibid. pag. 42, 43.

(10) Ibid. pag. 58.

(11) Ibid. pag. 83.

[*G*] *His* Diſſertationes Cyprianicæ.] There are two Editions of them, one in folio at the end of St. *Cyprian's Works* publiſhed by Dr. *John Fell* Biſhop of Oxford in 1682; and the other printed at Oxford 1684 in 8vo. He wrote theſe *Diſſertations* at the deſire of Biſhop Fell, and his Epiſtle Dedicatory to that Prelate is dated the 7th of April 1682 from his retirement at St. Aſaph. The *firſt Diſſertation* is concerning the name *Clerus*; in which he endeavours to ſhew, that it was not given in St. Cyprian's, Tertullian's, or the Apoſtles time, to the Laity, but that the Clergy had a ſuperiority over, and exerciſed diſcipline upon them. The *ſecond* is on the words in the IXth Epiſtle, *Me in iiſdem literis & Scripturæ & Senſus, & Chartæ ipſæ moverunt*; and in it he ſhews how the true *Literæ formatæ* might be diſtinguiſhed from the counterfeits, which the Chriſtians then made uſe of. The *third* relates to a practice condemned by St. Cyprian and a Synod, of women *cum Viris iiſque Clericis concumbentium*, and yet, as they profeſſed, keeping themſelves chaſte. The *fourth* is deſigned to prove the Continuance of divine *Viſions* and *Prophecies* in the Church till the time of St. Cyprian. The *fifth* is concerning the reciting of names out of the *Diptychs* of the Church in the time of the Euchariſt. The *ſixth* is on thoſe words of St. *Cyprian*, Epiſt. XXIX *Cum Preſbyteris doctoribus . . . doctorem audientium conſtituamus*, to ſhew who theſe *Preſbyteri Doctores* were. The *ſeventh* is on the *XXXIIId Epiſtle*, occaſioned by the *Lapſi*, procuring Reſtitution to Communion, not in the name of the Preſbyters or the Laity, but of the Martyrs, and this without the conſent of the Biſhops, (as the Donatiſts did afterwards;) by which the Martyrs challenged the right of being *Principles of Unity*, which St. Cyprian challenges as the prerogative of the Biſhop. The *eighth* is concerning the Nature of *Prerogatives*, and how the ſuffrage of *Martyrs* was in that Age by ſome ſo eſteemed, that what they granted could not be oppoſed even by the Biſhop himſelf; and likewiſe concerning the *Privilegium indulgentiæ*, according to the Roman Law. The *ninth*, after declaring what *Auctoritas* is in the Roman Law, ſhews, that *Epiſcopal* Authority belonged not to *Preſbyters* during the vacancy of the Biſhop's See. The *tenth* is deſigned to prove, that the power of ordaining not only *Preſbyters* and *Deacons*, but even *Lectores*, reſided in the *Biſhop*, *Preſbyters* having no right to ordain; and that *Biſhops* were a *College*, and a diſtinct *Order*. The *eleventh* ſhews how ſmall the number of *Martyrs* was in the firſt perſecutions, and how later *Martyrologies*, eſpecially of the Romaniſts, have multiplied them without the authority of ancient monuments. He inſiſts particularly upon the teſtimony of Origen againſt *Celſus L. III.* where he aſſerts, that *there were* ὀλίγοι . . . . κ) σφόδρα ἀναριθμητοι *few, and thoſe eaſily numbered, who ſuffered death in the cauſe of the Chriſtian Religion.* He ſhews how without authority and unſkilfully the compilers of the *Martyrologies* have enlarged the number of Martyrs under Decius; how falſely Adrian is made a perſecutor; how many of the perſecutions were only *local* and *partial*, as that under Trajan, and thoſe under him from the rage of the populace, ſometimes excited by the Jews, the bitter enemies of the Chriſtians; how *ſhort* many perſecutions were, the perſecutors themſelves reigning but a little time, as Decius; and ſome of them beginning their perſecutions late, as Valerian; what *Edicts* ſome Emperors made in favour of Chriſtians, which reſtrained the Governors of Provinces; and that if cities, from their privileges, uſed greater liberty againſt the Chriſtians, yet their power extended not to the lives of perſons: how ſome Emperors, as *Commodus, Alexander Severus, Philip, &c.* were favourable to Chriſtians, and others not enemies to them: how that many of the *Edicts* of perſecutors reſpected only ſuch as were *converted* from *Heatheniſm* or thoſe who *converted* them, (beſides thoſe, who offered themſelves,) and not ſuch as were born of Chri-

de Morte Perſecutorum was printed at the end of Lactantius's Works with Commentaries by Thomas Spark M. A. at Oxford 1684 in 8vo. In 1686 his Tract *de Jure Laicorum Sacerdotali* appeared [*H*]. In 1688 he publiſhed the poſthumous works of Dr. John Pearſon, Biſhop of Cheſter [*I*]; and the year following his own *Diſſertations upon Irenæus* [*K*]. April the 2d 1688 he was elected by the Univerſity of Oxford Camden's Profeſſor of Hiſtory, in his abſence, and without his knowledge; and May the 21ſt he was incorporated Maſter of Arts in that Univerſity (*k*). But in November 1691 he was deprived of his Profeſſorſhip for refuſing to take the Oaths of Allegiance to King William and Queen Mary [*L*]; and ſeparated from the Church of England, after their Majeſties had nominated Biſhops to fill the Sees of thoſe, who would not acknowledge their authority, he conſidering the new Biſhops, and thoſe who joined with them, as Schiſmatics [*M*]. He continued for ſome time at Oxford after he loſt his Profeſſorſhip;

(*k*) Wood, col. 831, 232.

ſtian parents; *Maximinus's* only reaching *Biſhops*, or, at moſt, them and *Preſbyters*, and even Decius's chiefly being directed againſt the Paſtors, which was likewiſe the caſe of the two firſt years of the perſecution under Dioclefian, till he reſigned the Empire. Many perſecutions were proſecuted more by *tortures*, *impriſonments*, and *baniſhments*, than by *capital* puniſhments. The firſt year of Valerian's perſecution was by baniſhment, and ſending to the mines; and when after he proceeded to put Chriſtians to death, and among others St. Cyprian and Xyſtus Biſhop of Rome, immediately wars aroſe, which diverted him from the violence of his perſecution. Some Governors of Provinces were leſs ſevere than others in executing ſevere Edicts. Mr. Dodwell deſcribes the *tenth* perſecution moſt largely in the ſeveral ſteps of it; and ſhews, that few ſuffered in the weſtern part of the Empire, which fell to the ſhare of Conſtantius Chlorus, and after his death to Conſtantine. He obſerves in the concluſion, that the fewneſs of thoſe, who ſuffered death for the Chriſtian Religion, (that is, few, if compared with the legendary Writers) detracts nothing from the honour of it, conſidering that the unparallel'd magnanimity of Chriſtians in their chearful ſuffering tortures and death, and the joy which they expreſſed in having the crown of martyrdom, abated the fury of their perſecutors, when they ſaw how much all people pitied them, and abhorred the cruelty of thoſe, who put them to death, and withal obſerved, that Chriſtians were not deterred hereby; that multitudes offered themſelves as ſacrifices in this cauſe; and that ſuch as perſiſted in their fidelity to Chriſt were eſteemed as glorious conquerors. He wrote this Diſſertation at the deſire of Biſhop Lloyd (12). It was attacked by Father Thierry Ruinart in his *General Preface* to his *Acta primorum Martyrum ſincera & ſelecta ex libris tum editis, tum manuſcriptis collecta, eruta, & emendata, notiſque & obſervationibus illuſtrata*, printed at Paris 1689 in 4to. Biſhop Burnet in a Letter to our Author (13) has the following paſſage relating to this ſubject. "In one "of theſe [*Diſſertations on St.* Cyprian] you labour-"ed to leſſen one of the glorious characters of the "Chriſtian Religion from the number of the Mar-"tyrs; and in the next you began the account of "the patience and fortitude of the Martyrs with "the wilfulneſs of the firſt Chriſtians, and their "deſire of fame and vain-glory. It is true, you af-"ter that give better reaſons for it: but would a "*Vaninus*, a *Hobbes*, and a *Spinoſa*, ſay any thing "more derogatory to that glory of our moſt holy "Faith, than you wrote in thoſe two Diſſertations? "And tho' what you wrote in the firſt of theſe, was "anſwered to the ſatisfaction of many, you neither "vindicated yourſelf, nor acknowledged your miſ-"takes, which in a matter of that great importance "you ought to have done." In anſwer to this Mr. Dodwell replies thus (14): *My Diſcourſes of Martyrs and Martyrdoms were written by me in a proſpect of the ſucceſſion of King James II. I am ſure, with a deſign of advancing, not of undervaluing martyrdom.... Nor am I conſcious of any thing produced by any of my learned adverſaries ſo unexceptionable and expreſs in favour of them, as the teſtimony of* Origen *is for me. Yet I could ſay more, if the bookſelling trade had been open, and if I had not a great veneration for the goodneſs and piety of ſeveral of the Fathers, who were notwithſtanding of too eaſy belief of matter of fact not ſufficiently atteſted.* Mr. Brokeſby tells us (15), that Mr. Dodwell often mentioned Ruinart as a learned and candid adverſary; and ſaid, that he could not anſwer him, becauſe during the war with France he could not procure his Book. But at the ſame time he acknowledged, that there was another thing, which diſcouraged him from reſuming that ſubject; which was, that he ſhould be obliged to expoſe the weakneſs and credulity of ſome ancient Writers, which might be made uſe of by men of little Religion to bad purpoſes. In his *twelfth* Diſſertation he treats of the ſignal Fortitude of the Martyrs. In the *thirteenth* he ſhews, that they were encouraged to ſuffer with this magnanimity from the belief, that *Martyrdom* was a *ſecond Baptiſm*, and procured the ſame benefits; which he obſerves to have been a received opinion in the firſt Ages of the Church, and founded upon the Scriptures. At the end of theſe *Diſſertations*, Mr. Dodwell has ſubjoined ſome Chronological Tables, chiefly the Canons of Ptolomy collated with manuſcripts, ſome *Faſti* out of manuſcripts, a Fragment of Theon, and another of the Emperor Heraclius, both on Ptolomy's Canons.

(12) Ibid. pag. 102.

(13) See *Four Letters, which paſſed between the Right Reverend Biſhop of Sarum, and Mr.* Henry Dodwell, *printed from the Originals*, edit. London 1713, in 12mo. Theſe Letters were publiſhed by Mr. Nelſon.

(14) Ibid.

(15) *Life of Dodwell*, pag. 103.

[*H*] *In* 1686 *his Tract* de Jure Laicorum Sacerdotali *appeared.*] It was printed at London in 8vo. It was written upon the following occaſion. Mr. William Baxter had tranſlated Hugo Grotius's Diſſertation *de Cœnæ adminiſtratione ubi paſtores non ſunt*, and publiſhed it under the title of *Anti-Dodwelliſm; being two curious Tracts formerly written by* Hugo Grotius, *concerning a ſolution of theſe two curious Queſtions: 1. Whether the Euchariſt may be adminiſtred in the abſence of, or want of Paſtors, &c.*

[*I*] *In* 1688 *he publiſhed the poſthumous Works of Dr.* John Pearſon *Biſhop of* Cheſter.] He added to them a Diſſertation of his own *concerning the Succeſſion of the Biſhops of Rome*, and publiſh'd them under the following title: Joannis Pearſonii *S. T. P.* Ceſtrienſis *nuper Epiſcopi Opera poſthuma: edenda curavit* H. Dodwellus, *cujus etiam acceſſit de ſucceſſione primorum Romæ Epiſcoporum uſque ad annales Cl.* Ceſtrienſis *Cyprianicos Diſſertatio ſingularis.* Oxford 1688 in 4to.

[*K*] *His* Diſſertations upon Irenæus.] They were printed at Oxford 1689 in 8vo under the title of *Diſſertationes in Irenæum.* Theſe Diſſertations are only *Prolegomena* to what he farther deſigned, which was to ſhew what the ancient hereſies were, which diſturbed the primitive Church, and what the foundation of them was. He has ſubjoined to them a *Fragment* of *Philippus Sidetes, de Catechiſtarum Alexandrinorum Succeſſione*, with his Notes upon it.

[*L*] *In November* 1691 *he was deprived of his Profeſſorſhip for refuſing to take the oaths of Allegiance to King William and Queen Mary.*] He was firſt forbidden to read his Lectures; the laſt, which he was permitted to read, being that of November 6th 1691. After that he was deprived. Tho' he was told by learned Council, that the Act ſeemed not to reach his caſe, becauſe he was *Prælector*, not *Profeſſor*; yet he being always ſtudious of peace, and averſe to contention even in defence of a juſt right, choſe rather to acquieſce in his deprivation (16). He gives us his own ſenſe of it in his *Appendix* to his *Lectures*. *Poſſem fortaſſe moleſtè ferre, quod culpâ meâ nullâ amotus fuerim; ſed dum cauſam expendo, contra mihi potius gratulor, habuiſſe me quo fuerim in tali cauſâ pellendus.*

(16) Ibid. pag. 220.

[*M*] *Separated from the Church of England.... conſidering the new Biſhops, and thoſe, who joined with them, as Schiſmatics.*] Upon this occaſion he publiſhed *A Cautionary Diſcourſe of Schiſm, with a particular regard to the Caſe of Biſhops, who are ſuſpended for refuſing to take the new oath*; printed at London in 8vo, and his *Vindication of the Deprived Biſhops*, in anſwer

ſhip; and then retired to Cookham, a village near Maidenhead in Berkſhire, in the road between London and Oxford. While he reſided here, he became acquainted with Mr. Francis Cherry of Shotteſbrooke, a Gentleman of great learning and piety, for the ſake of whoſe converſation he removed to Shotteſbrooke; and having loſt his nephews, whom he deſigned for his heirs, on the 24th of June 1694 married the daughter of a perſon, in whoſe houſe he had lodged at Cookham, and by her had ten children (*l*). He continued at Shotteſbrooke the reſt of his life, except when he went to London and Oxford to conſult books, and ſee his friends. But to return to an account of his works; in 1692 he publiſhed his *Lectures* read at Oxford [*N*]; and in 1694 wrote a *Preface* to the Engliſh Tranſlation of *Degory Whear's Method of reading Hiſtory*. In 1698 he publiſhed his *Annales Velleiani, Quintilianei, Statianei* [*O*]; and in 1701 his Treatiſe *de veteribus Græcorum Romanorumque Cyclis* [*P*]. The ſame year his *Letter to a Friend* was inſerted in the ſecond edition of the *Canon of the New Teſtament vindicated, by John Richardſon, B. D.* in which Letter Mr. Dodwell ſhews how far he was from Mr. Toland's ſentiments in his *Amyntor*, though that Writer had made uſe of ſeveral paſſages out of our Author to ſupport his own opinions. In 1702 he publiſhed his *Annales Thycididei & Xenophontei* [*Q*], and *An Apology for Tully's Philoſophical Writings*, prefixed to Mr. Samuel Parker's Tranſlation of Tully *de Finibus*. About the ſame time he wrote a Letter concerning the *Immortality of the Soul againſt Mr.* Henry Layton's *Hypotheſis*. In 1703 his Diſſertations upon the leſſer Greek Geographers were printed at Oxford with Dr. John Hudſon's edition of them. The year following his Chronology upon *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus* was publiſhed by Dr. Hudſon in his edition of that Hiſtorian at Oxford 1704 in fol.; and the ſame year his *Diſſertations upon the Age of Phalaris and Pythagoras* appeared [*R*]. In the year 1705 obſerving that the deprived Biſhops were reduced to a ſmall

(*l*) *Life of Dodwell*, pag. 304, 305, 306.

† It is intitled, *The Unreaſonableneſs of a Separation from the New Biſhops: or a Treatiſe out of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, ſhewing, that although a Biſhop was unjuſtly deprived, neither he nor the Church ever made a ſeparation, if the Succeſſor was not a Heretick. Tranſlated out of an antient Greek Manuſcript in the Publick Library at Oxford by* Humfrey Hody, *B. D. Fellow of Wadham College.* London 1691 in 4to.

ſwer to Dr. Hody, who had tranſlated and publiſhed a Greek Manuſcript, found among the Baroccian manuſcripts in the Bodleian Library †; but he writing an Anſwer to Mr. Dodwell, the latter publiſhed a *Defence of the Vindication of the deprived Biſhops*. He wrote likewiſe a Tract, which was deſigned as a Preface to the *Defence*, but being then ſuppreſſed, was afterwards printed with this title; *The Doctrine of the Church of* England *concerning the Independency of the Clergy on the Lay-Power as to thoſe Rights of theirs, which are purely ſpiritual, reconciled with our* Oath of Supremacy, *and the* Lay-Deprivations *of the* Popiſh *Biſhops in the beginning of the Reformation*; a *Letter to Dr.* Tillotſon *about Schiſm*; a *Diſcourſe againſt Marriages in different Communions*, annexed to Mr. Leſley's Diſcourſe on the ſame ſubject; a Latin Diſcourſe, intitled, *De Nupero Schiſmate Anglicano Paræneſis ad exteros, tam Reformatos, quam etiam Pontificios, quâ jura Epiſcoporum vetera, eorundemque Magiſtratu ſæculari independentia omnibus aſſerenda omnibus commendetur.* London 1704 in 4°; and a Treatiſe, intitled, *Occaſional Communion fundamentally deſtructive of the Diſcipline of the Primitive Catholick Church, and contrary to the Doctrine of the lateſt Scriptures concerning Church Communion:* London, 1705.

[*N*] *In* 1692 *he publiſhed his* Lectures *read at Oxford.*] They were printed at Oxford 1692 in 8°, under the title of *Prælectiones Academicæ in Scholâ Rhetorices Camdenianæ.*

[*O*] *In* 1698 *he publiſhed his* Annales Velleiani, &c.] They were printed at Oxford 1698 in 8vo under this title: *Annales Velleiani, Quintilianei, Statianei, ſeu Vitæ P. Vellei Paterculi, M. Fabii Quintiliani, P. Papiniani Statii, obiterque Juvenalis pro temporum ordine diſpoſitæ.*

[*P*] *His Treatiſe* de veteribus Græcorum Romanorumque Cyclis.] It was printed at Oxford 1701 in 4to. Dr. Edmund Halley, Savilian Profeſſor of Geometry in that Univerſity, wrote an Account of this Book in a *Letter to Robert Nelſon Eſq*; printed at London 1715 in 8vo, and ſubjoined to Mr. Brokeſby's *Life of Mr. Dodwell*; in which Letter he ſtiles that Book an *excellent one, and the moſt elaborate of all our Author's pieces, and which ſeems to have been the work of the greateſt part of his Life.* It is divided into *ten Diſſertations*; in the *firſt* of which he aſſerts the civil uſe of the Cycle invented by *Meto*; in the *ſecond* he ſhews the ſame with reſpect to the Cycle of *Calippus*; in the *third* he treats of the *Athenian* Cycles, which were more ancient than *Meto*; in the *fourth* of the civil Cycles of the Olympiads; in the *fifth* of the *Delphic* and *Bœotian* Cycles; in the *ſixth* of the *Iſthmian* Games, and the *Corinthian* and *Sicilian* Cycles; in the *ſeventh* of the *Nemean* and *Argolican* Cycles; in the *eighth* of the *Lacedæmonian* Cycles, and the Magiſtrates mentioned by *Xenophon* to the end of the *Peloponneſian* War; in the *ninth* of the *Macedonian*, and therein occaſionally of the *Jewiſh* Cycles; and in the *tenth* of the ancient Cycles of the *Romans*.

[*Q*] *His* Annales Thycididei & Xenophontei.] They were printed at Oxford in 4to 1702 under this title: *Annales Thycididei & Xenophontei. Præmittitur apparatus cum Vitæ Thycididis Synopſi Chronologicâ.*

[*R*] *His* Diſſertations upon the Age of Phalaris and Pythagoras.] They were printed at Oxford 1704 in 8vo with this title; *Exercitationes duæ: prima de Ætate Phalaridis: ſecunda de Ætate Pythagoræ Philoſophi.* This was written on occaſion of the diſpute between Dr. Bentley and Mr. Boyle. In the Preface Mr. Dodwell declares, that he cannot be entirely of the Doctor's opinion, that Atoſſa the daughter of Cyrus was the firſt inventor of writing Epiſtles; for which opinion the Doctor cites Hellanicus, who is mentioned by Tatian and Clemens Alexandrinus. Mr. Dodwell refutes this teſtimony; and obſerves, that there are ſufficient proofs of Epiſtles before Atoſſa's days. For tho' that of Bellerophon be allowed to be Homer's fiction, yet from thence it is evident, that Epiſtles were uſed in Homer's time, ſince he adapted himſelf to the cuſtoms uſed in his own days. Now Homer himſelf lived before Atoſſa's and even her father's time, viz. in the time of the Cimmerian's irruption under Cyaxares. Harpagus's Letter to Cyrus is mentioned as a thing not ſtrange, tho' the ſending it in an hare's belly is. Tho' the Epiſtles of Philoſophers in Laertius may be juſtly queſtioned; yet thoſe in the holy Scriptures cannot; ſuch as Jezabel's, 1 *Kings* xxi. the King of Syria's, 2 *Kings* v. Jehu's, 2 *Kings* x. and many others. The invention of Epiſtles is not to be expected from Hiſtory, ſince the Art of Writing was of ſo great uſe in men's private affairs; and conſequently firſt chiefly uſed therein; and then afterwards in other things written for pleaſure, as Poetry and Hiſtory. It is no wonder therefore, that we do not find in Hiſtory who firſt invented Epiſtles; neither does the teſtimony of Pliny ſignify any thing, which only relates to the matter, on which Epiſtles firſt were written. The invention aſcribed to Atoſſa was not that of writing Epiſtles, but that of joining the Tables, on which they were written, with ſuch exactneſs, that they might be more conveniently carried; which is expreſſed by the word συνάσσειν, an Art unknown to Homer. But ſuppoſing Atoſſa did invent Epiſtles, this hinders not but that Phalaris might write Epiſtles, ſince he was contemporary with her, who, after ſhe had had two former huſbands, and was probably near thirty years old then, was married to Darius

ſmall number, he wrote his *Caſe in View conſidered*, to ſhew that in caſe thoſe Biſhops ſhould leave all their ſees vacant either by death or reſignation, thoſe who had ſeparated from the Church of England would not then be obliged to keep up the ſeparation. And accordingly upon the death of Dr. Lloyd, the deprived Biſhop of Norwich, on January the 1ſt $17\frac{10}{11}$, Mr. Dodwell with ſome other friends wrote to Dr. Ken, the deprived Biſhop of Bath and Wells, to know whether he challenged their ſubjection. The Biſhop returned his anſwer, that he did not, and ſignified his deſire, that the breach might be cloſed by their joining with the Biſhops then poſſeſſed of the Sees, giving his reaſons for it. Upon this Mr. Dodwell with other friends joined in communion with them [*S*], though others did not. Our Author being exceedingly concerned for this wrote his *Caſe in View, now in Fact*, printed at London 1711 in 8vo. Beſides the books abovementioned, he wrote ſeveral others, which we ſhall give an account of in the note [*T*]. He died at Shotteſbrooke June the 7th 1711, aged ſeventy years, and was interred in the Chancel of the Church there, where a monument was erected to him by his widow. He was very communicative and ready to aſſiſt others in the advancement of learning, and a man of exemplary charity, humility, piety, and zeal, and of a very aſcetic life (*m*). He was of a ſmall, but well proportioned ſtature, of a ſanguine and fair complexion, of a grave, ſerious,

(*m*) Ibid. pag. 513, *& ſeqq.*

Darius Hyſtaſpes, in whoſe time there were many Greek and Aſian Colonies planted in Sicily; and hence there was an eaſy communication of uſeful inventions to each other. In the *firſt Diſſertation* he concludes, that Phalaris came to Agrigentum Olympiad LVIII. 1. obtained the Tyranny ſixteen years after, Olympiad LXIII. 1. and was killed between Olympiad LXIX. 2, and Olympiad LXX. 1. In the *ſecond Diſſertation* he determines, that Pythagoras was born in the latter end of Olympiad LII $\frac{1}{2}$; came to Italy Olympiad LXV $\frac{1}{2}$; and died Olympiad LXXXII. 1.

[*S*] *Mr. Dodwell . . . . joined in communion with them.*] On the 10th of February $17\frac{10}{11}$ he wrote a Letter to Dr. Burnet Biſhop of Sarum (17); which began thus:

(17) See *Four Letters, which paſſed between the Right Reverend the Lord Biſhop of Sarum, and Mr. Henry Dodwell, printed from the Originals.*

" Right Reverend Father in God,
" I am glad, that the extinction of the late ſchiſm " has inabled me to own your ſpiritual titles; but " ſhall be more ſo, if a like Providence may put in " my power to acknowledge your ſecular honours " alſo." At the end of this Letter he deſires the Biſhop to confirm his children, or to give him leave to get them confirmed by ſome other of his venerable brethren; and concludes thus: " I value this ordi- " nance more than the looſe *Latitudinarian* opinions " of this Age would oblige me to do, as taking it " for the true Baptiſm of the Spirit derived from the " Apoſtles. This will make me to value the more the " favour hereby conferred on my children, if they " may receive this office from you, which may en- " title them to ſo great benefits as are the conſe- " quents of the inhabitation of the Spirit. In the " mean time I beg another boon of your prayers and " epiſcopal benediction upon me and mine. I am,
" Your Fatherhood's unworthy Communicant
" *Henry Dodwell.*"

The Biſhop in his Anſwer gives an account of the grounds, which had led him to uſe any hard words with relation to Mr. Dodwell, and particularly objects to his two *Diſſertations* on St. Cyprian relating to the Martyrs among the primitive Chriſtians. *In your* Diſſertations, continues he, *upon* Irenæus, *to ſupport a ſingular conceit of your own; you ſhook the authority of the Canon of the Scriptures, and . . . neither vindicated your ſelf, nor retracted what you had wrote. And I have good reaſon to believe, that the long quotation from your Book fortified the infidelity of the Age, with relation to the Canon of the Scripture more than any one thing I know. In your Latin* Apology, *you have ſtruck the authority of Biſhops out of the Scriptures, and put it upon a conceit of your own; and you make that order to have begun about twenty years ſooner than Blondel had fixed it; which will make it paſs but for a human conſtitution among all thoſe, who make the Scriptures the only rule of their faith.* After ſome other animadverſions on Mr. Dodwell's writings the Biſhop proceeds thus: " You are a learned man, and your life has been, not " only without blemiſh, but exemplary. But you " don't ſeem to remember, or enough to conſider the " woe our Saviour has denounced againſt thoſe by " whom ſcandals come; and according to the true " notion of ſcandal, I know no man has laid more " in the way of the little ones, or weaker Chriſtians, " than you have done. . . . I do aſſure you, I would " rather wiſh that I could neither read nor write than " to have read or writ to ſuch purpoſes, as you have " been purſuing now above thirty years. You ſeem " to love novelties and paradoxes, and to employ your " learning to ſupport them. . . . . I do aſſure you, I " have a juſt value for many valuable things that I " know to be in you, and do heartily lament every " thing that is otherwiſe."

[*T*] *He wrote ſeveral others, which we ſhall give an account of in the Note.*] I. A Treatiſe *of the Lawfulneſs of Inſtrumental Muſick in holy offices.* London 1698. A ſecond Edition of it was printed in 1700. II. *An Epiſtolary Diſcourſe proceeding from the Scriptures and the firſt Fathers, that the ſoul is a principle naturally mortal; but immortalized actually by the pleaſure of God, to puniſhment or to reward, by its union with the divine Baptiſmal Spirit. Wherein is proved that none have power of giving this divine immortalizing Spirit ſince the Apoſtles, but only the Biſhops. By* Henry Dodwell *M. A.* London 1706 in 8vo. Our Author having in his Diſcourſe *concerning the Obligations to marry within the true communion*, and in his *ſecond Letter of Advice for Theological Studies*, repreſented the Immortality of the Soul as the effect of the divine Spirit reſtrained to thoſe within the Covenant; a Gentleman unknown to Mr. Dodwell, wrote two Letters to a friend of his, in which he miſtook Mr. Dodwell, as if he had ſuppoſed the actual mortality of all, who are out of the *Peculium*. This gave occaſion to the writing of this Diſcourſe. Biſhop Burnet having in a Letter to Mr. Dodwell (18) made ſome animadverſions upon our Author's doctrine in this book, Mr. Dodwell in his Reply (19) has the following paſſage: " The Atheiſts themſelves quickly gave over " their eagerneſs in buying my Book, as my Book- " ſeller himſelf informed me, when they found, upon " actual peruſal of it, how little it anſwered their ex- " pectation." It was immediately attacked in a Book intitled, *A Charge of Hereſy maintained againſt Mr. Dodwell's late* Epiſtolary Diſcourſe, *concerning the* Mortality of the Soul. *By way of addreſs to the Clergy of the Church of England. Laying open his oppoſition to the received creeds, and his falſification of all ſacred and profane antiquity. By* Edmund Chiſhull, B. D. *late Chaplain at* Smyrna, *and Fellow of* C. C. C. Oxon. London 1706 in 8vo. In this Book Mr. Chiſhull gives the character of Mr. Dodwell in the following words: " As for that painful layman, who " has engaged the Church in this diſpute, his mode- " ſty will, I hope, excuſe me, if I have expreſt my " ſelf ſomewhat freely concerning the ſize of his " judgment and underſtanding, and if I rank him " only in that lower claſs of learned men, who are " indeed fitted for the collecting of materials, but are " unqualified to judge rightly of, and to reaſon upon " what they ſhall collect. Yet 'tis not becauſe I " would detract from any degree of reputation he may " claim: 'tis becauſe I would leſſen that authority, " under which he propagates his errors, and becauſe " I think mankind to have a fairer right to truth, than " he to that character, in which he glories, by a falſe

(18) *Four Letters &c. ubi ſupra.*

(19) Ibid.

rious, but a comely pleaſant countenance, and a piercing eye; free and open in his diſcourſe, and facetious upon all proper occaſions (*n*). He generally travelled on foot, and read as he walked, always carrying with him in his journies books fitted for his pockets (*o*). His ſtyle is very obſcure and embarraſſed; and he uſed to complain to his friends, that he was not able to comprize his thoughts in a few words; for imagining that what he concluded was not firm unleſs he laid a large foundation, this occaſioned frequent digreſſions in his writings (*p*). He had a great correſpondence with the learned men abroad, who mention him with great reſpect; and particularly Cardinal *Noris*, *Pagi*, *Magliabecchi*, and *Grævius*.

(*n*) Mr. Hearne in his Edition of *Leland*, vol. 5. pag. 112.

(*o*) *Life of Dodwell*, pag. 523, 524.

(*p*) Ibid. pag. 535.

" and miſtaken learning. But if it ſhall be the for-
" tune of this diſcourſe to give that idea of our ad-
" verſary's abilities, which I have long ſince enter-
" tained from the ſtrain of all his writings, nothing
" will hereafter be believed, becauſe produced by Mr.
" Dodwell; but on the contrary, it will be queſtion-
" ed for that very reaſon, and will be ſuſpected of
" heterodoxy, novelty, and ſingularity, till it has
" been ſubmitted to the common teſt of truth, and
" warranted by the impartial verdict of reaſon and
" religion." There were publiſhed likewiſe againſt our Author *A Letter to Mr.* Dodwell, *wherein all the arguments in his* Epiſtolary Diſcourſe *againſt the Immortality of the Soul are particularly anſwered, and the judgment of the Fathers concerning that matter truly repreſented. By* Samuel Clarke, *M. A.* London 1706 in 8vo; and *A Philoſophical Diſcourſe concerning the natural Immortality of the Soul; wherein the great queſtion of the Soul's Immortality is endeavoured to be rightly ſtated and fully cleared. Occaſioned by Mr.* Dodwell's *late* Epiſtolary Diſcourſe. *In two parts. By* John Norris, *M. A. Rector of Bemerton.* London 1708 in 8vo. Mr. Dodwell wrote in vindication of himſelf, III. *A Preliminary Defence of the* Epiſtolary Diſcourſe *concerning the Diſtinction between Soul and Spirit, in two parts: 1. Againſt the charge of favouring impiety. 2. Againſt the charge of favouring hereſie. In the former is inſerted a digreſſion, proving that the collection of the code of the four Goſpels in* Trajan's *time is no way derogatory to the ſufficient atteſtation of them. By* Henry Dodwell, *M. A.* London 1707 in 8vo. IV. *The Scripture Account of the eternal Rewards or Puniſhments of all that hear of the Goſpel, without an Immortality neceſſarily reſulting from the nature of ſouls themſelves, that are concerned in thoſe rewards or puniſhments. Shewing particularly, 1. How much of this Account was diſcovered by the beſt Philoſophers. 2. How far the Accounts of thoſe Philoſophers were corrected and improved by the Helleniſtical Jews, aſſiſted by the Revelations of the Old Teſtament. 3. How far the Diſcoveries aforementioned were improved by the Revelation of the Goſpel. Wherein the teſtimonies alſo of St. Irenæus and Tertullian are occaſionally conſidered. By* Henry Dodwell, *M. A. Author of the* Epiſtolary Diſcourſe. London 1708 in 8vo. V. *The Natural Mortality of human Souls clearly demonſtrated from the holy Scriptures, and the concurrent Teſtimonies of the primitive Writers. Being an explication of a famous paſſage in the Dialogue of S.* Juſtin *Martyr with* Tryphon, *concerning the Soul's Immortality. In a Letter to a friend. With an* Appendix *conſiſting of a Letter to Mr.* John Norris *of* Bemerton. *And an Expoſtulation relating to the late inſults of Mr.* Clarke *and Mr.* Chiſhull. *By* Henry Dodwell *M. A.* London 1708 in 8vo. VI. *A Diſſertation concerning the Uſe of Incenſe in divine Offices.* London 1711 in 8vo. In this piece he ſhews, that it is no apoſtolical Tradition. VII. *Julii Vitalis Epitaphium, cum Notis Henrici Dodwelli, & Commentario G. Muſgrave. Accedit Dodwelli Epiſtola ad Cl. Gœzium de Puteolanâ & Bajanâ Inſcriptionibus. Iſcæ Dunmoniorum & Londini,* 1711 in 8vo. VIII. *De Parmâ Equeſtri Woodwardiana Diſſertatio, &c.* Oxon. 1713 in 8vo. It was publiſhed by Mr. Thomas Hearne, A. M. Mr. Dodwell does not doubt of the antiquity of Dr. Woodward's ſhield, and believes that it was made under the reign of Nero. IX. *De Tabulis Cœlorum Diſſertatio; & Tabulæ chronologicæ pro mente XII Patriarcharum,* printed in the firſt volume of Dr. Grabe's *Spicilegium*. He began likewiſe ſeveral other Works, which he left unfiniſhed; particularly *a Diſſertation concerning the Laws of Nature and Nations*, in which he propoſed to ſhew, that theſe were not, as is generally ſuppoſed, the reſults of reaſon, tho' highly agreeable to it; but Laws delivered by God to Adam or Noah, the firſt common parents of all mankind, or at leaſt to ſome in thoſe firſt Ages, wherein God moſt frequently communicated his will by immediate Revelation: That theſe were tranſmitted to poſterity by *Tradition*, which might eaſily be accompliſhed when they related to men's practice, and ſo occurred to men's ſenſes in ſocieties: That theſe Laws are ſuppoſed in the Scriptures, and in the other earlieſt monuments of antiquity, ſuch as the antienteſt Poets: That all looked on themſelves as obliged to the obſervance of them, from the expectation of rewards, if they obeyed, or of puniſhments, if they tranſgreſſed them: That theſe muſt proceed from the arbitrary pleaſure of the great Governor of the Univerſe, and this with regard to the good of the public: That Societies were neceſſary to this end; and that theſe were at firſt formed by God himſelf, exacting a due ſubordination of ſubjects to their Governors: That firſt an huſband, then parents were Governors of Societies; and that the ſupreme Parent had authority over all his deſcendents, tho' theſe were ſuperior over their own deſcendents: That the right of preſcribing to deſcendents was fortified by a right given them by God himſelf to reward their deſcendents with bleſſings, and to puniſh them by curſes, to be performed by God himſelf, for the performance of which God look'd on himſelf as a Guarantee: That tho' ſupreme Governors were exempt from being reſponſible for their male-adminiſtration to men, yet God took care to deter theſe from uſing their power arbitrarily, and from elation of mind, by his Μῆνις, or threats of divine vengeance. He takes notice of ſome poſitive Laws, which were generally eſteemed as *piacular*, the violation of which made the community obnoxious to divine puniſhment, till the crime was expiated. No antecedent reaſon could have obliged God to puniſh communities for the crimes of private perſons, had he not ſettled Societies. Theſe thoughts he has given us ſome ſtrictures of in ſome of his other writings, and particularly in his *Diſcourſe againſt Marriages in different Communions*; but more fully in his Letter to the Reverend Mr. John Falconer, a North-Briton, who deſired his aſſiſtance in his deſigned work againſt the Deiſts and other adverſaries of Chriſtianity; in anſwer to whom Mr. Dodwell began his *Diſcourſe of the Laws of Nations*, in which he intended to eſtabliſh the *Patriarchal Scheme* (20). Not long before his death he had a deſign of ſettling the time and order, in which Tertullian wrote each of his Books. He wrote alſo a Tract *concerning the Death of Judas*, in which he ſuppoſed, that Judas was not *ſtrangled with grief*, as Grotius and Dr. Hammond imagined, but actually *hanged himſelf*; and a Diſſertation concerning the Time of the Greek Tranſlation of the Old Teſtament by the *Septuagint*; which from the teſtimony of Eupolemus in Clemens Alexandrinus and others he determines to have been done in the time of Demetrius Phalereus the Grammarian, and of Ptolomy Philopator, who might be Philadelphus, as well as Ptolomy ſon of Lagida, as there were ſeveral *Phyſcones*, *Soteres*, *Philometores*, and *Euergetæ*. He reſolved likewiſe to publiſh St. *Barnabas's Epiſtle* with a literal Tranſlation and Paraphraſe, and *Prolegomena*, the laſt of which was finiſhed in 1691 (21).

(20) *Life of Dodwell*, pag. 499, 500, 501.

(21) Ibid. pag. 504, 505.

DOLABELLA (PUBLIUS CORNELIUS), ſon-in-law to Cicero, was firmly attached to the party of Julius Cæſar. He was preſent at the Battles of Pharſalia, Africa, and

and Munda [A]: and was wounded in the laſt of thoſe three engagements. While he was Tribune of the people he cauſed a thouſand diſorders, which mortally afflicted Cicero (a). He deſigned to get a Law paſſed for the abolition of Debts [B], in order to gain the affection of the populace, and to free himſelf from the obligation of ſatisfying his Creditors (b); but he met with very ſtrong oppoſition. Marc Antony, whoſe wife he had debauched, was the principal obſtacle in his way: ſo that it may be ſaid, if that woman had been virtuous, the city of Rome would have fallen into a terrible confuſion, by the good underſtanding there would have been between the two greateſt diſturbers of the public repoſe at that time in Italy. Every thing has its uſe in this world: the intrigues of Marc Antony's wife did a ſignal ſervice to her country, and were the occaſion (c) of his overthrowing all the deſigns of a factious Tribune (d). During theſe conteſts Cæſar was in Ægypt. His return to Rome reſtored the public tranquillity there: he pardoned Dolabella, and raiſed him to the Conſulſhip ſome years after, contrary to the eſtabliſhed forms; for Dolabella had not yet attained a competent age, nor had he been Prætor (e). Marc Antony oppoſed his taking poſſeſſion of the Conſulſhip to the utmoſt of his power [C]; but as Cæſar was killed a few months after this new quarrel between

(a) See the Article TULLIA.

(b) Dio, lib. 42. Pag. 223.

(c) Plutarch. *in Antonio*, pag. 919.

(d) Dio, lib. 42. pag. 224, &c.

(e) Idem, pag. 225.

[A] *He was preſent at the battles of Pharſalia, Africa, and Munda.*] The paſſage of Cicero which I produce to prove this, will ſerve another purpoſe. *Quonam modo igitur Dolabella pervenit* (in Hiſpaniam?) *aut non ſuſcipienda fuit iſta cauſſa, Antoni, aut, cum ſuſcepiſſes, defendenda uſque ad extremum. Ter depugnavit Cæſar cum civibus, in Theſſalia, Africa, Hiſpania; omnibus affuit his pugnis Dolabella: Hiſpanienſi etiam vulnus accepit: ſi de meo judicio quæris, nollem: ſed tamen conſilium à primo reprehendendum, laudanda conſtantia* (1). i. e. "How, therefore, did Dolabella "arrive *in Spain?* Either you ſhould not, Antony, "have engaged in that cauſe, or, when you had "engaged in it, you ſhould have defended it to the "utmoſt. Cæſar fought three battles againſt his fellow-citizens, in Theſſaly, Africa, and Spain; in "every one of which Dolabella was preſent; and he "even received a wound in the laſt. If you aſk my "opinion, I would not have adviſed you to have engaged in the affair; but though the deſign was to "be condemned from the very firſt, yet firm perſeverance in it would have deſerved commendation." Obſerve here two things; one of which is a piece of Rhetorical Legerdemain, and the other a tolerable good maxim. Cicero could not but know that Marc Antony, ſtaying in Italy by Cæſar's order, had done as much ſervice to the party, as if he had attended Cæſar to Egypt, and the Kingdom of Pontus. He could not but know that the fear of danger was not one of Marc Antony's faults, or that other reaſons had prevented him from following Cæſar to Africa and Spain. Yet, as his ſtaying at Rome at ſuch a conjuncture, conſidered generally, might receive a malicious turn, Rhetoric failed not to expoſe it loudly, as an act of cowardiſe. Cicero knew nothing could vex a military man more than inſults of this nature, and he took care to ply him from that quarter. *Cui bello cum propter timiditatem tuam tum propter libidines defuiſti . . . Tam bonus gladiator rudem tam cito accepiſti? Hunc igitur quiſquam qui in ſuis partibus, id eſt in ſuis fortunis tam timidus fuerit, pertimeſcat* (2)? i. e. "From which war you abſented your ſelf as well out "of cowardiſe as laſt . . . Have you, who are ſo good "a Gladiator, received your diſcharge ſo ſoon? Can "any one therefore fear this man, who has ſhewed "himſelf ſo timorous in the defence of his party, "when his own fortunes were at ſtake?" To irritate him the more he forgot not to beſtow great encomiums on Dolabella. I wiſh Commentators would take notice of theſe artifices of Rhetoricians.

(1) Cicero, *Philippic.* 2. cap. 30.

(2) Idem, cap. 29.

[B] *He deſigned to get a Law paſſed for the abolition of debts.*] This they called *novæ Tabulæ*. A learned Critic has explained them in the following manner: *Sunt tabulæ novæ nihil aliud quam lex ſeu decretum communi conſenſu factum, quo civitate per alterius partis ultimam pauperiem, & ex ea ſeditionem, in extremo periculo conſtituta, nexis atque obæratis, ad concordiam faciendam, debita in univerſum remittuntur, ita ut hoc nomine nec corpora eorum, neque bona vincta teneri queant* (3). i. e. "The *tabulæ* "*novæ* are no other than a Law or Decree enacted "by common conſent, whereby, when a State is in "imminent danger from the extreme poverty, and "conſequent ſeditious diſpoſition, of one party, for "the ſake of peace, all debts are remitted, and all "obligations cancelled, ſo that neither their bodies nor "goods may be liable to ſeizure on account thereof."

(3) Johan. Scheffer us, *in Libello de Novis Tabulis*, apud Caſparem Sagittarium, *in Vita Tulliæ*, pag. 13, 14.

[C] *Cæſar . . . raiſed him to the Conſulſhip . . . Marc Antony oppoſed his taking poſſeſſion of that dignity to the utmoſt of his power.*] Cicero has enlarged on this conteſt in his 2d Philippic, and pretends Dolabella was abuſed. They perſuaded him to ſtand for the Conſulſhip, they gave him hopes of obtaining it, and then ſuffered him to ſink under the oppoſitions which were raiſed againſt him. Cæſar was the contriver of this foul play. *Nihil queror de Dolabella qui tum eſt impulſus, inductus, elusus: qua in re quanta fuerit uterque veſtrum perfidia in Dolabellam quis ignorat? Ille* (Cæſar) *induxit ut peteret: promiſſum & receptum intervertit ad ſeque tranſtulit: tu ejus perfidiæ voluntatem tuam adſcripſiſti* (4). Cicero adds that the Senate being aſſembled on the firſt of January (5), Dolabella made a cutting ſpeech againſt Marc Antony (6), and that the latter paſſionately inveighed againſt Dolabella. Cæſar had declared that when he ſet out on his grand expedition againſt the Parthians, he would leave Dolabella Conſul in his ſtead. Marc Antony was then Cæſar's Collegue in that office; and having no mind to have Dolabella for his Collegue, he declared that he was Augur, and would take advantage of that dignity to prevent Dolabella's being choſen, or elſe to render his election void. *Cum Cæſar oſtendiſſet ſe priusquam proficiſceretur Dolabellam Conſulem eſſe juſſurum . . . . tum hic bonus augur eo ſe ſacerdotio præditum eſſe dixit, ut comitia auſpiciis vel impedire vel vitiare poſſet: idque ſe facturum eſſe aſſeveravit* (7). The day of the election being come, the Suffrages fell on Dolabella; whereupon Marc Antony, who had not ſaid a word during the election, declared aloud that the Aſſembly muſt be adjourned to another day. He ſpoke this as Augur, and deſiſted not from this denunciation till after Cæſar's death. Then it was his intereſt to allow the election of Dolabella to be legal, and he was reconciled to him (8). Plutarch (9) relates, in fewer words than Cicero, that Cæſar having acquainted the Senate that he intended to reſign his Office of Conſul to Dolabella, was obliged to put off that affair to another time, becauſe of the violent oppoſitions of Marc Antony, who uttered a thouſand injurious things againſt Dolabella, and received as abuſive language from him. Some time after Cæſar had a mind to proceed to his reſignation in favour of Dolabella, but was conſtrained to deſiſt, becauſe Marc Antony declared to him that the Auguries were contrary. Dolabella finding himſelf abandoned, fell into a violent rage. I find no other fault with this relation of Plutarch, than that he has omitted one very eſſential circumſtance; which is, that Cæſar did not acquieſce in ſuch a manner, as not to leave Dolabella in full right to make good his pretenſions. He left it undecided whether Marc Antony's oppoſition was null, or valid. I freely believe that he found himſelf incumbered with thoſe two men, and that notwithſtanding he ſaid one day, that he did not fear men who were ſo well fed, and ſo well dreſſed as they (10), but that he dreaded the pale and lean (11), yet he plainly felt that the friendſhip of Marc Antony and Dolabella was a burthen to him. There was probably ſome

(4) Cicero, *Philipp.* 2. cap. 33.

(5) In the year of Rome 710.

(6) *Invectus eſt copioſius multo in ipſum & paratius Dolabella quam nunc ego.* Idem, d. C.

(7) Idem, ibid. d. cap. 32.

(8) *Collegam tuum depoſitis inimicitiis, oblitus auſpiciorum à te ipſo populo Romano nunciatorum, illo die,* (that is, three days after Cæſar's death) *collegam tibi eſſe voluiſti.* Idem, *Philipp.* 1. cap. 13.

(9) Plut. *in Antonio*, pag. 921.

(10) Idem, ibid.

(11) He meant Brutus and Caſſius. *Idem, ibid.*

between Marc Antony and Dolabella, they ended their differences, that they might the better reſiſt the Republican party. They were Conſuls the year Cæſar was aſſaſſinated; and at firſt took ſome ſteps from which thoſe who meant well drew a good Omen [D]: but this had no conſequence. Dolabella obtained the government of Syria; but he made ſo little haſte to take poſſeſſion of it, that he gave Caſſius time to make himſelf maſter of that Province: and as he was informed the Senate had conferred the ſame government on Caſſius, he did not think fit to proceed on his journey. He ſtopped, therefore, at Smyrna, and there treacherouſly put to death Trebonius [E] Governor of Aſia Minor, and one of the murderers of Julius Cæſar. So ſoon as the news of this deed reached Rome, the Senate declared Dolabella an enemy of the Roman people. By the death of Trebonius the leſſer Aſia lay at the diſcretion of Dolabella, who then failed not to march towards Syria. All places ſubmitted to him, becauſe Caſſius was abſent; all, I ſay, ſubmitted, except Antioch: but Caſſius arriving with ſome very good troops, beſieged Dolabella in the City of Laodicea, and reduced him to the cruel neceſſity of either killing himſelf,

ſome colluſion between him and Marc Antony as to the Conſulſhip of Dolabella; but it is certain that Marc Antony ſpoke inſolently to him on other occaſions; for inſtance, when Cæſar after the African War demanded of him an account of the ſale of Pompey's effects. Here is what Cicero ſays on that head: the thing could not receive a better turn. *Appellatus es de pecunia, quam pro domo, pro hortis, pro ſectione debebas, primo reſpondiſti plane ferociter: &, ne omnia videar contra te, propemodum æqua, & juſta dicebas. A me C. Cæſar pecuniam? cur potius, quam ego ab illo? an ille ſine me vicit? at ne potuit quidem: ego ad illum belli civilis cauſſam attuli: ego leges perniciosas rogavi .... Num ſibi ſoli vicit? quorum facinus eſt commune, cur non ſit eorum præda communis? jus poſtulabat: ſed quid ad rem? plus ille poterat* (12). i. e. "You was called "upon for the money which you owed for your houſe, "your gardens, and the ſale of confiſcated effects. "At firſt you anſwered in a very arrogant manner, "and, leſt I ſhould ſeem to condemn you in every "reſpect, with ſome reaſon and juſtice. Does Cæſar "demand money of me? Why ſhould not I as well "make a demand upon him? Did he conquer with-"out me? He could not do it: I furniſhed him with "a cauſe for a civil war: it was I who propoſed per-"nicious laws .... Did he conquer for himſelf a-"lone? Ought not they who are concerned in the "ſame action, to divide the ſpoil among them? This "was no more than juſtice: but what was this to the "purpoſe? Cæſar's power was ſuperior." After his laſt expedition to Spain, Cæſar treated him much more civilly (13): he did him a thouſand friendly offices, which was a ſign that he looked on him as a very ill man, very capable of doing him ſervice, and diſſervice alſo. Cicero, as to the choice of his friends, gives Cæſar a very bad character. *Habebat hoc omnino Cæſar: quem plane perditum ære alieno, egentemque, ſi eundem nequam hominem audacemque cognoverat, hunc in familiaritatem libentiſſimè recipiebat* (14). i. e. "This was Cæſar's method: if he knew a man to "be over head and ears in debt, and in indigent cir-"cumſtances, he willingly made a friend of him, "provided he was at the ſame time wicked and dar-"ing." You will find in Appian (15) a long account of Marc Antony's intrigues with regard to the Conſulſhip of Dolabella before their reconciliation, and after the death of Cæſar.

(12) Cicero, *Philipp.* 2. cap. 29.

(13) Ibid. cap. 32.

(14) Ibid. d. C.

(15) Appian. lib. 2. *de Bello Civil.*

[D] *Marc Antony and Dolabella ... took ſome ſteps, from which thoſe who meant well drew a good Omen.*] Marc Antony, three days after Cæſar's death, made a ſpeech in the Senate on peace and concord, and charmed the men of probity. He ſent his ſon as a hoſtage to the Conſpirators, who durſt not come down from the Capitol. Cicero frequently reminds him of that day. *Unum illum diem quo in æde telluris Senatus fuit, non omnibus iis menſibus quibus te quidam multum à me diſſentientes beatum putant, anteponis? Quæ fuit oratio tua de concordia? Quanto metu veterani, quanta ſollicitudine civitas tum à te liberata eſt* (16)? i. e. "Do "you not prefer that ſingle day, whereon the Senate "was aſſembled in the temple of Tellus, to all thoſe "months in which ſome, who differ widely in opi-"nion from me, think you happy? What a ſpeech "did you make to recommend Concord? From what "dread were the Veterans, and from what appre-

(16) Cicero, *Philipp.* 1. cap. 13. He ſays in the 2d *Philipp.* cap. 36. *Qui tu vir, Dii immortales, & quantus fuiſſes, ſi illius diei mentem ſervare potuiſſes! Pacem haberemus quæ erat facta per obſidem, &c.* i. e. "Good "Gods! how "worthy and "how great "hadſt thou "been, couldſt "thou have con-"tinued in the "ſame mind "thou waſt on "that day! We "ſhould now "have enjoyed "that peace, "which was "then made by "hoſtage &c."

"henſions was the city then freed by you?" See at the beginning of the firſt Philippic a detail of the good acts which Marc Antony did in concert with Dolabella. The latter, in particular, did a ſignal action, which was very neceſſary for the public welfare. A crowd of people of all conditions paid divine honours to a column of marble, erected in the midſt of the Forum in honour of Julius Cæſar (17). Dolabella cauſed that column to be demoliſhed, and puniſhed a great number of the factious with death; by which means he prevented the city's being pillaged: for their deſign was to render all the lovers of liberty odious. *Cum ſerperet in urbe infinitum malum, idque manaret in dies latius, iidemque buſtum in foro facerent, qui illam inſepultam ſepulturam effecerant; & quotidie magis magiſque perditi homines cum ſui ſimilibus ſervis, tectis, ac templis urbis minarentur, talis animadverſio fuit Dolabellæ cum in audaces ſceleratoſque ſervos, tum in impuros & nefarios liberos, taliſque everſio illius execratæ columnæ, ut mihi mirum videatur &c.* (18). i. e. "When a dread-"ful evil ſpread through the city, and daily diffuſed "itſelf farther; when thoſe people raiſed a funeral "pile in the Forum, who had been concerned in that "feigned burial; and when abandoned men, with "their ſlaves as abandoned as themſelves, conti-"nually threatened the houſes and temples of the "city, ſuch was the chaſtiſement which Dolabella "inflicted both on thoſe audacious and wicked ſlaves, "and on thoſe vile and flagitious free-men, and ſuch "was his conduct in demoliſhing that curſed column, "that I wonder &c." See another paſſage of Cicero concerning this very action, in the Remark [L] of the Article TULLIA.

(17) *See* Suetonius, *in Cæſare*, cap. 85.

(18) Cicero, *Philipp.* 1. cap. 2.

[E] *He ſtopped at Smyrna, and there treacherouſly put to death Trebonius.*] He gave Trebonius ſo many marks of friendſhip, that he prevented his being on his guard: for which reaſon it was very eaſy for him to make himſelf maſter of Smyrna in the night, and to force the houſe of Trebonius. He cauſed him to be cruelly tortured for two days, and then ordered his head to be ſtruck off, and fixed on the point of a javelin, to be carried about and expoſed to public view: the body was dragged through the ſtreets, and at laſt thrown into the Sea. Cicero deſcribes all this in a very eloquent manner (19): *Conſecutus eſt Dolabella, nulla ſuſpicione belli: quis enim id putaret? ſecutæ collocutiones familiariſſimæ cum Trebonio, complexuſque ſummæ benevolentiæ falſi indices exſtiterunt in amore ſimulato: dexteræ, quæ fidei teſtes eſſe ſolebant, perfidia ſunt, & ſcelere violatæ: nocturnus introitus Smyrnam, quaſi in hoſtium urbem, quæ fidiſſimorum, antiquiſſimorumque ſociorum ... Interficere captum ſtatim noluit; ne nimis, credo, in victoria liberalis videretur; cum verborum contumeliis optimum virum inceſto ore laceraſſet, tum verberibus, ac tormentis quæſtionem habuit pecuniæ publicæ idque per biduum: poſt, cervicibus fractis, caput abſcidit, idque affixum geſtari juſſit in pilo: reliquum corpus tractum, atque laceratum abjecit in mare.* I refer you to the fountain-head; for I ſhould be tedious if I tranſcribed all that is to be found on this ſubject in the Oration I quote. You will ſee below (20) the pious Reflection which Marc Antony made on the death of this murderer of Cæſar. There is a certain ſtyle of morality which people uſe of courſe, and which the moſt abandoned of mankind have the impudence to adopt.

(19) *Philipp.* 11. cap. 2.

(20) In the Remark [G] Citation (31).

himself, or surrendring. Dolabella chose the former (*f*) [*F*]. It is said he was then but six or seven and twenty years old (*g*). To shew his turbulent and seditious temper, we need only remember that, after the example of Clodius, he procured himself to be adopted by a Plebeian, that he might be Tribune of the people (*b*). Moreri's faults [*G*] are considerable.

(*f*) Extracted from *Dion*, lib. 47. *ad ann. Romæ* 712.

(*b*) Dio, lib. 24. pag. 223.

(*g*) Appian, *de Bello Civ.* lib. 2. pag. m. 279, makes him 25 years old at the death of Julius Cæsar. See the Remark [*E*] of the Article TULLIA.

DOLABELLA

[*F*] *Dolabella chose to kill himself.*] According to Dion Cassius (21), he slew himself; but others say that one of his guards, at his request, cut off his head, and then killed himself, without regarding the advice his master had given him, to present it to the Conqueror, in order to obtain his pardon (22). Appian calls him Marsus, but Dion gives him the name of Octavius; which occasioned Archbishop Usher (23) to say that Marsus and Octavius slew themselves in Laodicea. It appears from one of the Philippics, that Marsus Octavius, a miserable Roman Senator, was one and the same person. Cicero speaks of him with the utmost contempt. *Quid opus fuit cum legione præmisso Marso nescio quo Octavio, scelerato latrone atque egente, qui popularetur agros, vexaret urbes, non ad spem constituendæ rei familiaris, quam tenere eum posse negant, qui norunt (mihi enim hic Senator ignotus est) sed ad præsentem pastum mendicitatis suæ? Consecutus est Dolabella* (24). i. e. "What occasion was there "that one Marsus Octavius, a wicked and indigent "robber, should be sent before with a Legion, to "plunder the country, and oppress the towns, not "in hopes of raising an estate, which those who "know him (for this Senator is an utter stranger to "me) say it is not in his power to keep, but for the "present supply of his necessities? Dolabella follow-"ed &c." This mistake of Usher, taken notice of by Father Noris (25), is the more excusable, because Appian has represented his Marsus in an imployment (26) much inferior to that which Dion has bestowed on Octavius. I believe we should read in Dion Μαρσὸς Ὀκτάβιος, and not Μάρκος Ὀκτάβιος. If I am told that, on the contrary, we should read in Cicero *Marcus Octavius*, and not *Marsus Octavius*, I answer that my conjecture is grounded on Appian's having named this person *Marsus*, without any other addition. It would be absurd to insist it ought to be read *Marcus* in Appian: for in a History people are never denoted by their *Prænomen* only. I would not absolutely reject the supposition of Glandorpius (27), that this man was named *Marcus Octavius Marsus*.

(21) Lib. 47. pag. 393.

(22) Appianus, *de Bello Civ.* lib. 4.

(23) In *Annalibus*.

(24) Cicero, *Philipp.* 11. cap. 2.

(25) Noris, *Cenotaph. Pisan.* pag. 278.

(26) That of *Præfectus nocturnarum excubiarum*.

(27) *Onomast.* pag. 638.

[*G*] *Moreri's faults are considerable.*] I. He should not have advanced it as a doubtful matter, that the Dolabella's *were descended from the Cornelij*. It is a certain fact, which no body is ignorant of. II. Speaking of Dolabella, who was declared an enemy of the Commonwealth for the murder of Trebonius, he ought not to have omitted either his name, or his prænomen. I say the same with regard to the other Dolabella's whom Moreri speaks of. III. He should not have said that he was declared an enemy of the Commonwealth in the year 710, but in the year 711; for the death of Trebonius was known at Rome a year (28) after Cæsar had been killed (29). Hirtius, who was Consul in the year 711, was actually in the exercise of his Office (30), when Marc Antony wrote to him (31): *Dedisse pœnas sceleratum* (he speaks of Trebonius) *cineri atque ossibus clarissimi viri, & apparuisse numen Deorum intra finem anni vertentis, aut jam soluto supplicio parricidii aut impendente lætandum est.* i. e. "The execution of the villain Trebonius has avenged "the ashes and relics of that great man; and the "Gods have manifested their justice within the year; "we have reason therefore to rejoice that the parri-"cide is now punished, or at least in a fair way to "be so." IV. He should not have represented our Dolabella as having *great power over the mind of Marc Antony*, since the quarrels of those two men are a thousand times more known, and lasted much longer than their good intelligence. *Quorum summum quondam inter ipsos odium, bellumque meministis, eosdem postea singulari inter se consensu, & amore devinxit impurissimæ naturæ & turpissimæ vitæ similitudo* (32). i. e. "Whose former extream hatred, and professed enmity "you must needs remember, though an agreement in "vicious inclinations, and a most debauched life, has "since reconciled and brought them to be intimate "friends." V. He ought not to have been distinguished from the son-in-law of Cicero. VI. Nor, perhaps, from him who referred the trial of that woman of Smyrna, who had poisoned her husband, to the Areopagus. Valesius is of opinion that the Dolabella who refused to try that woman, was not a different person from him who put Trebonius to death, and who perished at Laodicea (33). VII. However, he ought not to have given the person who directed that reference the prænomen of *Cneius*, since Valerius Maximus gives him that of *Publius*. And let me not be told that Aulus Gellius calls him *Cneus*; for, besides that Moreri does not quote Aulus Gellius, but Valerius Maximus, it must be observed that Aulus Gellius cites Valerius Maximus as his Original. It is therefore more reasonable to correct the Transcriber by Valerius Maximus, than the latter by the Transcriber. VIII. He should not have asserted that the woman whose trial was referred to the Areopagus, was accused *of having poisoned her husband, and a son he had by a former wife*: for the most natural and proper sense of the words of the Author quoted by Moreri (34), is that this woman poisoned her husband and the son she had had by that husband, because they had killed the son she had had by another husband. Aulus Gellius, who has related this story in other words, when he copied Valerius Maximus, so well understood the sense I am speaking of, that he took care his readers might be in no doubt about it: *Mulier Smyrnæa . . . id fecisse confitebatur, dicebatque habuisse se faciendi causam, quoniam idem illi maritus & filius* ALTERUM FILIUM *mulieris ex viro priore genitum, adolescentem optimum & innocentissimum, exceptum insidiis occidissent* (35). i. e. "The woman of Smyrna confessed the fact, and in-"sisted she had good reason for committing it, be-"cause her said husband and son had treacherously "murdered ANOTHER SON of that woman by a for-"mer husband, a most virtuous and innocent youth." Ammianus Marcellinus, speaking of this fact, no doubt avoided the ambiguity which might be in the expression of Valerius Maximus; but as his Text is greatly corrupted in that place (36), it cannot wholly remove our doubts. Some Editions have it, *Smyrnæa matersamilias filium* PROPRIUM *& maritum venenis necasse confessa*; others have SOBOLEM PROPRIAM. All this condemns Moreri. Let us observe, by the way, a particular which would be repeated a hundred thousand times, were it to be mentioned on every occasion; that the Latin Tongue has not the advantage of preventing ambiguous senses as ours does. Here is Valerius Maximus, who in relating a singular and most surprizing fact, has made use of an expression which has occasioned Interpreters to be divided in opinion as to the species of the crime committed by this woman. Moreri is not the ablest man who has supposed that this woman was stepmother to one of the two men whom she poisoned. The learned Henry Valesius (37) has put the same construction on the phrase of Valerius Maximus: wherein he is less worthy of credit than Aulus Gellius, who believed the woman poisoned her own son. The difference is so great between the crime as conceived by Aulus Gellius, and the crime as represented by Valesius, that the Historian is inexcusable who has related a fact of such importance in so ill a manner as to give room for such different interpretations. IX. Moreri ought not to have attributed the murder of the young man entirely to the woman's husband; for the son, either of that husband, or of that woman, was an accomplice in the assassination. X. Lastly, he should not have asserted that the woman's accuser and her husband were the same person: for since she was guilty of having killed her husband, it was not her husband who prosecuted her; and consequently the Areopagus did not order that husband to appear before them with the accused woman at the expiration of a hundred years.

(28) Note that, as to this mistake, a great many Chronologers are of Opinion that Cæsar was killed in the year 709. See the Remark [*O*] of the Article CÆSAR.

(29) *See* Fabricius, *in Vita Ciceronis, ad annum ultimum*, pag. m. 214.

(30) Cicero, *Philipp.* 13. cap. 11.

(31) *Apud* Ciceron. ibid.

(32) Cicero, *Philipp.* 13, *init.* cap. 1.

(33) Vales. *in Ammian. Marcellin.* lib. 29. cap. 2. pag. m. 562.

(34) *Matersamilias Smyrnæa virum & filium interemit, cum ab his optimæ indolis juvenem quem ex priore viro enixa fuerat, occisum comperisset.* Val. Maxim. lib. 8. cap. 1. *sub fin.*

(35) Aulus Gellius, lib. 12. cap. 7.

(36) Lib. 29. cap. 2. pag. 562, 563.

(37) Vales. *in Amm. Marcell.* lib. 29. cap. 2. pag. 563.

DOLABELLA (HORACE), Author of a Book intitled *Apologia pro Puritanis*. It is properly a burleſque Satyr againſt the Proteſtants. This Book muſt needs be very ſcarce; for it does not ſo much as appear in the Catalogues of the moſt numerous Libraries. I am no otherwiſe acquainted with it than by having ſeen it quoted in the *Doctrine Curieuſe* of Father Garaſſe. It is written by way of Queſtion and Anſwer, and the Scripture muſt have been therein treated with little decency, ſince that Jeſuit ſpeaks of it in the manner he does [*A*].

[*A*] *He is the Author of a Book . . . wherein the Scripture muſt have been treated with little decency, ſince Father Garaſſe ſpeaks of it in the manner he does.*] "This Author has written a Book which is much "ſought after and eſteemed by men of ſenſe, where- "in he overthrows all the maxims and fancies of "the Puritans by expreſs Texts taken from the holy "Scriptures: but I wiſh he had ſhewn more reſpect "to the Holy Ghoſt, and had not taken the liberty "of making him ſometimes ſay things which are a "little ſcandalous. I allow they ſtrike home; but, "in my opinion it would have been more expedient "to have uſed other weapons, and not have ſtirred a "dunghil with a golden ſcepter, as he has done (1)." Father Garaſſe has quoted ſeveral paſſages of this Book of Dolabella: the following is one of them. *Quæro cur univerſa nobilitas Anglicana dedignetur ſervire in miniſterio domus Dei, & quare viliſſimos homines & idiotas cogantur aſſumere ad miniſterium? Reſpondetur quia ſcriptum eſt Ezechielis XXVII, habuerunt nautas ad miniſterium; & Joan. II, Miniſtri autem ſciebant qui hauſerant aquam.* i. e. "I deſire to "know why the Engliſh Nobility in general diſdain "to ſerve in the Miniſtry of God's Houſe, and why "they are forced to preſer men of the meaneſt rank "and capacity to the miniſterial office? Anſwer: Be- "cauſe it is written in the XXVII chapter of Eze- "kiel (†), they had mariners for the miniſtry: and "in the ſecond chapter of S. John, The ſervants (or "Miniſters) which drew the water knew whence it "was."

(1) Garaſſe, *Doctrine Curieuſe*, pag. 672, 673.

(†) According to the Vulgar Tranſlation.

DOLET (STEPHEN) a good Philologer, burnt at Paris for his Opinions as to Religion (*a*) the 3d of Auguſt 1546 (*b*), was of Orleans. He laboured to reform the Latin Style, and compoſed ſome tolerably good Works [*A*] on that ſubject. Some (*c*) have thought that in his Commentaries on the Latin Tongue (*d*) he was conſiderably aſſiſted by Naugerius, in whoſe houſe he had lived at Venice. Others publickly accuſed him of Plagiariſm [*B*]. He applied himſelf to the making of Latin and French Verſes, and ſucceeded indifferently well [*C*]. He wrote an Apology for the Sect of the Ciceronians, whom

(*a*) See the Remarks [*C*] and [*G*].

(*b*) And not 1543, as *Moreri* ſays; or 1545, as Mr. *Baillet*, *la Caille*, &c. ſay.

(*c*) Sturmius, *Præfat. Formular. Linguæ Latinæ Stephani Doleti.*

(*d*) They were printed in the year 1536, in 2 Volumes in folio.

[*A*] *He compoſed ſome tolerably good works.*] You will find a more compleat Liſt of his Works in Geſner, and in the Sieur de la Caille (1), than in Moreri. It muſt not be forgotten that Dolet, who was a Printer and Bookſeller at Lyons, had printed ſome of his own Writings. He would have printed a French Tranſlation he had made of the greateſt part of Plato's Works, if he had not been prevented by his execution (2).

(1) *Hiſtoire de l'Imprimerie*, pag. 321.

(2) Baillet, *Jugem. des Sav.* tom. 4. pag. 516.

[*B*] *He was ſtrongly accuſed of Plagiariſm.*] Before the appearance of Charles Stevens's *Theſaurus*, and the Obſervations of Nizolius, Dolet's Commentaries were of no larger a ſize than the Elegancies of Lawrence Valla (3): they ſwelled afterwards to two volumes in folio, at the expence of Charles Stevens, Nizolius, Riccius, and Lazarus de Baïf. This was ſoon known: Charles Stephens ſaw ſome ſheets of the ſecond volume during the courſe of the impreſſion, and obſerved that almoſt whatever related to Navigation was taken out of the Book *de Re Navali* publiſhed by Baïf. Obſerve what he did: he made an Abridgment of that Book *de Re Navali*, and publiſhed it. This gave him an opportunity of ſhewing the thefts, and ſome faults of Dolet. The latter, to juſtify himſelf, publiſhed a Treatiſe *de Re Navali*, extracted out of his ſecond volume, and added it to an Anſwer to his Cenſurer, which he dedicated to Lazarus de Baïf: he did not deny but he had taken a great many things from Lazarus, but he maintained it was no robbery (4).

(3) Thoſe who had ſeen the Manuſcript affirmed it.

(4) This is taken from Thomaſius's Treatiſe, *de Plagio Literario*, pag. 409, & *ſeq.* Thomaſius took it from ſome paſſages of *Franciſcus Floridus Sabinus*, and from the *Anſwer of Dolet*.

John Vulteius made very loud complaints of the perſecution which he ſuppoſed jealouſy had then raiſed againſt his friend Stephen Dolet. Let us ſee in what manner he ſpoke of it to Cardinal John of Lorraine, when he dedicated to him his two Books of Epigrams, which he got printed at Lyons, by Sebaſtian Gryphius, in the year 1536. *Nemo (ut ingenuè, quod ſentio, dicam) tam inimicus nomini Gallico eſſe creditur, quàm Gallus. Id cum multi hactenus ſint experti, tum nuper* STEPHANUS DOLETUS *Aurelius, juvenis de lingua Latina (ne quid amplius dicam) optimè prima jam adoleſcentia meritus: reliquo vitæ curſu quid non literis adſtruet tam divino natus ingenio? tanta laborum omnium patientia, tanta conſtantia, tanta animi alacritate ad nominis immortalitatem contendens? Is, inquam, ætatis noſtræ lumen, ac Galliæ ſempiterna gloria, invidiæ morſus expertus eſt vel acerbiſſimos. Nam cùm linguæ Latinæ Commentarios (at quod opus? quàm minimè a juvene expectandum? quantæ diligentiæ? quanti laboris? quàm exacti judicii?) ad publicam omnium linguæ Latinæ amantium utilitatem in lucem emitti voluit, nullos magis ſibi adverſos cenſores ſenſit, quàm à quibus laboris uberrimum fructum jure merito expectabat. Sed valeant hujuſcemodi literarum peſtes, qui, cùm obeſſe ſurgenti doctorum gloriæ conantur, tum vel maximè profunt.* i. e. "No one (to declare my opinion "ingenuouſly) is thought to be ſo great an enemy to "the French name, as a Frenchman. This has been "experienced by many, and lately by Stephen Dolet "of Orleans, who has done great ſervice to the La- "tin tongue (to ſay no more) even in his youth; "and what may not be expected in the future part of "his life, for the advancement of learning, from a "perſon born with ſo excellent a genius, of ſuch un- "wearied diligence and application, and aſpiring "with ſuch alacrity of mind to immortal fame? "This perſon, I ſay, who is the ornament of the "age, and will be the eternal glory of France, ex- "perienced the ſevereſt ſtrokes of envy. For when "he deſigned to publiſh his Commentaries of the "Latin tongue (a work of immenſe labour and exact "judgment, and little to be expected from ſo young "a man) for the public uſe of all lovers of that lan- "guage, he found no cenſurers oppoſe him more "violently than thoſe perſons from whom he had "juſt reaſon to expect the moſt grateful return for "his labour. But farewel ſuch peſts of the Repub- "lic of Letters; who when they endeavour to preju- "dice the riſing glory of learned men, contribute moſt "effectually to eſtabliſh it." Note that among thoſe Epigrams there are a great many verſes in praiſe of Dolet, and againſt his Cenſurers, and particularly againſt one Maurus.

[*C*] *He applied himſelf to the making of Latin and French Verſes, and ſucceeded indifferently well.*] His Latin Verſes were by Gruterus judged worthy of being inſerted in the *Deliciæ Poetarum Gallorum*; and if they are not excellent, they are yet far from being ſo imperfect as Julius Cæſar Scaliger repreſents them. This Critic's rage againſt Dolet has ſomething in it ſo violent, and, if I may ſay it, ſo brutiſh, that one cannot help thinking that great man's pen was guided by a perſonal reſentment (5). I ſhall quote the whole paſſage; where we ſhall ſee Dolet puniſhed with death, not for what was called Lutheraniſm, but for Atheiſm. *Doletus . . . . Muſarum carcinoma aut vomica dici poteſt. Nam præter quam quod in eo tam grandi corpore*

(5) Mr. Baillet very juſtly blames him for it, in his *Jugemens ſur quelques Poetes*, num. 1279, tom. 3. pag. 220.

whom Erasmus had insulted. Cultivating polite literature so much as he did, it is no wonder that he had a share in the affection of Castellanus, a learned Prelate, and very much beloved by Francis I. Castellanus interceded so earnestly for him, that he got him discharged out of prison [D], and repelled in a very rational manner the reproaches which

corpore (ut ait Catullus) ne mica salis quidem, vult insanum agere Tyrannum in Poesi. Ita suo arbitratu Virgilianas gemmas suæ inserit pici, ut videri velit sua. Ignavus loquutulejus, qui ex tessellis Ciceronis febriculosas quasdam conferruminavit (ut ipse vocat) orationes: ut docti judicant, latrationes. Putavit tantundem licere sibi in divinis operibus Virgilianis. Ita dum optimi atque maximi Regis Francisci fata canit, ejus nomen suo malo fato functum est, quodque tum illi, tum illius versibus debebatur, solus passus est Atheos flammæ supplicium. Flamma tamen eum puriorem non efficit: ipse flammam potius efficit impuriorem. In Epigrammatum vero colluvionibus atque latrinis illis, quid ejus tibi sordes dicam? Languida, frigida, insulsa, plenissima illius vecordiæ, quæ summa armata impudentia ne Deum quidem esse professa est. Quapropter quemadmodum summus Philosophus Aristoteles in Natura animalium fecit, ut post enarratas partes, quibus constituuntur, etiam excrementorum faciat mentionem, hic ita ejus legatur nomen, non tanquam poetæ, sed tanquam poetici excrementi (6). i. e. "Dolet may be called the canker or im-
"postume of the Muses. For besides that in so vo-
"luminous a Writer, there is not a grain of wit, he
"sets up for a furious Tyrant in Poetry. He has
"according to his own fancy worked up Virgil's gold
"with his own base metal in such a manner, that he
"would have it pass for his. A wretched prater,
"who out of the shreds of Cicero has patched up
"certain wild Orations (as he calls them); but which
"the learned judge to be latrations. He imagined
"he had as good a right to be free with the divine
"works of Virgil. So while he was singing the fate
"of that great and good King Francis, his name met
"with its own evil fate, and the Atheist alone suffer-
"ed the punishment of the flames which both he and
"his verses deserved. Yet the flames did not purify
"him, but he rather made the flames impure. Why
"should I mention the filthiness which is to be found
"in the sink or common shore of his Epigrams?
"They are dull, cold, witless, and full of that ar-
"rogant madness, which, being armed with the most
"consummate impudence, would not even confess the
"being of a God. Wherefore as the Prince of Phi-
"losophers, Aristotle, in discoursing of the nature of
"animals, first describes the several parts of which
"they are composed, and then takes notice even of
"their excrements, so let his name be read here, not
"as the name of a Poet but of a poetical excrement."

(6) Scaliger, *Poetic.* lib. 6. pag. m. 730.

THE Origin of Julius Scaliger's hatred to Dolet.

The learned Naudé, who justly suspected that Julius Cæsar Scaliger was induced to speak in this manner by some private hatred, knew not the original ground of it (7): but I think I have discovered it. Dolet had the boldness to interfere with Scaliger: he wrote against Erasmus in favour of the Ciceronian Sect, after Scaliger had defended the cause. There are very few Authors who like such a procedure. It is looked upon as an affected design, either to surpass the first champion, or to deprive him of the glory of being the only person who breaks a lance. It is even thought that he who interposes in the combat, judges the cause has not been well defended, and stands in need of assistance. If this be the general disposition of Authors, judge how great Scaliger's indignation was when he saw Dolet enter the lists, and pretended he had catched him in several unfair artifices. He pretended, among other things, that the finest ornaments of his Oration had been pillaged by Dolet, and placed in a false light; and as to the praises which Dolet had given him, he thought himself no ways obliged to him for them, since they came too late, and with too ill a grace to repair the first offence. You will judge better of the whole from the following words of Scaliger (8):

(7) *Tu en oublie deux qui valoient mieux que ton* Badius, *savoir* Geofroi Tory, & Etienne Dolet, *que Jules Scaliger par* JENE SAI QUELLE *haine ait dit du dernier.* Naudé, *Dial. de Masurat*, pag. 8.

(8) This is what he wrote to *Arnold Ferron*, See his 14th *Letter*, pag. 35. of the Edition of Toulouse, in 4to 1620.

Arbitror te Doleti vidisse Dialogum adversus eum (Erasmum) *quem non puduit extantibus scriptis meis, flexu alio orationis omnia mea suffurari, atque ineptissimis inurere calamistris. Itaque eædem quæ in orationibus intemperiæ, stilus paulo minor asper, sed emendicatus, ut verbis potius alienis conquisitis, atque corrogatis, quàm oblato argumento ejus loquacitas excrescere videatur. At Cæsarem laudat, inquies: accipio. Nam te ajunt ad eum retulisse, consuleret dignitati suæ, qui temere atque stolide nimis super Italico nomine ineptisset; à me integrum Dialogum apparatum, quo illius ostenderem & malevolum animum cum inani gloria conjunctum, & præceps ingenium cum stupore, & impurum dicendi genus cum loquacitate, & amentem dictionem cum impudentia. Ita igitur adblanditum, ut animum meum deflecteret à proposito, ita laudasse, ut sequi potius aliorum judicium invitus, quàm suum ipse libens apponere videretur. Pro ea re data est à nobis opera, ut & eum & alium, quem velit ipse, pœniteat posthac rabiei illius, seu impudicitiæ. Audio illum præesse Lugduni Librariis, quorum manum emendet. Id quod si verum est, in illis libris, quos nuper invulgatos à Gryphio ære comparavimus, deprehenderunt etiam pueri nostri vel insigni scutica vitia animadvertenda. Perstrinxi eum in hac secunda Oratione, sublato quidem nomine, sed ita depictum, ut vel ab infantibus Tolosanis agnosci possit.* i. e.
"I suppose you have seen Dolet's Dialogue against
"Erasmus, who was not ashamed, when my writings
"were in print, to steal every thing from me by giv-
"ing my Oration another turn, and decking it out
"with his tinsel. Therefore there appear the same
"extravagancies as in his Orations, a style not quite
"so rugged, but for which he is beholden to another,
"so that his loquacity seems to be supported rather
"by other peoples words collected and raked toge-
"ther, than by a connected argument. But you will
"say he praises Cæsar; I agree he does. For they
"say you advised him to consult his reputation, he
"having already rashly and foolishly plaid upon my
"Italian name; and acquainted him that I had fi-
"nished a Dialogue, wherein I should expose his ma-
"licious temper and his empty arrogance, his petu-
"lancy and his stupidity, his impropriety and his lo-
"quacity, his raving expressions and his impudence.
"Having thus soothed me, with design to divert
"me from my purpose, he praised me in such a
"manner, that he seemed rather unwillingly to fol-
"low the judgment of other people, than freely to
"give his own. Wherefore I have endeavoured that
"both he and others may for the future repent of
"their rage and impudence. I hear he is corrector
"of a press at Lyons; and if it be true that he was
"concerned in the correcting of those Books bought
"by me, which were lately printed by Gryphius, our
"very school-boys have therein discovered faults for
"which he deserves a severe whipping. I have re-
"primanded him in this second Oration, not by name
"indeed, but painted in such colours that he may be
"known by the very children of Toulouse." He says several other things against Dolet in the same Letter. Confirm what I have said of Authors who write on the same subjects, by this passage of Diogenes Laertius. Ἔοικε δὲ καὶ Ξενοφῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἴσχειν οὐκ εὐμενῶς· ὥσπερ γὰρ διαφιλονικήσαντες τὰ ὅμοια γεγράφασι, συμπόσιον, Σωκράτους ἀπολογίαν, τὰ ἠθικὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα. *Videtur & Xenophon haudquaquam amico in illum* (Platonem) *fuisse animo: nam veluti contentionis studio similia scripsere, Symposium, Socratis defensionem, Commentaria moralia* (9). i. e. "Xenophon like-
"wise seems to have been no friend to Plato: for
"with a design as it were of vying with one another
"they wrote on the same subjects; and published each
"a Symposium, a Defence of Socrates, and moral
"Discourses."

(9) Laert. *in Platone*, lib. 3. num. 34.

[D] *Castellanus interceded so earnestly for him, that he discharged him out of prison.*] Here is what the Author of Castellanus's Life says of it (10): *Id magis verum esse credat qui Doletum longi carceris illuvie fœdatum, prima accusatione impiæ fraudis reum, Castellano supplice carcere emissus, & omni noxa condonata liberatum esse cognoverit.* i. e. "He will be more in-
"clined to believe this to be true, who shall know
"that Dolet, after having suffered a long and noisome
"imprisonment, on an accusation of impious fraud,
"was delivered from prison at the intercession of Ca-
"stellanus, and received a full pardon." The re-
proach which a certain Cardinal made Castellanus testifies that Atheism (11), or something very near of kin

(10) Petrus Galandius, pag. 62.

(11) See the Remarks [C] and [G].

which a Cardinal had caſt on him upon that account [*E*]. I eaſily believe that Dolet promiſed to be a good Catholic; but as he kept not that promiſe, no body durſt ſpeak any more in his behalf when he was impriſoned the ſecond time. Being abandoned, therefore, to the fury of the Inquiſitors, he was condemned to die. A Letter has been publiſhed which teſtifies that he recommended himſelf to the Holy Virgin and to St. Stephen, a little before he was ſtrangled [*F*]; but, for the reaſons I have mentioned in another place (*e*), teſtimonies of this kind are greatly to be ſuſpected. The Poets of both parties had ſome ſkirmiſhes on occaſion of this execution. You may ſee ſome of their Verſes in Mr. le Laboureur (*f*), who is much in the wrong to ſay that Dolet has been placed in the Martyrology of the Proteſtants [*G*].

(*e*) Above, in the Remark [*I*] of the Article BERQUIN.

(*f*) *Addit. a Caſtelnau*, tom. 1. pag. 355, 356.

It has been ſaid (*g*) *that he was a baſtard of Francis I, but* that *he was not owned as ſuch.* I cannot think he was that Monarch's ſon: I know he was very young when he publiſhed two Tomes in folio, in the year 1536; but I cannot perſuade myſelf he was young

(*g*) *Patiniana*, pag. 22. of the Paris Edit.

kin to it, was the crime of which Dolet was ſuſpected: *Unus primi nominis Cardinalis Caſtellanum gravi & objurgatrice oratione adortus eſſet, quod cum in Eccleſia Orthodoxorum Pontificis locum teneret, contra omnes tamen homines quibus religio & pietas cordi eſſet, eorum qui non modo Lutherana lue infecti, ſed etiam Dei expertes impietatis rei eſſent, partes tueri apud Chriſtianiſſimum Regem auſus eſſet.* i. e. "A Cardinal of "principal note ſeverely reproved Caſtellanus, for that "he, who bore the rank of a chief Prieſt in an Orthodox Church, ſhould yet, in oppoſition to all men "who had religion and piety at heart, dare to defend "before the moſt Chriſtian King, not only thoſe who "were infected with the Lutheran Hereſy, but even "thoſe who were impious and profeſſed Atheiſts." In the next Remark we ſhall ſee the general Anſwer which Caſtellanus gave; and here is what he anſwered in particular concerning Dolet: *Se apud Regem Doleti fraudibus & ſceleribus nullum patrocinium tribuiſſe, pro eo qui promitteret vitæ morumque emendationem homine Chriſtiano dignam Regi ſupplicem factum eſſe.* i. e. "That he had never defended any of Do"let's frauds or crimes before the King, but had only "become an interceſſor with his Majeſty for one who "promiſed a reformation of life and manners worthy "a Chriſtian." This ſhews that Dolet promiſed to forſake his debauched courſe of life.

[*E*] . . . *Caſtellanus . . . repelled . . . the reproaches which a Cardinal had caſt on him upon that account.*] He maintained that he did what a Biſhop ought to do, but that the Cardinal required Prelates to act the part of Executioners. He told him it was the duty of Biſhops, to incline the minds of Princes to clemency, and to bring home the ſtray ſheep on their ſhoulders. I weaken the expreſſions of Gallandius too much not to think myſelf obliged to tranſcribe them here, that thoſe Readers who underſtand Latin may loſe nothing. *Memini Caſtellanum cùm paulum ſe collegiſſet animo ſatis incitato & commoto reſpondiſſe, ſe de quo accuſabatur in accuſatorem merito retorquere poſſe, cùm ipſe quod viri Eccleſiaſtici & viri Pontificis proprium eſſet, feciſſet; ille vero quod veri carnificis eſſet ab Epiſcopis exigeret. Epiſcoporum enim eſſe & Sacerdotum Chriſti & Apoſtolorum, virorumque ſanctorum qui nobis ſuo ſanguine Eccleſiam conſecrarunt exemplo, Regem à ſævitia & immanitate ad manſuetudinem, clementiam & miſericordiam convertere, errantem ovem humeris impoſitam in ovile reducere, deque ea recepta tanquam expugnatis hoſtium caſtris gaudio triumphare* (12).

(12) Galland. *in Vita Caſtellani*, pag. 62, 63.

(13) He was a Phyſician at Tergow, and is now (in 1699) Profeſſor of Polite Learning at Harderwick.

(14) Intitled, *Amœnitates Theologico-Philologicæ* Amſtel. 1694.

(15) *Mi Deus quem toties offendi propitius eſto, teque Virginem matrem precor, divumque Stephanum, ut apud Dominum pro me peccatore intercedatis.* i. e. "My God, "whom I have "ſo often offended, be merciful to me, and "I beſeech thee, "O Virgin Mother, and thee, "O Holy Stephen, to intercede with the "Lord for me a "ſinner. *Apud* Almeloveen, pag. 79.

[*F*] *A Letter has been publiſhed, which teſtifies that he recommended himſelf . . . . a little before he was ſtrangled.*] Mr. Almeloveen (13) has inſerted it in one of his Books (14). It was written from Paris, the 25th of Auguſt 1546. Florens Junius, who wrote it, relates that the third of that month Stephen Dolet was executed, and that the Executioner having made every thing ready, adviſed him to think on his ſalvation, and recommend himſelf to God and the Saints; that Dolet making no haſte, and only muttering ſomething, the Executioner declared to him that he had orders to ſpeak to him of ſalvation before all the people: therefore, ſaid he to him, you muſt call upon the holy Virgin, and S. Stephen your patron, whoſe feſtival is celebrated this day; and if you do it not, I know what I have to do. Immediately Dolet repeated a prayer according to the form of the Executioner (15), and warned the ſpectators to read his Books with a great deal of circumſpection, and proteſted above three times that they contained many things which he had never underſtood; and having afterwards recommended himſelf to God, he was ſtrangled, and then burnt to aſhes. Florens Junius ſays that one who aſſiſted as an officer at the execution related all theſe particulars to him (16).

(16) *Hæc quæ ſcribo didici ex eo qui executioni interfuit ex officio.* Ibid.

[*G*] *Monſr. le Laboureur is in the wrong to ſay that Dolet has been placed in the Martyrology of the Proteſtants.*] "The pretended Martyrology of the Huguenots puts "a high value on Dolet, who was indeed a man of "wit and learning, but a Libertine; as were all the "firſt Preachers of the new Goſpel." Theſe are Mr. le Laboureur's words (17). A man might very eaſily be deceived by them; for who could believe that he ſhould advance ſuch a thing without having caſt his eyes on the volume wherein, he ſays, Stephen Dolet has been ſo much extolled? Yet what he affirms is moſt falſe: the Martyrology of the Huguenots does not mention this perſon. I have purpoſely conſulted the little Latin Martyrology of John Criſpin, and afterwards the large one in folio, which was printed in French in the year 1582; but I have found nothing in it concerning Stephen Dolet. I remember alſo to have obſerved that Theodore Beza, who keeps a pretty exact account (18) of the perſons who were put to death in France for what was called Lutheraniſm, ſays not a word of this pretended Martyr. This ſilence would have aſtoniſhed me, if I had not known that John Calvin has placed Stephen Dolet among the impious. *Agrippam, Villanovanum,* DOLETUM, *& ſimiles vulgo notum eſt tanquam Cyclopas quoſpiam Evangelium ſemper faſtuoſe ſpreviſſe. Tandem eò prolapſi ſunt amentiæ & furoris, ut non modo in filium Dei execrabiles blaſphemias evomerent, ſed quantum ad animæ vitam attinet, nihil a canibus & porcis putarent ſe differre* (19). i. e. "It is publickly known that Agrip"pa, Servetus, DOLET, and others of the ſame ſtamp, "have always contemned the Goſpel with gigantic ar"rogance; and at length fell into ſuch diſtraction and "frenzy, that they not only uttered execrable blaſ"phemies againſt the Son of God, but fancied that "as to the ſoul's life there was no difference between "themſelves and dogs or ſwine." In this Calvin and Prateolus are of one and the ſame mind: for Prateolus, ſpeaking of Atheiſts (20), joins Stephen Dolet with Diagoras, Euemerus, Theodorus, and the like perſons taken notice of by Antiquity for not admitting a Deity. Mr. le Laboureur (21) quotes ſome Latin Verſes, underneath which it is declared that Stephen Dolet, a native of Orleans, was burnt in the ſquare *Maubert* the 3d of Auguſt 1546, on S. Stephen's day which was his birth-day (22). So that Moreri ought not to have called in queſtion the circumſtances related by la Croix du Maine; and he had yet leſs reaſon to found his doubt on la Croix du Maine's being a Proteſtant: for if any myſtery were to be found in thoſe circumſtances, it would be much more the buſineſs of a Catholic than of a Proteſtant, to ſearch after it; a Catholic would draw thence a greater number of pious reflections than a Proteſtant.

(17) Le Laboureur, *Addit. aux Mémoires de Caſtelnau*, tom. 1. pag. 355.

(18) In the *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches of France.*

(19) Calvin. *in Tract. de Scandalis*, pag. 90 *Tractatuum Theologicorum.*

(20) In *Elencho Hæret.* Voce *Athei.*

(21) *Addit. aux Mémoires de Caſtelnau*, tom. 1. pag. 356.

(22) *Stephanus Doletus, Aurelius Gallus, die ſancto Stephano ſacro, & natus & Vulcano devotus in Malbertina area Lutetiæ 3 Auguſti* 1546.

I have very lately diſcovered that Theodore Beza, who, before he had publickly profeſſed the Reformed Religion, had publiſhed an Epitaph very much to the honour of our Dolet (23), ſtruck it out of the Editions of his Poems which he publiſhed after he had abjured the Romiſh Faith. This is a proof that the Proteſtants did not think themſelves concerned in that man's execution.

(23) It is among the *Juvenilia Theodori Bezæ*, fol. 31 of the Edition I make uſe of, which is in 16, without any Printer's name, or date.

young enough to be the ſon of a man who was born in the year 1494 (*b*). It is aſſerted, in the *Patiniana*, that *he wrote ſome Orations againſt the City of Toulouſe, for which he made the* Amende honorable.

(*b*) This was the year wherein Francis I was born.

DOMITIA LONGINA, daughter of the illuſtrious Domitius Corbulo (*a*), rendred herſelf unworthy of ſuch a father by her lewdneſs. Domitian, having been declared Cæſar, abandoned himſelf to licentiouſneſs of all ſorts. He debauched ſeveral women, and finding Domitia much to his liking, he obliged her to leave her huſband (*b*): he kept her ſome time in quality of his concubine, and afterwards ſolemnly married her (*c*). The dignity of Empreſs did not prevent her falling in love with a Player [*A*]; on which account the Emperor divorced her: but as he could not live without her, he took her again ſoon after (*d*); and to cover ſo mean an action, he pretended it was the people's deſire that he ſhould call her home again: *Id populus curat ſcilicet*. It is ſaid that this woman, miſtruſting her huſband's ſavage temper, ſought means to rid herſelf of him, and that ſhe was concerned in the conſpiracy which deſtroyed him [*B*]. Titus, the brother of Domitian, was ſuſpected of having had to do with her: but ſhe was held to be ſufficiently cleared, when ſhe had denied it on oath; for inſtead of denying ſuch adventures, ſhe uſed always to boaſt of them [*C*]. She had a great regard for Joſephus, and was a continual benefactreſs to him (*e*). As to her firſt huſband (*f*), his loſing of her did not excuſe him from further injury: for Domitian, not ſatisfied with having deprived him of his wife, took from him his life alſo (*g*). We read in Procopius an action of this wife of Domitian which deſerves great commendation [*D*]. The queſtion is whether it be true.

(*a*) Xiphil. *in Veſpaſ.* pag. m. 217.

(*b*) Sueton. *in Domit.* cap. 1.

(*c*) Xiphil. *in Veſpaſ.* pag. 217.

(*d*) Sueton. *in Domit.* cap. 3.

(*e*) Joſeph. *de Vita ſua, ſub fin.*

(*f*) His name was Ælius Lamia.

(*g*) Sueton. *in Domit.* cap. 10.

[*A*] *The dignity of Empreſs did not prevent her falling in love with a Player.*] This Player's name was Paris: he was killed in the open ſtreet by the order of Domitian, for having dared to enjoy the Empreſs. Domitian had a great mind to have his wife's throat cut, to puniſh her for that infamous commerce; but by the advice of Urſus he was ſatisfied with turning her away. Xiphilin tells us no more of the matter (1); but Suetonius informs us that Domitian quickly recalled her home. *Uxorem Domitiam ex qua in ſecundo ſuo Conſulatu filium tulerat, alteroque anno à Conſulatu filiam, Auguſtam eandem Paridis Hiſtrionis amore deperditam repudiavit, intraque breve tempus impatiens diſcidii quaſi efflagitante populo reduxit* (2). i. e. "He divorced his wife Domitia, by whom he had had a "ſon in his ſecond Conſulſhip, and a daughter the ſecond year after, for that being Empreſs, ſhe had "fallen deeply in love with Paris the player; but "within a very ſhort time, not bearing to be parted "from her, he took her again, pretending it was "the people's deſire." It is very probable that Dion had not forgotten this conduct of Domitian, and that we ought to charge it on Xiphilin's ill taſte, if it is not to be found in his Abridgment of Dion. I maintain that the ſuppreſſing ſuch a fact argues an ill taſte; for Domitian's ill qualities are much better laid open, when it is known that he was mean ſpirited enough to reſtore the dignity of Empreſs to a woman who had proſtituted herſelf to a player; it is a very convincing evidence of the utmoſt corruption, which draws on the memory of that Tyrant the contempt and horror it deſerves. And as it is part of the duty of an Hiſtorian to diſcover the character of his Actors by the moſt ſtriking paſſages, which ſhew the extent of their virtues, or of their vices, it is clear that Xiphilin had not much diſcernment, if he did not think himſelf obliged to preſerve the recalling of Domitia; for I ſuppoſe he found it in the Hiſtory which he abridged. Let me not be told that he did the office of an Epitomizer: one line would have been ſufficient to inform us that Domitia was recalled. The principle which has now been laid down is not favourable to Suetonius with regard to our Domitia. That Hiſtorian ſuppreſſes her having for ſome time been Domitian's concubine: he would have it that ſhe left not her firſt huſband, but in order to marry that Prince. This is to extenuate her fault, and prevent our being acquainted with the full extent of that woman's lewdneſs. Is this the duty of an Hiſtorian?

(1) Xiphil. *in Domit.* pag. 230, 231.

(2) Sueton. *in Domit.* cap. 3.

ADVICE to the Authors of Abridgments.

[*B*] *It is ſaid . . . . ſhe was concerned in the conſpiracy which deſtroyed* Domitian.] It is Aurelius Victor who obſerves it: *Adſcita etiam in conſilium tyranni uxore Domitia, ob amorem Paridis Hiſtrionis à Principe cruciatus formidante* (3). i. e. "Having alſo engaged "Domitia, the Tyrant's wife, in the deſign, who "dreaded her huſband's cruelty on account of her "love for Paris the Player." It is ſurprizing that the other Writers ſhould not know this.

(3) Aurelius Victor, *in Epitome Imperatorum.*

[*C*] *She denied on oath that ſhe had had to do with Titus . . . . inſtead of denying ſuch adventures, ſhe uſed always to boaſt of them.*] This is the height of impudence. Suetonius has acted like an Hiſtorian of good taſte, ſince he has expreſſed that woman's character by ſo ſingular a circumſtance. *Quidam opinantur conſuetudinem recordatum* (Titum) *quam cum fratris uxore habuerit, ſed nullam habuiſſe perſancte Domitia jurabat, haud negatura ſi qua omnino fuiſſet, immo etiam gloriatura, quod illi promptiſſimum erat in omnibus probris* (4).

(4) Sueton. *in Tito*, cap. 10.

[*D*] *We read in Procopius an action of this wife of Domitian, which deſerves great commendation.*] Procopius (5) relates that the wife of Domitian, having never approved of her huſband's tyrannical conduct, and having never done an injury to any perſon, was much reſpected by the Senators. For which reaſon, after Domitian had been aſſaſſinated, they requeſted her to come into the Senate, and offered her whatever ſhe ſhould deſire of that wicked Prince's eſtate. She demanded nothing but leave to bury him, and to erect a ſtatue to him. After this had been granted her, ſhe cauſed all the ſcattered and mangled parts of Domitian's body to be ſought for, and joined them together in the beſt manner ſhe was able. The corps thus patched up was the model of the ſtatue which ſhe erected to her huſband in the ſtreet leading to the Capitol. This ſtatue ſtood there in Procopius's time, and repreſented the barbarity which had been practiſed on Domitian. His wife's deſign was only to preſerve a monument of the barbarous action of the aſſaſſins. Triſtan has juſt reaſon to admire why *this extraordinary action, if true, ſhould be concealed by ſo many Hiſtorians* (6).

(5) In his *Secret Hiſtory*, cited by Triſtan, *Comment. Hiſtoriques*, vol. 1. pag. 346.

(6) Triſtan, ibid.

DONALDSON (*a*) (WALTER), born at Aberdeen in Scotland, bore ſome rank among the learned men of the 17th Century. He had been in the retinue and ſervice of David Cuningham, Biſhop of Aberdeen, and Peter Junius, Great Almoner of Scotland, when they went on an Embaſſy from King James to the Court of Denmark, and to the Princes of Germany. After his return home, he went to Heidelberg, where the famous Dionyſius Gothofredus taught the Civil Law. Donaldſon, having there dictated to ſome young Students a ſhort Courſe of Moral Philoſophy, ſoon ſaw himſelf dubbed an Author before he was aware of it; for the young man of Riga in Livonia, who put that

(*a*) *Konig* calls him *Donaldſonius*: it ſhould have been *Donaldſonus*; for ſo the Author names himſelf in the Title of his Books.

that Manuſcript to the preſs [*A*], aſked nobody's leave for ſo doing. The Author, when he informs us of this, forgets not the ſeveral Editions which were made of that Work in Germany, and in Great Britain: neither does he forget the Plagiariſm of Keckerman [*B*]. He was afterwards Profeſſor of Natural and Moral Philoſophy, and of the Greek tongue, in the Univerſity of Sedan, and was Principal of the College ſixteen years; after which he was invited to open a College at Charenton; but that eſtabliſhment was immediately oppoſed by Law. Not to remain idle while the Law-ſuit was depending, he ſet himſelf to collect from among his papers the ſeveral parts of his *Synopſis Oeconomica*, which he got printed at Paris in 1620, in 8vo, and dedicated it to the Prince of Wales. It is a Book worth reading (*b*), and was reprinted at Roſtoch, in 8vo, in the year 1624. That wherein he reduced into Common Places, and under certain General Heads, all that lies ſcattered in Diogenes Laertius concerning the ſame thing, may likewiſe have its uſes (*c*). It was printed in Greek and Latin, at Francfort, in the year 1612, under the title of *Synopſis Locorum communium, in qua ſapientiæ humanæ imago repræſentatur, &c.*

(*b*) Barthius, *in Stat.* pag. 39, having quoted ſomething out of it, calls the Author *Sani judicii hominem.*

(*c*) See the Preface of the *Synopſis Oeconomica.*

[*A*] *A young man . . . . put to the preſs the Manuſcript* of his Courſe of Moral Philoſophy.] His name was Vernerus Becker. The Sieur Konig was not well acquainted with the date of this Work, ſince he ſays the Author made his *Synopſis Ethica* in 1631. It is the ſame Book with the *Synopſis Moralis Philoſophiæ*, printed in 1604, according to the Oxford Catalogue.

[*B*] *He does not forget the Plagiariſm of Keckerman.*] The Collection of Plagiaries publiſhed by Thomaſius, Profeſſor of Leipſic, does not contain the Accuſation which is here brought againſt Keckerman. I ſhall ſet down our Author's words at length, becauſe a blunder will be ſeen in them, which may be of ſome uſe to the Readers, to inſtruct them the better to form a judgment on Compilations. *Acceſſit & eorum non tacitum, utcunque ſuppreſſo meo nomine, teſtimonium qui ex eo ſcripſerunt, & in ſyſtemata ſua quæ ad guſtum vidébantur tranſtulerunt. Keckermannum cum meis qui conferet, haud vana hæc aut oſtentationi dicta reperiet: plagii manifeſtarii ex eo mangonem deprehendent, quod ne erroribus quidem mutatis, tanquam mancipiorum nominibus, familiæ ſuæ pleraque adſcripſerit. Specimen accipe, quod libri ſecundi cap. 5. mendoſe ab operis erat vulgatum, plagiarius qui authorem ipſum ne de nomine quidem habebat notum ſic nothum citat.* Hoc loco ſubjicimus præclaram ſententiam Caſſii quæ eſt 2. lib. epiſtolarum Ciceronis: ipſi homini duplices manus, ſoclas aures, oculos geminos divina tribuerunt, & *quæ ſequuntur. At vero apud Ciceronem nuſquam iſta extat ſententia, nec eo libro ulla vel Caſſii ad Ciceronem vel Ciceronis ad Caſſium epiſtola: verba autem ſunt Amalaſuenthæ Reginæ apud Caſſiodorum epiſtola tertia libri* 10. *variarum quam Senatui Romano ſcribit, rationem reddens cur fratrem in regni ſocietatem aſſumpſerit; cujus hoc eſt caput, aſtra ipſa cœli mutuo reguntur auxilio & vicario labore participato mundum ſuis luminibus adminiſtrant: ipſi quoque homini, &c* (1). i. e. "Hereto we may add the not ſilent Teſtimony of "thoſe who, notwithſtanding my name has been "ſuppreſſed, have tranſcribed from it, and tranſplanted whatever ſuited their taſte into their own ſyſtems. "Whoever will take the pains to compare Keckerman with my work, will find that I do not ſpeak "out of vanity or oſtentation: they will diſcover the "barefaced plagiary by this; that he has generally "appropriated to himſelf what was written by me, "without ſo much as altering the miſtakes which appear, like the names of ſlaves, to detect him. For "inſtance, a quotation had been falſe printed in the "fifth Chapter of the ſecond Book; and the Plagiary, who knew not ſo much as the name of the "real Author, quotes a fictitious one in this manner. *Here I ſhall ſubjoin a notable ſaying of Caſſius, "in the ſecond Book of Cicero's Epiſtles: Nature has "given man two hands, two ears, and two eyes &c.* "Now this ſentence is no where to be found in Cicero, nor is there in that Book any Epiſtle either "from Caſſius to Cicero, or from Cicero to Caſſius: "but the words are Queen Amalaſuentha's, and are "extant in the third Epiſtle of the 10th Book of "Caſſiodorus's Collection, which ſhe wrote to the "Roman Senate, to acquaint them with the reaſon "why ſhe had taken her brother as a partner in the "throne; of which this is the ſubſtance: The very "ſtars of heaven are directed by mutual aſſiſtance, "and adminiſter light to the world by ſharing alternate labour: ſo nature has given man &c." If we were to look for ſuch faults in Keckerman, we might find them in abundance. It is uſual with thoſe who compoſe at the expence of their neighbour: they carry away the houſehold-ſtuff and the ſweepings alſo; they take the corn, the ſtraw, the chaff, and the duſt at the ſame time. *Rem auferunt cum pulviſculo* (2).

(1) Donaldſonus, *Præfat. Synopſis Oeconom.*

(2) *See* Plautus *in Prologo* Truculenti, ver. 19.

DONATUS (JEROME) a noble Venetian. I ſhall add ſomething to what Moreri has ſaid of him. He commanded in Breſcia in the year 1496, and had already publiſhed his Tranſlation of Alexander Aphrodiſeus's Book *de anima* (*a*). Two years after he commanded in Ferrara (*b*). He died at Rome, after he had reconciled the Republic of Venice with Pope Julius II, and before the French had marched out of Italy (*c*). His children ſuppreſſed the Writings which the affairs of State had hindred him from perfecting (*d*). One of his Letters which we have extant contains a deſcription of the Earthquake which happened in Candia, while he commanded there (*e*). He has been inſerted by Pierius Valerianus in the Liſt of unfortunate learned men [*A*]. We ſhall ſee the Judgment which Eraſmus made of him [*B*].

(*a*) Petrus Bembus, *Epiſt.* 6. lib. 2. pag. m. 450.

(*b*) Idem, *Epiſt.* 7. lib. 2. pag. 451.

(*c*) Paulus Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 56. pag. 132.

(*d*) Idem, ibid.

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

DONATUS

[*A*] *He has been put . . . . into the Liſt of unfortunate learned men.*] And this for three reaſons. I. Becauſe his Domeſtics obeyed him ſo ill, and cauſed him ſo much vexation, that if he had not found ſome comfort in his ſtudies, he would have been the moſt miſerable of men. II. Becauſe having had a thouſand difficulties to rub through, with incredible patience, to appeaſe the fierce temper of Julius II, he had not the ſatisfaction of enjoying the fruit of ſo many fatigues; for he fell ſick the very day that he had concluded the Treaty between that Pope and the Venetians, and his diſtemper was ſo violent a fever that it quickly carried him off: ſo that the happineſs he procured his country, againſt a moſt obſtinate oppoſition of fortune, was never ſeen by him. III. Becauſe almoſt all the Works which he had written to immortalize his name, remained buried in obſcurity (1), a very mortifying diſgrace to learned men (2). The Author who ſays all this, obſerves that our Donatus was not ignorant of any ſcience, and that he was a Poet, an Orator, a Philoſopher, a Divine, and a Mathematician, in an eminent degree.

(1) *Quod eruditis indigniſſimum eſt ærumnarum genus.* Pier. Valerian. *de Literat. Infelic.* lib. 1. pag. 62. Edit. Amſt. 1647.

(2) Extracted from *Pierius Valerianus*, ibid.

[*B*] *We ſhall ſee the Judgment which Eraſmus made of him.*] He had ſcarce ſeen any more of Donatus's Writings than his Letters, and yet he believed him to have been a man who might eaſily have ſucceeded in any Literary enterprize, if State Negotiations had allowed him to dedicate himſelf intirely to the culti-

DONATUS (MARCELLUS), Count of Ponzano, and Knight of St. Stephen, was a Florentine; but he ſettled at the Court of the Duke of Mantua, where he had ſome conſiderable employments (*a*). He died in the beginning of the ſeventeenth Century, before the Impreſſion of his *Scholia in Latinos Romanæ Hiſtoriæ Scriptores* was finiſhed. His Relation Frederic Donatus took care to get the remaining part printed, and they were publiſhed at Venice in the year 1604. Gruterus inſerted them in the 6th Volume of his *Theſaurus Criticus*, in the year 1607. It is agreed that Donatus had ſome learning; but yet his Work is ſpoken of in terms not greatly for his honour. We ſhall ſee what Caſaubon thought of it [*A*], and we ſhall add to it the Judgment of Barthius [*B*].

(*a*) See the Remark [*B*].

[*A*] *We ſhall ſee what Caſaubon thought of it.*] This is to be found in his Commentary on Suetonius, in the 11th Chapter of the Life of Julius Cæſar. *Tropæa ſemper ſcribendum*, ſays he, *non* trophæa. *Nullo enim modo ferendus eſt* Marcellus Donatus, *qui tantum hoc loco perdit verborum, ut probet veram ſcriptionem eſſe* trophæa. *Fuit omnino vir ille plurimarum literarum, & in Romana antiquitate adprime verſatus: ſed qui Græcæ eruditionis plane expers eſſet, ἀφύσαρον Criticum ubique ſeſe prodit. Cujuſmodi ſane hoc eſt illius judicium.* i. e. "We ſhould always write *tropæa*, "not *trophæa*. Marcellus Donatus is unſufferable, "who throws away ſo many words in this place to "prove the true ſpelling to be *trophæa*. He was in"deed a man of conſiderable learning, and extremely "well verſed in the Roman Antiquities; but being "utterly deſtitute of the Greek language, every "where diſcovers himſelf to be an aukward Critic, "of which this judgment of his may be an in"ſtance."

[*B*] *We ſhall add to it the Judgment of Barthius.*] If the whole be taken together, it is rather diſobliging than otherwiſe. I ſhall tranſcribe it at length: and we ſhall ſee ſome facts in it which relate to the Hiſtory of our Donatus; we ſhall there find him firſt a Plagiary, and then a Copier from our modern Copiers. *Vide multis Andream Tiraquellum ad Legem Nonam Connubialem, pag. CCLX. Et* Marcelli Donati *Dilucidationes in Tacitum, pag. CXXII. Pleriſque auctorum teſtimoniis Tiraquello debitis. Eum hominem fuiſſe plurimarum Litterarum, & in Romana Antiquitate benè verſatum, judicium eſt Iſ. Caſauboni, Ultima Editione Suetonii, ubi de* Tropæi *orthographia ſermo eſt. Nos nihil inde detrahimus. Tamen* exſcriptorem *ſtrenuum recentium, & quidem vulgatorum, Rhapſodorum, ipſorumque adeo Lexicographorum, agnoſcimus. Editæ ſunt ejus* Lucubrationes *Venetiis, Anno M. DC. IV. Ut mirum ſit tot paginis in Suetonium ſcriptis, non meminiſſe præclari Caſauboni Commentarii, qui toto decennio ante prodiit. Ipſe* ſe in Comitatu Principis Mantuani fuiſſe *memorat, &* in eo Germaniam habitaſſe, *ad Claudium Suetonii, cap. VIII. Eidem Principi fuit* à Libellis & Secretis, *in Domitianum Ejuſdem, cap. VII.* Legatus *quoque, deportandis Nuptialibus Muneribus, ad Capitolini Claudium Albinum. Habuit* ſuburbanum, *idque coluit,* Montanariæ, *quod eſt oppidum tertio à Mantua Miliario. Quamvis autem hoc quod modo de* exſcriptione Neotericorum *dixi, verum ſit, etiam illud quod de ſumma* Græci ſermonis imperitia *ipſe fatetur, & notat Caſaubonus; certum tamen fuiſſe* in multis ſani Judicii hominem, *& qui Juventutis commodo bene ſecerit. Nos iſta ea de cauſa huc adnotavimus, ut ſtudioſa juventus melius ejus* Dilucidatoris *meritum agnoſcere, & cautius omnia arbitrari poſſit* (1). i. e. "Conſult An"drew Tiraquellus at large on the ninth matrimonial "Law, pag. CCLX. and *Marcellus Donatus*'s Ex"planatory Notes on Tacitus, pag. CXXII: moſt of "the Teſtimonies of Authors are owing to Tiraquel"lus. Caſaubon, in his laſt Edition of Suetonius, "where he ſpeaks of the Orthography of the word "*Tropæum*, acknowledges him to be a man of con"ſiderable learning, and well verſed in the Roman "Antiquities. From this judgment we ſhall detract "nothing. However, I know him to be a great "*Tranſcriber* from Modern Writers, and even the "moſt common, as Rhapſodiſts, Lexicographers, &c. "His *Lucubrations* were printed at Venice, in the "year MDCIV; wherefore it ſeems very ſuprizing "that he ſhould write ſo many pages on Suetonius, "and not ſo much as once mention the excellent "Commentary of Caſaubon, which had been pub"liſhed full ten years before. In his Notes on the "8th Chapter of Suetonius's Life of Claudius, he "ſays *he was in the Duke of Mantua's retinue, and attended him in Germany:* in his Notes on the 7th "Chapter of the ſame Author's Life of Domitian, "he tells us he was *Secretary* to that Prince; and "in his Notes on Capitolinus's Life of Claudius "Albinus, that he was his *Embaſſador*, to carry the "nuptial preſents. He had a *Country Seat* which he "lived in *at Montanaria*, three miles from Mantua. "Though what I have juſt now obſerved of his *copying the Moderns* be true, and alſo what he himſelf "confeſſes, and Caſaubon mentions, of his being ut"terly *unacquainted with the Greek Language*; it is "however certain that he has ſhewn himſelf *in many "inſtances a man of ſound judgment*, and has been of "great ſervice to young ſcholars. It is for their "ſakes that I have made theſe remarks, the better "to acquaint them with the merit of this Annotator, "and to enable them to form their judgment with the "greater caution." Barthius was in the right to think it of uſe to give young men ſuch information.

(3) Eraſmus, *in Ciceroniano*, pag. m. 71, 72.

(1) Barthius *in hæc verba* Statij *Sævæ novercæ*, Silv. 1. lib. 2. ver. 49. pag. 171.

DONEAU (HUGH), in Latin *Donellus*, one of the moſt learned Civilians of the ſixteenth Century, was born at Chalons on the Saone (*a*), in the year 1537. His Schoolmaſter, a ſevere man, and a great whipper, had ſo diſheartened him, that neither threats nor promiſes could make him return to ſchool [*A*]. But at laſt, being afraid he ſhould be

(*a*) And not in a Town near Autun, as *Moreri* aſſerts, being deceived by theſe Words of Meurſius, *in Heduis natus*, which he did not underſtand.

[*A*] *His ſchoolmaſter . . . . had ſo diſheartened him, that* they could not *make him return to ſchool.*] Perhaps the Reader will be glad to ſee the Latin words of the Author who acquaints me with this fact. *Cum puer ob Præceptoris plagoſi ſævitiam à ludo literario planè alienaretur, ut nullis minis aut blanditiis ad eum reduci poſſet, fortè accidit, ut pater ejus pertranſeuntem iſtâc paſtorem ſuarium cerneret, quo ad ſe vocato, coram filio, rogare inſtitit, ecquid famulo opus haberet? eſſe ſibi domi filium, quem ei mancipare cuperet, averſum à literis & immorigerum. Eâ voce puer adeò conterritus eſt, ut rem ſeriò agi exiſtimans, & flens parentis genibus advolutus eum obteſtaretur, ne ſe filium ſuum in eas ſordes projiceret, velle ſe literis deinceps operam ſtudioſè dare* (1). i. e. "Having, when a boy, taken "ſuch an averſion to the ſchool, by reaſon of his "maſter's harſhneſs, that he could not be prevailed on "to return to it either by fair means or by foul, his "father happening to ſee a ſwine-herd paſſing by, "called him, and aſked him before his ſon, whether "he had occaſion for a ſervant, telling him that he "had a ſon who was undutiful, and hated learning, "and was deſirous of putting him out as a ſervant "to him. The lad was ſo terrified at this, thinking "his father in earneſt, that burſting into tears he "fell at his father's feet, and begged of him not to "throw him into ſo ſordid a condition, promiſing "that he would apply himſelf diligently to his ſtudy "for the future."

(1) Freherus, *in Theatro*, pag. 924.

be put out ſervant to a Swineherd, he promiſed to ſtudy diligently for the future. He learned Civil Law at Toulouſe under the Profeſſors John Cotraſius and Arnold du Ferrier (*b*), who had no leſs than four thouſand Auditors. He was admitted to the degree of Doctor of Civil Law at Bourges in the year 1551, and profeſſed that Science in the ſame city, with Duaren, Hotman, and Cujacius [*B*]. He afterwards profeſſed it at Orleans. He was very near being killed in the maſſacre of 1572 (*c*), becauſe he was a Proteſtant; and he could not have eſcaped the violence of the murtherers, if ſome of his ſcholars, who were Germans by nation, had not ſaved him by diſguiſing him in a German dreſs, as one of their domeſtics. He had embraced the Reformation when very young, at the inſtigation of his ſiſter. He ſtayed ſome time at Geneva; and afterwards he went into the Palatinate, where he taught the Civil Law in the Univerſity of Heidelbergh. He was invited to Leyden in the year 1575, to take upon him the ſame employment: he accepted it, and diſcharged it in a worthy manner. But becauſe he was ſo imprudent as to engage himſelf farther than he ought to have done in Leiceſter's faction [*C*], he was forced to leave Holland in the year 1588. He returned to Germany, and was Profeſſor of Law at Altorf all the reſt of his life. He died the 4th of May 1591. He had ſo happy a memory, that he knew the whole *Corpus Juris* by heart (*d*). You will find the Titles of ſome of his Works in Moreri: the reſt are of the ſame nature. He had endeavoured all his Life to leſſen the reputation of Cujacius by criticiſing him (*e*). Thuanus has been guilty of ſome miſtakes [*D*].

(*b*) See Remark [*B*].

(*c*) Note, that according to *Thuanus*, lib. 52. pag. 1082, 1083. he then taught at Bourges.

(*d*) Taken from the *Theatre of Paul Freherus*, pag. 924, where he quotes *Vitæ Profeſſorum Leidenſium*, and the *Funeral Program of Hugo Donellus.*

(*e*) See the Remark [*D*].

DONI

[*B*] *He profeſſed* Civil Law at Bourges *with Duaren, Hotman, and Cujacius.*] The Author whom I have quoted (2) gives him one Collegue more, namely, Eguinard Baron; but as I know Eguinard Baron died in the year 1550, I would not affirm that he was Profeſſor of Law at the ſame time with Doneau, who, according to my Author's (3) own account, did not teach Law at Bourges till after he had taken his Doctor's degree in that ſcience, in the year 1551. It was Duaren who conferred that degree on him, the 17th of July. The Speech which he made on that occaſion in praiſe of Doneau is printed among his Works. Father Jacob (4), who had read Doneau's funeral Oration made by Scipio Gentilis, has diſtinguiſhed what ought to be diſtinguiſhed better than Paul Freher. He has contented himſelf with ſaying that Doneau was very aſſiduous at the Lectures of Eguinard Baron, and at thoſe of Francis Duaren, that he inſinuated himſelf into their favour, and Duaren eſpecially expreſſed a ſingular affection for him. I have corrected another fault of Paul Freher: he calls one of the Profeſſors of Toulouſe, whoſe ſcholar our Doneau was, *Arnoldum Ferronum*; whereas he ſhould have called him *Arnoldum Ferrerium*, as Father Jacob has done. Take this for one example of the negligence I have mentioned above (5).

(2) Paul Freher.

(3) Paul Freher.

(4) Ludovicus Jacob, *de claris Scriptor. Cabilonenſibus*, pag. 42.

(5) In the Remark [*B*] of the Article DEMETRIUS, Citation (19).

[*C*] *He was ſo imprudent as to engage himſelf . . . in Leiceſter's faction.*] Leiceſter had brought 6000 Engliſh into Holland, towards the end of the year 1585; and inſtead of maintaining the liberty of that new Republic, he endeavoured to poſſeſs himſelf of the Sovereignty: and as he was not ignorant that the people, ſupported by the Preachers, ſtuck to the Governor's intereſt againſt the Magiſtrate's party, he dexterouſly fomented thoſe diſpoſitions of the people, wherein he ſucceeded with ſo much the greater eaſe, as the oppoſite faction drew on themſelves the hatred of the Eccleſiaſtics, by oppoſing the authority of the Conſiſtories. Mr. Huber (6), who informs me of this, adds that thoſe who were on the ſide of the Conſiſtories maintained that the Sovereignty did not belong to the Magiſtrates, but to the people; a propoſition which the States of Holland ordered to be condemned the 16 of October 1587. All theſe intrigues of Leiceſter filled the new Commonwealth with factions; and ſome plots were diſcovered, whereby he endeavoured to ſeize on the greateſt towns, and particularly on Leyden and Dort. Theſe were the affairs which our Donellus was found to be concerned in, and for which he was baniſhed (7). *Eam conjunctionem* (plebis & Concionatorum cum Gubernatore) Leiceſtrius *imprimis curæ habuit, obtrectando optimatibus, & concionatores plebeſque* ſpecie religionis *ſibi conciliando. Quâ in re multum ei profuit, quod Optimates* diſciplinæ Eccleſiaſticæ *fere adverſabantur, &* Conſiſtoria *ſibi adverſa reputantes, quantum poterant,* cohibere gaudebant. *Quorum patroni viciſſim plebi inculcabant,* jus ſupremum non eſſe penes Proceres, ſed penes populum, *cui iſti rationem reddere cogerentur. Contrà quàm ſententiam Ordines Hollandiæ decretum ſive diſputationem publicam ediderunt* 16 d. Octobris 1587 (8). A great many people will credit this rather on the authority of Mr. Huber, than on that of Grotius; for which reaſon I do not cite what the latter has ſaid in the fifth Book of his Hiſtory of the Netherlands. It is thus he ſhould be cited, and not in the fifth Book of his Annals (9). Doneau was not the only Profeſſor who caballed againſt the authority of the States in favour of England. Lambert Daneau, a French Miniſter who took refuge in Holland, and Profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden, engaged in the ſame cabal (10). If we may believe Thuanus, this was the faction of the Preachers and the populace, and their deſign was to ſubject the Republic to the Dominion of the Engliſh (11).

(6) Profeſſor of Civil Law at Franeker: he died the 8th of November 1694.

(7) *Inſidiæ quoque civitatibus Hollandiæ occupandis, nominatim* Dordraco Leidæque *factæ ſunt, ubi proditores quidam capite, &* Hugo Donellus Juris Anteceſſor *exilio, mulctati ſunt.* Ulricus Huber. *in Hiſtoria Civil.* tom. 2. pag. 413.

(8) Idem, ibid. pag. 412, 413.

(9) Mr. Teiſſier, *Addit. aux Eloges*, tom. 2. pag. 424. quotes the 5th Book of the *Annals.*

(10) Thuan. lib. 88. pag. 147.

(11) Thuan. lib. 88. pag. 146, & *ſeq.*

[*D*] *Thuanus has been guilty of ſome miſtakes.*] According to his narration we ſhould believe that Doneau, when he left France, went to Leyden. *Qui cum primum Avarici Biturigum* (12) *diu docuiſſet, poſt tumultum Pariſienſem ſolum patrium vertere coactus Lugduni Batavorum aliquanto tempore hæſit* (13). i. e. "Who having firſt taught for a long time at Bourges, "was after the Maſſacre of Paris obliged to quit his "native country, and ſtaid ſome time at Leyden." Now this is falſe: for after his flight he was Profeſſor at Heidelberg, before he was ſo in Holland. Beſides this, Thuanus is miſtaken in the age of our Profeſſor: he makes him to have lived as long as Cujacius, that is ſixty eight years (14); and yet Doneau's Epitaph (15) teſtifies that he died in the ſixty fourth year of his age. *Pridie Eid. Majas*, they are Thuanus's words (16), *fatis conceſſit, eodem quo Cujacius ætatis anno, eo minore fama, quod illius famæ voce & ſcriptis obſtrepere tota vita pro ludo habuerit.* i. e. "He "departed this life the 14th of May, in the ſame year "of his age as Cujacius did, but not in ſo great fame, "having made it the diverſion of his whole life to "ſpeak and write againſt the reputation of that great "Civilian." See the XXIVth Letter of Voſſius, in page 73. I am ſurprized Thuanus ſhould not know the Zacharias Furneſterus of whom he ſpeaks is our Doneau: it was he who under that fictitious name refuted the Apology of the maſſacre of Paris ſent to the Diet of Poland in 1572 by the Biſhop of Valence. *Contra eam defenſionem biennio poſt contraria defenſio edita eſt admodum virulenta à Gallo quodam in Germania profugo, Zachariæ Furneſteri nomine, quæ cum Monlucii nomen & pudorem admodum ſugillaret, anno poſt Lugduni publicatur adverſus illum Furneſteri libellum pro Joanne Monlucio Epiſcopo & Comite Valentino Dienſi præſcriptio elegantiſſime ſcripta à Jacobo Cujacio J. C. hujus ætatis principe, nomine tamen ſuppreſſo* (17): i. e. "Two years after a moſt virulent Refutation of that "Defence was publiſhed by a Frenchman, who had "taken refuge in Germany, under the name of Za"chary Furneſter; which reflecting very ſeverely on "the character and reputation of Monluc, the next "year a Reply was publiſhed at Leyden to the Libel "of Furneſter, in defence of John Monluc Biſhop "and

(12) That is, at *Bourges*, and not at *Bourdeaux*, as is ſaid in the Tranſlation of *Thuanus*, in Teiſſier, *Eloges*, tom. 2. pag. 160.

(13) Thuan. lib. 100. pag. 405.

(14) Idem, lib. 99. pag. 378.

(15) *Apud* Meurſium, *Athen. Brat.* pag. 132.

(16) Lib. 100. pag. 405.

(17) Thuan. *Hiſt.* lib. 53. pag. 1092, col. 1.

DONI (ANTONY FRANCIS) lived in the ſixteenth Century. He was a native of Florence, and publiſhed a great number of Italian Books [*A*], which made him paſs for a wit. His firſt writings expreſſed an abuſive and ſatyrical character; but this he did not ſo much to ſatisfy his own inclination, as in compliance with the requeſt of one of his friends. He ſuffered ſome Letters which were not written by him to be inſerted in his Works, which did him a great deal of prejudice; for the Authors of thoſe Letters preſently boaſted that they had compoſed all that had appeared under the name of Doni. He put an end to theſe inſults by publiſhing a new Edition of his Works in a better form, and purſuant to the good advice of the Academy of the *Peregrini*. He ſuppreſſed the Encomiums he had beſtowed on perſons unworthy of that honour, and he praiſed others whom he had injuriouſly cenſured. He died at Venice in the month of September 1574 (*a*). He had fixed his abode there towards the end of the year 1547, being then about thirty ſix years old (*b*). He was a member of the Academy abovementioned; the ſurname of *Bizzarro*, which he had taken, ſuited him admirably well; for he was one who not only in his Poems, but even in his Proſe Writings, followed very particular ways. His inventions and his *concetti* were ſtrange flights of imagination, and he ſtrove to diſtinguiſh himſelf by ſurprizing his Readers with fictions a little too extravagant. He was of a very good family [*B*].

(a) *Extracted from* Ghilini, *Teatro d'Huomini Letterati*, Parte 1. pag. 20.

(b) See the 224th page of his *Inferni*.

☞ DONNE

" and Count of Valence, written in a moſt elegant " ſtyle, by James Cujas, the greateſt Civilian of this " age, but without having his name ſet to it." Mr. Deckher (18) knew very well that Donellus was the Author of the Writing of the pretended Furneſterus; but he has been miſtaken in two particulars: 1, in ſaying that the Anſwer of Furneſterus was publiſhed in the year 1572; 2, in ſaying it was written to refute the Apology which Michael Seureus (*a*), a Knight of Malta, had made in the general Diet of Poland (19).

§ (*a*) Michael de Sévre, Knight of Malta, and Commander of the Order. The Journal of the reign of Henry III, and the Memoirs of Queen Margaret, ſpeak of him by the name of the Chevalier de Sévre. Rem. Crit.]

(18) Deckherus, *de Scriptis Adeſpotis*, pag. 263.

(19) *Sub eadem Catharina infamis lanienæ Pariſienſis defenſor Michaël Seureus, Eques Hieroſolymitanus, coram Ordinibus regni Poloniæ fuit.* Ibid.

[*A*] *He publiſhed a great number of Italian Books.*] Here is the Liſt which Ghilini has given of them (1). *Quattro libri di Medaglie: le Novelle: tre Invettive, che hanno queſti titoli, il Baleno, la Saetta, e il Tuono: tre Dialoghi ſeparatamente ſtampati, cioè della Fortuna & Infelicita di Ceſare, della Muſica, e del Diſſegno: la Libraria, diviſa in due parti: un Trattato dell' Huomo in tutte le forme, per comparazioni, alla qual' Opera diede titolo di Microcoſmo: l'Eternita della Patria in cinque libri ſpiegata: una Comedia intitolata lo Stufaiuolo: i Marmi, ne' quali s'introducono più perſone a diſcortere: i Mondi: gl' Inferni: la Zucca: la Filoſofia morale: il Cancelliere: le Proſe antiche di Dante: la Guerra navale trà la ſacra Lega, e gl' Infedeli in verſi heroici narrata: le Stanze alla villaneſca: e le Lettere.*

(1) Ghilini, *Teatro*, Parte 1. pag. 20.

I ſhall ſay ſomething of three or four of theſe Books, and ſhall begin with that which is intitled *gl' Inferni*. It is a quarto of 224 pages, printed at Venice, *nell' Academia Peregrina, per Franciſco Marcolini*, in the year 1553. The Author had then been at Venice above five years (2), and propoſed to ſpend the remainder of his life there. There are ſeven Hells in this work; *Inferno de gli Scolari & de Pedanti. Inferno de mal Maritati, & de gli Amanti. Inferno de ricchi Avari, & de Poveri liberali. Inferno delle Puttane, & de Ruffiani. Inferno de Dottori ignoranti, Artiſti, & Legiſti. Inferno de Poeti & Compoſitori. Inferno de Soldati & Capitani poltroni &c.* i. e. " The Hell of Scholars " and Pedants. The Hell of ill married people, and " of lovers. The Hell of rich miſers, and poor pro- " digals. The Hell of whores and rogues. The " Hell of ignorant Doctors, Artiſts, and Lawyers. " The Hell of Poets and Compoſers. The Hell of " Soldiers and cowardly Captains &c." This is but the firſt part of the *Inferni del Doni*. I do not know whether he ever publiſhed the remainder.

(2) See the 224th page of his *Inferni*.

He had already publiſhed another Work: the title of it, which I ſhall give you at length, may ſerve to acquaint us with this man's method. *I Marmi del Doni Academico Peregrino. Ciò è Ragionamenti introdotti à farſi da varie conditioni d'Huomini, à luoghi di honeſto piacere in Firenze: ripieno di Diſcorſi in varie Scienze & Diſcipline, Motti arguti, Iſtorie varie, Proverbii antichi & moderni, Sentenze morali, Accidenti & Novellette morali; Diviſo in quattro Libri. Opera giovevole à perſone d'ogni ſtato per il corregimento de' Coſtumi, & per ogni profeſſione d'Huomini.* i. e. " The " Marbles of Doni, Member of the Academy of the " *Peregrini*. That is to ſay, Dialogues ſuppoſed to " paſs between men of various conditions, in reputa- " ble places of diverſion in Florence: full of Diſ- " courſes in different Sciences, ſmart Sayings, various " Hiſtories, ancient and modern Proverbs, moral Sen- " tences, Moral Stories and Novels; divided into four " Books. A work uſeful for people of all conditi- " tions, for the reformation of manners, and for men " of all profeſſions, &c." I have not the firſt Edition of this Book, which is that of Venice 1552; but I have that of the year 1609, *in Venetia, preſſo Gio. Battiſta Bertoni, in* 4to.

Here is the Title of another Book, which he printed at the ſame place, *appreſſo Fran. Rampazetto*, in the year 1565, in 8vo: *La Zucca del Doni Fiorentino, diviſa in cinque libri di gran valore, ſotto titolo di poca conſideratione.* i. e. " The Gourd of Doni the Flo- " rentine, divided into five Books of great importance, " under a trifling title."

Ghilini obſerves that Doni's *Libraria* is divided into two parts; but Mr. Teiſſier ſpeaks of it in a different manner. *La Libraria*, ſays he (3), *diviſa in tre Trattati: Nel primo ſono ſcritti li Autori volgari, con cento e piu Diſcorſi ſopra di quelli: Nel ſecondo, ſono dati in luce tutti i Libri che l'Autore ha veduti a penna, il nome de componitori dell' opere, i titoli, &c. le materie: Nel terzo, ſi legge l'inventione dell' Academie, inſieme con i ſopranomi, i motti, le impreſe, & l'opere fatte da tutti li Academici. In Vinegia appreſſo Gabriel Giolito de Ferrari, 1557, in* 12, *& ibidem apud Altobellum Salicatum, 1580, in* 12. i. e. " The *Libra-* " *ria* is divided into three parts. The firſt comprizes " the Italian Authors, with above a hundred Diſ- " courſes upon them. The ſecond acquaints us with all " the Books which the Author had ſeen in manuſcript, " the names of the Writers, their titles, ſubjects &c. " The third treats of the inventions of the Academies, " with the ſurnames, motto's, devices, and works of " all their members."

(3) Teiſſier, *in Catalogo Autorum, &c.* pag. 22 of the Edit. of Geneva, 1686.

[*B*] *He was of a very good family.*] I have read a Letter which was written from Como by Benedetto Volpe, wherein he obſerves that he was great-grandſon of Salvino Doni, the contemporary of Dante, and a good Poet. *Io non ho già la Poeſia per heredità, come voi, che ſete Figliuolo d'un Nipote de Salvino Doni, che fu compagno di Guitton Saluti, Meſſer Cino, & Dante, Franceſchin noſtro, & tutta quella ſchierra* (4). i. e. " I have not Poetry by inheritance, as you have, who " are the ſon of a grandſon of Salvino Doni, the " companion of Guitton Saluti, Meſſer Cino, and " Dante, our Franceſchino, and all that tribe." Doni anſwered, that he was deſcended from a man who had brought from Rome the Coat of Arms which was preſented to the Florentines; that the poſterity of that man continued in Florence till the time of Farinata de gli Uberti; that then one Francis Doni, who was of the Ghibeline faction, choſe to leave Florence, rather than conſent the city ſhould be diſmantled (5). He married a woman of Fieſola; from which marriage ſeveral families are derived, which

(4) La Zucca del Doni, *folio* 312 *verſo*.

(5) Leandro Alberti, *Deſcritt. di tutta l'Italia, folio m.* 44 *verſo*, relates the fact otherwiſe, and without ſaying any thing of this Doni.

I

DONNE (JOHN), an excellent Poet and Divine of the ſeventeenth Century, was born of virtuous parents of the Romiſh Religion at London in the year 1573, and deſcended by the father's ſide of a very antient family in Wales, and by the mother's of that of Sir Thomas More, and Judge Raſtal (*a*). In the beginning of Michaelmas Term 1584 he became a Commoner of Hart-Hall in Oxford, with his younger brother Henry; and having continued there about three years (*b*) removed to the Univerſity of Cambridge, where he ſtaid till his ſeventeenth year, without having taken any degree at either Univerſity, on account of the oath to be adminiſtred to him for that purpoſe [*A*]. From Cambridge he was tranſplanted to Lincoln's-Inn for the ſtudy of the Law; but before his admiſſion into that Society, his father, who was a Merchant, died, and left him three thouſand pounds. His mother and his friends uſed their utmoſt efforts to keep him firm to the Romiſh Religion, in which he had been born; but his regard for truth engaged him in a ſerious examination of the Controverſies between that Church and the Proteſtants, which at laſt determined him in favour of the latter [*B*]. About the twenty firſt year of his age he reſolved to travel; and the Earl of Eſſex going firſt to Cales in 1596, and the Iſland Voyages in 1597, he attended his Lordſhip, and did not return to England, till he had ſtaid ſome years in Italy and Spain [*C*], where he made many uſeful obſervations of thoſe countries, and learned their languages to perfection (*c*). Soon after his return he was appointed by Sir Thomas Egerton, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, his chief Secretary [*D*], in which poſt he continued five years (*d*); during which time he fell in love with Anne, the daughter of Sir George More, then Chancellor of the Garter, and afterwards Lieutenant of the Tower, and niece to the Lord Keeper's Lady; and marrying her privately in the year 1602 (*e*), was diſmiſſed from his

(*a*) *Life of Dr. John Donne, &c. By Izaac Walton*, pag. 11, 12. 4th edit. London 1675. Fuller his *Church Hiſtory of Great Britain*, B. 10. pag. 112 ſays, *that he was by his mother's ſide great great grandſon to Sir* Thomas More.

(*b*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 554. 2d. edit. London 1721.

(*c*) Walton, pag. 11-15.

(*d*) Idem, pag. 15.

(*e*) In the Epitaph on her monument in the Church of St. Clement's Danes, ſhe is ſaid to have been married *fifteen* years, and died Auguſt the 15th 1617. *See* Strype's edition of *Stowe's Survey of London*, vol. 2. B. 4. pag. 113. edit. London 1720, in fol.

which are ſettled at Piſtoia, in Hungary, and in the Kingdom of Naples. Salvino Doni was deſcended from the latter. He made a Sonnet, to which Dante wrote an Anſwer, and which is printed in a Collection of ancient pieces (6). Moreri's Dictionary mentions the branches of this family which have ſettled in France.

(6) Taken from a Letter of Doni printed at the end of his Zucca, folio 314.

Take notice that all the Doni's are not noble; for ſome of them are deſcended from a Factor, or neceſſary man, who took his maſter's name; it being very frequent in Florence for thoſe who had been long employed to do the buſineſs of noble families, ſcandalouſly to aſſume the names of their patrons. *Euui un' altra parte de Doni, che ſon nati d'un Fattore, il quale faceva le facende loro, come ne ſono molti nella Citta di Firenze, i quali uſurpono ſpeſſo la robba & i nomi delle caſe nobili, dove hanno fatto la fattoria molto tempo; coſa molto infame & vituperoſa* (7).... *vi ſapro dire quali ſono i Doni nobili diſceſi dalla vera caſa, & quali ſono i plebei venuti per via di fatterie* (8).

(7) *Il Doni*, folio 314 *verſo* of the *Zucca*.

(8) Ibid. folio 315.

[*A*] *Without taking any Degree at either* Univerſity, *on account of the Oath to be adminiſtered to him for that purpoſe.*] He forbore taking any Degrees, *by the advice of his friends*, ſays Izaack Walton (1), *who being for their Religion of the Romiſh Perſuaſion, were conſcionably averſe to ſome parts of the Oath, that is always tendered at thoſe times, and not to be refuſed by thoſe, that expect the titulary honour of their ſtudies.*

(1) *Life of Dr. John Donne &c.* pag. 12. 4th edit. London 1675.

[*B*] *His mother and his friends uſed their utmoſt efforts to keep him firm to the Romiſh Religion .... but his regard for truth engaged him in a ſerious examination .... which at laſt determined him in favour of the Proteſtants.*] " His Mother, ſays Walton (2), and " thoſe, to whoſe care he was committed, were watch- " ful to improve his knowledge, and to that end ap- " pointed to him tutors both in the Mathematicks, " and in all the other liberal Sciences, to attend him. " But with theſe arts they were adviſed to inſtill in- " to him particular principles of the Romiſh Church; " of which thoſe Tutors profeſt (tho' ſecretly) them- " ſelves to be Members. They had almoſt obliged " him to their faith, having for their advantage, be- " ſides many opportunities, the example of his dear " and pious parents." Our Author himſelf likewiſe tells us (3), that he had uſed no inordinate haſte, nor precipitation in binding his conſcience to any local Religion. " I had a longer work, *ſays he*, to do than " many other men; for I was firſt to blot out certaine " impreſſions of the Romane Religion, and to wreſ- " tle both againſt the examples and againſt the rea- " ſons, by which ſome hold was taken, and ſome an- " ticipations early layde upon my conſcience, both " by perſons, who by nature had a power and ſupe- " riority over my will, and others who by their learn- " ing and good life ſeemed to me juſtly to claime " an intereſt for the guiding and rectifying of mine " underſtanding in theſe matters." He was now en-

(2) Ibid. pag. 12, 13.

(3) Preface to his *Pſeudo-Martyr*, § 4. edit. London 1610, in 4to.

tered into the eighteenth year of his age; and at that time had betrothed himſelf to no Religion, that might give him any other denomination than a Chriſtian. And reaſon and piety had both perſuaded him, ſays Walton (4), that there could be no ſuch ſin as ſchiſm, if an adherence to ſome viſible Church were not neceſſary. About the nineteenth year of his age, he, being then unreſolved what Religion to adhere to, and conſidering of how much importance it was to chooſe the beſt, immediately laid aſide the ſtudy of the Law, and of all other Sciences, that might give him a denomination, and began ſeriouſly to examine the controverſies between the Church of Rome and the Proteſtants (5). But let us hear his own words upon this ſubject in the *Preface* to his *Pſeudo-Martyr* abovecited. " Although, ſays he, I apprehended " well enough, that this irreſolution not only retarded " my fortune, but alſo bred ſome ſcandal, and en- " dangered my ſpiritual reputation, by laying me open " to miſinterpretations; yet all theſe reſpects did not " tranſport me to any violent and ſudden determina- " tion, till I had, to the meaſure of my poore wit " and judgment, ſurveyed and digeſted the whole " body of Divinity controverted betweene ours and " the Romane Church. In which ſearch and diſqui- " ſition, that God, which awakened me then, and " hath never forſaken me in that induſtry, as he is " the Author of that purpoſe, ſo he is a witneſs of " this proteſtation, that I behaved my ſelfe; and " proceeded therein with humility, and diffidence in " my ſelfe; and by that, which, by his Grace I tooke " to be the ordinary meanes, which is frequent prai- " er and equall and indifferent actions." When he undertook this enquiry, he believed Cardinal *Bellarmin* to be the beſt Defender of the Romiſh Cauſe, and therefore applied himſelf to the examination of his reaſons. He proceeded in this ſearch with all moderate haſte, and about the twentieth year of his age ſhewed the then Dean of Glocester (6) all the Cardinal's Works marked with many weighty obſervations under his own hand (7).

(4) Pag. 13.

(5) Idem, ibid.

(6) Mr. Walton, pag. 14. *ſays, that he cannot recollect that Dean's name.*

(7) Walton, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 14.

[*C*] *Staid ſome years in Italy and Spain.*] The time, which he ſpent in Spain was at his firſt going into Italy deſigned for travelling to the Holy Land, and for viewing Jeruſalem and the Sepulchre of our Saviour. But at his being in the furtheſt parts of Italy, the diſappointment of company or of a ſafe Convoy, or the uncertainty of returns of money into thoſe remote parts, denied him that opportunity; which he often mentioned with regret (8).

(8) Idem, ibid. pag. 15.

[*D*] *Appointed by Sir* Thomas Egerton, *Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, his chief Secretary.*] His Lordſhip, during Mr. Donne's attendance upon him, treated him as a friend rather than a ſervant, appointing him a place at his own table, to which he eſteemed his company and diſcourſe to be a great ornament (9).

(9) Idem, ibid.

his place at the ſollicitation of Sir George More, and thrown into priſon [E]. Mr. Donne's circumſtances being now greatly reduced, he and his wife were entertained by their kinſman Sir Francis Wolley of Pitford in Surry for ſome years [F], till the death of Sir Francis, a little before which that Gentleman procured a perfect reconciliation between Sir George More and his ſon-in-law and daughter; Sir George engaging to pay Mr. Donne eight hundred pounds at a certain day, as a portion with his wife, or twenty pounds quarterly for their maintenance as the intereſt for it, till the portion was paid (*f*). Our Author then took a houſe in Micham (*g*) near Croydon in Surrey, where his wife and children remained; and for himſelf hired a lodging near Whitehall, whither his friends and occaſions drew him often, and where he was as often viſited by many of the Nobility and others of this Nation, "who uſed him in their counſels of greateſt conſi-"deration, and with ſome rewards for his better ſubſiſtence (*h*)." His acquaintance and friendſhip were likewiſe ſought by moſt Embaſſadors of foreign Nations, and by many other ſtrangers, whoſe learning or buſineſs occaſioned their ſtay in England. His fortune was now very narrow [G], and thus it continued with him for two years; all which time

(*f*) Walton, pag. 20-24.

(*g*) It appears from ſeveral of his Letters, that he lived at *Micham* in 1607.

(*h*) Walton, pag. 25.

. [E] *Fell in love with* Anne, *the daughter of Sir* George More . . . . *and marrying her privately, was diſmiſſed from his place, . . . and thrown into priſon.*] The young Lady lived in the Lord Keeper's family. Sir *George More*, her father, having had ſome intimation of their paſſion for each other, removed her to his own houſe at Lotheſly in Surrey; but it was too late, by reaſon of ſome faithful promiſes, which were ſo interchangeably paſſed, as never to be violated by either party. Theſe promiſes were only known to themſelves; and the friends of both uſed much diligence and many arguments to divert their paſſion, but in vain. For they found methods to come together, and compleat their marriage. The news of this, in favour to Mr. *Donne*, and with his allowance, was made known to Sir George More by his honourable friend and neighbour Henry Earl of Northumberland. Sir George was ſo highly exaſperated, that he immediately engaged his ſiſter, the Lord Keeper's Lady, to join with him to procure his Lordſhip to diſcharge Mr. Donne from his place. This requeſt was followed with violence; and tho' Sir George was put in mind, that errors might be over-puniſhed, and deſired therefore to forbear till ſecond conſiderations might clear ſome ſcruples; yet he became reſtleſs till his ſuit was granted. The Lord Keeper at Mr. Donne's diſmiſſion ſaid, that *he parted with a friend, and ſuch a Secretary, as was fitter to ſerve a King than a ſubject.* Sir George More was not ſatisfied with this, and never reſted till our Author and his fellow pupil at Cambridge, Mr. Samuel Brook, afterwards Maſter of Trinity College in that Univerſity, who married him, and his brother Mr. Chriſtopher Brook, who gave Mrs. Donne in marriage, and witneſſed it, were all committed to three ſeveral priſons. Mr. Donne was firſt ſet at liberty, and never ceaſed till he had procured the enlargement of his two friends. However his wife was detained from him, and he was obliged to recover her by a long and tedious ſuit at Law, *which proved troubleſome and ſadly chargeable to him, whoſe youth, and travel, and needleſs bounty, had brought his eſtate into a narrow compaſs* (10). At laſt his great merit and winning behaviour gained ſo much upon Sir George More, that as the world had approved his daughter's choice, ſo he likewiſe was ſo far mitigated that he uſed his own and his ſiſter's intereſt with the Lord Keeper, that his ſon-in-law might be reſtored to his place. But the Lord Keeper anſwered, that *tho' he was unfeignedly ſorry for what he had done, yet it was inconſiſtent with his place and credit, to diſcharge and readmit ſervants at the requeſt of paſſionate petitioners.* Sir George's endeavours for Mr. Donne's readmiſſion were kept ſecret; but it was not long before he appeared ſo far reconciled, as to wiſh their happineſs, and not to deny them his paternal bleſſing; but yet refuſed to contribute any means towards their ſupport (11).

(10) Idem, pag. 18.

(11) Idem, pag. 18, 19.

[F] *Entertained by their kinſman Sir Francis Wolley of Pitford in Surry for ſome years.*] Moſt of the years, that he lived with Sir Francis, he ſtudied the Civil and Canon Law; in which he gained ſo perfect a knowledge, as was judged to hold proportion with many, who had made that ſtudy the employment of their whole life (12). As his charge encreaſed, (his wife every year bringing him a child,) ſo did Sir Francis's love and bounty (13). At this time Dr. Thomas Morton, afterwards Biſhop of Durham, ſent to Mr. Donne to deſire to ſpeak with him, and inform'd him, that the King having the day before made him Dean of Glouceſter (14), he would readily quit to his friend a Benefice of equal value with the Deanery; and therefore deſired Mr. Donne to wave all his expectations from the Court, and enter into holy Orders. Mr. Donne departed, according to Dr. Morton's deſire, without any Anſwer till the third day, and then his Anſwer, after returning him thanks for his generous offer, was to this effect: "Sir, my re-"ſuſal is not for that I think my ſelf too good for "that calling, for which Kings, if they think ſo, "are not good enough; nor for that my education "and learning, tho' not eminent, may not, being "aſſiſted with God's grace and humility, render me "in ſome meaſure fit for it. But I dare make ſo dear "a friend as you are my Confeſſor: ſome irregulari-"ties of my life have been ſo viſible to ſome men, "that though I have, I thank God, made my peace "with him by penitential reſolutions againſt them, "and by the aſſiſtance of his grace baniſhed them "my affections; yet this, which God knows to be "ſo, is not ſo viſible to man, as to free me from their "cenſures, and it may be that ſacred calling from a "diſhonour. And beſides, whereas it is determined "by the beſt of *Caſuiſts*, that *God's glory ſhould be "the firſt end, and a maintenance the ſecond motive to "embrace that calling*; and though man may pro-"poſe to himſelf both together; yet the firſt may "not be put laſt without [illegible] of conſcience, "which he that ſearches the heart will judge. And "truly my preſent condition is ſuch, that if I aſk "my own conſcience, whether it be reconcileable to "that rule, it is at this time ſo perplexed about it, "that I can neither give my ſelf nor you an anſwer. "You know, Sir who ſays, *Happy is that man, "whoſe conſcience doth not accuſe him for that thing, "which he does.* To theſe I might add other reaſons, "that diſſuade me; but I crave your favour, that I "may forbear to expreſs them, and thankfully de-"cline your offer."

(12) Idem, pag. 24.

(13) Idem, pag. 20.

(14) He ſucceeded Dr. *G. Lewys* in the Deanery of Glouceſter in 1607.

[G] *His fortune was now very narrow.*] This appears from ſeveral of his Letters publiſhed by his ſon (*). In his Letter to *the Honourable Sir R. D.* he writes thus (15). "With me, Sir, it is thus: there "is not one perſon, beſides my ſelf, in my houſe well. "I have already loſt half a child, and with that "miſchance of hers my wife fallen into an indiſpo-"ſition, which would afflict her much, but that the "ſickneſs of her children ſtupifies her; of one of "which, in good faith, I have not much hope. This "meets a fortune ſo ill provided for phyſique and ſuch "relief, that if God ſhould eaſe us with burialls, I "know not well how to perform even that. I flat-"ter my ſelf in this, that I am dying too; nor can "I truly die faſter by any waſte, than by loſs of "children." Mr. Walton, who gives this paſſage with ſome variation, tells us, that the Letter was written Auguſt 10th from Micham; and in the Poſtſcript Mr. Donne mentions his *Epithalamium* on the Earl of Somerſet's marriage, which is probably that printed in his *Poems* (16), and dated December 26th 1613, the day of the marriage. In another Letter (17) addreſſed to Sir *Henry Goodere* he writes as follows: *The Devil doth not only ſuffer, but provoke us to ſome things naturally*

(*) *Letters to ſeveral Perſons of Honour: written by* John Donne, *ſometime Deane of St. Paul's London. Publiſhed by* John Donne, *Doctor of the Civill Law*, pag. 152, 153. London 1654 in 4to.

(15) Ibid. pag. 152, 153.

(16) *Poems by* J. D. *With Elegies on the Author's Death*, pag. 123, & *ſeqq.* edit. London 1633 in 4to.

(17) *Letters*, pag. 49, 50, 51.

time his family remained at Micham, whither he often retired to ſtudy ſome points of controverſy between the Engliſh and Romiſh Church, and eſpecially thoſe of Supremacy and Allegiance. But at laſt he removed with his family to London, where Sir Robert Drury aſſigned him and his wife an apartment in his magnificent houſe in Drury-Lane. April 18, 1610 he was incorporated Maſter of Arts in the Univerſity of Oxford (*i*). In 1612 he accompanied Sir Robert Drury to Paris [*H*]. Before this journey, and during his

(*i*) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. I. col. 187.

turally good, upon condition that we ſhall omit ſome other more neceſſary and more obligatory. And this is his greateſt ſubtlety, becauſe herein we have the deceitful comfort of having done well, and can hardly ſpie our errour, becauſe it is but an inſenſible omiſſion, and no accuſing act. With the firſt of theſe I have often ſuſpected my ſelf to be overtaken, which is, with a deſire of the next life; which though I know it is not meerly out of a wearineſſe of this, becauſe I had the ſame deſires, when I went with the tide, and enjoyed fairer hopes than now; yet I doubt worldly encumbrances have encreaſed it. I would not that death ſhould take me aſleep; I would not have him meerly ſeize me, and onely declare me to be dead, but win me, and overcome me. When I muſt ſhipwrack, I would do it in a ſea, where mine impotencie might have ſome excuſe; not in a ſullen weedy lake, where I could not have ſo much as exerciſe for my ſwimming. Therefore I would fain do ſomething; but that I cannot tell what, is no wonder. For to chuſe, is to do; but to be no part of any body, is to be nothing. At moſt, the greateſt perſons are but great worms and excreſcences; men of wit and delightfull converſation, but as moales for ornament, except they be ſo incorporated into the body of the world, that they contribute ſomething to the ſuſtentation of the whole. "This I made account that I began early, "when I underſtood the ſtudy of our Laws; but "was diverted by the worſt voluptuouſneſs, which is "an hydropique immoderate deſire of human learn- "ing and languages; beautiful ornaments to great "fortunes; but mine needed an occupation, and a "courſe, which I thought I entred well into, when "I ſubmitted my ſelf to ſuch a ſervice, as I thought "might employ thoſe poor advantages, which I "had. And there I ſtumbled too; yet I would try "again; for to this hour I am nothing, or ſo little, "that I am ſcarce ſubject and argument good enough "for one of my own letters; yet I fear, that doth "not ever proceed from a good root, that I am ſo "well content to be leſſe, that is, dead." In another Letter to the ſame Gentleman we have the following paſſage (18): *I have contracted a ſickneſſe, which I cannot name or deſcribe. . . . If it be the gout, I am miſerable, for that affects dangerous parts, as my neck and breſt, and (I think fearfully) my ſtomach, but it will not kill me yet. I ſhall be in this world, like a porter in a great houſe, ever neareſt the door, but ſeldomeſt abroad. I ſhall have many things to make me weary, and yet not get leave to be gone. If I go, I will provide by my beſt means, that you ſuffer not for me in your bonds . . . . . Sir, you would pity me, if you ſaw me write, and therefore will pardon me if I write no more. My pain hath drawn my head ſo much awry, and holds it ſo, that mine eye cannot follow mine hand. I receive you therefore into my prayers, with mine own weary ſoul, and commend my ſelf to yours. I doubt not but next week I ſhall be good news to you, for I have mending or dying on my ſide, which is two to one. If I continue thus, I ſhall have comfort in this, that my bleſſed Saviour exerciſing his juſtice upon my two worldly parts, my fortune and body, reſerves all his mercy for that, which beſt taſte it, and moſt needs it, my ſoul. I profeſſe to you truly, that my loathneſſe to give over now, ſeems to my ſelf an ill ſign, that I ſhall write no more.* We ſhall add one paſſage more from another of his Letters (19): "I write from the fire-ſide in "my parler, and in the noiſe of three gameſome chil- "dren, and by the ſide of her, whom becauſe I have "tranſplanted into a wretched fortune, I muſt labour "to diſguiſe that from her by all ſuch honeſt devices, "as giving her my company and diſcourſe. There- "fore I ſteal from her all the time, which I give this "Letter; and it is therefore that I take ſo ſhort a "liſt, and gallop ſo faſt over it. I have not been "out of my houſe ſince I received your pacquet. As "I have much quenched my ſenſes, and diſuſed my "body from pleaſure, and ſo tried how I can en- "dure to be mine own grave; ſo I try now how I "can ſuffer a priſon. And ſince it is but to build one "wall more about our ſoul, ſhe is ſtill in her own "center, how many circumſtances ſoever fortune or "our own perverſeneſſe caſt about her. I would I could "as well intreat her to go out, as ſhe knows whether "to go. But if I melt into a melancholy whileſt I "write, I ſhall be taken in the manner, ; and I ſit "by one too tender towards theſe impreſſions; and it "is ſo much our duty to avoid all occaſions of giv- "ing them ſad apprehenſions, as St. Hierome ac- "cuſes Adam of no other fault in eating the apple, "but that he did it *ne contriſtaretur delicias ſuas.*"

(18) Ibid. pag. 31-37.

(19) Ibid. pag. 137, 138.

[*H*] *Accompanied that Gentleman to Paris.*] Mr. Walton tells us (20), that "the Lord *Hay* was by "King *James* ſent upon a glorious Embaſſy to the "then French King *Henry* IV; and Sir Robert put "on a ſudden reſolution to accompany him to the "French Court, and to be preſent at his audience "there. And Sir *Robert* put on as ſudden a reſolution "to ſubject Mr. Donne to be his companion in that "journey." But there are two groſs miſtakes in this paſſage; for, I, The Lord Hay was not ſent Embaſſador to France till July 1616 (21), whereas Henry IV of France was killed on the 3d of May 1610; II. Mr. Donne was not at Paris with Sir Robert Drury at the ſame time that the Lord Hay was Embaſſador there, but in the year 1612; as is evident from ſeveral of his letters publiſhed at London 1654 in 4to. by his ſon John Donne, Doctor of the Civil Law. There is one dated at Paris April the 9th 1612 New Style (22); another dated there April the 14th New Style (23), in which he ſays, that he hopes to ſee England before Chriſtmas; another dated at the Spa July the 26th 1612 New Style (24), in which he obſerves, that he made account to be in England about the end of Auguſt. Mr. Walton informs us (25), that when Sir Robert Drury firſt requeſted Mr. Donne to be his companion in that journey, Mrs. Donne, who was then with child, and under a dangerous habit of body, profeſt an unwillingneſs to allow her huſband any abſence from her, ſaying, that *her divining ſoul boded her ſome ill in his abſence.* Mr. Donne therefore laid aſide all thoughts of the journey; but Sir Robert became ſo importunate, that Mrs. Donne at laſt gave a faint conſent to the journey, which was propoſed to be but for two months. Within a few days after Sir Robert Drury, and Mr. Donne left London; and on the twelfth day arrived ſafe at Paris. Two days after Mr. Donne was left alone in the room, in which Sir Robert and he and ſome other friends had dined together. To this place Sir *Robert* returned within half an hour, and as he left, ſo he found Mr. *Donne* alone, but in ſuch an ecſtaſy, and ſo altered as to his looks, as amazed Sir Robert to behold him; ſo that he earneſtly deſired Mr. *Donne* to declare what had befallen him in the ſhort time of his abſence? Mr. *Donne* was not able to make a preſent anſwer; but after a long and perplexed pauſe, at laſt ſaid, *I have ſeen a dreadful viſion ſince I ſaw you: I have ſeen my dear wife paſs twice by me through this room, with her hair hanging about her ſhoulders, and a dead child in her arms. This I have ſeen ſince I ſaw you.* To which Sir Robert anſwered; *Sure, Sir, you have ſlept ſince I ſaw you; and this is the reſult of ſome melancholly dream, which I deſire you to forget, for you are now awake.* Mr. Donne anſwered; "I cannot be "ſurer that I now live, than that I have not ſlept ſince "I ſaw you; and am as ſure, that at her ſecond ap- "pearing ſhe ſtopt and looked me in the face, and "vaniſhed." Reſt and ſleep had not altered his opinion the next day, for he then affirmed this viſion with a more deliberate and ſo confirmed a confidence, that he inclined Sir Robert to a faint belief that the viſion was true. It is truly ſaid, that *deſire and doubt have*

(20) Pag. 28, 29.

(21) See *Camden's Annals of King James I, ad. ann.* 1616. *and Wilſon's Life and Reign of King James I*, pag. 92, 93. edit. London 1653, fol.

(22) *Letters to ſeveral Perſons of Honour. Written by John Donne*, pag. 127, & *ſeqq.*

(23) Ibid. pag. 237-239.

(24) Ibid. pag. 89-93.

(25) Pag. 28, 29.

his ſtay in France, and after his return, many of the Nobility and others ſollicited the King for ſome ſecular employment for him [*I*]; but his Majeſty, who frequently took pleaſure in his converſation, and had engaged him in writing his *Pſeudo-Martyr* [*K*], printed at London in 1610 in 4to, was ſo highly pleaſed with that work, that in 1614 he

have no reſt; and it proved ſo with Sir Robert, for he immediately ſent a ſervant to *Drury*-Houſe, with a charge to haſten back, and bring him word, whether Mrs. *Donne* was alive? and if alive, in what condition ſhe was as to her health? The twelfth day the meſſenger returned with this account; that he found and left Mrs. Donne very ſad and ſick in her bed; and that after a long and dangerous labour ſhe had been delivered of a dead child. And upon examination the abortion proved to be the ſame day, and about the very ſame hour that Mr. Donne affirmed he ſaw her paſs by him in his chamber (25). Mr. Walton obſerves (26), that though this ſtory was not related to him by Mr. Donne himſelf, *it was told me*, ſays he, *(now long ſince) by a perſon of honour, and of ſuch intimacy with him, that he knew more of the ſecrets of his ſoul, than any perſon then living; and I think he told me the truth; for it was told with ſuch circumſtances and ſuch aſſeverations, that (to ſay nothing of my own thoughts) I verily believe he that told it me, did himſelf believe it to be true.* In one of our Author's letters (27), which appears to be written from Paris before Eaſter (28), and is addreſſed to Sir *G. F.* he has theſe words: "I am yet in the ſame perplexity, "which I mentioned before; which is, that I have "received no ſyllable neither from herſelf nor by "any other, how my wife hath paſſed her danger, "nor do I know whether I be increaſed by a child, "or diminiſhed by the loſſe of a wife." Before Mr. Donne entered upon this journey he gave his wife the following copy of verſes, which Mr. Walton tells us (29) he heard "ſome critics, learned both in lan-"guages and poetry ſay, none of the Greek or Latin "Poets did ever equal."

(25) Idem, pag. 29, 30.

(26) Pag. 32.

(27) *Letters to ſeveral Perſons of Honour*, pag. 74.

(28) This appears from theſe words in that Letter; *Preſently after Eaſter (I think) we ſhall go to* Frankford *to be there at the Election.*

(29) Pag. 33.

A Valediction, forbidding to mourn.

As virtuous men paſs mildly away,
And whiſper to their ſouls to go,
Whileſt ſome of their ſad friends do ſay,
The breath goes now, *and ſome ſay,* no:

So let us melt, and make no noiſe;
No wind-ſighs, or tear-floods us move:
'Twere profanation of our joys
To tell the Laity our love.

Movings of th' earth cauſe harms and fears:
Men reckon what they did or meant.
But trepidation of the ſpheares,
Though greater far, is innocent.

Dull ſublunary lovers love
(Whoſe ſoul is ſenſe) cannot admit
Abſence; becauſe that doth remove
Thoſe things that elemented it.

But we, by a ſoul ſo much refin'd,
That our ſouls know not what it is,
Inter-aſſured of the mind,
Care not hands, eyes, or lips to miſs.

Our two ſouls therefore, which are one,
Though I muſt go, endure not yet
A breach, but an expanſion,
Like gold to aiery thinneſs beat.

If we be two, we are two ſo,
As ſtiff twin-compaſſes are two:
Thy ſoul, the fixt foot, makes no ſhow
To move, but does, if th' other do.

And though thine in the center ſit;
Yet when my other far does rome,
Thine leans, and hearkens after it,
And growes erect as mine comes home.

Such thou muſt be to me, who muſt,
Like the other foot, obliquely run:
Thy firmneſs makes my circle juſt,
And me to end, where I begun.

[*I*] *Many of the Nobility and others ſollicited the King for ſome ſecular employment for him.*] This we are informed of by Mr. Walton (30), who obſerves likewiſe, that the King had "given him ſome hopes "of a State-Employment, being always much pleaſed "when Mr. Donne attended him, eſpecially at his "meals, where there were uſually many deep diſ-"courſes of general learning, and very often friend-"ly diſputes or debates of Religion betwixt his Ma-"jeſty and thoſe Divines, whoſe places required their "attendance on him at thoſe times, particularly the "Dean of the Chapel, who was then Biſhop Moun-"tague (31), the Publiſher of the learned and eloquent "works of his Majeſty, and the moſt Reverend Dr. "*Andrews*, the late learned Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, who "was then the King's Almoner." The ſame Writer likewiſe tells us (32), that among others, who ſollicited for a ſecular poſt for our Author, was the Earl of Somerſet, when in the greateſt height of favour; who being then at Theobalds with the King, where one of the Clerks of the Council died that night, poſted a meſſenger for Mr. Donne to come to him immediately; and at Mr. Donne's coming, ſaid, *Mr. Donne, to teſtify the reality of my affection and my purpoſe to prefer you, ſtay in this garden till I go up to the King, and bring you word that you are Clerk of the Council. Doubt not my doing this, for I know the King loves you, and know the King will not deny me.* But the King gave a poſitive denial to all his requeſts, and replied, *I know Mr. Donne is a learned man, has the abilities of a learned Divine, and will prove a powerful Preacher; and my deſire is to prefer him that way, and in that way I will deny you nothing for him.* It appears from one of his *letters* (33), that Mr. Donne ſollicited for the place of one of his Majeſty's Secretaries in Ireland upon the death of Sir *Geoffry Fenton*. "I have made ſome offer, ſays he, for the place, in "preſervation whereof, as I have had occaſion to im-"ploy all my friends, ſo I have not found in them "all (except *Bedford*) more haſte and words (for when "thoſe two are together, there is much comfort even "in the leaſt) then in the Lord *Hay*. In good faith "he promiſed ſo roundly, ſo abundantly, ſo profuſely, "as I ſuſpected him; but performed whatever he "undertook, (and my requeſts were the meaſures of "his undertakings) ſo readily and truly, that his com-"plements became obligations, and having ſpoke "like a Courtier, did like a friend.... I know not "yet what conjecture to make of the event. But I "am content to go forward a little more in the "madneſs of miſſing rather than not pretend, and "rather wear out, than ruſt."

(30) Pag. 34, 35.

(31) Dr. James Mountague, Biſhop of Wincheſter.

(32) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 35, 36.

(33) Pag. 145, 146. The Letter is addreſſed to Sir *H. Goodere*.

[*K*] *His* Pſeudo-Martyr.] The title of it is as follows: *Pſeudo-Martyr. Wherein out of certaine propoſitions and gradations this concluſion is evicted; that thoſe, which are of the Romane Religion in this Kingdome, may and ought to take the oath of Allegeance.* London 1610 in 4to. It is dedicated to King James I. Mr. Walton tells us (34), that ſeveral diſputes having ariſen concerning the Oath of Supremacy and Allegiance, in which the King had appeared, and engaged himſelf by his public writings, and his Majeſty diſcourſing with Mr. Donne concerning many of the reaſons, which are uſually urged againſt the taking of thoſe oaths, apprehended ſuch a validity and clearneſs in his ſtating the queſtions, and his anſwers to them, that his Majeſty commanded him to beſtow ſome time in drawing the arguments into a method, and then to write his anſwers to them; and having done that, not to ſend, but to be his own meſſenger and bring them to him. To this he immediately applied himſelf, and within ſix weeks brought them to the King in his own hand-writing, as they are now printed. The Work contains 392 pages in 4to. beſides a long *Preface* addreſſed to *the Prieſtes, and Jeſuites, and to their Diſciples in this Kingdome*, in which he hath the following paſſage (35). *And if they* (the Popiſh Writers) *will be content to impute to me all humane infirmities, they ſhall neede to faine nothing. I am, I confeſſe, obnoxious*

(34) Pag. 35.

(35) § 2. and 3. The pages of the Preface are not numbered.

he prevailed with him to enter into Holy Orders [*L*], and the ſame month appointed him one of his Chaplains, and upon the King's viſiting the Univerſity of Cambridge, recommended him to it for the Degree of Doctor of Divinity, which was immediately conferred upon him (*k*). His abilities and induſtry in his profeſſion were ſo conſpicuous, and himſelf ſo well beloved by perſons of Quality, that within the firſt year of his taking Orders, he had fourteen Advowſons of ſeveral Benefices offered him; but being unwilling to leave London he refuſed them. Immediately after his return from Cambridge (*l*) his wife died on the 15th of Auguſt 1617, on the ſeventh day after the birth of her twelfth child (*m*), and her death overwhelmed him with grief [*M*]. In this time of ſadneſs he was choſen Preacher to the honourable Society of Lincoln's-Inn [*N*], and was extremely valued by that Society. In 1619 he attended the Earl of Doncaſter in his Embaſſy into Germany *. In 1621 he was made Dean of St. Paul's (*n*) [*O*]; and in March 162$\frac{3}{4}$ the Vicarage of St. Dunſtan in the Weſt in London fell to him by the death of Dr. Tho. White [*P*], the Advowſon of it having been given to him long before by Richard Earl of Dorſet. By theſe and another Eccleſiaſtical Endowment, which fell to him about the ſame time, given him formerly by the Earl of Kent, he was enabled to become charitable to the poor, and kind to his friends, "and to make ſuch proviſion "for his children, that they were not left ſcandalous, as relating to their or his profeſ- "ſion and quality (*o*)." In 162$\frac{3}{4}$ he was choſen Prolocutor to the Convocation (*p*). About

(*k*) Walton, pag. 41.

(*l*) Idem, ibid.

(*m*) See her Epitaph in Strype's edition of Stowe's *Survey of London*, *ubi ſupra*.

* In the 3d Volume of his Sermons is a *Sermon of Valediction* preached at Lincoln's-Inn April 18, 1619, on Eccleſ. xii. 1. at his going to Germany.

(*n*) He was elected Nov. 27, 1621. See *Faſti Eccleſ. Anglicanæ* by *John Le Neve Gent.* pag. 185. edit. London 1716 in fol.

(*o*) Walton, pag. 47.

(*p*) Fuller's *Church Hiſtory of Great Britain*, Book 10. pag. 112.

obnoxious enough: My naturall impatience not to digge painefully in deepe, and ſtony, and ſullen learnings; my indulgence to my freedome and libertie, as in all other indifferent things, ſo in my ſtudies alſo, not to betroth or enthral myſelfe to any one Science, which ſhould poſſeſſe or denominate me: My eaſineſs to afford a ſwete and gentle interpretation to all profeſſors of Chriſtian Religion, if they ſhake not the foundation, wherein I have in my ordinary communication and familiar Writings often expreſſed and declared myſelfe, hath opened me enough to their malice, and put me into their danger, and given them advantage to impute to me whatſoever ſuch degrees of laxines, of liberty, of irreſolution, can produce. But if either they will transferre my perſonal weakneſſes upon the cauſe, or extend the faults of my perſon to my minde, or to her pureſt part, my conſcience; if they will calumniate this poore and innocent worke of mine, as if it were written either for Oſtentation *of any ability or faculty in my ſelfe; or for* Provocation, *to draw them to an aunſwere, and ſo continue a bookewarre; or for* Flattery *to the preſent State, which though my ſervices be by many juſt titles due to it, needes it not; or for* Exaſperation, *to draw out the civill ſword in cauſes, which have ſome pretence and colour of being ſpirituall; or to get occaſion hereby to uncover the nakednes, and lay open the incommodious and undefenſible ſentences and opinions of divers ſeverall Authors in that Church; or to maintaine and further a ſchiſme and diviſion amongſt you in this point of the Pope's pretences to temporal juriſdiction; I have no other ſhelter againſt theſe imputations, but an appeale to our bleſſed Saviour, and a proteſtation before his face, that my principall and direct ſcope and purpoſe herein, is the Unity and Peace of his Church.* This Book of our Author was animadverted upon by *Thomas Fitzherbert* in his *Cenſure of it*, ſubjoined to his *Supplement to the Diſcuſſion of Dr.* Barlow's *Anſwer to the Judgment of a Catholick Engliſh Man* &c. *interrupted by the death of the Author* F. Robert Parſons *a Jeſuit:* printed at St. Omers 1613 in 4to.

[*L*] *In* 1614 *the King prevailed with him to enter into holy Orders.*] When his Majeſty had read and conſidered his *Pſeudo-Martyr*, he perſuaded him to enter into the Miniſtry; to which at that time he was and appeared to be very unwilling, apprehending it (ſuch was his modeſty) to be too weighty for his abilities (36). After this, as our Author informs us himſelf (37), the King *deſcended to a perſuaſion, almoſt to a ſollicitation of him to enter into Holy Orders*; which though Mr. Donne did not then refuſe, yet he deferred it for almoſt three years; all which time he applied himſelf to an inceſſant ſtudy of textual Divinity, and to the attainment of a greater perfection in the learned languages, Greek and Hebrew (38). He was ordained Deacon, and ſoon after Prieſt, by his dear friend Dr. John King, then Biſhop of London, who had been Chaplain to the Lord Keeper Egerton, at the ſame time that Mr. Donne was his Secretary (32). He ſoon became one of the moſt eminent Preachers of his time; and Mr. Chidley, a frequent hearer of his Ser-

(36) Walton, pag. 35.

(37) In his *Devotions upon emergent Occaſions*, London 1624 in 12mo.

(38) Walton, pag. 36.

(39) Idem, pag. 38.

mons, in his *Elegy* upon him, gives the following character of him in that reſpect.

——Each Altar had his fire——
He kept his love, but not his object, wit;
He did not baniſh, but tranſplanted it;
Taught it both time and place, and brought it home
To Piety, *which it doth beſt become.*
For ſay, had ever pleaſure ſuch a dreſs?
Have you ſeen crimes ſo ſhap't, or loveline ſs
Such as his lips did clothe Religion in?
Had not reproof a beauty paſſing ſin?
Corrupted nature ſorrowed that ſhe ſtood
So near the danger of becoming good.
And when he preach't, ſhe wiſh't her ears exempt
From Piety, that had ſuch pow'r to tempt.
How did his ſacred flattery beguile
Men to amend?

[*M*] *His wife's death . . . . overwhelmed him with grief.*] "She left, *ſays Mr. Walton* (40), a man of "a narrow unſettled eſtate, and (having buried five) "the careful father of ſeven children then living, to "whom he gave a voluntary aſſurance never to bring "them under the ſubjection of a ſtep-mother; which "promiſe he kept moſt faithfully, burying with his "tears all his earthly joys in his moſt dear and de- "ſerving wife's grave; and betook himſelf to a moſt "retired and ſolitary life. . . . . His firſt motion from "his houſe was to preach, where his beloved wife "lay buried (in St. Clement's Church near Temple- "Bar London;) and his Text was a part of the Pro- "phet Jeremy's *Lamentation*; *Lo, I am the man, "that have ſeen affliction.*"

(40) Pag. 41, 42, 43.

[*N*] *Choſen Preacher to the honourable Society of Lincolns-Inn.*] Mr. Walton tells us (41), that he was choſen upon the removal of Mr. (42) Thomas Gataker; but this is a groſs miſtake, for Mr. Gataker left Lincoln's-Inn for the Rectory of Rotherhith in Surrey in 1611 (43), which was ſix years before Dr. Donne was choſen there.

(41) Pag. 43.

(42) Mr. Walton ſtiles him Dr.; which is a miſtake; for Mr. Gataker only took the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity.

(43) See Mr. Simeon Aſhe's *Funeral Sermon on Mr. Tho. Gataker, preached at Redrith near London, Auguſt* 1, 1654, pag. 48. edit. London 1654 in 4to.

[*O*] *In* 1621 *he was made Dean of St. Paul's.*] Dr. Valentine Carey, his Predeceſſor in that Deanery, being advanced to the Biſhopric of Exeter, and by that means the Deanery becoming vacant, the King ſent for Dr. Donne, and appointed him to attend him the next day at dinner. When his Majeſty was ſate down, before he had eat any meat, he ſaid, "Dr. "Donne, I have invited you to dinner; and though "you ſit not down with me, yet I will carve to you "of a diſh, that I know you love well; for knowing "you love London, I do therefore make you Dean "of Paul's; and when I have dined, then do you "take your beloved diſh home to your ſtudy: ſay "grace there to your ſelf, and much good may it do "you (44)."

(44) Walton, pag. 46.

[*P*] *In March* 162$\frac{3}{4}$ *the Vicarage of St. Dunſtan in the Weſt in London fell to him by the death of Dr. Thomas White.*] Mr. Walton tells us (45), that it fell to him IMMEDIATELY *after his admiſſion into his*

(45) Pag. 47.

About that time he was seized with a dangerous sickness, which inclined him to a consumption; and upon his recovery he wrote and published a book of *Devotions* [Q]. In August 1630 being with his eldest daughter Mrs. Harvey at Abrey-Hatch in Essex, he fell into a fever, "which with the help of his constant infirmity, "vapours from the spleen, hastened him into a consumption (q)." However he preached in his turn at Court on the first Friday in Lent following upon *Psalm* lxviii. 20 [R], and died on the 31st of March 1631, and was interred in the Cathedral of St. Paul's, where a monument was erected for him. His writings [S] shew him to be a man of incomparable wit and learning; and he was highly celebrated by all the great men of that

(q) Walton, pag. 51, 52.

his Deanery . . . by the death of Dr. White. But this is a mistake; for he was admitted into his Deanery in the latter end of 1621, and the Vicarage of St. Dunstan's was not vacant till the death of Dr. White, which happened March 1st 162¾ (46). Dr. Donne's first Sermon at that Church, as Vicar there, was preached there April 11th 1624, and is printed in the *second volume* of his *Sermons* (47).

(46) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 486.

(47) *Sermon* 45. pag. 422, *& seqq.*

[Q] *He wrote and published a Book of* Devotions.] The *second* Edition printed at London 1624 in 12mo, is intitled, *Devotions upon emergent occasions, and several steps in his sickness.*

[R] *He preached in his turn at Court on the first Friday in Lent following upon* Psalm 68. 20.] This Sermon was printed at London 1633 in 4to under the following title: *Death's Duell: Or a Consolation to the Soule against the dying life and living death of the body. Deliuered in a Sermon at Whitehall before the Kings Majestie in the beginning of Lent* 1630. *By that late learned and reverend Divine,* John Donne, *Doctor in Divinity, and Deane of St. Pauls, London. Being his last sermon, and called by his Majesties Houshold, the* Doctors owne Funeral Sermon. The Editor in his Preface tells us, that "this Sermon was, by sa-"cred authoritie, stiled the Author's own Funeral Ser-"mon: most fitly, whether wee respect the time, or "the matter. It was preached not many dayes be-"fore his death, as if having done this, there re-"mained nothing for him to doe but to die. And "the matter is of death, the occasion and subject of "all Funerall Sermons. It hath beene observed of "this reverend man, that his faculty in preaching "continually increased; and that as he exceeded o-"thers at first, so at last he exceeded himselfe."

[S] *His Writings.*] Besides those abovementioned he wrote the following works. *An Anatomie of the World: wherein by the occasion of the untimely death of Mistris* Elizabeth Drury, *the frailty and the decay of this whole world is represented. A Poem in two Anniversaries.* London 1625 in 8vo. The second Anniversary is intitled, *The Progresse of the Soule: wherein by occasion of the religious death of Mistris* Elizabeth Drury, *the incommodities of the soule in this life, and her exaltation in the next, are contemplated. A Sermon on* Judges v. 20. London 1622 in 4to. *A Sermon* preached before the King at Whitehall Febr. 24 1625 on *Isaiah* i. 1. published by his Majesty's Command. London 1626 in 4to. *A Sermon on* 2 Peter iii. 13. London 1627 in 4to. Juvenilia, *or Paradoxes and Problemes.* London 1633 in 4to. *Divine Poems, with Epistles to Sir* Henry Goodere. London 1633 in 4to. *Poems by* J. D. *With Elegies on the Author's Death.* London 1633 in 4to and 1635 in 8vo. *Six Sermons.* London 1634 in 4to. *Eighty Sermons,* published by his son, and dedicated to the King. London 1640 fol. in which are included the *six Sermons* abovementioned. This is called the *First Volume of Dr.* Donne's *Sermons. Fifty Sermons.* London 1649 in fol. Dedicated by his son to Basil Earl of Denby. There is likewise another Dedication to *the Right Honourable Bolstred Whitlock, Richard Keeble, and John Leile, Lords Commissioners of the Great Seal,* in which his son observes, that the "reward, which many years since "was proposed for printing these Sermons, had been "lately conferred on him by the authority of the "Great Seal." This is the *second* volume. *Six and twenty Sermons.* London 1661 fol. dedicated by his son to King Charles II. This is called the *Third Volume* of his Sermons. *Fasciculus Poematum & Epigrammatum Miscellaneorum.* Translated into Latin by Jaspar Main, D. D. with this title, *A Sheaf of Miscellany Epigrams.* London 1632 in 8vo. *Ignatius his Conclave; or his Inthronisation in a late Election in Hell.* London 1635 in 12mo. An Edition of this piece was published in 1626 in 8vo, intitled, *Ignatius his Conclave, viz. of establishing a Church in the Moon.* An *Apologie for the Jesuits,* printed with the former. *Essayes in Divinity by the late Dr.* Donne *Dean of St. Paul's. Being several disquisitions interwoven with Meditations and Prayers, before he went into Holy Orders. Now made public by his son* J. D. *Dr. of the Civil Law.* London 1651 in 12mo. In the Preface we are informed, that these *Essays* were printed from an exact copy under the Author's own hand; and that "they were the voluntary sacrifices of "several hours, when he had many debates betwixt "God and himself, whether he were worthy and com-"petently learned to enter into holy Orders. They "are now published both to testifie his modest valua-"tion of himself, and to shew his great abilities; and "they may serve to inform thee in many holy curio-"sities." *Paradoxes, Problemes, Essayes, Characters, written by Dr.* Donne, *Dean of Paul's. To which is added a Book of* Epigrams, *written in Latin by the same Author; translated into English by* J. Maine, *D. D. As also* Ignatius his Conclave, *a Satyr translated out of the originall copy written in Latin by the same Author, found lately amongst his own papers.* London 1653, in 12mo. The Dedication of these pieces by his son John Donne, Doctor of the Civil Law, to Francis Lord Newport, is dated from his house in Covent Garden March 2d 165⅔. *Letters to severall Persons of Honour: written by* John Donne, *sometime Deane of St. Pauls London. Published by* John Donne *Dr. of the Civill Law.* London 1654 in 4to. There are several Letters of his, and others to him from the Queen of Bohemia, the Earl of Carlisle, Archbishop Abbot, Ben Johnson, printed in a Book intitled, *A Collection of Letters made by Sir* Tobie Matthews, *Knt. With a Character of the most excellent Ladie* Lucy, *Countesse of* Carleile: *by the same Author. To which are added many Letters of his own to severall Persons of Honour, who were contemporary with him.* London 1660 in 8vo. This Book is dedicated to that Countess by *John Donne,* who was undoubtedly our Author's son, and the same, who published the abovementioned volume of his Letters of his father. *Biathanatos: or a Declaration of that Paradox or Thesis, that self-homicide is not so naturally a sin, that it may not be otherwise.* London 1644, 1648 &c. in 4to. Mr. Wood tells us (48), that he had seen the original under the Author's own hand in the Bodleian Library, dedicated to Edward Lord Herbert of Cherbury. Mr. Walton (49) stiles this *an exact and laborious Treatise,* wherein "all "the Laws violated by that Act are diligently survey-"ed and judiciously censured; a Treatise written in "his younger years, which alone might declare him "then not only perfect in the *Civil* and *Canon* Law, but "in many other such studies and arguments, as enter "not into the consideration of many, that labour to "be thought great Clerks, and pretend to know all "things." Among our Author's *Letters* is one (50) addressed to *the noblest Knight Sir* Edward Herbert *Lord of* Cherbury, *sent to him with his Book* Biathanatos; and another (51) addressed to Sir *Robert Carre,* afterwards Earl of *Ankerum,* and sent with that Book upon the Doctor's going to Germany. In this Letter he observes, that the Book was written by him many years before; and *because,* says he, *it is upon a misinterpretable subject, I have always gone so near suppressing it, as that it is onely not burnt. No hand hath passed upon it to copy it, nor many eyes to read it; onely to some particular friends in both Universities, then when I writ it, I did communicate it; and I remember I had this Answer, that* certainly there was a false thread in it, but not easily found, *Keep it, I pray, with the same jealousie: let any, that your discretion admits to the sight of it, know the date of it, and that it is a Book written*

(48) *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 555.

(49) Pag. 60.

(50) Pag. 20, 21.

(51) Pag. 21, 22.

that age [T]. Lucius Lord Falkland ſtiles him (r) *one of the moſt wittie and moſt eloquent of our modern Divines.* Mr. Walſh (s) aſſerts, that "there never was "a more copious fancy, or greater reach of wit, than what appears in Dr. "Donne." And Mr. Dryden (t) gives him the character of the *greateſt Wit, though not the greateſt Poet of our Nation*; and he tells us (u), with regard to his poetical performances, that "he has great variety, multiplicity, and choice of thoughts; but that "he affects the metaphyſicks not only in his *Satires*, but in his amorous verſes, "where Nature only ſhould reign, and perplexes the minds of the fair ſex with nice "ſpeculations of Philoſophy, when he ſhould engage their hearts, and entertain them "with the ſoftneſſes of love." The ſame Writer afterwards writes thus: *Would not* Donne's Satires, *which abound with ſo much wit, appear more charming, if he had taken care of his words and of his numbers? But he followed* Horace *ſo very cloſe, that of neceſſity he muſt fall with him. And I may ſafely ſay it of this preſent age, that if we are not ſo great Wits as* Donne, *yet certainly we are better Poets.* Mr. Pope has given us two of his Satires in a very beautiful dreſs (x). He had a ſon of both his names, who was elected a Student of Chriſt Church in Oxford from Weſtminſter School in 1622, and afterwards took the Degree of Doctor of the Laws at Padua in Italy, and on the 30th of June 1638 was incorporated in the ſame Degree in the Univerſity of Oxford. He died in the winter of the year 1662, and was interred in the Church-yard of St. Paul's Covent-Garden (y). Mr. Wood tells us (z), that he was "no better all his life-time than an Atheiſtical Buf-"foon, a Banterer, and a perſon of over-free thoughts; yet valued by King Charles II;" that he was *a man of ſenſe and parts*; and that beſides ſeveral writings of his father, he publiſhed *ſeveral frivolous trifles* under his own name, among which is *The Humble Petition of* Covent-Garden *againſt Dr.* John Baber *a Phyſician*, anno 1662.

(r) *Anſwer to Mr.* Walter Mountague's *Letter concerning the changing his Religion*, ſubjoin'd to *Lord Falkland's Diſcourſe of Infallibility &c.* pag. 288. edit. London 1651.

(s) *Preface* to his *Letters and Poems Amorous and Gallant.*

(t) *Preface* to his *Eleonora: a Panegyrical Poem dedicated to the Memory of the late Counteſs of Abingdon.*

(u) *Dedication* of his *Tranſlation of Juvenal*, pag. 9, 10. 6th edit. London 1735 in 12mo.

(x) Works of Alexander Pope, Eſq; vol. 2. pag. 133, *& ſeqq.* edit. London 1735 in 12mo.

(y) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 276, 277.

(z) Ibid.

written by Jack Donne, *and not by* Dr. Donne. *Reſerve it for me, if I live, and if I die, I only forbid it the preſſe and the fire. Publiſh it not, but yet burn it not, and between thoſe do what you will with it.* Our Author tranſlated likewiſe from the Greek into Engliſh, *The ancient Hiſtory of the Septuagint.* London 1633 in 12mo; which Tranſlation was reviſed and very much corrected by another hand, and printed at London 1685 in 8vo (52). Mr. Wood propoſes a Quære, whether he was the Author of a piece intitled, *A Scourge for Paper Perſecutors*, printed in the reign of King James I. The running title at the top of every page is *Paper's Complaint*, and it contains three ſheets and an half in 4to. He left at his death, beſides an hundred and twenty Sermons all written with his own hand, *the reſultance of* 1400 *Authors, moſt of them abridged and analyſed with his own hand* (53). "All the buſi-"neſſes likewiſe that paſt of any public conſequence "either in this or any of our neighbouring Nations, "he abbreviated either in Latine, or in the language "of that Nation, and kept them by him for uſeful "memorials. So he did the copies of divers Letters "and Caſes of Conſcience, that had concerned his "friends, with his obſervations and ſolutions of them, "and divers other buſineſſes of importance, all par-"ticularly and methodically digeſted by him (54)."

(52) Wood, col. 556.

(53) Walton, pag. 60.

(54) Idem, ibid.

[T] *Highly celebrated by all the great men of that Age.*] At the end of the edition of his Poems printed in 1633 in 4to we have Elegies upon him written by Dr. *Henry King*, afterwards Biſhop of Chicheſter, *Thomas Browne*, *Edward Hyde*, afterwards Earl of Clarendon, Dr. *Corbet*, afterwards Biſhop of Oxford, *Henry Valentine*, *Izaac Walton*, the Writer of his Life, *Thomas Carie* or *Carew*, Sir *Lucius Cary*, afterwards Lord Falkland, *Jaſpar Mayne*, of Chriſt-Church Oxon, *Arthur Wilſon* the Hiſtorian, *Endymion Porter*, &c. Ben Johnſon ſent his *Epigrams* to our Author with theſe verſes:

Who can doubt, Donne, *where I be a Poet bee?*
When I dare ſend my Epigrams to thee;
That ſo alone canſt judge; ſo alone do'ſt make:
And in thy cenſures, evenly doſt take
As free ſimplicity to diſavow,
As thou has beſt Authority t' allow.
Read all I ſend, and if I finde but one
Mark'd by thy hand, and with the better ſtone
My title's ſeal'd. Thoſe that for claps do write,
Let punies, porters, players praiſe delight,
And till they burſt, their backs like aſſes load;
A man ſhould ſeek great glory, and not broad.

T.

DONZELLINUS (JEROM) a learned Italian Phyſician, and Author of ſome Books [A], flouriſhed in the ſixteenth Century. He was born at Orzi nuovi, in the territory of Breſcia, and practiſed Phyſic in Breſcia for ſome time: but he was conſtrained to leave that city, on account of a literary quarrel wherein he had engaged himſelf againſt Vincent Calzaveglia, in defence of Joſeph Valdagna (a). Theſe were two Phyſicians, the former of whom publiſhed a Book againſt the other, and was refuted in ſo terrible a manner by Donzellinus, that Joſeph Valdagna and his Advocate were both obliged to quit the city of Breſcia. The latter retired to Venice, and practiſed there with great ſucceſs; but it is ſaid he came to a tragical end, and that being accuſed of having in an execrable manner affronted the Majeſty of Religion, and that of the State, he was condemned to be thrown into the ſea (b). Cozzando, who furniſhes me with this Article, places this in the year 1560. A Book is aſcribed to this Phyſician, which may well belong to another JEROME DONZELLINUS [B].

(a) A Phyſician of Breſcia, a native of Verona.

(b) Leonardo Cozzando, *della Libraria Breſciana*, pag. 197, 198.

DORIEUS,

[A] *He is the Author of ſome Books.*] He tranſlated from Greek into Latin the Treatiſe of Galen *de Ptiſana*, and eight Orations of Themiſtius (1). His *Conſilia & Epiſtolæ Medicæ* are to be found in the Collection which Scholzius publiſhed in the year 1598, at Francfort. His Letter *De natura* &c. was printed at Venice, in 1570, in 4to. (2).

[B] *A Book is aſcribed to him, which may well belong to another* JEROME DONZELLINUS.] It is intitled *Remedium ferendarum injuriarum, ſive de compeſcenda Ira*, and was printed at Venice, in the year 1586, in 4to; at Altorf, in 1587, in 8vo; and at Leyden, in 1635, in 12mo. (3). The Oxford Catalogue, *Lindenius renovatus*, Leonardo Cozzando, Konig, &c. attribute it to the ſame Author who wrote the Books I have mentioned above; but I doubt whether they be in the right: for the Donzellinus who compoſed the *Remedium ferendarum injuriarum*, is ſurnamed *Veronenſis* in the Title of the Work; and it is certain that the other was ſurnamed *Brixienſis* (4).

(1) Printed at Baſil, *apud* Petrum Pernam, 1559, in 8vo. *Epit. Geſneri*, pag. m. 775.

(2) *See* Lindenius renovatus, pag. 419, 420.

(3) This Edition contains 256 pages.

(4) *Epit. Geſneri*, pag. 347.

If

DORIEUS, ſon of Diagoras the Rhodian, acquired incomparable glory in the public Games of Greece. His addreſs in thoſe exerciſes was hereditary: for his father held a very illuſtrious rank among the perſons who had won the prize in thoſe Games. Dorieus obtained crowns in the Olympic Games. He obtained eight crowns ſucceſſively in the Iſthmian Games, and won ſeven in the Nemean (*a*). See the Sequel of the Hiſtory in the Article of DIAGORAS (*b*).

(*a*) *Ex* Pauſanias, lib. 6. pag. 184.

(*b*) A famous Athlet, Remark [*D*].

If Cozzando had rightly fixed the tragical death of the latter under the year 1560, he would have been manifeſtly in the wrong in aſcribing to him the *Remedium ferendarum injuriarum*, a Work which the Author dedicates to Sixtus Vicedomini, Biſhop of Modena, and ſon of a ſiſter of Cardinal Moron. That Cardinal lived till the year 1580, and was dead when the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the *Remedium ferendarum injuriarum* was written. This Treatiſe is full of excellent Morality: the Author therein declares that he is not one of thoſe who think the immortality of the Soul cannot be proved by Philoſophical reaſons (5), and he endeavours to juſtify Galen, who is accuſed of having not diſtinguiſhed the Soul from the conſtitution of the Body (6).

(5) Donzell. *Remed. ferend. Injur.* pag. 143. 144. Lugd. Bat. 1635.

(6) Idem, ibid. pag. 143, *&* *ſeq.*

☞DORSET (THOMAS SACKVILLE Earl of), Lord Treaſurer to Queen Elizabeth, was deſcended of an antient family [*A*], and ſon of Richard Sackville Eſq; and born at or near Withyam in the County of Suſſex (*a*) in the year 1536 [*B*]. He was educated in the Univerſity of Oxford (*b*) in Hart-Hall (*c*), where he became an excellent Poet (*d*), as appears from his performances in that way [*C*]. He afterwards removed to Cambridge, where he had the degree of Maſter of Arts conferred on him (*e*); and

(*a*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 347. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*b*) See *A Sermon preached at Weſtminſter May* 26, 1608, *at the Funeral Solemnities of the Right Hon.* Thomas *Earle of* Dorſet, *late Lord High Treaſurer of England. By* George Abbot *Doctor of Divinitie, and Deane of Winchester, one of his Lordſhip's Chapleines*, pag. 13. edit. London 1608 in 4to.

(*c*) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, and *Faſti Ox.* vol. 1. col. 142.

(*d*) David Lloyd's *State-Worthies*, pag. 677. 2d edit. London 1670.

(*e*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon. ubi ſupra.*

[*A*] *Deſcended of an ancient family.*] Mr. Arthur Collins informs us (1), that it is evident as well from the Norman Hiſtorians as other Authorities, that this family was of noble extraction in Normandy, and denominated from a Town and Seigniory of their name in that Province, of which they were owners. HERBRAND, Lord of the ſaid Seigniory of Sackvil, is mentioned in the Norman Hiſtorians to be one of the Nobles, who came into England with William the Conqueror, and returning into Normandy, was living there in the year 1079, having iſſue three ſons, Sir JORDAN DE SACKVIL, who was Sewer of England by Grant of William the Conqueror, but reſided in Normandy, where he died; Sir WILLIAM SACKVIL, who left three daughters, heirs to their brother; and Sir ROBERT SACKVIL, the third ſon, from whom is deſcended THOMAS SACKVIL, the firſt Earl of Dorſet, of whom we treat in this article, and who was ſon of RICHARD SACKVIL, Eſq; who was a Gentleman of eminent abilities, and was of the Privy Council to King Edward the VIth, Queen Mary, and Queen Elizabeth (2). By Winifrede his Lady, daughter of Sir John Bruges, Lord Mayor of London, and married ſecondly to William Paulet Marquis of Wincheſter, he left iſſue the abovementioned THOMAS SACKVILLE, and a daughter ANNE, married to Gregory Fines, Lord Dacres of the South, who dying without iſſue by him in the 37th year of Queen Elizabeth, was buried at Chelſea (3).

(1) *Peerage of England. By Arthur Collins Eſq*; vol. 1. pag. 384, 385. edit. London 1735 in 8vo.

(2) Idem, ibid. pag. 395.

(3) Idem, ibid. pag. 398.

[*B*] *Born . . . in the year* 1536.] Dr. George Abbot tells us (4), that he was ſuppoſed to be *ſeventy two years* old, when he died, which was on the 19th of April 1608.

(4) In his *Sermon preached at Weſtminſter May* 26, 1608, *at the Funerall Solemnities of the Right Honourable* Thomas *Earle of* Dorſet *&c. &c.* pag. 16.

[*C*] *Became an excellent Poet, as appears from his performances in that way.*] Fuller informs us (5), that while he continued at Oxford, he wrote ſeveral Latin and Engliſh Poems. And Mr. Wood obſerves (6), that thoſe Poems were publiſhed, *yet I preſume*, ſays he, *they are loſt or forgotten, as having either no name to them, or that the copies are worn out.* Mr. Joſeph Spence, Profeſſor of Poetry in the Univerſity of Oxford, remarks likewiſe (7), that "the Lord Buckhurſt "was (what perhaps all perſons of his birth ought "to be) a Poet only in his youth. All the latter "part of his life he was wholly taken up in State-"affairs. In both of theſe views he was one of the "moſt conſiderable men of his time." His poetical Writings, which are ſtill extant, are, I. The *Introduction* to the *Mirrour of Magiſtrates*, with a Preface in Proſe: II. The Story of the unfortunate Duke of Buckingham in Richard the ſecond's time: III. The *Tragedy of* Ferrex *and* Porrex, *ſons to* Gorboduc *King of Britain. The Mirrour of Magiſtrates*, as Mr. Spence obſerves (8), is an old faſhioned title to a ſett of Poems, which were very much applauded in their time. It conſiſted of examples of eminent bad men, who had come to miſerable ends. The inſtances were taken, here and there, from our Engliſh Hiſtory, without any great order. There was once a deſign of collecting all the examples from the beginning of our Hiſtory to their own times. "It was then (9), *ſays Mr.* "*Spence*, that Lord Buckhurſt wrote his *Induction*, "which was to have ſerved for an Introduction to the "whole: but as that deſign was afterwards dropt, it "was inſerted in the body of the work juſt, before one "of the particular ſtories written by the ſame hand." The *Mirrour* was printed at London in 1559 in 4to, in an old Engliſh character under the following title: *A Mirrour for Magiſtrates, wherein may be ſeen by example of others, with how grievous plagues vices are puniſhed &c.* We have now before us an Edition of 1563 in 4to. under the following title: *A Myrrour for Magiſtrates. Wherein maye be ſeen by example of others, with howe grevous plagues vices are puniſhed: and howe frayle and unſtable worldly proſperity is ſounde even of thoſe, whom fortune ſeemeth moſt highly to favour.* Anno 1563. *Imprinted at London in Fleetſtreet: nere to Sayncte Dunſtan's Churche by Thomas Marſhe.* It is dedicated to *the Nobilitie and all other in Office* by William Baldwin, who in the Epiſtle Dedicatory obſerves, that "the "Worke was begun, and parte of it prynted in Queene "*Maries* time, but hyndered by the Lorde Chaun-"cellor that then was: nevertheles, through the means "of my Lord *Stafford*, the *fyrſt Parte* was licenced "and imprynted the fyrſte yeare of the raygne of "this our moſt noble and vertuous Queene, and dedi-"cate then to your Honours wyth this Preface. Since "which time, although I have bene called to another "trade of lyfe, yet my good Lorde *Stafforde* hath not "ceaſed to call upon me to publyſhe ſo much as I "had gotten at other men's hands, ſo that through "his Lordſhyppes earneſt meanes, I have now alſo "ſet forth another parte, conteyning as little of myne "owne, as the *firſt* part doth of other mens. Which "in the name of all the Authors I humbly dedicate "unto your Honours, inſtantly wiſhing, that it may "ſo like and delyte your myndes, that your heartful "receyving therof may encourage worthy wittes to "enterpryſe and perfourme the reſt. Which as ſoone "as I maye procure, I entende, through God's leave "and your favourable allowaunce, to publiſhe with "al expedicion." In the Preface to the Reader Mr. Baldwin tells us, that the Printer having a deſign to publiſh Lydgate's Book of the *Fall of Princes* tranſlated from Boccace, was adviſed to procure the ſtory to be continued where Boccace left off to the preſent time, *chiefly of ſuch as fortune had dalyed with here in this Yland*; upon which he engaged ſeven Gentlemen of wit and learning to aſſiſt Mr. Baldwin in that Work, who *all agreed*, ſays that Writer, *that I ſhould uſurpe Bocha's rowme, and the wretched Princes complayne unto me; and toke upon themſelves every man for his part to be ſundry perſonages, and in their behalfes to bewaile unto me their grevous chaunces, heavye deſtinies, and woful misfortunes.* In the Preface to the *ſecond part* we are informed that the ſtory of *Edmund Duke of Somerſet ſlain at St. Albans* was written by Mr. *Ferrers*; that of *Shore's Wife, Edward the IV's concubine*,

(5) *Worthies*, in Suſſex. *See likewiſe* Lloyd's *State-Worthies*, pag. 677.

(6) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 347.

(7) *Some Account of the Lord Buckhurſt and his Writings in a Letter to the Right Honourable the Earl of Middleſex*, pag. 2. prefixed to *the Tragedy of* Gorboduc, *written by* Thomas Sackville *Lord Buckhurſt, afterwards Lord Treaſurer to Queen Elizabeth and Earl of Dorſet*, London 1736 in 8vo.

(8) Ibid. pag. 5.

(9) In 1557.

and thence to the Temple, where he took the degree of Barriſter, "and gave tokens of "ſuch pregnancy, ſuch ſtudiouſneſs, and judgment, that he was held no way inferior to "any of his time or ſtanding (*f*)." He was elected one of the Knights for the County of Weſtmorland to the Parliament held in the 4th and 5th years of the reign of King

(*f*) Abbot, *ubi ſupra.*

cubine, deſpoyled of all her goodes, and forced to do open penance, by Mr. *Church-yard*; that of Lord Haſtyngs by Mr. *Dolman*; that of King Richard III. by *Francis Segars*; and that of the *Blackſmith and Lord Audleye executed for trayterous rebellion,* by Mr. *Cawyl.* The occaſion of Mr. Sackville's Induction, was, as we are informed in this Book (10), "that after he un-"derſtoode, that ſome of the Counſayle would not "ſuffer the Booke to be printed in ſuche order as "we, *ſays Mr.* Baldwin, had agreed and determined, "he purpoſed with himſelfe to have gotten at my "handes all the Tragedies, that were before the *Duke "of Buckingham's*, which he would have preſerved in "one Volume. And from that time backward even "to the time of *William the Conqueror* he determined "to continue and perfect all the ſtory himſelf in ſuch "order as *Lydgate* (folowing *Bochas)* had already "uſed. And therefore to make a meete Induction "into the matter he deviſed this Poeſye, which in "my judgment is ſo wel penned, that I woulde not "have any verſe thereof left out of our Volume."

(10) Fol. 114. *averſo*, & 115.

It is evident that Mr. Wood had never ſeen this Edition, ſince he tells us, that Mr. Sackvile wrote *a Preface in proſe, and an Induction in verſe, ſet before the* ſecond part *of the* Mirrour of Magiſtrates: *not to that Edition of the* Mirrour *publiſhed by* William Baldwyn, *but that, I ſuppoſe, which was publiſhed by* John Higens. In this paſſage Mr. Wood has committed two miſtakes; for 1. Mr. *Sackville's Induction* is printed in Mr. *Baldwin's* Edition: 2. Our Poet did not write *a Preface in Proſe* to the *ſecond Part* of the *Mirrour*. Mr. John Higens's Edition of that Work was publiſhed with additions in 1586; and in 1610 it was reprinted in 4to. by *Richard Niccols*, who added to it *A Winter Night's Viſion, being an addition of ſuch Princes, eſpecially famous, who were exempted in the former Hiſtory.* After his Epiſtle to the Reader follows his *Induction* in Verſe, and then the lives of certain Princes, with their pictures wrought from wooden cuts: viz. 1. King *Arthur*: 2. *Edmund Ironſide*, &c. The laſt is *Richard III.* To them is added, *England's Elizabeth, or the glorious and triumphant reign of that Virgin Empreſs of ſacred memory Elizabeth, Queen of England,* written by Mr. Niccols. But to return to the Lord Buckhurſt's *Induction*; the plan of it, is a deſcent into hell. The Poet feigns he deſcended thither in perſon, as *Dante* had done. Thoſe unhappy men were to have paſſed there in review before him: and each in his turn to have told his tale, his own faults, and his misfortunes. "This "piece is written, ſays Mr. *Spence* (11), very much "in *Spenſer's* manner. It abounds in the ſame ſort "of deſcriptions of ſhadowy beings, and is a good "deal in the ſame ſtile. The firſt time I read it, "theſe two Authors ſeemed ſo evidently of the ſame "ſchool, (for there are ſchools in Poetry, as diſtin-"guiſhable as thoſe in painting) that I immediately "concluded Lord *Buckhurſt* might be ſet down "as a ſcholar of *Spenſer's*. But when I came to com-"pare dates, it appeared that (if one formed himſelf "by the other) it muſt have been *Spenſer*, that was a "ſcholar of Lord Buckhurſt's. For his Induction was "written before *Spenſer* was ten years old; and indeed "he took to the ſtudy of Politicks and Management "of affairs ſo early, that he left off writing before "*Spenſer* began." We have ſeveral beautiful paſſages cited out of this *Induction*, in *England's* Parnaſſus: *or the choyſeſt flowers of our modern Poets, with their poeticall compariſons, deſcriptions of beauties, perſonages, caſtles, pallaces, mountains, groves, ſeas, ſprings, rivers, &c. Whereunto are annexed other various diſcourſes both pleaſaunt and profitable. Imprinted at London for* N. L. C. B. *and* T. H. 1600, in 12mo. This Book, which contains 494 pages, is dedicated in Verſe to Sir Thomas Mounſon Knt. by R. A. Since the abovementioned edition of the *Mirrour of Magiſtrates* is now very rarely to be met with, we ſhall tranſcribe ſome paſſages out of Lord Buckhurſt's *Induction*.

(11) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 5.

He repreſents *ſorrow* appearing to him, whom he deſcribes in this manner.

Her body ſmall forwithered and foreſpent,
As is the ſtalke, that ſommers drought oppreſt,
Her wealked face with woful tears beſprent,
Her colour pale, and (as it ſeem'd her beſt)
In woe and playnt repoſed was her reſt.
And as the ſtone, that droppes of water weares,
So dented were her cheekes with fall of tears.

Her iyes ſwollen with ſtowing ſtreames aſlote,
Wherewith her lookes throwen up full piteous lye;
Her forceles handes together ofte ſhe ſmote,
With doleful ſtrikes, that echoed in the ſkye:
Whoſe playnt ſuch ſighes dyd ſtrayt accompany,
That in my doome was never man did ſee
A Wight but halfe ſo woe begon as ſhe.

He afterwards repreſents himſelf as conducted by *ſorrow* to hell, which he deſcribes in a very poetical manner.

"And firſt within the porche and jaws of hell
"Sate diepe *Remorſe of Conſcience*, al beſprent
"With tears; and to herſelfe oft would ſhe tell
"Her wretchednes, and curſing never ſtent
"To ſob and ſigh; but ever thus lament,
"With thoughtful care, as ſhe that all in vayne
"Would weare and waſte continually in payne.

"Her iyes unſtedfaſt rolling here and there,
"Whirl'd on eche place, as place that vengeaunce
"brought
"So was her mind continually in feare,
"Toſſed and tormented with the tedious thought
"Of thoſe deteſted crymes, which ſhe had wrought:
"With dreadful cheare and lookes throwen to
"the ſkye,
"Wiſhing for death, and yet ſhe could not die.

"Next ſawe we *Dread* al trembling how ſhe ſhooke,
"With foote uncertayne prefered here and there:
"Benumde of ſpeeche, and with a gaſtly looke
"Searcht every place al pale and dead for feare,
"His cap borne up with ſtaring of his heare,
"Stoynde and amazde at his own ſhade for dreed,
"And fearing greater daungers than was nede.

"And next within the entry of this lake
"Sate fell *Revenge* gnaſhing her teeth for yre,
"Deviſing meanes how ſhe may vengeaunce take,
"Never in reſt tyll ſhe have her deſire;
"But frets within ſo far forth with the fyer
"Of wreaking flames, that nowe determines ſhee
"To dye by death, or vengde by death to be."

Our Author next deſcribes *Miſery* in the following manner.

His face was leane, and ſum deale pyned away,
And eke his handes conſumed to the bone;
But what his body was, I cannot ſay,
For on his carkas rayment had be none,
Save clouts and patches pieced one by one:
With ſtaffe in hand, and ſkrip on ſhoulders caſt,
His chiefe defence againſt the winters blaſt.

His foode for moſt was wylde fruytes of the tree,
Unles ſumtime ſum crummes fell to his ſhare,
Which in his wallet long, God wote, kept he,
As on the which full dayntlye would he fare.
His drinke the running ſtreame; his cup the bare
Of his palm cloſed; his bed the hard cold grounde:
To this poor life was Miſerie *ybound.*

Whoſe wretched ſtate when we had well behelde,
With tender ruth on him, and on his feares,
In thoughtful cares, furth then our pace we helde,
And by and by another ſhape appears
Of greedy Care, *ſtill bruſhing up the breres;*
His knuckels knobde, his fleſhe deepe dented in,
With tawed handes, and hard ytanned ſkyn.

† *The Peerage of England. By Arthur Collins Esq*; vol. 1. pag. 399. edit. London 1735, in 8vo.

King Philip and Queen Mary; and in the first year of Queen Elizabeth was chosen for the County of Sussex, at the same time that his father was elected for Kent. In the fifth of that Queen he was returned one of the Knights for Buckinghamshire to the Parliament then held †. He travelled into France and Italy, where "he profited very much "in

The morrowe graye no sooner hath begunne
To spread his light even peeping in our eyes,
When he is up, and to his worke yrunne,
But let the nightes blacke mistye mantels rise,
And with fowle darke never so much disguysse
The fair bright day, yet ceaseth he no while,
But hath his candles to prolong his Toyle.

By him lay heavy Slepe, *the cosin of Death,*
Flat on the ground, and stil as any stone,
A very corps, save yielding forth a breath.
Small kepe took he whom fortune frowned on,
Or whom she lifted up into the throne
Of high renowme, but as a living Death,
So dead alyve, of lyef he drew the breath.

The bodyes rest, the quyete of the hart,
The travaylers ease, the still nightes feer was he;
And of our life in earth the better parte;
Rever of sight, and yet in whom we see
Thinges oft that tide, and ofte that never bee:
Without respect esteming equally
King Cresus *pomp, and* Irus *poverty.*

Mr. *Sackville* then describes *Old Age*, desirous of continuing longer in life.

" But who had sene him sobbinge howe he stoode
" Unto himselfe, and howe he would bemone
" His youth forepast, as though it wrought him good
" To talke of youth, al were his youth foregone,
" He would have mused, and mervayled much
" whereon
" This wretched *Age* should life desyre so fayne,
" And knowes ful wel life doth but length his
" payne.

" Crooke-backt he was, tooth-shaken, and blereyed,
" Went on three feete, and sometime crept on fower,
" With old lame bones that ratled by his side,
" His skalpe all pilde, and he with elde forlore,
" His withered fist still knocking at Deathes dore,
" Fumbling and driveling, as he draws his breth,
" For briefe, the shape and messinger of Death.

" And fast by him pale *Maladie* was plaste,
" Sore sick in bed, her colour al forgone,
" Bereft of stomake, savour, and of taste
" Ne could she brooke no meat but brothes alone.
" Her breath corrupt; her keepers every one
" Abhorring her, her sickenes past ne cure.
" Detesting phisicke, and all phisickes cure.

" But oh! the doleful sight that then we see;
" We turnde our looke, and on the other side
" A griesly shape of *Famine* mought we see,
" With griesly lookes, and gaping mouth that cryed,
" And roar'd for Meat, as she would there have dyed;
" Her body thin and bare as any bone,
" Wherto was left nought but the case alone.

" And that alas! was knawen on every where,
" All full of holes, that I ne mought refrayne
" From teares to se how she her armes could teare,
" And with her teeth gnashe on the bones in vayne:
" When all for nought she sayne would so sustayne
" Her starven corp, that rather seemde a shade,
" Then any substaunce of a creature made.

" Great was her force, whom stone-wall could not
stay,
" Her tearing nayles snatching at all she sawe:
" With gaping jawes, that by no means ymay
" Be satisfyed from hunger of her mawe;
" But eates herselfe as she that hath no lawe:
" Gnawing alas! her carkas all in vayne,
" Where you may count eche sinew, bone, and
" vayne.

" On her while we thus firmely fixt our iyes,
" That bled for ruth of such a drery sight,
" Loe sodaynely she shryght in so huge wise,
" As made Hell-gates to shyder with the might;
" Wherewith a darte we sawe howe it did lyght
" Ryght on her brest, and therewithal pale Death
" Enthrylling it to reve her of her breath.

" And by and by a dum dead corps we sawe,
" Heavy and colde, the shape of *Death* aryght,
" That dauntes all earthly creatures to his lawe:
" Against whose force in vayne it is to fyght:
" Ne pieres, ne princes, nor no mortal wyght,
" Ne townes, ne realmes, cities, ne strongest
" tower,
" But al perforce must yield unto his power.

" His dart anon out of his corps he tooke,
" And in his hand (a dreadfull sight to see)
" With great tryumphe estsoones the same he
" shooke,
" That most of all my feares affrayed me:
" His bodye dight with nought but bones perdie;
" The naked shape of man there saw I playne,
" All save the flesshe, the synewe, and the vayne.

" Lastly stoode *Warre* in glitteryng armes yclad,
" With visage grym, stern lookes, and blackely
" hewed;
" In his right hand a naked sworde he had,
" That to the hiltes was al with blud embrewed;
" And in his left (that kinges and kingdomes rewed)
" Famine and fyre he held, and therewythall
" He razed townes, and threwe downe towers
" and all.

" Cities he sakt, and realmes, that whilom floured,
" In honour, glory, and rule above the best,
" He overwhelmed, and all theyr fame devoured,
" Consumed, destroyed, wasted, and never ceast,
" Till he theyr wealth, theyr name, and all oppreste:
" His face forhewed with woundes, and by his
" side
" There hunge his targe with gashes depe and
" wyde.

" In mid's of which depaynted there we founde
" Deadly debate, al full of snaky heare,
" That with a bloudy fillet was ybound,
" Out breathing nought but discord every where."

We shall proceed now to the Lord Buckhurst's *Tragedy of* Ferrex *and* Porrex, *sons to* Gorboduc, *King of* Britaine. Acted before the Queen by the Gentlemen of the Inner-Temple, at Whitehall, 18th January 1561. It was not then published; but afterwards, whilst Lord Buckhurst was in his travels, and about the time, that he was detained at Rome, some Bookseller here took the advantage of his absence, and published it at London 1565 in 8vo in a very incorrect manner (12). After his return, a correct edition of it was published under the following title: *The Tragedy of* Ferrex *and* Porrex, *set forth without addition or alteration, but altogether as the same was shewed on the stage before the Queen's Majesty about nine years past, viz. the eighteenth day of January* 1561, *by the Gentlemen of the Inner-Temple.* Mr. Wood observes (13), that Mr. Thomas Norton, who translated xxvii of David's Psalms into English Verse, and was the Author of several pieces, wrote the three first Acts of this Tragedy; and Mr. Gerard Langbaine (14) mentions an Edition printed at London 1590 in 4to with the following title: *The Tragedy of* Gorboduc; *whereof three Acts were written by* Thomas Norton, *and the two last by* Thomas Sackville; *set forth as the same was shewed before the Queen's most excellent Majesty, in her Highness's Court of Whitehall, by the Gentlemen of the Inner-Temple.* Mr. Wood is mistaken in asserting (15), that it is written *in old English Rhime*; as

(12) Spence, pag. 6, 7. *and* Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 347, 348.

(13) Col. 348. and 77.

(14) *Appendix* to his *Account of the English Dramatick Poets*, edit. Oxon. 1691 in 8vo. See likewise *the Account*, pag. 169.

(15) Col. 348.

(g) Idem, ibid.

(h) Idem, pag. 14.

(i) Stowe's *Chronicle of England*, fol. 661. edit. London 1631.

(k) Abbot, pag. 14. *See likewise* Hollinshed, *ad ann.* 13. *Elizabeth.*

" in the languages, in matter of Story and State (*g*);" and being prisoner at Rome for fourteen days, (which trouble was brought upon him by some, who hated him for his love to Religion, and his duty to his Sovereign,) he behaved himself so prudently, that he was set at liberty (*h*). Upon his return to England, he took possession of the vast estate left to him by his father, in 1566; the greatest part of which he spent in a short time by his magnificent way of life [*D*]. June the 8th 1567 he was created Baron of Buckhurst in Sussex (*i*), and in 1571 was sent Embassador to Charles IX King of France, partly to congratulate his marriage with the daughter of Maximilian the Emperor, and partly about other weighty affairs relating to both Kingdoms (*k*). In 1587 he was sent Embassador into the Low-Countries [*E*] upon a business of a very delicate nature, which he

(16) In the *Preface* to his *Rival Ladies.*

(17) Ibid.

(18) *Apology for Poetry*, edit. London 1595 in 4to.

(19) Spence, pag. 7, 8.

(20) *A Short View of Tragedy, its Original, Excellency and Corruption. With some Remarks on* Shakespear *and other Practitioners for the Stage*, cap. 7. pag. 84, 85. edit. London 1693.

(21) *See* Mr. Spence, *ubi supra*, pag. 8, 9.

Mr. Dryden is likewise in the passage (16), where he tells us, that it is " written in English Verse, and con- " sequently that Verse was not so much a new way " amongst us, as an old way new reviv'd." It is evident, that Mr. Dryden had never seen it, since he stiles it *The Tragedy of Queen* Gorboduc, and represents it as written in rhime, whereas it is in blank Verse; so that Shakespear, notwithstanding Mr. Dryden's allegation (17), was not the first beginner of that way of writing. Sir Philip Sidney (18) has the following passage relating to this Tragedy. *Our Tragedies and Comedies are not without cause cried out against; observing rules neither of honest civility, nor skilful Poetry, excepting* Gorboduc, *(again I say of those I have seen) which notwithstanding, as it is full of stately speeches and well-sounding phrases, climbing to the height of* Seneca's *style, and as full of notable Morality, which it doth most delightfully teach, and so obtain the very end of Poesy; yet in truth it is defectuous in the circumstances; which grieves me, because it might not remain an exact model of all Tragedies.* The defect, of which Sir Philip speaks, is the neglect of the unities of time and place, according to the rules laid down by Aristotle; to which few Authors of any Age, and none of that, have conformed themselves (19). However Mr. Rymer has found the fable and the structure of it worthy his commendation. " *Gorboduc*, " says he (20), is a fable doubtless better turned for " Tragedy, than any on this side the Alps in that " time, and might have been a better direction to " Shakespear and Ben Johnson, than any guide they " had the luck to follow . . . . . Here is a King, a " Queen, and their two sons. The King divides his " Realm, and gives it between his two sons. They " quarrel. The elder brother kills the younger; which " provokes the mother to kill the elder. Thereupon " the King kills the mother; and then, to make a " clear stage, the people rise up and dispatch old " *Gorboduck*. It is objected by our neighbours against " the English, that we delight in bloody spectacles. " Our Poets, who have not imitated *Gorboduck* in the " regularity and roundness of the design, have not " failed on the Theatre to give us the *Atrocité* and " Blood enough in all conscience. From this time " Dramatic Poetry began to thrive with us, and flou- " rish wonderfully." Mr. Pope is of opinion (21), that the *Writers of the succeeding Age might have improved much in other respects by copying from Lord* Buckhurst *a propriety in the sentiments, a dignity in the sentences, an unaffected perspicuity of style, and an easy flow in the numbers; in a word, that chastity, correctness, and gravity of style, which are so essential to Tragedy, and which all the Tragic Poets, who followed, not excepting* Shakespear *himself, either little understood, or perpetually neglected.* There has been an Edition of it just published under the title of *The Tragedy of* Gorboduc: *written by* Thomas Sackville *Lord Buckhurst, afterwards Lord Treasurer to Queen Elizabeth, and Earl of Dorset.* London 1736 in 8vo. To this Tragedy is prefixed *Some Account of Lord* Buckhurst *and his Writings, in a Letter to the Right Honourable the Earl of Middlesex*, by the Reverend Mr. Joseph Spence, Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford; in which Letter he observes, that it was Mr. *Pope*, who *gave this Tragedy to be printed.* We shall transcribe the *Chorus*, at the end of the *fourth Act.*

" When greedy lust in royal seat to reign
" Hath reft all care of Gods and eke of men;
" And cruel heart, wrath, treason, and disdain,
" Within th' ambitious breast are lodged then;
" Behold how mischief wide herself displays,
" And with the brother's hand the brother slays.
" When blood thus shed doth stain this Heaven's
" face,
" Crying to Jove for vengeance of the deed;
" The mighty God ev'n moveth from his place
" With wrath to wreke; then sends he forth with
" speed
" The dreadful furies, daughters of the night,
" With serpents girt, carrying the whip of Ire,
" With hair of stinging snakes, and shining bright
" With flames of blood, and with a brand of fire.
" These for revenge of wretched murder done,
" Do make the mother kill her only son.
" Blood asketh blood, and death must death re-
" quite:
" Jove by his just and everlasting doom,
" Justly hath ever so required it:
" These times before record, and times to come
" Shall find it true, and so doth present proof
" Present before our eyes for our behoof.
" O happy wight, that suffers not the snare
" Of murderous mind to tangle him in blood;
" And happy he, that can in time beware
" By other's harms, and turn it to his good.
" But wo to him that fearing not t' offend,
" Doth serve his lust, and will not see the end."

[*D*] *Took possession of the vast estate left to him by his father; . . . the greatest part of which he spent in a short time by his magnificent way of life.*] Dr. Abbot tells us (22), that upon his coming to court, " on di- " vers occasions he feasted her Highness and her No- " bles; and so he did to foreign Embassadors. At " that time he entertained Musicians the most curi- " ous, which any where he could have; and therein " his Lordship excelled unto his dying day." Sir Robert Naunton (23) observes, that Lord Buckhurst in his youth *spent the best part of the great wealth and the vast patrimony left him by his father, until the Queen by her frequent admonitions diverted the torrent of his profusion. He was a very fine Gentleman of person and endowments, both of art and nature; but without measure magnificent, till on the turne of his honour, and the allay that his yearly good counsell had wrought upon those immoderate courses of his youth, and that height of spirit inherent in his house; and then did the Queen as a most judicious indulgent Prince, who when she saw the man grown settled and stayed, gave him an assistance, and advanced him to the Treasurership, where he made amends to his house for his mis-spent time, both in the increasment of his estate and honour, which the Queen conferred upon him together with the opportunity to remake himself, and thereby to shew, that he was a child that should have a share in her grace.* Lloyd also having observed (24), that in a short time by his magnificent prodigality he had spent the greatest part of his estate, tells us, " that he coming to an Alder- " man of London, who had gained great penny- " worths by his former purchases of him, was made " (being now in the wane of his wealth) to wait the " coming down of the Alderman so long, that his " generous humour being sensible of the incivility of " such attendance, resolved to be no more beholding " to wealthy pride, and presently turned a thrifty im- " prover of the remainder of his estate."

(22) *Sermon preached at Westminster, May* 26, 1608 *at the Funerall Solemnities of the Right Honourable Thomas Earl of Dorset, &c.* pag. 14.

(23) *Fragmenta Regalia*, pag. 34, 35. edit. 1641 in 4to.

(24) *State-Worthies*, pag. 678.

[*E*] *In* 1587 *he was sent Embassador to the Low-Countries.*] After the Earl of Leicester's return from thence, the States-General met, and agreed to invest Prince Maurice, son of William, Prince of Orange, who had been killed at Delft, with the full power and authority

he executed with great ſucceſs (*l*). Upon his return from this Embaſſy, her Majeſty "to give contentation to a great Perſonage *, in thoſe days of high employment, was "pleaſed to command him unto his own houſe [*F*], there privately to remain till her "farther pleaſure was known. Where his Lordſhip did bear himſelf ſo dutifully and "obſequiouſly unto her Highneſs's command, that in all the time of his reſtraint for nine "or ten months ſpace, he never would endure either openly, or ſecretly, either by day "or by night to ſee either wife or child (*m*)." April the 24th 1589 he was elected Knight of the Order of the Garter, but was not inſtall'd till the 18th of December (*n*). The Chancellorſhip of the Univerſity of Oxford becoming void upon the death of Sir Chriſtopher Hatton on the 20th of Nov. 1591, the Earl of Eſſex ſtood for it, being ſupported by thoſe of the Puritanical Party, and was oppoſed by the Lord Buckhurſt, in whoſe favour it was determined by the influence of a letter written by the Queen in his favour; upon which he was elected Chancellor on the 17th of December following (*o*), and in January 159½ he was incorporated Maſter of Arts in that Univerſity (*p*). May the 15th 1598 he was conſtituted Lord High Treaſurer of England; in which poſt the Queen "noted the continual and exceſſive pains and care, which his Lordſhip did take "in her buſineſs, his fidelity in his advices, his dexterity in advancing of her profit (*q*)." In 1600 there being a general ſcarcity of corn, occaſioned partly by immoderate rains about the end of the preceding year, and partly by the coldneſs of the following Spring, beſides the great exportation of it abroad, the populace reproached the Lord Treaſurer for granting Licences to the Exporters; upon which he applied to her Majeſty, who cleared him by a public Proclamation from this charge, and caſt the fault upon ſome private huckſters, ordering thoſe, who had been moſt clamorous upon this occaſion to be ſeized and puniſhed (*r*). King James I, upon his acceſſion to the Throne, continued him in the Poſt of Lord Treaſurer, and on the 13th of March 160¾ created him Earl of Dorſet (*s*). He died ſuddenly at the Council-Table of an Apoplexy [*G*] on the 19th of

(*l*) Abbot, ibid.

* The Earl of Leiceſter. See Note [*F*].

(*m*) Idem, pag. 14, 15.

(*n*) *Peerage of England*, p. 402.

(*o*) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 341.

(*p*) Idem, ibid. col. 142.

(*q*) Abbot, pag. 15.

(*r*) *Camdeni Annales Elizabethæ* vol. 3. pag. 827. edit. Hearne.

(*s*) *Peerage of England*, vol. 1. pag. 406.

authority of Stadtholder, and to appoint him the Captain General of Holland, Zealand, and Frieſland, and to give him the command over all the Militia within the ſaid Provinces. And purſuant to this determination, they obliged all the Officers to receive a new Commiſſion from him, and to take a new oath to the States, and diſcharged all the recuſants whatſoever from the ſervice. Queen Elizabeth appears to have been diſpleaſed with theſe alterations in the Government, and to have reſented the diminution of the Earl of Leiceſter's authority, as an injury offered to herſelf. She immediately ſent over the Lord Buckhurſt to enquire into the matter, to complain of the innovations, which they had introduced in the Earl of Leiceſter's abſence, and to ſettle all differences between them (25). The States in return aſſured her Majeſty, that their late proceedings were but proviſional, and enforced thro' fear of a general revolt upon the loſs of Deventer; and that at the Earl's return they would readily acknowledge both him and his authority in as ample a manner, as if it had been granted him at the firſt (26). Lord Buckhurſt laid before the States the danger of limiting the Earl's authority; ſignified to them her Majeſty's inclination to ſend back the Earl; and oppoſed the alterations made in the Government of the Provinces by the States, but without effect (27). He likewiſe notified the diſtreſſes of the Low-Countries to the Queen; and drew up a new ſcheme for the Government of the United Provinces, which very highly offended the Earl of Leiceſter (28), and ſeems to have been one principal motive of the averſion and hatred he ever after expreſſed towards him (29),

[*F*] *Her Majeſty, to give contentation to a great perſonage, in thoſe days of high employment, was pleaſed to command him unto his own houſe.*] Camden informs us (30), that the Earl of Leiceſter, upon his return from the Low-Countries, finding an accuſation was preparing againſt him by the Lord Buckhurſt, and ſome others of his enemies, for his miſconduct in the management of affairs in the United Provinces, and that he was ſummoned to appear and give an account of his behaviour before the Council, privately threw himſelf at her Majeſty's feet, and implored her protection; earneſtly intreating her, "not to receive him with diſ-"grace upon his return, whom at his firſt departure "ſhe had ſent out with honour; nor bring him down "alive to the grave, whom her former goodneſs had "raiſed from the duſt." The Queen was ſo pacified with his expreſſions of humility and ſorrow, as to paſs by the diſpleaſure, which ſhe had conceived againſt him, and admit him into her former grace and affection. The next day, when it was expected he ſhould give in his anſwer, he took his place at the Council-Table; and when the Secretary began to read his Accuſation, he roſe up and interrupted him, complaining of the injuries which had been offered him, and declaring that his public Commiſſion was limited by private inſtructions; and making his appeal to the Queen, he evaded the Accuſation, and came off in triumph. But the Lord Buckhurſt was treated in a different manner; for the Earl's averſion to him and power with the Queen ſo far prevailed, that a cenſure was paſſed upon his negotiation; and his Lordſhip was confined to his houſe for ſeveral months. The points objected to him, with his Anſwers, and the Replies of the Earl of Leiceſter, are printed in the *Cabala* (39).

(25) *Life of Robert Earl of Leiceſter, the Favourite of Queen Elizabeth. Drawn from Original Writings and Records*, pag. 223, 224. edit. London 1727 in 8vo.

(26) Ibid. pag. 225. *See* Lord Buckhurſt's *Letter to Secretary Walſingham*, in the *Cabala*, Part 2. pag. 14.

(27) *Life of Robert Earl of Leiceſter*, pag. 229, 236.

(28) Ibid. pag. 237, 238.

(29) Ibid. p. 238. *Cabala*, Part 2. p. 61, *& ſeqq.*

(30) *Annales Elizabethæ* lib. 3.

[*G*] *He died ſuddenly at the Council-Table of an apoplexy.*] Arthur Wilſon (32) obſerves, that this *gave occaſion to ſome perſons diſaffected to him (as what eminent Officer, that hath the managing of monies, can pleaſe all?) to ſpeak many things to his diſhonour.* Osborn tells us (33), that the Earl "being a very cor-"rupt man, or much abuſed, did lay claim to ſome "part of the Kentiſh *Lucies* land, that lay contigu-"ous to his own, and miſtruſting the integrity of "any other or more legal trial, did by the high-"neſs of his hand bring it to the Council-Table, "where about this time many cauſes were ſhamefully "carried, and from whence the moſt excellent Chan-"cellor (34) for parts that ever ſate in that Court, "might derive the moſt capital of his faults,) and "after ſome debate the Treaſurer ſtanding up, "and offering to pull out of his boſom papers, that "were pretended for their Lordſhips full and final ſa-"tisfaction, he fell down dead, as called to anſwer at "a higher Tribunal. Neither hath any ſince, as I "have been told by ſome of the family, ever queſ-"tioned *Lucies* Land, in the quiet poſſeſſion of which "he was thus miraculouſly eſtated. Some years af-"ter meeting with the Secretary of Richard Earl of "Dorſet (a noble Gentleman and of good parts, had "they not been poiſoned, together with the owner, by "a future malice and jealouſy in the Duke of Buc-"kingham that he was his enemy) he told me the "Treaſurer was ſubject to ſwooning, which happen-"ing in a place, where there was ſo little help, it "became his death." Echard (35) obſerves that he died as he was pulling out ſome papers relating to a cauſe, which he had brought before the Council; and that his *ſudden death and effeminate life gave occaſion to his enemies to make ſevere and unuſual interpretations*; but that his head being opened there were found in it certain little bags of water, which by breaking might naturally cauſe his death.

(31) Part 2. pag. 55, *& ſeqq.*

(32) *Hiſtory of Great Britain; being the Life and Reign of King James I*, pag. 43. edit. London 1653 in fol.

(33) *Traditional Memoirs on the Reign of King James.* Sect. 42. See the *Works of Francis Osborn Eſq;* pag. 536, 537. 7th edit. London 1673 in 8vo.

(34) Bacon, Lord Verulam.

(35) *Hiſtory of England*, B. 4. cap. 1. pag. 926. edit. London 1707. See likewiſe *Sir Richard Baker's Chronicle.*

of April 1608 (*t*). We ſhall give his character in the Note [*H*]. His Grace Lionel the preſent Duke of Dorſet is lineally deſcended from him [*I*].

(*t*) *Camden's Annals of King James*; and *Arthur Wilſon's Hiſtory of Great Britain, being the Life and Reign of King James I.* pag. 43. edit. London 1656, in fol.

DRABICIUS

[*H*] *We ſhall give his character in the note.*] Sir Robert Naunton tells us (36), that "they much commend his elocution, but more the excellency of his pen; for he was a ſcholar, and a perſon of quick diſpatch, faculties that yet run in the blood; and they ſay of him that his Secretaries did little for him by way of indictment, wherein they could ſeldom pleaſe him; he was ſo facete and choice in his phraſes and ſtyle: and for his diſpatches, and for the content he gave to ſuitors, he had a decorum ſeldom put in practice; for he had of his attendance that tooke into a roll the names of all ſuitors, with the date of their firſt addreſſes; ſo that a freſh man could not leap over his head, that was of a more antient edition, excepting the urgent affairs of the State. . . . . He was wholly intentive to the Queen's ſervice; ſuch were his abilities, that ſhe received aſſiduous proofs of his ſufficiency; and it hath been thought, ſhe might have more cunning inſtruments, but none of more ſtrong judgment and confidence in his ways, which are ſymptoms of magnanimity; whereunto methinks his Motto hath ſome kind of reference, *Aut nunquam tentes, aut perfice.*" Dr. Abbot repreſents his character at large, and informs us (37), that he was an indulgent huſband, a kind father, a firm friend, a generous enemy, true to his word, ſo that an honourable perſon ſoon after the Earl's death gave that teſtimony of him, that *in much converſation and concurrence in many cauſes of great weight and importance, he never heard him ſpeak, or in earneſt affirm that which he found to be otherwiſe.* He lived in a very hoſpitable manner. Having lived ſeventy two years, and being married more than fifty three years to the ſame Lady, *he kept houſe for forty and two years* in an honourable proportion. For thirty of theſe, his family conſiſted of little leſs, in one place or another, than two hundred perſons. But for more than twenty years, beſides workmen and others hired, his number at leaſt was two hundred and twenty daily. *A very rare example*, ſays Dr. Abbot (38), *in this preſent age of ours, when houſe-keeping is ſo decayed.* He was a man of ſtrict juſtice. He bought no land, but he commonly paid more for it than it was worth, giving this reaſon of it, that it would the better proſper and continue in his name and poſterity. In his Will he was careful, that all his debts ſhould be paid. He was very kind to his tenants, of whom he commonly took leſs fines by a third part, than was uſual among other Noblemen. He was extremely charitable to the poor. In the year 1597, which was a time of the greateſt ſcarcity that had been known, "his Lordſhip ſent in- "to Suſſex of his free gift unto ſix Pariſhes ſtore of "Danſke Rie bought at Billingſgate. Divers other "years, and namely this preſent year 1608, his Lord- "ſhip hath cauſed weekly certain quarters of wheat "to be carried from his own granary at Lewes in "Suſſex, and to be ſold in the market to the poor "at a far lower rate than the price, which commonly "men did take (39)." With regard to Religion, *his faith*, ſays Dr. Abbot (40), *was agreeable unto the Word of God, and according to the profeſſion of the renowned Church of England. In that famous Univerſity of Oxford, where his Lordſhip for more than ſixteen years was our honourable Chancellor, it was his ſpeciall care to ſubſtitute ſuch under him as were moſt ſound for Religion; which the wiſer ſort did obſerve, although common men did not mark it. As he kept down with the one hand all novelties and humours in opinions, which laboured to ſet trouble in the Church and Commonwealth; ſo with the other hand to the utmoſt of his power he depreſſed the Prieſts and Jeſuits, which have uſed too much to that place, not to the Univerſity, which, God be praiſed, is free from all ſuch imputation; but to ſome few of the city, who embrace their old ſuperſtitions. In that place I can witneſs, that his Lordſhip neither openly nor ſecretly did ever give countenance unto any that was backward in Religion. And on the other ſide, that there never was any thing ſoberly and wiſely purpoſed, which might forward true piety, which his Lordſhip did not further.* But Oſborn (41) gives him a more diſadvantageous character, and tells us, that "he was much given to women and corruption in the general opinion; after whom theſe "Verſes were ſent, it being, *ſays our Author*, the faſhion of the Poets all my days, to ſum up great men's virtues or vices upon their graves; theſe with many more to a like ſenſe belonging to this man:

(36) *Fragmenta Regalia*, pag. 31.

(37) Pag. 16.

(38) Ibid.

(39) Ibid. pag. 17, 18.

(40) Pag. 18.

(41) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 537.

"*Diſcourteous death, that would'ſt not once conſor,*
"*Or deign to parley with our Treaſurer:*
"*Had he been thee, or of thy fatal tribe,*
"*He would have ſpar'd a life to gain a bribe.*

"Another:

"*Here lies a Lord, that wenching thought no ſin,*
"*And bought his fleſh by ſelling of our ſkin:*
"*His name was* Sackvile; *and ſo void of pity,*
"*As he did rob the country with the city.*"

[*I*] Lionel, *the preſent Duke of* Dorſet, *is deſcended from him.*] The Earl married Cecily, daughter of Sir John Baker, Knt. and by her had iſſue, 1. *Robert*, Earl of Dorſet. 2. *Henry*. 3. *William*, who was knighted in France by King Henry IV in October 1589, at the age of nineteen, and loſt his life in the wars in that Kingdom in 1591. 4. *Thomas*, who diſtinguiſhed himſelf againſt the Turks in 1595: and three Daughters, *Anne*, married to Sir Henry Glenham of Glenham in Suffolk; *Jane*, married in February 1591, to Anthony Viſcount Mountacute; and *Mary*, married to Sir Henry Nevile, ſon and heir to Edward Lord Abergavenny. ROBERT, eldeſt ſon and heir, was above 47 years old at the deceaſe of his father. He had all the advantages of education, attained ſeveral languages, and had a ſingular knowledge in many ſciences. He was elected for the Borough of Lewes in Suſſex in the 31ſt year of Queen Elizabeth; and in all other Parliaments, whilſt he continued a Commoner, was one of the Knights for that County. He lived in the dignity of an Earl not a full year, and died at Dorſet-houſe near Fleetſtreet in London, February 27th 160⅞, and was interr'd at Withiam, according to his directions, where a noble monument was erected to his memory. His firſt Lady was Mary, only daughter of Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk, and ſhe dying Sept. 4th 1591, he married *Anne*, Widow of Henry Lord Compton; but had iſſue only by his firſt wife, viz. three ſons, 1. *Thomas*, who died in his infancy 1581. 2. *Richard*, who ſucceeded him in his honours. 3. *Edward*, ſucceſſor to his brother: and three daughters, *Winifrede*, who died in her infancy in 1587; *Cecily*, married to Sir Henry Compton, Knight of the Bath, third ſon to Henry Lord Compton; and *Anne*, married firſt to Edward Seymour, Lord Beauchamp, grandſon to Edward Earl of Hertford, and afterwards to Sir Edward Lewes, Knight. RICHARD, Earl of Dorſet, born March 28th 1589, in the Charter-Houſe, London, was married to the Lady Anne Clifford, daughter and heir of George Earl of Cumberland, February 28th, 160⅞; and his father dying two days after, became Earl of Dorſet. He lived with great magnificence and hoſpitality in his houſes at Knowle in Kent, Bolebrook in Suſſex, and Dorſet-Houſe in London, and died March 28th 1624, and was interred at *Withiam*. He had three ſons, who died infants; and two daughters, Lady *Margaret*, born at Dorſet-Houſe July 2d 1614, who was married to John Tufton, Earl of Thanet; and Lady *Iſabella*, born at Knowle in Kent, October 6th 1622, and married July 5th 1647, to James Compton, Earl of Northampton. He was ſucceeded in the Earldom of Dorſet by his younger brother, Sir EDWARD SACKVILLE, who was born in 1590, and in 1613, narrowly eſcaped with his life in a duel with the Lord Bruce, a particular account of which we have in a manuſcript in the *Aſhmolean Muſeum* Library at Oxford, and in the *Guardian*. At the creation of Charles Prince of Wales, November 3d 1616, he was one of the Knights of the Bath, and having been elected one of the Knights for the County of Suſſex, was one of the leading Members in the Houſe of Commons. He was preſent at the battle of Prague in 1620, and in July 1621, ſucceeded Sir Edward Herbert as Embaſſador to the King of

DRABICIUS (NICHOLAS), a famous Enthuſiaſt of the ſeventeenth Century, was born about the year 1587 (*a*) at Stranſnitz in Moravia, where his father was Burgomaſter. He was admitted Miniſter in 1616, and exerciſed his function at Drahotutz; and when he was obliged to ſeek a retreat in foreign countries on account of the ſevere Edicts of the Emperor againſt the Proteſtant Religion, he retired to Lednitz, a town in Hungary, in 1629 (*b*). He had no hopes of being reſtored to his Church, and therefore turned Woollen-draper, in which employment his wife, who was a daughter of one of the

(*a*) Comenius born in March 1592 ſays, *Hiſt. Revelat.* pag. 138. that *Drabicius* was five years older than himſelf. *Moreri* places the birth of *Drabicius* on the 5th of Decemb. 1588.

(*b*) Comen. ibid. pag. 141.

France; and was made one of the Privy Council to King James. Succeeding his brother as Earl of Dorſet, he was elected Knight of the Garter May 15th 1625, and inſtalled November 23d following. After the breaking out of the Civil Wars, he was appointed Lord Chamberlain of the Houſhold to King Charles I. He died July 17, 1652, and was interred at Withiam. Several of his ſpeeches are publiſhed. The Earl of Clarendon, who has made ſome miſtakes in the account, which he gives of his Lordſhip and his family, gives him this character: "That his perſon was beautiful "and graceful, and vigorous; his wit pleaſant, ſparkling, and ſublime; and his other parts of learning "and language of that luſtre, that he could not miſcarry in the world. The vices he had were of the "age, which he was not ſtubborn enough to contemn "or reſiſt. Yet his known parts, and the very good "general Reputation he had acquired, notwithſtanding his defects (for as he was eminent in the Houſe "of Commons whilſt he ſat there, ſo he ſhined in the "Houſe of Peers, when he came to move in that "ſphere) inclined King James to call him to his Privy "Council before his death. And if he had not too "much cheriſhed his natural conſtitution and propenſity, he would have been an excellent man of buſineſs; for he had a very ſharp, diſcerning ſpirit, "and was a man of an obliging nature, much honour, "and great generoſity, and of moſt intire fidelity to "the Crown." By his Lady Mary, daughter and heir of Sir George Curſon of Croxhall in Derbyſhire, Knt. he had iſſue a daughter, *Mary*, who died young, and two ſons, *Richard*, his ſucceſſor, and *Edward*, who married Bridget Baroneſs Norris, daughter and ſole heir of Edward Wray, Eſq; by his wife Elizabeth, daughter and heir of Francis Lord Norris, Earl of Berkſhire. This *Edward* was killed at Chawley in Comnore Pariſh near Abingdon, by a common ſoldier of the garriſon at Abingdon, on the 11th of April, 1646 (43) leaving no iſſue. His brother RICHARD, Earl of Dorſet, born at Dorſet-Houſe Sept. 16th 1622, was elected for the Borough of Eaſt Grinſted in Suſſex, to the Parliament which met in November 3d 1640, and ſucceeding his father in 1652, lived retired till the Reſtoration, after which he was appointed Lord Lieutenant of the County of Suſſex. By his Lady Frances, daughter of Lionel Cranfield, Earl of Middleſex, and at laſt heir to Lionel, Earl of Middleſex, her brother, he had iſſue ſeven ſons; 1. *Charles*, his ſucceſſor. 2. *Edward*, born April 2d 1641, who died unmarried in 1678. 3. *Lionel*, who was born June 25th 1645, and died July the 21ſt following; 4. *Richard*, who died in 1712; 5. *Lionel*, born October the 25th 1656, who died young. 6. *Cranfield*, born Dec. 18th 1660, who died January 1ſt following. 7. *Thomas*, born February 3d 1662, who died Auguſt 19th 1675. Alſo ſix daughters, *Elizabeth*, *Anne*, and *Catherine*, who died young; *Mary*, born February 4th 1646, married to Roger Boyle, Lord Broghill, ſon and heir of Roger Earl of Orrery; *Anne*, born June 7th 1650, and married to Alexander Earl of Hume in Scotland; *Frances*, born February 6th 1665, married to Sir George Lane, Bart. created Lord Viſcount Laneſborough, and afterwards to —— Muſtian, Eſq;. CHARLES, Earl of Dorſet, eldeſt ſon of *Richard* Earl of Dorſet, was born June 24th 1637. The ſprightlineſs of his wit, and his exceeding good nature, recommended him very early to the intimacy of King Charles II. and thoſe of the greateſt eminency in the Court; but his mind being rather turned to books and converſation, than to what more immediately concerned the public buſineſs, though, as Biſhop Burnet in the *Hiſtory of his own Time* obſerves, "the King courted him for a favourite. "But when the honour and ſafety of his Country de"manded his aſſiſtance, he readily entered into the "moſt active parts of life, and underwent the greateſt "dangers with a conſtancy of mind, which ſhewed he "had not only read the rules of philoſophy, but under-

(43) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 155.

"ſtood the practice of them." Being poſſeſſed of the eſtate of his uncle the Earl of Middleſex, who died in 1674, he was created Earl of that County, and Baron of Cranfield in Bedfordſhire, by Letters Patents bearing date at Weſtminſter April 4th 1675; and in Auguſt 1677 ſucceeded his father as Earl of Dorſet. His firſt wife Elizabeth, daughter of Harvey Bagot of Pipe-Hall in Warwickſhire Eſq; and widow of Charles Berkley, Earl of Falmouth, dying without any iſſue, he married March 7th 168$\frac{4}{5}$ the Lady Mary, daughter of James Compton, Earl of Northampton, who was one of the Ladies of the Bed-Chamber to Queen Mary, and died Aug. 6th 1691, leaving iſſue by him, *Lionel* now Duke of Dorſet, and one daughter, the Lady Mary, who was married in 1702 to Henry Somerſet, Duke of Beaufort, and died in child-bed June 18th 1705. He had a very conſiderable hand in the Revolution, and in the Debates in Parliament, argued and voted for the vacancy of the Throne, and that the Prince and Princeſs of Orange ſhould be declared King and Queen of England. When their Majeſties had accepted of the Crown, his Lordſhip was the next day ſworn of their Privy Council, and declared Lord Chamberlain of their Houſhold. Febr. 2d 169$\frac{1}{2}$ he was elected Knight of the Garter, and inſtalled on the 24th of that month; and was four times conſtituted one of the Regents of the Kingdom during his Majeſty's abſence. April 19th 1697 he voluntarily reſigned the place of Lord Chamberlain. He died at Bath January 29th 170$\frac{1}{6}$, and was interred at Withiam on the 17th of February following. He was a great patron of men of Letters, and wrote ſeveral beautiful pieces printed in *Dryden's Miſcellanies* and elſewhere. Mr. Dryden in the Dedication of his Tranſlation of *Juvenal* to his Lordſhip, and Mr. Prior in the Dedication of his *Poems* to the preſent Duke of Dorſet, have drawn his character to great advantage.* His ſon and ſucceſſor LIONEL Earl of Dorſet, born January 18th 168$\frac{7}{8}$, was on the 28th of December 1708 conſtituted Conſtable of Dover Caſtle, and Lord Warden and Lord Admiral of the Cinque-Ports, which office he reſigned in 1713. On the demiſe of Queen Anne, his Lordſhip was commiſſioned by the Regency to go to Hanover, and notify her death in form, and congratulate his Majeſty's acceſſion to the Crown; whereupon his Majeſty before his leaving the yatch, which brought him to England, appointed him firſt Gentleman of his Bed-Chamber, and on the 8th of October 1714 Conſtable of Dover-Caſtle, and Lord Warden of the Cinque-Ports, having before been ſworn of his Privy-Council. On the 16th of the ſame month he was elected Knight of the Garter. June 13th 1720 he was created Duke of Dorſet; and May 30th 1725 he was appointed Lord Steward of his Majeſty's Houſhold; and on the 7th of June following, one of the Lords Juſtices during the King's abſence, as he was likewiſe again on the 31ſt of May 1727. At the Coronation of his preſent Majeſty, his Grace was Lord Steward of his Houſhold, and appointed Lord High Steward of England on that ſolemn occaſion. January 11th 172$\frac{7}{8}$ he was confirmed in the office of Lord Warden of the Cinque-Ports, and Conſtable of Dover-Caſtle. June 19th 1730, upon reſigning his place of Lord Steward of the Houſhold, he was declared in Council Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. January 170$\frac{8}{9}$ his Grace married Elizabeth, daughter of Lieutenant-General Walter-Philip Collier, brother to David Earl of Portmore; by whom he had iſſue, 1. Lady *Anne*, who died March 23d 172$\frac{0}{1}$ in the 11th year of her age; 2. *Charles*, Earl of Middleſex, born Febr. 6th 171$\frac{0}{1}$; 3. Lady *Elizabeth*, who was married Decemb. 6th 1726 to Thomas Lord Viſcount Weymouth, but died before cohabitation, whilſt his Lordſhip was on his travels, June 29th 1729; 4. Lord *John Philip Sackville*, born June 22d 1713; 5. Lord *George Sackville*, born January 26th 171$\frac{3}{6}$; 6. Lady *Carolina*. T.

the ſame buſineſs was of great ſervice to him. He endeavoured to perſuade the other Miniſters to betake themſelves to ſome ſecular employment, notwithſtanding the regulations made to prevent ſuch a diſorder [*A*]; and he forgot ſo much the decorum of his former character, that he became one of the hardeſt drinkers in the country, and indulged himſelf in all the actions of a lay-man (*c*). Finding himſelf, in danger of being robbed as he returned from a fair, he defended himſelf, and was wounded, and perhaps would not have eſcaped ſo well if he had not been aſſiſted. The other Miniſters juſtly ſcandalized at his conduct informed their ſuperiors of it, who in a Synod, which was called in Poland, examined into the affair. It was reſolved that Drabicius ſhould be ſuſpended from the Miniſtry, and that if he did not live in an edifying manner, the diſcipline of the Church ſhould be exerciſed upon him (*d*). This ſeverity of the Synod induced him to behave himſelf with more decency. But the caſe was quite different, when he imagined himſelf become a Prophet. He had his firſt viſion on the night of the 23d of February 1638, and the ſecond on the night of the 23d of January 1643. The firſt viſion promiſed him in general great armies from the North and Eaſt, which ſhould cruſh the Houſe of Auſtria; the ſecond declared particularly, that Ragotſki ſhould command the army from the Eaſt, and ordered Drabicius to inform his brethren, that God was about to reſtore them to their own country, and to revenge the injuries done to his people, and that they ſhould prepare themſelves for this deliverance by faſting and prayer. He received orders to write down what had been revealed to him, and to begin in the manner of the antient Prophets, *The word of the Lord came unto me* (*e*). The next day he communicated his viſion to the Miniſters, who were refugees in the ſame place with him. They communicated it likewiſe to others, but they paid no regard to it. Theſe two firſt viſions were followed by a great many others in the ſame year 1643; and there was one, which ordered, that he ſhould open the whole affair to Comenius (*f*), who was then at Elbing in Pruſſia. One of the viſions in January 1644 aſſured Drabicius, that the Imperial troops ſhould not deſtroy the refugees (*g*). They committed great ravages upon the territories of Ragotſki, plundered the town of Leidnitz, and beſieged the caſtle. Drabicius ſhut himſelf up there, and whether he had ſome little diſtruſt of the viſion, or whether he thought that the good cauſe had occaſion for aſſiſtance, he did not amuſe himſelf with prayers: he ſtood near the cannon as they were firing againſt the beſiegers, and ſet his hand to the work [*B*]. Unhappily for him the flame flew into his face, and almoſt deprived him of one of his eyes. The Imperialiſts raiſed the ſiege. But ſome time

(*c*) *Politicâ illâ cum plebe converſatione corrumpi, licentioſiuſque poculis indulgenda profanioris vitæ exemplis abripi viſus eſt.* Ibid. pag. 339.

(*d*) Idem, ibid. pag. 139, 140.

(*e*) *De his viſis & auditis in ſcriptum referendis mandatum accipit . . . & à verbis illis* Factum eſt ad me verbum Domini *(ſic non aliter) inchoare jubetur.* Comenius, *Hiſt. Revelat.* pag. 141.

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 143.

(*g*) Ibid. pag. 145.

[*A*] *The regulations made to prevent ſuch a diſorder.*] The ſuperiors of the Miniſters in exile took care to make an order, that every one ſhould continue in the town, which he had choſen for the place of his habitation; and that though every congregation had but one Paſtor, the reſt of the Miniſters ſhould preach in their turn. This appointment was made to avoid two great inconveniencies. The one was, that without this ſome of them would have run about from place to place to collect alms: *Volebant patres noſtri Eccleſiis orbatos Paſtores, confratres ſuos, non mendicitati vacare, & ſtipis quærendæ cauſa alienas terras* (ut ab aliis factitatum vidimus) *pererrare.* (1). The other was, that by diſcontinuing to preach they would become leſs fit for the ſervice of a Church, if God ſhould ever recall them to their former functions. *Ut exilii tractu nemo prorſus laboribus ſacris deſueſceret, potius ſeſe mutuâ diligentiâ magis acuerent: ut ſi Deus noſtri miſertus rurſum nos Eccleſiis redderet, nemo hebetatus rediret, exercitatior potiùs* (2).

(1) Comen. *Hiſt. Revel.* pag. 139.

(2) Idem, ibid.

[*B*] *He ſhut himſelf up in the Caſtle of Leidnitz . . . He ſtood by the Canon . . . . and put his hand to the work.*] Comenius blames him for this, *Drabicio tamen,* ſays he (3), *vitio datum, quòd dum ex Arce tormenta in hoſtem librarentur, ille non intereſſe tantùm* (ad alios præſentiæ divinæ ſpe, juxta promiſſionem ſibi factam, animandum) *ſed & tormento uni ignem ipſemet admovere voluit: cum eum in angulo eſſe, & precibus vacare, præſtitiſſet. Sed inconſideratus hic novi Petri (materiali gladio Dominum defendere præſumentis) zelus à Domino ipſo caſtigatus fuit: permiſſo ut flammæ pars in illum retrò ſe agens faciem illi ambureret, oculumque alterum læderet. Utili commonitorio, ut quiſque ſibi demandata faciat, aliena munia aliis relinquat.* i. e. " However Drabicius was cenſured, becauſe when the " cannon was fired from the caſtle againſt the enemy, " he not only would be preſent *(to animate the reſt " by hopes of the Divine Preſence, according to the " promiſe made to him,)* but likewiſe fire one of the " cannon himſelf; whereas it had been more proper " for him to have been in a corner, and applied himſelf to prayer. But the imprudent zeal of this new " Peter (preſuming to defend the Lord with the material ſword) was chaſtiſed by the Lord himſelf, " who permitted part of the flame to recoil and burn " his face, and hurt one of his eyes; which is an " uſeful inſtruction, that every man ſhould diſcharge " his own office, and leave others to perform their " particular province." A man, who believes that he has Revelations, ought to be full of faith; he ought to ſay, *fata viam invenient,* i. e. " The fates " will find out a way."

(3) Idem, ibid. pag. 145.

But on the contrary we ſee very often, that ſuch a man diſtruſts the Providence of God, unleſs it be aſſiſted by all that human prudence can contribute on its part. Our inſpired perſons, or thoſe who call themſelves ſo, allow themſelves leſs repoſe than other people: their agitation, ſollicitude and vigilance in preparing human means, which may be capable of bringing about events the leaſt foreſeen and foretold, ſhew that they are too much influenced by thoſe Pagan maxims, which I have mentioned in the Article of Acosta (4); namely, that after the example of the Lacedemonians the Gods are to be invoked by putting our hand to the work, and that according to the precept of Heſiod, the huſbandman ſhould ſay his Prayers with his hand on the plough (5); and that in ſhort the Prayers of the ſlothful are unacceptable to Heaven, and ſent back empty.

Sibi quiſque profecto
Eſt Deus: ignavis precibus fortuna repugnat (6).

The King of Macedon was ridiculed (7), becauſe he immediately retired out of the battle, under pretence of offering ſacrifices to Hercules: it was ſaid, that victory is due only to that General, who aſks it of the Gods by fighting valiantly: This is the true way of being heard, ſay the Pagans: Ἀλλὰ ταῖς Αἰμιλίου παρῆν εὐχαῖς ὁ θεός· εὔχετο γὰρ κράτος πολέμου καὶ νίκην δόρυ κρατῶν, καὶ μαχόμενος παρεκάλει σύμμαχον τὸν θεόν. *Sed Pauli precibus volens propitiuſque annuit Deus, quippe petebat victoriam belli & palmam haſtam tenens, pugnanſque opem implorabat Dei* (8). i. e. " But God willingly " granted the Prayers of Æmilius, becauſe he deſired " victory with the ſpear in his hand, and requeſted " the aſſiſtance of the Deity as he fought." Our pretended Prophets in reality purſue theſe notions.

(4) Note [*B*].

(5) In this manner ſome underſtand the paſſage of Heſiod, lib. 2. Ἔργ. καὶ ἡμέρ. ver. 83.

(6) Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 8. ver. 72.

(7) Plutarch *in Paulo Æmilio,* pag. 265.

(8) Idem, ibid. C.

time after they beſieged the place again, and took it. The refugees were plundered, contrary to the article of capitulation, by which they were to have their lives and goods ſecured to them (*b*). Thus fell Drabicius into the hands of the Imperialiſts. This did not prevent him from going to Ragotſki, and telling him in Auguſt 1645, that God commanded him to deſtroy the Houſe of Auſtria and the Pope [*C*], and that if he refuſed to attack that neſt of vipers, he would draw down upon his family a general ruin, which ſhould not ſpare even *him that piſſeth again the wall.* The Prince already knew, that Drabicius had aſſumed the character of a Prophet; for Drabicius, according to the reiterated orders, which he received in his extaſies, had ſent him a copy of his revelations, which Ragotſki threw into the fire (*i*). With regard to the command which the Prophet brought to him in perſon, he anſwered that a treaty of peace had juſt before been concluded (*k*). The death of that Prince, which happened in the month of October 1647, plunged Drabicius into extreme ſorrow: he feared that his revelations would vaniſh into mere ſmoke, and ſaw himſelf expoſed to ridicule. But he had one extatic conſolation, which reanimated him, and forbad him caſting into the fire his writings, ſince God would ſend him Comenius, to whom they ſhould be conſigned (*l*). Comenius having ſome buſineſs in Hungary in 1650 [*D*], ſaw there Drabicius himſelf and his prophecies, and made ſuch reflections as he thought proper, upon the viſions having for three years before promiſed Drabicius that he ſhould have Comenius for a Coadjutor. It is ſomewhat remarkable, that Sigiſmond Ragotſki being urged by Drabicius to make war againſt the Emperor, and by his mother to continue in peace with him, could not tell what to do, attacked as he was on both ſides with terrible threats. Drabicius denounced againſt him the judgments of the Almighty in caſe of peace, and his mother threatened him with her curſe in caſe of war. In this perplexity he recommended himſelf to the prayers of Drabicius and Comenius (*m*), and kept himſelf quiet till his death, that is, till the 4th of February 1652. Comenius, who expected nothing of this (*n*), was ſtrangely ſurprized at it. The Angel, who informed him of every thing, had not revealed to him this great Article [*E*]. George Ragotſki, Prince of Tranſilvania, brother

(*b*) Ibid.

(*i*) Ibid. pag. 146.

(*k*) Ibid. pag. 148.

(*l*) Ibid. pag. 148, 149.

(*m*) Ibid. pag. 156.

(*n*) Ibid. pag. 157.

[*C*] *He went to Ragotſki and told him .... that God commanded him to deſtroy the Houſe of Auſtria and the Pope.*] He received orders to go to the camp of that Prince, and to ſpeak to him at firſt in a gentle, and afterwards in a threatning manner. He was to begin with informing the Prince, that God had choſen him King of Hungary, but that it was on condition, that he ſhould overthrow the dominion of the Houſe of Auſtria and the Pope, in which God would aſſiſt him in a very particular manner. In the concluſion he was to aſſure him, that if he reſiſted the voice of God, every one belonging to him ſhould be deſtroyed, even to the very dogs. " (9) Ignarus horum arcanorum Drabicius (10), mandatum accipit " 22. Julii & 31. Julii Principis Racocii caſtra adeundi, " Principemque primùm blandis verbis, deinde duris, " alloquendi. *Blandis: electum eſſe divinitùs in Regem Hungariæ, ſed eâ conditione ut Auſtriacæ & " Papali dominationi finem imponat: habiturus auxilio Deum ad omnes hoſtiles exercitus clade afficiendum* " (Rev. XXX.) *Duris autem: ſi viperinam illam " progeniem perſequi renuerit, mala inducturum eſſe " Deum, exciſurumque de Domo ejus mingentem etiam " ad parietem* (Rev. XXXI. v. 4.)" i. e. " *Drabicius being ignorant of theſe ſecrets received a command on the 22d and 31ſt of July to go to the Camp " of Prince Ragotſki, and ſpeak to the Prince at firſt " in gentle, and afterwards in ſevere terms:* In gentle " terms, that he was choſen by heaven King of Hungary, but upon this condition, that he ſhould put " an end to the Dominion of the Houſe of Auſtria and " the Pope; and that he would be aſſiſted by God in " deſtroying all the armies of the enemy *(Rev. XXX.)* " In ſevere terms, that if he ſhould refuſe to purſue " with vengeance that race of vipers, God would " bring on him calamity, and cut off from his houſe " even him that piſſeth againſt the wall *(Revel. " XXXI. v.* 4.") This was an exact imitation of the ſtyle and manner of the antient Prophets. I do not find, that Drabicius ſpoke himſelf to the Prince; but communicated his commiſſion to him by other perſons (11).

(9) *Hiſtor. Revelat.* pag. 147.

(10) That is, Drabicius did not know that the Turk had ſent Courier after Courier to Ragotski to forbid his joining his troops with the Swedes in Moravia in 1645, and the Emperor offered Ragotski the moſt favourable conditions of peace.

(11) *Per Theologum, Medicum, Aulæque magiſtrum de ſibi commiſſis informat.* Drabicius, *Hiſt. Revel.* pag. 147.

[*D*] *Comenius having buſineſs in Hungary in* 1650.] The Proteſtants, whom the Emperor had baniſhed from his dominions, had always entertained hopes of returning thither: ſome grounded their expectations on the leagues formed againſt the Emperor; others upon the viſions of ſome Enthuſiaſts. During the life of Guſtavus the affair became almoſt certain, and there was no reaſon to deſpair after his death; for his Lieutenants continued the war to the honour of their nation, and the advantage of the league. The refugees were in hopes therefore, that the recalling of them would be one of the articles of the Peace of Munſter. But they ſaw with regret, that this long and important negotiation was concluded in January 1650 without taking the leaſt notice of their baniſhment. The Houſe of Auſtria managed with ſuch addreſs, that it obtained terms vaſtly more advantageous than it could have promiſed itſelf: the Church paid for the Emperor, notwithſtanding the proteſtations of the Court of Rome: all that had been done againſt the Sectaries of his Dominions continued fixed and immoveable. Thus the poor refugees, who were diſperſed in divers places, ſaw themſelves without any manner of hopes, and reſolved to call an aſſembly to conſult of affairs. *Pacis Monaſterii & Oſnabrugæ ſexennio agitatæ, tandemque concluſæ; iterumque Norimbergæ biennio ventilatæ, tandemque terminatæ, ultima publicatio incidit in Januarium anni* 1650. *Quâ Bohemiæ Regno, cum incorporatis Provinciis, hæreditatis nomine, Auſtriacæ Domui relictis,* diſperſi propter Evangelium à ſpe reditûs æternùm excluſi, quid jam agendum eſſet deliberare cœperunt (12). Thoſe of Poland deſired that the reſt ſhould ſend their deputies to them; all agreed except the Hungarians. The refugees in Hungary alledged for excuſe among an hundred other things, that they had often ſent Deputies to Poland ſince their common baniſhment, and that it was reaſonable that they ſhould for once come to them. They demanded particularly, that Comenius the Surintendant of the Churches of Moravia might be ſent to them: this was the more eaſily conſented to, becauſe Comenius was at that time ſent for by Prince Sigiſmond Ragotſki to conſult upon ſome points relating to the reformation of the ſchools (13). This was the reaſon, which induced Comenius, when he left Elbing, to paſs through Sileſia and Moravia into Hungary, where he celebrated the feaſt of Eaſter with ſeveral Miniſters and Gentlemen deputed thither. Drabicius was preſent there, and communicated to him his Revelations, and from that time made him in ſome meaſure his Coadjutor (14).

(12) Ibid. pag. 49.

(13) See the Article of COMENIUS in the Text, between the Quotations (*b*) and (*i*).

(14) Comenius, *Hiſt. Rev.* pag. 149, 150.

[*E*] *Ragotſki died in* 1652. .... *The Angel, who informed Comenius of every thing, had not revealed to him this great article.*] This expreſſion, which is imitated from a paſſage in the *Memoirs of the Ducheſs of Mazarin*, offering itſelf, I have made uſe of it. I hope I ſhall be excuſed for it. Drabicius is here the Angel who informed Comenius of every thing; but he

ther of the deceaſed, knew nothing of all this prophetical management; but Comenius gave him a particular account of it, by preſenting him with the writings of Drabicius. The latter was reſtored to the Miniſtry the 20th of June 1654 (*o*). Comenius did this as he paſſed through Hungary in his return to Poland. After his departure from the Court of Tranſilvania, it was neceſſary to employ another perſon to inform the Prince of the viſions of Drabicius. They preſented themſelves more frequently than ever, and ordered from time to time that they ſhould be communicated to the Coadjutor, in order that he might publiſh them to the Nations and Languages, and all people of the earth, and particularly to the Tartars and Turks (*p*). Comenius found himſelf embarraſſed between the fear of God and that of men: he was apprehenſive, that by not printing the Revelations of Drabicius he ſhould diſobey God; and by printing them, he ſhould expoſe himſelf to the ridicule and cenſure of men. He took a middle way (*q*). He reſolved to print them, and not to diſtribute the copies; and upon this account he entitled the book, *Lux in tenebris* (*r*). But his reſolution of concealing this light under a buſhel did not continue long; it gave way to two remarkable events, which were taken for a grand criſis, and the unravelling of the myſtery. One of theſe events was the irruption of Ragotſki into Poland [*F*]; the other the death of the Emperor Ferdinand III. Neither of theſe events were of any ſervice to the predictions; on the contrary, they ſerved to confound them. Ragotſki periſhed in his deſcent into Poland; and Leopold King of Hungary was elected Emperor in the room of Ferdinand III his father; an election, which reſtored the Houſe of Auſtria to its former grandeur in Germany, or very near it, and abſolutely ruined the Proteſtants in Hungary. The hopes founded on theſe two events being ſoon blaſted, Drabicius was the greateſt ſufferer by it [*G*]; for the Court of Vienna being informed, that he was the perſon who ſounded the trumpet againſt the Houſe of Auſtria, ſought means to puniſh him, and, as it is ſaid, ſucceeded in it. Comenius had nothing to fear on that account: he had ſecured himſelf in an impenetrable aſylum; he was become a citizen of Amſterdam, and enjoyed there all kinds of protection. He had nothing to fear but the pen of certain Divines, and the reproaches of Ragotſki's Secretary [*H*]; but this was of no conſequence to a man, who wanted neither wit,

(*o*) Ibid. pag. 177.

(*p*) Ibid. pag. 179.

(*q*) Ibid. pag. 183.

(*r*) See the Note [*A*] of the Article KOTTERUS.

was ſo far from acquainting him with the death of Ragotſki before it happened, that he ſent him Revelations after that Prince's death, which ſuppoſed him to be ſtill living. One of their confidents ſaid upon that occaſion, that undoubtedly Drabicius trifled with them: Comenius was ſtopped, but having had time to conſider of the affair, and examine the conformity of ſeveral viſions, he found that they had prefigured the death of the Prince a year before. Theſe are the people for my money; they never are at a loſs, if they have but time to adjuſt their affairs. *Febris malignæ morbo correptus fuit* (Sigiſmundus Racocius) *quæ illi* 4. *Februarii vitæ finem attulit. Quod quia nec prædictum adeò, nec exſpectatum fuit, novus offenſionis lapis fuit factum. Præſertim cùm Drabicius novas ſuas nobis ſubmittens Revelationes, tanquam de vivente adhuc ſermocinaretur, quem nos non vivere jam certi eramus. Hinc amicorum rei conſciorum unus (J. T.) ad me:* Ludificamur quàm verè vivit Deus. *Ad quod nihil quod reſponderem habens obmutui. Nunc iſta ordine relegenti ſapientiæ Dei veſtigia manifeſtè ſeſe oſtentant* (15).

(15) Idem, pag. 156, 157.

[*F*] *The deſcent of Ragotſki into Poland.*] Comenius frankly acknowledges, that he took this for an accompliſhment of the Prophecy, which their three Seers had declared, that the Eaſt ſhould join with the North to bring on the terrible day of the Lord (16). He owns likewiſe very ingenuouſly that he was miſtaken: he could not deny it, becauſe Ragotſki's fooliſh deſign was attended with the worſt ſucceſs imaginable. But ſee what cauſe Comenius aſſigns for his miſtake: it was, ſays he (17), becauſe I had not ſufficiently obſerved, that according to the prophecies of Chriſtina Poniatovia the Eaſtern and the Northern Lions were not to meet except to confer together, and that they ſhould not even come to a good underſtanding, but part without doing any thing. Add to this, ſays he, that, according to Drabicius, it was not neceſſary that Ragotſki ſhould enter into Poland without having taken meaſures with the Tartars and Turks, and ſettled affairs in his own country. We thought, continues he, that he had done all this before he took the field, and we were deceived in that point. Conſider this well, and you will ſee here a proof of the obſtinacy of theſe men; they never want evaſions; there is always ſome clauſe, which they did not take notice of; and thus they always reſerve for themſelves a backdoor, and a reſſource in order to begin their Prophecies afreſh. If Ragotſki had executed the conditions, which Drabicius preſcribed to him, and notwithſtanding this his expedition had proved unſucceſsful, it would not have been owned that the Prophecies had been falſe; for did not Poniatovia foretel, that the Eaſt and North ſhould meet without doing any thing? Comenius was more ſubtle than we imagine, when he tacked his three ſeers together. We find more ſubterfuges in three Prophets than in one. Read the marginal Note (23) in Remark [*H*].

(16) *Ab inſperato Principis Tranſ. cum exercitu in Poloniam adventu, credebamus jam illud impleri quod ab omnibus bis Videntibus prædictum, ut ſe Orians jungat Septentrioni, tremendumque illud opus Dei mox procedat.* Ibid. pag. 183.

(17) Idem, ibid.

[*G*] *Drabicius was the greateſt ſufferer.*] I have not met with one perſon, who could tell me what the end of him was, and I cannot tell what regard is to be paid to the following account, which I have extracted from a French Author (18): *Several reflections were made,* ſays he, *with which I think I ought not to amuſe my Readers, who indeed are not obliged to believe them, any more than a ſilly letter, which an arrant fool (whoſe name and perſon I do not deſire to know) ſent a great Monarch, agreeably to the extravagant Viſions of Nicholas Drabicius a Bohemian, burnt for an impoſtor and falſe Prophet, whoſe Book was carried to all the Courts of Europe, and even to that of the Grand Seignior, by a Miniſter of Zurich in Swiſſerland; who upon this account was fourteen years in priſon, during all which time, as a mark of his madneſs, he ſuffered his beard to grow down to his girdle, as a Gentleman of great veracity, who knew him, aſſured me.* Mr. Des Marets had heard a very different account from this, which was that Drabicius was ſo far from baptizing the Great Turk, as he expected, that he was obliged to ſeek refuge in Turky, where he died. *Ad multa particularia proceſſerunt* (hi impoſtores) *circa Ragocium . . . . magnum Turcam à Drabicio baptizandum (cum è contrario feratur ipſum Drabicium ad Turcas tranſiiſſe & inter eos obiiſſe) quorum impoſturas & falſitatem oppoſitus eventus docuit* (19).

(18) Rocoles, *Vienne deux fois delivrée*, pag. 381.

(19) Mareſius, *in Antirrhetico contra J. A. Comenium*, pag. 67.

[*H*] *Comenius . . . . had nothing to fear but the reproaches of Ragotſki's Secretary.*] That Prince having ſucceeded his brother Sigiſmond, was initiated in the myſteries of Drabicius: he did not diſcover, whether he believed them or not; but he ordered that the viſions, which Drabicius might have for the future, ſhould be communicated to him (20). The Princeſs his mother was made privy to it: Drabicius was commanded by a viſion of the night to go to her, and declare a bleſſing or curſe to her, according as ſhe received his Prophecies (21). They were given to be examined by John Biſterfield a Divine and Counſellor of State, who rejected them (22). However, the reproaches of the

(20) *Hiſt. Revelat.* pag. 162.

(21) Ibid. pag. 165.

(22) Ibid. p. 175.

wit, nor learning, nor a faculty of writing books, and citing upon all occaſions phraſes of Scripture and other ſpiritual maxims, with an air of great zeal for the cauſe of God, and the deſtruction of Antichriſt. He ſupported himſelf by theſe engines; and if he loſt his authority, his reputation, and his glory, it was only with a few perſons of good ſenſe, who are ſcarce ever the arbiters of a man's reputation. Thoſe who had once been credulous with regard to him, continued to be ſo (*s*), and this is what will always be the caſe. Thus all future Viſionaries and Fanatics have nothing to fear; they may vent confidently whatever comes into their head, if they have but addreſs enough to accommodate themſelves to the prevailing paſſions of the times. They will not indeed have the laughers of their ſide; but they will have other partiſans of more importance than the laughers. Conſult the Articles of COMENIUS and KOTTER. Drabicius's Viſions extend to the year 1666. It is a miſtake to aſcribe his baniſhment to ſeditious diſcourſes (*t*); for he was baniſhed upon the ſame account with the reſt of the Bohemian Miniſters, &c. We ſhall ſee elſewhere (*u*) whether Mr. Jurieu ought to have ſaid, that the learned men of Paris ſcarce knew the name of Drabicius.

(*s*) *Toties ineptiis ejus decepti, eum pro magno Prophetâ habere pergunt, nec quicquam inde detrimenti auctoritas ejus ſenſit. Sic mundus vult decipi.* Append. Diſcurſus Theolog. Arnoldi contra Comentium.

(*t*) Moreri has committed this miſtake.

(*u*) In the note [*A*] of the Article KOTTERUS.

the Secretary of Ragotſki ſhewed, that this Prince had to his loſs given credit to Drabicius. Theſe reproaches were not paſſed by in ſilence; Comenius repreſented that the Prince had not followed the directions of the Seer; for he went into Poland without making an alliance with the Turks. *Brevi poſt à Principis Tranſylvaniæ Secretario, C. S. triſtes venerunt (ternâ vice) quibus hiſtoricè Principis ſui ruinam recitans, non obſcurè culpam in Revelationes iſtas (quaſi fidem illis habens eò impulſus fuiſſet Principes) conferre videbatur, cauſa fuit data ad nebulas illas diſcutiendum ſcribendi aliquid* (23). It would be difficult to ſay whether Ragotſki really credited the Prophecies of Drabicius, or only believed that they might procure him victory by the influence, which they might have upon the people. It is poſſible enough, that a Prince of courage and a conſiderable ſhare of wit, but without any learning, might be prevailed upon by ſuch diſcourſes as thoſe of Drabicius; I mean, that he might think there was ſomething divine and prophetic in them, and be apprehenſive of the curſes denounced by that Prophet. George Ragotſki was given to underſtand that his father and brother had felt the effects of them: why may not we believe that he became credulous? But beſides it is very poſſible, that a Prince of ſagacity enough to deſpiſe theſe chimera's, may form ſchemes and great deſigns agreeably to the viſions of theſe people; for it is a very powerful engine for bringing about great revolutions, to prepare the people by explications of the Apocalypſe, uttered with an air of inſpiration and enthuſiaſm. This has occaſioned the enemies of the Proteſtants to ſay, that their Authors have laboured ſo much upon the Apocalypſe with a view only to raiſe war over all Europe, by inſpiring a Prince, who had no thought of the matter, with a deſire of taking advantage of thoſe conjunctures. Comenius was not exempt from this ſuſpicion. See the Article of KOTTERUS.

(23) Ibid. pag. 184. Obſerve that if Ragotski's expedition had ſucceeded, no notice had been taken of his not having obſerved the conditions preſcribed by the Prophet, and thus the ſame clauſes are eſſential or accidental to the prophecies of theſe people, according as the events ſhall determine. This is their great key.

DRELINCOURT (CHARLES) Miniſter of the Church of Paris, was born July the 10th 1595 at Sedan, where his father had a conſiderable poſt [*A*]. He paſſed thro' the ſtudy of polite Literature and Divinity at Sedan, but was ſent to Saumur, to go through a courſe of Philoſophy there under Profeſſor Duncan. He was admitted Miniſter in June 1618, and diſcharged his function near Langres [*B*], till he was called by the Church of Paris in March 1620. In 1625 he married the only daughter of a rich Merchant

[*A*] *His father had a conſiderable poſt at Sedan.*] He was at firſt Secretary to Henry Robert de la Mark Duke of Bouillon, and ſovereign Prince of Sedan, and was afterwards choſen Regiſter of the ſupreme Council of that City (1). He married N. Buyrette, daughter of Nicholas Buyrette, Advocate in the Parliament of Paris. This Advocate embraced the Reformation; his wife and children followed his example with ſo much zeal, that Thomas Buyrette his eldeſt ſon is placed in the Proteſtant Martyrology, and James Buyrette his ſecond ſon devoted himſelf to the Miniſtry, and would have been actually one of the Paſtors of the Church of Paris, if he had not died the ſame week, which was appointed for his ordination. Thomas Buyrette, by the advice of Calvin and his collegues, undertook the office of a Miniſter at nineteen years of age, and exerciſed it at Lyons (2). *Some years after, the vehemence of the perſecutions obliged him to retire to Geneva . . ; but not finding any comfort except in the diſcharge of his vocation, he was immediately ſent to Beſançon, where God enabled him to ſettle a Church ſecretly, and to advance the Kingdom of Chriſt in a wonderful manner.* His mother not having ſeen him, ſince he became a Miniſter, was paſſionately deſirous of ſeeing him; upon which he took a journey to Paris the year of the maſſacre. *He fell the third day into the hands of the maſſacrers, who having learned from him his religion and function, put him to death in a cruel manner together with John Molé, huſband of Mary Buyrette, his eldeſt ſiſter, and inhumanly drag'd both their bodies into the river. This is the ſame Thomas Buyrette, who is mentioned in the Book of Martyrs, and rank'd amongſt thoſe Miniſters of Chriſt, who have ſealed the truth of the Goſpel with their blood.* His mother *eſcaped this deluge of blood* by a kind of miracle, *and retired to Sedan with the reſt of her children, whom ſhe educated in the fear of God.* The laſt of them was a poſthumous daughter, and was married to Peter Drelincourt, who had likewiſe retired to Sedan, and was then Secretary to Henry Robert de la Mark (3). Theſe are the father and mother of our Charles Drelincourt.

(1) The Manuſcript Life of Charles Drelincourt.

(2) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the *IX Dialogues de Mr. Drelincourt contres les Miſſionairès, touchant le Service des Egliſes Réformées.*

(3) See the ſame Epiſtle Dedicatory.

[*B*] *He was admitted Miniſter . . . . and diſcharged his function near Langres.*] It was thought, that a Church might be founded at *the Gates of Langres as in a Bailywick.* Thoſe who laboured to eſtabliſh it, were deſirous that Mr. Drelincourt ſhould be Miniſter of this riſing Church. *As he was aſſured, that there was a proſpect of a conſiderable harveſt in thoſe parts, he accepted of this invitation with joy, and preferred it to all the others, which were then made to him; for tho' he was but twenty two years and ſome months old, he had the happineſs to be deſired by many Churches of the Kingdom, and even ſome of the moſt conſiderable foreign Churches . . . . When he came to* Langres, *he was filled with great hopes, for he found in that city a great number of people, who are called* Temporizers, *who ſeemed only to wait for an opportunity of declaring themſelves; and in the country he ſaw people, who breathed after the purity and ſimplicity of the Goſpel, and even upon the mere report of the ſettlement of this Church flocked thither to the number of above five hundred in hopes of hearing a Sermon.* But the neceſſary Decree could never be obtained of the King's Council. Mr. Drelincourt *felt ſo deep a ſorrow on this account, that he fell into a fit of ſickneſs, which laſted three months, and brought him almoſt to his grave. . . . In expectation of the eſtabliſhment ſo much deſired he preached in the neighbouring churches, and even in the caſtle of Precigni, where he received impoſition of hands* in the beginning of June 1618. *He was not permitted to make his ordinary abode at Langres:* this made him the more *diligent in viſiting, inſtructing, and comforting* the Proteſtants in the Country. At laſt, when all hopes of ſeeing the Church of Langres eſtabliſhed were loſt, he accepted

Merchant of Paris (a); by whom he had ſixteen children [C]. The bleſſing of God, which ſhewed itſelf in his marriage by an uncommon fruitfulneſs, was not leſs viſible in the ſucceſs of his Miniſtry. His Sermons were very edifying; he was incomparably well ſkilled in comforting of the ſick, and he managed with great ſucceſs the affairs of his Church, and even thoſe of other flocks, upon which he never failed of being conſulted when they were important. The ſervices which he did the Church by the fruitfulneſs of his pen cannot be ſufficiently diſplayed [D], whether we conſider his books of devotion, or thoſe of controverſy. There is ſuch a vein of piety in the former, and the ſpirit and expreſſions of Scripture run through them in ſuch a manner, that religious minds have always and ſtill do wonderfully edify from them. What he wrote againſt the Church of Rome

(a) His name was Bolduc; he had turned Proteſtant.

of the call of the Church of Paris. He preached there for the firſt time on the 15th of March 1620. He always maintained a peculiar affection for the members of his former Church (4).

(4) Extracted from the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the 3d volume of his *Sermons*. He dedicated it to Meſſieurs Heudelot, Lords of Precigny, and the reſt of the Faithful in and about the City of Langres.

[C] *He had ſixteen children.*] The ſeven firſt were all ſons; the reſt were intermixed, ſix ſons and three daughters.

The eldeſt of all was LAURENCE DRELINCOURT. He was at firſt Miniſter of Rochelle; but being obliged to leave that Church by an Edict, which prohibited that Church to have any Paſtor, who was born out of Rochelle; "he was called to Niort, where he "exerciſed his miniſterial functions with great eſteem "and faithfulneſs, till God having deprived him of "ſight in the year 1680, he died ſix months after, "aged 56 years. We have ſeveral fine Sermons of "his compoſing. He left likewiſe a Collection of "Chriſtian Sonnets (5), which are extremely ele-"gant, and highly eſteemed by thoſe, who have a "taſte for piety as well as wit. Beſides his being a "ſolid Divine, a good Preacher, and well ſkilled in "Hebrew, he had this peculiar in him, that having "at his leiſure hours ſtudied the French Language to "perfection, he admirably well underſtood all the de-"licacies and purity of it, ſo that the famous Monſr. "Conrart conſulted him almoſt every poſt upon thoſe "points. He left among other manuſcripts one, the "deſign of which is to clear the French Tongue of all "low and impure expreſſions, and which deſerves to "be publiſhed. . . Laurence Drelincourt was married, "and left only daughters (6)." If the reader has any curioſity of ſeeing what affection his father had for him, he need only read the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the *Faux Paſteur convaincu*.

(5) There are ſix editions: the laſt is of Amſterdam, printed by Nicholas Parmentier, 1693.

(6) Extracted from the *Manuſcript Life*.

The ſecond ſon was named HENRY DRELINCOURT. He was conſecrated to the holy Miniſtry, and exerciſed the functions of it at firſt at Gien, and afterwards at Fontainebleau. Theſe two brothers had the conſolation to receive impoſition of hands from their own father. The Sermons, which he preached upon theſe occaſions, have been publiſhed. Henry Drelincourt died before the laſt perſecution (7). He had been an Advocate, before he was a Miniſter (8).

(7) The *Manuſcript Life*.

(8) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the *Faux Paſteur convaincu*, dated April the 4th 1656. He was not then a Miniſter.

The third ſon is the illuſtrious CHARLES DRELINCOURT, Profeſſor of Phyſic at Leyden (9), whom I have already had occaſion to ſpeak of more than once (10). "He had ſcarce taken his Degrees at Montpellier in "1654, but he was immediately choſen firſt Phyſi-"cian to the Armies of the King of France in Flan-"ders, under Marſhal Turenne. Afterwards mar-"rying at Paris, he was invited to the Profeſſorſhip "of Phyſic at Leyden in 1668. He is at preſent "Dean of the Univerſity. He ſerved William III "King of England, and Queen Mary his Conſort, "till their advancement to the Throne. It was to "him alone that the King intruſted the care of his "Conſort in her journey to the waters of Aix in "1681. He had the advantage likewiſe of being "called in to all the great Perſons of the Court at the "Hague (11)." I will not omit the mention of a circumſtance, which I have read in the Epiſtle Dedicatory to the *Faux Paſteur convaincu*, that he had an inclination to the Miniſtry even after he became Doctor of Phyſic. If he has not the title, it is certain that he does not want any one of the qualifications requiſite for a true Miniſter of the Goſpel. There are no Divines, who are greater maſters of the Scriptures than he; and there are few but what he excells in that point. His piety is ſolid, benevolent, obliging, charitable. He ſpares neither his purſe, nor intereſt, nor advice, for the ſervice of the Refugees, who ſtand in need of his good offices. Never any man was ſo thorough a friend as he. Thoſe, who ſhall undertake a panegyric on him, will find it difficult to determine, whether the qualifications of the ſcholar or the man of honour are moſt eminent in him. If we were to collect all the encomiums on him by different Authors, it would make a Book. Thoſe, which his collegues have given him in their public Orations (12), appear to me of great value; and it is well known, that lately (13) they have repreſented his merit to great advantage upon an occaſion (14), which called them to another object, the greateſt and nobleſt, which can be imagined, and the moſt capable of diverting and engaging the whole attention of the Orator. All the writings, which he has publiſhed, are of an original and inimitable character. Conſult the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, where you will find Extracts from ſome of his Treatiſes on Phyſic. See likewiſe the Epiſtle Dedicatory to a Sermon printed at Leyden in 1682 (15). He underſtands admirably well the French Language. Neither Vaugelas nor Bouhours could point out ſo exactly the faults and negligencies of our French Writers. The ſmalleſt and moſt imperceptible defects of ſtyle cannot eſcape him, when he will give himſelf the trouble of obſerving them.

(9) See the following Article.

(10) See among other paſſages above the Preface to the Article of ACHILLES Note [A], the Article of ANDROMACHUS of *Crete*, and the Note [G] of the Article BRISEIS.

(11) Extracted from the *Manuſcript Life*.

(12) See the *Funeral Oration* upon Dr. *Herman*, written by Dr. *Bidloo*, the illuſtrious Profeſſor of Phyſic at Leyden. I omit many other *Orations*, in which he is applauded.

(13) In March 1695.

(14) The *Funeral Oration on the Queen of England*. Mr. Spanheim, and Mr. Perizonius have both written beautiful Orations on the death of that Princeſs.

The fourth ſon is ANTHONY DRELINCOURT. He is Phyſician at Orbes in Swiſſerland, and highly eſteemed in his profeſſion. The Magiſtrates of Bern have appointed him their Phyſician extraordinary.

The fifth ſon died at Geneva, while he ſtudied Divinity there.

The ſixth is PETER DRELINCOURT. He is a Prieſt of the Church of England, and Dean of Armagh. He is a man of great merit.

All the other children died either in their infancy, or in the flower of their youth (16), except a daughter, who is ſtill living. She was married to Monſr. Malnoe, Advocate of the Parliament at Paris; and inſtead of following him to Holland, whither he retired for Religion at the time of the Dragoonade, ſhe continued at Paris, where ſhe openly profeſſes the Roman Catholic Religion.

(15) It is intitled, *Les Etoiles de l'Egliſe & les Chandeliers myſtiques*. It was preached by Laurence Drelincourt before the Synod of Poitou at Fontenai Octob. 25, 1677. The Author of the Dedication is named Mr. Baignoux. He was Miniſter of Poitiers, and married the eldeſt daughter of Laurence Drelincourt.

(16) Among the reſt, a daughter, who died with great ſentiments of devotion, Decemb. 5, 1655. See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the *Faux Paſteur convaincu*.

[D] *He did great ſervice to the Church by the fruitfulneſs of his pen.*] His firſt Eſſay was a Treatiſe of Preparation for the Holy Supper. This, and his Catechiſm, his ſhort View of the Controverſies, and his Conſolations againſt the fears of death, are of all his Works thoſe, which have been the moſt frequently reprinted. Some of them have paſſed through above forty Editions, and have been tranſlated into divers languages, High Dutch, Low Dutch, Italian, and Engliſh. His charitable viſits, in five Volumes, ſerve for a continual conſolation to private perſons, and for a ſource and model to Miniſters. He publiſhed three Volumes of Sermons. His Controverſial Works, which I can recollect, are as follow: *The Jubilee: The Roman Combat: The Jeſuit's Owl: An Anſwer to Father Cauſſin: Diſputes with the Biſhop of Bellai concerning the honour due to the Holy Virgin: An Anſwer to la Milletiere (17): Dialogues againſt the Miſſionaries, in ſeveral Volumes: The falſe Paſtor convicted: The falſe Face of Antiquity: The pretended Nullities of the Reformation: An Anſwer to Prince Erneſt of Heſſe: An Anſwer to (18) the Speech of the Clergy ſpoken by the Archbiſhop of Sens: A Defence of Calvin.* He wrote ſome letters, which have been printed, one to the Dutcheſs of Tremouille upon her huſband's revolt from the Proteſtant Religion; one of Conſolation addreſſed to Madam de la Tabariere: one upon the Reſtoration of Charles II King of Great Britain: ſome upon the Engliſh Epiſcopacy, &c. I omit the Prayers, which he publiſhed. Some were made for the King, others for the Queen, and the Dauphin.

(17) He had a conference with Milletiere, and confounded him. The Acts of it were publiſhed. See the *Hiſtory of the Edict of* Nantes, tom. 2. pag. 515, 516.

(18) He wrote it under the name of *Philalethes*, in 1656.

Rome has confirmed the Proteſtants more than can be expreſſed; for with the arms with which he furniſhed them, thoſe, who had not the advantage of learning, were enabled to oppoſe the Monks and Pariſh Prieſts, and reſolutely contend with the Miſſionaries. His writings have made him conſidered as the ſcourge of the Roman Catholic Controvertiſts; and yet he was beloved by thoſe of the other party [*E*]. The great Lords of the Reformed Religion always ſhewed a very great regard for him [*F*]. He died November the 3d 1669 in the moſt pious diſpoſition, which could be expected from a Miniſter, who had always appeared animated by a warm zeal (*b*), and with indefatigable application conſecrated all his labours to the glory of God and the ſervice of the Church [*G*]. He had been extremely aſſiduous in prayer; and in the latter years of his life, if he was alone, he never heard the clock ſtrike but he fell down on his knees in prayer to God (*c*). Paul Freher is miſtaken in many points [*H*].

(*b*) See his *laſt Hours*, which were publiſhed after his death, and annexed to his book of the *Conſolations againſt the fears of death*, in the later editions.

(*c*) Extracted from his *Manuſcript Life*, written by a French Refugee Miniſter in England, who is writing the *Lives of the famous Paſtors of France*.

[*E*] *He was beloved by thoſe of the other party.*] "It is well known, that he had an eaſy acceſs to the Secretaries of State, the firſt Preſident, the King's Advocate, and the civil and criminal Lieutenants: but he never made any other uſe of his intereſt with them, than to aſſiſt the afflicted Churches, or to ſerve an infinite number of private perſons, whom he either raiſed in the world, or ſaved from the whip, the gibbet, and the galleys (19)." It may be affirmed that tho' the Catholics of France were ſuperior to the Proteſtants in every thing, which relates to worldly advantages, the latter did not ceaſe to preach boldly againſt the doctrines of the Romiſh Communion, and to write controverſial Treatiſes, in which they did not ſcruple to give every thing its proper name (20). A great many perſons of merit and authority in the other party, were equitable enough to do juſtice to a Proteſtant Author, who defended his cauſe well, and kept within the bounds of his ſubject. Our Drelincourt is an inſtance of this; and Mr. Claude is another; for he was highly eſteemed among the Roman Catholics (21). We may perceive by this the error or groſs artifice of ſome people, who make it a great merit in them, that they are hated, like the plague, among the Roman Catholics, Arminians, Anabaptiſts, &c. If they had only maintained their cauſe well, they would not have become the object of univerſal hatred: it is therefore to their manner of acting, their perſonal abuſes, their diſhoneſt practices, evident in their writings, that they ought to impute the general averſion, which they labour under.

(19) The *Manuſcript Life* abovementioned.

(20) See the *Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes*, tom. 2. lib. 11. pag. 556.

(21) See Note [*E*] of the Article CLAUDE.

[*F*] *The great Lords of the Reformed Religion ſhewed a very great regard for him.*] "The Duke de la "Force, the Marſhals Chatillon, Gaſcon, and Turenne, the Ducheſs of Tremouille, highly eſteemed "him. They ſent for him to their Palaces, and honoured him from time to time with their viſits. "Foreign Princes (22), and Noblemen, the Embaſſadors of England and France did the ſame, and "all of them often made uſe of his prudent advice (23)."

(22) He was particularly eſteemed by the Houſe of Heſſe, as appears by the Books, which he dedicated to the Princes and Princeſſes of that name.

(23) The *Manuſcript Life*.

[*G*] *He had with indefatigable application conſecrated all his labours to the Glory of God and the ſervice of the Church.*] As he was of a very ſtrong conſtitution, he never ſpared himſelf, when he had any miniſterial function to perform. Upon an extraordinary occaſion he had reſolution and ſtrength enough to preach ſeven times in one day. "It was by the advan"tage of this vigour of body and mind, which God "had beſtowed on him, that for the ſpace of twelve "years he ſerved the Church of Paris, being the "third Miniſter after the removal of Monſr. du Mou"lin. But among other things he had more aſſidu"ity and readineſs in viſiting the ſick, than had ever "been ſeen in any other perſon. . . . He took ſo "much pleaſure in labouring in his function, and "eſpecially in attacking of error, that he wiſhed to "die with his pen in his hand (24)." He preached to the laſt week of his life; for his laſt Sermon was that of the 27th of October 1669.

(24) Ibid.

[*H*] *Paul Freher is miſtaken in many points.*] I. He fixes the birth of Charles Drelincourt on the 10th of October (25); whereas it ſhould have been the 10th of July. II. He makes him enter upon his Miniſtry in the Church of Paris in 1619; and yet Mr. Drelincourt, who had been a Miniſter from the year 1618, did not begin to ſerve that Church till 1620. III. He ſays, that at the ſame time (26) Monſr. du Moulin retired to Sedan; and that therefore Charles Drelincourt and John Meſtrezat had alone the care of the flock for ſeveral years. Du Moulin retired to Sedan in 1620, and there remained three Paſtors in the Church of Paris. Mr. Drelincourt was one of the three; and for twelve years he ſerved that great Church, being the third Miniſter (27). IV. He affirms that Mr. Drelincourt not having ſtrength enough to go up into the pulpit on account of the infirmities of old age, preached frequently in the Church-yard near the Church (28). All this is falſe. They never preached in the Church-yard of Charenton but upon Sacrament Days, or upon ſome other ſolemnity, which occaſioned the aſſembly to be more numerous than ordinary. Upon theſe occaſions they preached in the Church according to cuſtom, and beſides that in the Church-yard. A Miniſter, who had not ſtrength enough to go up into the Pulpit, could not have been able to preach in a Church-yard, ſince they preached in a pulpit there. Mr. Drelincourt neither in his youth nor old age was ever pitched upon more than any other Miniſter to preach in the Church-yard. V. What he adds concerning the eighteen laſt months of his life is a very erroneous account; we find nothing in it but what contradicts that truth, that *he preached to the laſt week of his life* (29). Will not thoſe, who underſtand the practice of the Phyſicians at Paris, think it ſurprizing, that it ſhould be related as a ſtrange thing, that this Miniſter was let blood four times during an indiſpoſition of eighteen months? *Seſquianno ante obitum à M. Majo A. 1668. catharris frequenter ad pectus delapſis cum tuſſi & aſthmate miſere affligus; poſtquam* INTEREA *quater ipſi vena ſecta fuiſſet . . . . . vitam morte beata terminavit 3. Nov. A. C.* 1669. (30). I cannot ſay, whether the German Book, cited by Freher, contains theſe errors; but I make no doubt of it.

(25) *Theatr. Viror. Erudit.* pag. 696.

(26) That is, according to him, in 1619.

(27) See the Note [*G*].

(28) *Viribus tamen ob ſenium diminutis Cathedram conſcendere nequiret, ſæpius in cæmiterio proximo conciones peregit.* Freher. *in Theatro Virorum eruditor.* pag. 696.

(29) The *Manuſcript Life*. See Note [*G*].

(30) Freher, pag. 696.

DRELINCOURT (CHARLES) ſon of the preceding, was born at Paris February the 1ſt 1633. He took the Degree of Doctor of Phyſic at Montpellier in 1654, and after having diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the practice of it as well in the army commanded by Marſhal de Turenne in Flanders, as at Paris, he was choſen by the Curators of the Univerſity of Leyden to the Profeſſorſhip of Phyſic in 1668 (*a*). He accepted of that place, and diſcharged the functions of it with extraordinary ſucceſs. His method of teaching was the moſt clear and exact imaginable; and he diſplayed in Anatomy a dexterity and ſagacity, which was univerſally admired. He was perfectly ſkilled in the Greek and Latin tongues; and from the vaſt extent of his learning one would have imagined, that he had applied himſelf for his whole life to the ſtudy of polite learning. You will find another part of his excellent character in the Remark [*C*] of the preceding Article. He died at Leyden May the 31ſt 1697, after having ſuffered for ſome time the moſt ſevere pains with a patience truly chriſtian. He had the conſolation to ſee his only ſon

(*a*) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory to Mr. *Van Banning* before his Treatiſe *de oſſifmeſtri Partu vitali*.

CHARLES

(b) Feb. 3. 1693.

CHARLES DRELINCOURT, admitted Doctor of Phyſic (b), and well married, and father of two ſons. He ordered that no funeral Oration ſhould be made for him.

DRESSERUS (MATTHEW) born at Erfort, the Capital of Thuringia, Auguſt the 24th 1536, raiſed himſelf a conſiderable name among the Learned. The firſt Academical Lectures which he heard were thoſe of Luther and Melancthon at Wittenberg. He had not the advantage of them long, becauſe the air of that City diſagreeing with him, obliged him to return ſoon to Erfort, where he ſtudied Greek under Maurice Sideman. When he had taken the degree of Maſter of Arts in 1559, he read Lectures in Rhetoric at home, and afterwards taught in the College of Erfort, and having been admitted among the Profeſſors of Philoſophy, he taught polite Literature and the Greek tongue. After he had taught ſixteen years in his own country, he was invited to Jena to ſupply the place of Lipſius, as Profeſſor of Hiſtory and Eloquence. He pronounced his inaugural Oration (a) in 1574. Some time after he went to Meiſſen, to be Head of the College there; and having continued there ſix years, he obtained in 1581 the Profeſſorſhip of polite Learning in the Univerſity of Leipſic, and a particular penſion was ſettled on him to continue the Hiſtory of Saxony. Upon his coming to Leipſic he found a great many diſputes about the Doctors; ſome of them were for introducing the Philoſophy of Ramus, and others oppoſed it; ſome were deſirous of advancing towards Calviniſm, and others would ſuffer no innovations in Lutheraniſm. He determined to keep clear of theſe conteſts with regard to innovations in Philoſophy; but when he ſaw the connexion of them with the other diſputes [*A*], he became one of the moſt zealous Anti-Ramiſts that was ever known in that country. He ſpent the remainder of his life at Leipſic, and died there October the 5th 1607. He is the Author of ſeveral works [*B*]. He married in 1565, and became a widower in 1598, and married again very ſollicitous for the intereſts of Dreſſerus; for he omitted no meaſures for the ſuppreſſing of the Book, which the Ramiſts publiſhed againſt this adverſary, and for puniſhing the Authors. *Idem Berlepſchius omnes vias perſecutus eſt quibus ſcriptum adverſus Dreſſerum editum à Ramæis profligaret, & in autores juſta ſeveritate animadverteret* (3). We are not to wonder at this, ſince he thought that Ramiſm lead to Calviniſm. *Memini*, inquit, *Pariſiis quantas turbas, quantas cædes pepererit Rami ſecta.* Quin & in hæc verba gravitate magna erupit, *quid quæritis? Ramiſmus eſt gradus ad Calviniſmum* (4). i. e. "I remember, *ſays he*, what vaſt confuſion and ſlaughter "the ſect of Ramus was the occaſion of at Paris. "*And he broke out into theſe words with great gra-*"*vity*; What do you aim at? Ramiſm is the way "to Calviniſm." We at preſent juſtly laugh at thoſe violent conteſts, which divided the Univerſities in the XVIth Century on account of trifles; for ſo we ought to call the diſputes between the Ramiſts and Ariſtotelians. We cannot read the account of ſo many tumults without laughter or pity. Our age will be treated in the ſame manner by the ſucceeding ages; and thus is verified the maxim, that one half of the world laughs at the other; it is verified, I ſay, at the expence of another very juſt maxim:

(a) *De Eloquentiæ & Hiſtoriarum ſtudio.* It is printed with ſome other Orations of the ſame Author.

(3) Melch. Adam. *in Vitis Philoſophor. Germanor.* pag. 497.

(4) Idem, ibid.

Loripedem rectus derideat, Æthiopem albus (5).

(5) Juven. Sat. 2. ver. 28.

"Let him cry Blackmoor, Devil, whoſe ſkin is "white,
"And homely legs, who treads himſelf upright.
TATE.

(6) Idem, ibid. ver. 27.

and by the fulfilling of a third very unjuſt maxim.

Clodius accuſat mœchos, Catilina Cethegum (6).

"Clodius tax bawds, Cethegus Catiline."
TATE.

(7) *Cum aliis Libellis juventuti Scholaſticæ utilibus.* Melchior. Adam. *in Vit. Philoſ. Germanor.* pag. 497.

(8) It is intitled, *De Partibus humani corporis & animæ, ejuſque potentiis libri duo. Adjectæ ſunt ad finem Morborum & Medicamentorum communiſſimorum Appellationes.* Merklin. *in Lindenio renovato.* pag. 793. Paul. Freher. *Theatr.* pag. 1505.

(9) Freher, ibid. p. 1504, aſcribes it to him.

[*A*] *When he ſaw their connection with other diſputes.*] I imagine, that there happened in Saxony at that time what has ſince happened in Holland. The Divines of the Augſbourg confeſſion, who inclined towards Calviniſm, had properly no concern in protecting the Ramiſts; for what connection was there between the hypotheſes of Ramus, and the confeſſion of Geneva? And yet the cauſe of the Ramiſts and that of theſe Divines were combined: both parties thought proper to unite their intereſts, that they might be the better able to reſiſt thoſe, who would not permit any innovations. This was undoubtedly the reaſon why the rigid Lutherans oppoſed the Ramiſts with as much vigour as they did the favourers of Calviniſm. The Reader will underſtand by this what I have ſaid, that Matthew Dreſſerus declared againſt the ſubtilties of Ramus, when he ſaw that they were complicated with the theological diſputes, which diſturbed Saxony. Here is an exact image of the combination, which appeared in Holland between Cocceianiſm and Carteſianiſm; theſe two things have only this in common, that one is conſidered as a new method of explaining Divinity, and the other as a new Philoſophy. As for the reſt, the principles of the Cocceians, and the ſpirit of their hypotheſes are entirely different from the Carteſian ſpirit.

RAMISM and Carteſianiſm combined with Theological Diſputes.

Let us give the very words of Melchior Adamus. *Venit autem Lipſiam eo tempore, quo (verba referimus ipſius Dreſſeri) anceps malum in Academiam illam invaſerat: dum nonnulli argutias Rami, repudiata doctrina Ariſtotelis & Melanchthonis, invehere conarentur: alii religionis quædam dogmata ad ſenſum Calvini inflecterent. Utrumque extremum declinare ipſe cupiebat: & quoniam concertatio de Rami novitatibus Philoſophicam communitatem vehementer conturbarat, abſtinendum ſibi ab ejus conſortio eſſe putavit, ne in medium certamen atque diſcrimen ſe objiceret* (1). i. e. "He came to Leipſic "at that time, when (to make uſe of Dreſſerus's own "words) a double evil had forced itſelf into that "Univerſity; whilſt ſome endeavoured to introduce "the ſubtilties of Ramus, rejecting the doctrine of "Ariſtotle and Melancthon; others warped ſome "doctrines of Religion to the ſenſe of Calvin. He "deſired to avoid both extremes; and becauſe the "diſpute concerning the novelties of Ramus greatly "diſturbed the Philoſophical Community, he thought "proper to keep clear of it, leſt he ſhould expoſe him-"ſelf to the heat of the conteſt and danger." Berlepſch, the Electoral Commiſſary, diverted him from this pacific deſign, and there happened to Dreſſerus what happens to many perſons, who engage late in this kind of diſputes; they are more zealous than the firſt promoters of them. Ramiſm appeared to Dreſſerus an horrible monſter (2); he entered into all the views of the Electoral Commiſſary, who on his part was

(1) Melch. Adam. *in Vitis Philoſophor. Germanor.* pag. 496.

(2) *Ubi vero cognovit cum Rami doctrina conjunctam eſſe illius dogmatis diſceptationem, magni animi ardore peſtiferum id genus amovere conatus eſt.* Idem, ibid. pag. 497.

[*B*] *He is the Author of ſeveral Works.*] Of a *Rhetorica inventionis, diſpoſitionis, & elocutionis, exemplis ſacris & profanis quam plurimis illuſtrata:* of three Books *Gymnaſmatum Literaturæ Græcæ, Orationum, Epiſtolarum, & Poëmatum ex Auctoribus ſacris ac profanis, cum exemplis modum ſcribendi monſtrantibus:* Of an *Iſagoge Hiſtorica per millenarios diſtributa, & ad annum uſque nonageſimum primum ſupra mille quingentos deducta:* of ſeveral orations, and other little pieces uſeful to youth (7). This is all that Melchior Adamus mentions concerning the Writings of Dreſſerus. He does not ſpeak of the Phyſical Books, which others aſcribe to him (8), nor of the Treatiſe *De feſtis diebus Chriſtianorum, Judæorum, & Ethnicorum* (9).

(b) Extracted from his *Life* among those of the *German Philoſophers*, compiled by *Melchior Adamus*. pag. 495, & *ſeq.*

again two years after (*b*). He was a man of great induſtry; he ſhewed this at Erfort, for he brought all his Collegues, who except one were Roman Catholics, to conſent that the Confeſſion of Augſbourg and Hebrew ſhould be taught in the Univerſity (*c*).

(c) Paul. Freher. *in Theatr.* pag. 1504.

He does not even ſay any thing, that can inſinuate that Dreſſerus ever meddled with Phyſic or any other profeſſion, but that of teaching the languages, hiſtory, and polite literature. Who can tell, but that there may have been a Phyſician named Matthew Dreſſerus, whoſe Works have been aſcribed to our Author? I forgot to obſerve, that he was attacked by Bodin upon the four univerſal Monarchies, and that he defended himſelf (10), and that one Gaſpar Hap publiſhed a Book, intitled, *Erratica Hiſtoria Dreſſeri*.

(10) Melch. Adam. *in Vitis Philoſ. Germ.* pag. 497.

DRIEDO (JOHN) in Low Dutch *Dridoens*, born at Turnhout in Brabant, ſtudied at Louvain, and took there the degree of Doctor of Divinity in Auguſt 1512. Hadrian Florent, who was afterwards Pope Hadrian VI, performed the ceremony of promoting him to that degree; and having obſerved that his ſcholar had applied himſelf too much to human learning, he put him in mind of the diſtinction, which ought to be made between the miſtreſs-ſcience, and thoſe which are her hand-maids. After this advice Driedo directed his chief application to the ſtudy of Divinity (*a*). He became Profeſſor of that Science in the Univerſity of Louvain (*b*). He was alſo Curate of St. James, and Canon of St. Peter in that City (*c*). He oppoſed Lutheraniſm with great vigour; but if we judge of him by a Letter of Eraſmus, he moderated his zeal a little better than the other Doctors of that country [*A*]. He publiſhed ſeveral books of Divinity [*B*]; but meddling with Chronological Difficulties, he blundered wretchedly [*C*]. He died at Louvain in 1535 [*D*], though thoſe who have publiſhed his Epitaph, have repreſented it as affirming that he died Auguſt the 4th 1555.

(a) Valer. Andreas, *Biblioth.* pag. 494.

(b) See his *Epitaph in Swert. Athen. Belgic.* pag. 420.

(c) See the ſame Epitaph.

[*A*] *If we judge of him by a Letter of Eraſmus, he moderated his zeal a little better than the other Divines of that country.*] Here is what he wrote to Godeſchalc Roſemond, Rector of the Academy of Louvain in 1519. *Diſputationibus veſtris adverſus* Lutherum *ſemper conſtantiſſime favi: ſed multo magis ſcriptis, maxime* Johannis Turenholtii, *qui docte & ſine affectibus diſputavit, ut audio* (1). i. e. "I always was an hearty "friend to your diſputations againſt Luther; but "much more to your writings, eſpecially thoſe of "John of Turnhout, who, as I hear, has diſputed "learnedly and without paſſion."

(1) Eraſm. Epiſt. 18. lib. 12. pag. 685.

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſeveral Books of Divinity.*] They relate to the diſputes between the Roman Catholics and Proteſtants: they treat *de gratia & libero arbitrio: de concordia liberi arbitrii & prædeſtinationis: de captivitate & redemptione generis humani; de libertate chriſtiana; de Scripturis & Dogmatibus Eccleſiaſticis.*

[*C*] *But meddling with chronological difficulties, he blundered wretchedly.*] He muſt neceſſarily do ſo, ſince he took Annius of Viterbo's Beroſus and Metaſthenes for genuine Works. His Treatiſe *de Scripturis & Dogmatibus Eccleſiaſticis* is divided into four Books, the third of which relates to the times: *Ad illuſtrandas obſcuritates in Sacra Scriptura emergentes: ſed erravit in multis toto (ut dicitur) cœlo, eo quod ſtatuerit ſequendam ſupputationem Beroſi Chaldæi, Metaſthenis Perſæ, & Philonis Judæi, aliorumque quorum Chronographiam cum Hebraica Sacræ Scripturæ veritate concordare conatur: at bonus vir alioquin doctiſſimus nondum animadverterat auctores eſſe ſuppoſititios* (2). i. e. "To explain the obſcure parts of the Scriptures; but he "blundered extravagantly, ſince he reſolved to follow "the Chronology of Beroſus the Chaldean, Metaſthenes the Perſian, and Philo Judæus, and others, "whoſe accounts he attempts to reconcile with Scripture. But the good men, tho' otherwiſe very learned, "did not then perceive, that thoſe Authors were ſpurious." In this manner ſpeaks Francis Swertius (3). See Poſſevin (4).

(2) Val. André, *Bibl. Belg.* pag. 494.

[*D*] *He died at Louvain in* 1535.] This we are informed of by Aubertus Miræus (5), and Valerius Andreas; but Swert does not write thus; on the contrary he cites the Epitaph of Driedo, where we find *obiit atque hic ſepultus eſt a nativitate Domini* CIↃ. IↃ. LV. IV. *Men. Auguſti* (6). i. e. "He died and was bu- "ried here Auguſt 4th 1555." Father Labbe therefore was in the wrong to refer thoſe perſons to Swert, who would correct the error of a certain Author, whom he does not name, who fixes Driedo's death in 1555. *De eo plura Valerius Andreas, Swertius, Miræus &c. ex quibus corrigendus qui anno* 1555 *die* 4. *Auguſti ſub Paulo IV. Papa mortuum docuit* (7). i. e. "Of him "we may read more fully in Valerius Andreas, Swer- "tius, Miræus &c. from whom we may correct that "Writer, who has aſſerted that he died Aug. 4th "1555 under Pope Paul IV." Francis Swert is ſo far from being a proper perſon to furniſh a correction of this miſtake, that he might readily lead one to imagine, that Aubertus Miræus, Valerius Andreas, and the reſt, are miſtaken; for who would not pay more regard to Epitaphs, with reſpect to the time of a perſon's death, than to the ſingle teſtimony of an Hiſtorian? Paul Freher (8) cites Driedo's Epitaph with the ſame error as Swert had done. This ſhould caution compilers to take particular care not to ſuffer Printers to falſify titles and public monuments.

(3) Swert. *Ath. Belg.* pag. 420.

(4) Poſſev. lib. 2. *Bibliotb. Selectæ*, cap. 14. & *in Apparatu Sacro.*

(5) *De Scriptor. Sæc.* 16. pag. 420.

(6) Swert. *Ath. Belg.* pag. 420.

(7) Philippus Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. 1. pag. 558.

(8) *In Theatro*, pag. 166.

DRUMMOND (*a*) a very noble and antient family in Scotland, of which the Earl of Perth is now the head. The firſt who bore the name of Drummond in that family was a Hungarian Gentleman named Maurice, who left England with Edward Atheling, the lawful heir of the country, to avoid the cruelty of William the Conqueror, who poſſeſſed himſelf of England in 1066. Maurice commanded the ſhip on board of which Edward Atheling, with Agatha his mother and Margaret and Chriſtina his ſiſter, embarked. A violent ſtorm forced them to put into Scotland; and they landed in a Port on the river Forth, which, to this day, is called by the name of one of Edward's ſiſters (*b*). It is ſhe, who, being very famous for her piety, was canonized after her death: in a word it is St. Margaret. She married Malcolm III King of Scotland, who beſtowed large poſſeſſions on our Maurice Drummond; raiſed him to very exalted dignities; gave him many lands in the province of Dunbarton, and made him Seneſchal of Lenox. The Queen alſo favoured him with ſome marks of her eſteem, ſhe beſtowing one of her maids of honour on him in marriage. From theſe nuptials ſprung a ſon called Malcolm, who was father of Maurice, father of John, father of Malcolm. Hiſtory does not inform us of their actions and alliances, but we find their genealogical deſcent in Records which were preſerved with great care for ſome ages in the Abbey of Inchafry, and at laſt depoſited

(*a*) Both the Text and Notes of this Article, (which were ſent to the Bookſeller the 16th of ... 1695) have been printed *verbatim* according to the Manuſcript.

(*b*) Called St. Margaret's Road.

(*c*) In 1695.

ſited in the Archives of the family. Some of them were loſt at the Revolution in 1688; but there are ſtill enough extant to prove what is advanced in this Article, not to mention thoſe which are furniſhed by the Scotch Hiſtorians. The reader will find in the Notes, the ſucceſſors of MALCOLM DRUMMOND II [A], to JAMES DRUMMOND III, Earl of

[A] *The reader will find in the Notes, the ſucceſſors of* Malcolm Drummond II.] His ſon Malcolm III, ſirnamed *Begg*, i. e. *the little*, married Adda daughter of Malduin Earl of Lenox, who had only a brother that left no children; who married the ſiſter of the John Monteith, who ſold to the Engliſh the famous William Wallace or Wallis Viceroy of Scotland. This John Monteith, foreſeeing that the Earl of Lenox and his brother-in-law would leave the Earldom to Malcolm his ſiſter's huſband, adviſed the King to demand her. He flattered himſelf with the hopes that the King would then beſtow her upon him, but was miſtaken; the King giving her to Robert Stuart, whoſe deſcendants were Earls of Lenox. Malcolm *Begg* had, by Adda his wife, four ſons, JOHN, MAURICE, THOMAS and WALTER. The laſt was Secretary to the King. Maurice married the daughter of the Seneſchal of Strathern, and ſucceeded to his dignity and ample poſſeſſions. Thomas was created Baron of Balfrew. Their elder brother John Drummond ſeventh Chief Juſtice of Lenox, declared war againſt John Monteith. A hatred had long ſubſiſted between their families. Monteith was overthrown, and loſt three ſons in this war. The King obliged the contending parties to conclude a peace. The great men of the Kingdom met together for this pacification, the Guarantees of which were the Earls of Douglas, of Angus, and of Arran, and Lord Robert nephew to King Robert Bruce. Their ſignatures and ſeals are ſtill viſible in the Treaty; and we find that Lord Robert, the King's nephew, owns himſelf one of the neareſt relations of the two families which had been lately reconciled. Drummond having loſt, by one of the articles of the Treaty, the lands poſſeſſed by him in the Earldom of Lenox, and that by the death of the three ſons of John Monteith, retired with his family into the Province of Perth, where he had the eſtates of Stobhall and Cargill. He was married to the eldeſt daughter of William de Montifex, Lord High Treaſurer of Scotland. His eldeſt ſon, Malcolm IV, married Iſabella Douglas hereditary Counteſs of Marr, and was joined in very ſtrict friendſhip with Earl Douglas his brother-in-law. He joined with him in making war upon the Engliſh, and ſignalized himſelf in the bloody battle of Otterburn (1), where he took priſoner Ralph Piercy, a General of great reputation among the Engliſh. For his atchieving this action, a penſion was allowed him for life. His brother William married the daughter of the Baron of Airth, who brought him the Barony of Carnock as her dowry. From this marriage ſprung the branch of Athornden. Some mention muſt be made of the four daughters of John Drummond. The eldeſt was named ANABELLA, and married Robert III King of Scotland. This Queen is greatly applauded by the Scotch Hiſtorians, on account of her virtue and ſingular prudence. She was mother to James I of Scotland. One of his ſiſters was married to Archibald Earl of Argyle; another to Alexander Macdonald Lord of the Iſles, eldeſt ſon of the Earl of Roſs, and another to Stuart of Dually.

(1) In the language of the country *Chevy Chace.*

Malcolm IV, dying without iſſue, JOHN DRUMMOND his brother became the head of the family. He married Elizabeth Sinclare, daughter of the Earl of Orkney, Caithneſs, Roſſin, &c. as renowned among the Danes as among the Scotch. She brought him three ſons and a daughter. The laſt was married to the Lord Thomas Baron of Kinnaird. We ſhall ſpeak of Walter the eldeſt of the three ſons. Robert his ſecond ſon married the heireſs of Barnbougall. John the youngeſt went to the Iſland of Madera, where his poſterity makes a great figure at this day.

WALTER DRUMMOND, married to Margaret, daughter of Lord Patrick Ruthven, Head of a very noble Houſe, was father to the following Malcolm, to JOHN Biſhop of Dunblain, to WALTER created Baron of Leidcrief, from whom iſſued the branch of Blair-Drummond, which produced two other branches, that of Newton and that of Gardrum.

MALCOLM V married Mary Murray daughter of the Lord of Tullibardin (2), by whom he had John Lord Drummond, created Peer of the Realm. WALTER, Lord of Deanſton; JAMES, Lord of Corrivechter; Thomas, Lord of Druminarinoch, from whom ſprung the branches of Invermay, of Cultmalinder, of Comrie, and of Pitcairns.

(2) The Earls of Tullibardin, now Marquiſſes of Athol, are his deſcendants.

JOHN DRUMMOND, eldeſt ſon of Malcolm V, married Elizabeth Lindſey, daughter of the famous Earl of Crawford (3), and became powerful and illuſtrious. He was a man of very great abilities. He was great Juſticiary of Scotland, which, in that Age, was the higheſt poſt in the Realm. He purchaſed of his kinſman the Baron of Concraig, all the eſtates ſituated in the Province of Strathern, and, with the King's permiſſion, the poſt of hereditary Seneſchal of that Province. He did ſignal ſervice to James IV King of Scotland; he routing the Duke of Lenox, and the Lord Liſle with their aſſociates, who were going to join the Earl Mariſhal and the Lord Gordon, in order to put in execution the conſpiracy he had formed, viz. to ſeize the young Monarch, and govern the Kingdom, upon pretence of revenging the death of James III. He was ſent Plenipotentiary into England, to conclude a Treaty of Peace with Richard III. After the King's death, he was removed from his employments and all his eſtate confiſcated, for having given a box on the ear to a Herald at Arms, who went to ſummon him in the caſtle of Drummond, to appear before the Parliament, there to give an account of the Queen's marriage with the Earl of Lenox (4); but at the ſolicitation of the Queen and upon the interceſſion of the great men of the Kingdom, he, in conſideration of his exalted extraction and eminent ſervices, was reſtored to his eſtates and employments two days after. He had four daughters, one of whom named Margaret appeared ſo charming in the eye of James IV King of Scotland, that he reſolved to marry her; but as a Diſpenſation from the Pope was neceſſary, becauſe of their nearneſs in blood, the impatient Prince cauſed the nuptials to be ſolemnized privately. From this clandeſtine marriage iſſued a daughter, who was afterwards married to the Earl of Huntley. Upon the arrival of the Diſpenſation, the King intended to be married publickly; but the jealouſy which ſome Nobles entertained againſt the Houſe of Drummond, fired them with the horrid reſolution to poiſon Margaret, in order that her Houſe might not have the glory to give two Queens to Scotland. ELIZABETH, his ſiſter, was Counteſs of Angus; EUPHEMIA, his other ſiſter, was wife to the Lord Fleming; ANNABELLA, his other ſiſter, was Counteſs of Montroſs.

(3) He is commonly called *Earl Beardie.*

(4) This Earl was alſo ſummoned at the ſame time. He was then in Drummond Caſtle.

WILLIAM DRUMMOND, ſon to John, and huſband to Iſabella Campbell daughter of the Earl of Argyle, had two ſons, Walter and Andrew. He and his family engaged in open war with that of Murray; and ſome of his friends were ſo cruel as to burn in a church (5) ſome Gentlemen of the Houſe of Murray. He was altogether innocent of this crime; but not being beloved by the King, he was condemned to loſe his head, which ſentence was accordingly executed. His ſon ANDREW was created Baron of Bellichlon, and founded a branch, of which the laſt male, MAURICE DRUMMOND, left four daughters, who married very honourably in England. One of them was wife to Caryl, Secretary of State to King James I. WALTER DRUMMOND, eldeſt ſon of William, had by Elizabeth Graham, daughter to the Earl of Montroſs, only one ſon, viz.

(5) That of Minniward.

DAVID DRUMMOND, who married Margaret Stuart, daughter to the Duke of Albany, Viceroy of Scotland, and by her he had but one daughter, who was wife to the Lord of Poury Ogilby. After Margaret's death he married Lilia Ruthven who brought him five daughters, I, JANE, wife of John Earl of Montroſs, Chancellor and Viceroy of Scotland: II, ANN, married to John Earl of Marr, Lord High Treaſurer of Scotland: III, LILIA, Counteſs of Crawford: IV, CATHERINE, Lady of Tullibardin: V, MARGARET,

of Perth [*B*], Chancellor of Scotland, the preſent head of the family, who now reſides in Rome, whither he fled for his Religion. The reader will meet with a great number of very illuſtrious alliances, which alone would ſufficiently prove that this family has always lived in very great ſplendor.

GARET, Counteſs of Keir. The two ſons of David Drummond are Patrick mentioned below, and JAMES Lord of Maderly, from whom deſcended the Viſcounts of Strathallan, and the Barons of Marchani. The firſt who was created Viſcount of Strathallan, was named WILLIAM DRUMMOND. He was Lieutenant General in the Armies of King James; and conſpicuous both in the cabinet and the field.

PATRICK DRUMMOND, married to Margaret Lindſey, daughter to the Earl of Crawford, ſprung from the branch of Edzel, had five daughters. I, CATHERINE, Counteſs of Rothes: II, LILIA, Counteſs of Dumferlin, mother of the Counteſſes of Lauderdale, of Kelly, of Balcarres and of Cathneſs: III, JANE, Counteſs of Roxburgh, Governeſs of the children of Charles I: IV, ANNE, Lady of Torray Barclay: V, ELIZABETH, married to the Lord Elphinſtoun. Patrick Drummond had, beſides theſe five daughters, two ſons, JAMES and JOHN.

JAMES DRUMMOND, created Earl of Perth, married Iſabella Seatoun, daughter of the Earl of Winton, and left but one daughter who was Counteſs of Sunderland. He died young, and JOHN his brother, Earl of Perth, ſucceeded him. He was married to Jane Kerr, daughter of the Earl of Roxburgh, by whom he had four ſons and two daughters, one of whom was Counteſs of Wigtown, and the other Counteſs of Tullibardin. The four ſons are, JAMES, mentioned below; ROBERT, who died in France; JOHN, who founded the branch of Logy Almond; and WILLIAM Earl of Roxburgh, from whom ſprung the branch of Roxburgh and that of Bellandine.

JAMES DRUMMOND II, Earl of Perth, married Ann Gordon, daughter to the Marquis of Huntley, by whom he had two ſons and one daughter, viz. JAMES, who will be mentioned in the following remark; JOHN and ANNE. The latter is a Lady of great merit, and married the Earl of Erroll hereditary Conſtable of Scotland. JOHN DRUMMOND, Earl of Melfort, Secretary to James II King of Great Britain, was twice married; firſt to the heireſs of Lundin, by whom he had three ſons and three daughters. Theſe are, ANNE married to the Baron of Houſtoun, ELIZABETH, wife of Viſcount Strathallan, and MARY who is unmarried. The three ſons are, JAMES, Baron of Lundin, ROBERT and CHARLES. He married a ſecond wife, viz. Euphemia Wallis or Wallace, daughter of Thomas Wallis, Baron of Cragie, the head of a very ancient family. He had, by the ſecond venter, ſix ſons and three daughters, viz. JOHN, Lord of Torth, THOMAS, WILLIAM, ANDREW, RINALDO and PHILIP; CATHERINE, THERESA and MARY.

[*B*] *JAMES DRUMMOND III, Earl of Perth.*] He was made a Privy Councellor in 1678, Chief Juſticiary of Scotland in 1684, and High Chancellor of Scotland in 1684. He was ſo ſtruck by the peruſal of ſome papers, which were found in the ſtrong box of Charles II, relating to the controverſy between Proteſtants and Papiſts, that having examined the affair of religion very curiouſly and with great attention, he imagined that the Church of Rome was the only true one, and accordingly profeſſed it publickly. His attachment to that Church, and to the ſervice of King James, whom he reſolved to follow to France, expoſed him to very ill treatment, both from the Populace and the Council of Scotland. He was kept very cloſe priſoner in the caſtle of Sterling two years and ſeven months; after which he was allowed to take the air becauſe of his indiſpoſition; he then was again confined; was not releaſed till nine months after, and at laſt was permitted to leave the Kingdom. He withdrew to Rome, where his virtue and zeal for the Romiſh Religion gained him the utmoſt eſteem (6). His greateſt enemies have not been able to lay any thing to his charge but his turning Roman Catholick. He had three wives, I, Jane Douglas, daughter of William Marquis of Douglas; II, Lilia, Counteſs of Tullibardin; III, Mary Gordon, daughter to Lewis Marquis of Huntley, and ſiſter to the Duke of Gordon. From the firſt marriage ſprung MARY wife of William, Earl of Mareſchal, hereditary Marſhal of Scotland: ANNE, who is unmarried; and JAMES Lord DRUMMOND, who, at fifteen years of age, left the Academy in Paris, and went over to Ireland with King James in 1689. He was at the ſiege of Londonderry, at the battles of Newtown Butler, and of the Boyne. Returning to France with King James, he went thro' his exerciſes in the Academies of Paris, after which he travelled into France, Italy, Flanders and Holland. He is now in Scotland. The other two wives of the Earl of Perth brought him each two ſons.

(6) i. e. in 1695.

DRUSBICKI (*a*) (GASPAR), a Poliſh Jeſuit, entred into the Society Auguſt the 24th 1609, at twenty years of age. He there was raiſed ſucceſſively to the moſt conſiderable employments; he being not only Maſter of the Novices ſeven years, but likewiſe Rector or Principal of the College ſeveral times, and twice Provincial of the Province of Poland. This Province ſent him twice to Rome in quality of its Sollicitor, and he aſſiſted in two general Congregations (*b*). He uſed to be for ever at prayer, and it is thought that God revealed a great many things to him. His devotion for the bleſſed Virgin was carried to the utmoſt extremities. The ſeverity he exerciſed on himſelf is aſtoniſhing [*A*]. He died piouſly at Poſnania, the 2d of April 1660; and it is ſaid that his body continued unputrified for many years. He wrote many books, but publiſhed only a few [*B*]. His Life written by Daniel Pawlowſki (*c*) contains a great number of remarkable particulars (*d*) [*C*].

(*a*) The true Orthography, in the Poliſh Language, is *Druzbicki*. I followed that of the Librarian of the Jeſuits above-cited.

(*b*) At the 8th and 10th.

(*c*) Printed in Cracow, in the beginning of 1670

(*d*) Extracted from Nat. Southwell, *Biblioth. Societat. Jeſu.* pag. 276.

[*A*] *The ſeverity he exerciſed on himſelf is aſtoniſhing.*] Witneſs the dreadful gaſhes which were found on his body during his laſt ſickneſs; the effects of the dreadful diſcipline he exerciſed on himſelf. *Deſpicientiſſimus ſui, corpus ſuum inclementer admodum tractabat, id quod potuit in extremo morbo quando infirmariis exuentibus eum & induentibus, carnes miſerandum in modum flagris conciſæ apparuerunt* (1).

(1) Nathan. Sotuel, *Biblioth. Script. Soc. Jeſu*, pag. 276.

[*B*] *He wrote many Books, but publiſhed only a few.*] During the Interregnum, a Profeſſor of Cracow publiſhed a piece againſt the Jeſuits, which was diſperſed among the Nobility. Gaſpar Druſbicki anſwered this Libel. His Anſwer, publiſhed in Poliſh, is intitled, *Declaratio memorialis exorbitantium, & proceſſus Academiæ Cracovienſis inter Ordines diſtributi.* By the title alone it appears, that this was not a controverſy carried on againſt the Jeſuits by a Profeſſor of the Academy of Cracow; but that the Univerſity in a body had ſome diſpute with them (2). The other writings of Druſbicki, that have been publiſhed, are in Latin, and are books of devotion, *De Paſſione Jeſu Chriſti Filii Dei. Faſciculus Exercitionum & Conſiderationum de præcipuis virtutibus Chriſtianæ fidei. Sol in virtute ſua, ſive Jeſus Chriſtus in ſplendore ſuarum excellentiarum ſpectabilis* (3).

(2) There are few Univerſities with which the Jeſuits have not had diſputes; and, in general, they might ſay, with regard to their Controverſies, *Quæ regio in terris noſtris non plena laboris?* i. e. "What re-" gion has not " ſeen our migh-" ty labours? Virg. *Æneid.* lib. 1. ver. 464.

(3) Nathan. Sotuel, *Biblioth. Script. Societ. Jeſu*, pag. 276.

[*C*] *His Life . . . . . contains a great number of remarkable particulars.*] I conjecture that theſe do not relate to the management of the affairs of the Society with which he was intruſted; but rather chimæras, viſions, and extaſies, and ſuch other incidents of enthuſiaſtic devotion. Thoſe who have his Book by them, will be ſo good as to inform me whether I am miſtaken, for which I ſhall think my ſelf obliged.

DRUSILLA wife of Agrippa I King of the Jews, was but ſix years of age when her father died. She had before been betrothed to Epiphanes, ſon of Antiochus King of Comagena (*a*); but this marriage was diſſolved before it was conſummated, becauſe Epiphanes would not fulfill the promiſe he had made of embracing the Jewiſh Religion. Azizus King of the Emiſeni was not ſo ſcrupulous, he conſenting to be circumciſed, upon condition that he ſhould marry Druſilla. She accordingly was given to him in marriage, and he turned Jew (*b*). She was a woman of exquiſite beauty, and was no ſooner ſeen by Felix, but he fell in love with her. He made propoſals of marriage, and his offers were ſo advantageous, that ſhe accepted of them. Accordingly ſhe left Azizus her huſband, and her Religion, at the ſame time [*A*]; and married Felix who then commanded in Judea. The jealouſy that reigned between her and Berenice her ſiſter [*B*], was one of the great motives which prompted her to this ſecond marriage (*c*). Felix

(*a*) Joſeph. *Antiquit.* lib. 19. cap. 7.

(*b*) Idem, ibid. lib. 20. cap. 5.

(*c*) Ibid.

[*A*] *She left Azizus her huſband, and her Religion at the ſame time.*] I promiſed a remark on this occaſion elſewhere (1). A learned man has obſerved to me, that the words of the Jewiſh Hiſtorian ſignify only, that this marriage of Druſilla was contrary to the Laws; now this does not imply a change of Religion. I own it; but methinks Joſephus declares what I advanced. Here follow his words, Ἡ δ' (Δρούσιλλα) *καλῶς πράττουσα, καὶ φυγεῖν τὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀδελφῆς Βερενίκης βλασφημίαν φθόνον, ἀφῆκε μὲν τὸ κάλλος πρὸ ἐκείνης ἐν ὀλίγοις ἐβλάπτετο, παραβῆναι τὰ τῶν πατρίων νόμιμα πείθεται, καὶ τῷ Φήλικι γήμασα.* That is, according to Gelenius's verſion: *Illa* (Druſilla) *male conſulta volens evadere moleſtationes ſororis Bernices, invidentis ſibi formæ præcellentiam, conſenſit calcata religione patria Felici nubere:* and according to Genebrard's tranſlation, *She, being ill adviſed, and deſirous of ſecuring herſelf from the envy of Berenice her ſiſter, who was vexed at her being ſo exquiſitely beautiful, conſented to* FORSAKE HER RELIGION, *and to marry Felix.* Arnaud d'Andilli has given the ſame interpretation, (with reſpect to her abjuration of the Jewiſh Religion) of the Greek text of the Hiſtorian. A circumſtance which perſuades me, that Genebrard has tranſlated this paſſage juſtly is, that it is not probable that Felix, in the employment he enjoyed, would have dared to marry a woman who looked upon the Religion of the Romans as an abomination; that he would have dared, I ſay, to have married ſuch a woman, without repreſenting to her, that ſhe muſt entertain a different idea of the worſhip of the Gods of Rome. It is not probable that Druſilla rejected this condition, ſince ſhe was to marry a man who commanded over Judæa; who had a great ſhare in the Emperor's favour, and had a brother who was that Monarch's favourite. I know very well that the Romans were great friends to toleration in Religion; but there is a wide difference between tolerating a Religion which does not condemn yours; and tolerating a ſect which pronounces an anathema againſt, and damns you. This the Jews did with regard to all other Religions. Farther, there is a great difference between permitting a woman to profeſs, undiſturbed, the Jewiſh Religion; and marrying her notwithſtanding ſhe profeſſes it. We may alſo make an obſervation on the conſtruction of Joſephus's words; for had he meant, only, that Druſilla married a Heathen, and that the Laws of the Jewiſh Religion would not ſuffer her to marry him; he then needed not to have divided his words in the manner he has done. They evidently contain two propoſitions; the one, that ſhe forſook her Religion; and the other, that ſhe married Felix. This is a ſign that there is ſomething in the firſt which is not included in the ſecond. However, I would not inſiſt too much on this proof: for there are but too many examples to ſhow, that Writers ſeldom obſerve with ſtrictneſs, the maxims of Logic in the conſtruction of their words; and it was antiently a figure of Grammar (4) to ſeparate a ſingle object into two expreſſions. *Pateris libamus & auro* (5) for *Pateris aureis.* i. e. "We quaff out of cups "and gold, inſtead of golden cups." I would not have my Readers imagine, that I here draw Feſtus as a devout heathen and a conſcientious man; I do but aſcribe to him ſome political ſcruples; and only ſuppoſe that he was not ignorant, that the advances he made in riches and dignity raiſed the jealouſy of ſeveral formidable Courtiers, whom it would not be his intereſt to furniſh with an opportunity of defaming and undermining him at Court, with ſo ſpecious an opportunity, I ſay, as this would have been, had he married a woman who profeſſed an open abhorrence for the houſhold Gods and the Religion in general of the Romans.

(1) In the Remark [*E*] of the Article BERENICE, granddaughter &c.

(2) Mr. de la Roque a French Refugee Miniſter, living in London.

(3) Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. 20. cap. 5. pag. 693.

(4) It was called ἐν διὰ δυοῖν.

(5) Virgil. *Georgic.* lib. 2. ver. 192.

[*B*] *The Jealouſy which reigned between her, and Berenice her ſiſter.*] I have ſpoken elſewhere of this Berenice. She was a beautiful, ambitious, gay, intriguing woman. I am not ſurprized that ſhe did not love her ſiſter, ſhe being exquiſitely handſome, and ten years younger than Berenice. The latter would gladly, on this occaſion, have reſigned to her the right of ſeniority. In the article of beauty, ten years make this right very diſtaſteful. An elder ſiſter would with pleaſure give it up, and exchange it for the title of younger ſiſter; but nature cannot be changed. Berenice's jealouſy was not a hidden ſenſation: Druſilla felt the effects of it; ſo that ſhe was very glad to be enabled by her marrying the Governor of Judæa, a man who was in great favour with the Emperor Claudius (6), to diſpute for priority with Berenice. The Antients had a Proverb declaring, that the hatred of brothers is bitter to the laſt degree, *Fratrum inter ſe iræ ſunt acerbiſſimæ* (7): now it is my opinion that the hatred between ſiſters is ſtill more violent: and if it may be affirmed, that all thoſe times belong to the iron age, in which a friendſhip between brothers was an unuſual thing, *Fratrum quoque gratia rara eſt* (8); I believe the ſame may be ſaid with much greater juſtice, with regard to that of ſiſters. Three circumſtances commonly (9) prevent their entertaining a jealouſy one againſt the other, viz. the Grace of God, and want of qualities that excite envy, and an extreme ſtupidity; for if their age gives them an opportunity of exhibiting themſelves advantageouſly at the ſame time, with great beauty, wit and fortune, it is almoſt impoſſible for them to love one another; and it would be the worſt way for a perſon, in order to make his court to the one, to applaud the other. Many have the art and ſtrength of mind not to diſcover the uneaſineſs which that occaſions in them; but then they are not the leſs tortured with it. I ſhall end this remark with the concluſion of a letter written by Mr. de la Fontaine to the Dutcheſs de Bouillon (10), "Thoſe "innocent creatures, Madam, are your Highneſs and "Madam Mazarine. This would be the proper place "for making alſo her Elogium, in order to join it "to yours; but as theſe kind of parallels are ſome-"what delicate, I fancy it will be more proper for "me to wave them.

Vous vous aimez en ſœurs, cependant (11) j'ai raiſon
D'éviter la comparaiſon:
L'on ſe peut partager, mais non pas la louange;
Le plus grand Orateur, quand ce ſeroit un Ange,
Ne contenteroit pas en ſemblables deſſeins
Deux Belles, deux Heroes, deux Auteurs, ni deux Saints." That is,

"You love as ſiſters ought to do, and yet
"I've reaſon not to attempt the parallel:
"Gold may be ſoon divided, but not praiſe.
"The greateſt Orator, tho' an Arch-Angel,
"Wou'd not, on this occaſion, ſatisfy
"Two Saints, two Wits, two Beauties or two He-"roes.

(6) He was that Emperor's freedman. Sueton. *in Claud.* cap. 28. and brother of Pallas. Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. 20. cap. 5. Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 12. cap. 54. Pallas had a great ſhare in the Emperor Claudius's favour. Sueton. ibid. Tacit. ibid.

(7) Eraſmus, in commenting this Proverb, cites Ariſtotle, *Politic.* 7. who ſays, Ὅθεν εἴρηται, χάλεποι γὰρ πόλεμοι ἀδελφῶν, "Whence the "proverb, *the* "*wars of brothers* "*are cruel.*"

(8) Ovid. *Met.* lib. 1. ver. 145.

(9) I would have the reader lay due ſtreſs on theſe words: for every perſon may know very good and noble exceptions to this rule.

(10) Printed in tome 2. of *Retour des Pieces choiſies*, printed in 1688; and in the *Poſthumous Works of la Fontaine*, pag. 85, & *ſeq.* edit. Amſterdam in 1696.

(11) It were better to ſay on many other occaſions, *therefore, that nevertheleſs.*

Cunæus argues very well on the motive of the prohibition with regard to the marrying of two ſiſters at one and the ſame time. *In Levitici cap. XVIII,* ſays he (12), *edictum Numinis extat, quo Judæi duas ſorores eodem tempore habere uxores vetantur, non ob aliam cauſam profectò, quàm quòd ardentiſſima eſſe inter has æmulatio*

(12) Cunæus, *de Repub. Hebr.* lib. 2. cap. 23. pag. m. 256. See *Polygamia triumphatrix*, pag. 373.

(d) *Acts of the Apostles*, chap. xxiv. ver. 25.

Felix and Druſilla are mentioned in Scripture (*d*). They had a ſon called Agrippa, who, with his wife, periſhed in the flames of Mount Veſuvius (*e*). Tacitus is very probably miſtaken, in what is advanced by him relating to the marriage of Felix [*C*]. Moreri has committed ſome miſtakes which he might eaſily have avoided [*D*], had he wrote with attention, and accuſtomed himſelf to accuracy.

(e) Joſeph. *Antiquit.* lib. 20. cap. 5.

æmulatio in tali conjunctione ſolet ; cum cæteræ omninò, quæ eâ conſanguinitate non ſunt, æquiore animo ſub eodem marito ætatem unà agant. i. e. "In chap. "XVII of Leviticus *(ſays he)* is a decree by which "the Jews are forbid to have two ſiſters, (as wives) "at one and the ſame time ; and for this reaſon "only, becauſe there frequently happens to be the "ſharpeſt ſtrife between them, when thus married ; "whilſt others who are not ſo nearly related, live in "greater friendſhip under the ſame huſband."

[*C*] *Tacitus is very probably miſtaken, in what is advanced by him relating to the marriage of Felix.*] Here follow his words (13). *Claudius defunctis regibus aut ad modicum redactis Judæam provinciam equitibus Romanis aut libertis permiſit. Et quibus Antonius Felix per omnem ſævitiam ac libidinem jus regium ſervili ingenio exercuit, Druſilla Cleopatræ & Antonii nepte in matrimonium accepta, ut ejuſdem Antonii Felix progener, Claudius nepos eſſet.* i. e. "Claudius, when the Kings "of Judæa were all dead, or their power very much "leſſened, gave the government of Judæa as a Pro"vince of the Empire, either to the Roman Knights "or his freedmen. Among the latter was Antonius "Felix, who, behaving with the utmoſt licentiouſneſs "and cruelty, exerciſed the regal authority with the "mean ſpirit of a ſlave. He had married Druſilla, "grand-daughter to Cleopatra and Anthony ; ſo that "whilſt the Emperor was Anthony's grandſon, Fe"lix was huſband to Anthony's grand-daughter." Theſe words ſignify evidently, that Felix was the huſband of Druſilla, grand-daughter of Mark Anthony and Cleopatra, at that time that he commanded our Judæa. Now this has not ſo much as the ſhadow of probability ; for Joſephus, who ought to be credited ſooner than Tacitus on this occaſion, informs us, that Felix made his addreſſes to Druſilla, a little after his arrival in Judæa. But would Felix have preſumed to do this, had he been actually married to a Lady who was Couſin German to the Emperor ? Could he have married Druſilla, ſiſter to Agrippa II, during the life of the other Druſilla grand-daughter to Mark Anthony ? Could he, I ſay, have married her without firſt divorcing the other Druſilla ? And had he divorced her, would Joſephus have concealed an incident like this, ſo proper to caſt an odium on this Governor ? for in this caſe, Felix would have diſſolved two marriages to ſatisfy his paſſions. He would have divorced one Druſilla, and have made another Druſilla forſake her huſband. A national Hiſtorian ſeldom paſſes over ſuch circumſtances of theſe. Tacitus may the more juſtly be ſuſpected of negligence, as it is certain that he is miſtaken with regard to the time in which Felix governed Judea. He ſuppoſes (14), that Felix and Cumanus commanded in that country, at one and the ſame time ; Felix over Samaria, and Cumanus over Galilea. Now nothing can be more falſe than this ; for, according to Joſephus, who certainly had better informations than Tacitus ; Felix was not ſent into Judea, till after Cumanus had been ſent into baniſhment, becauſe of his male-adminiſtration (15). I perhaps may be aſked, how came Tacitus to commit this error ? I believe two cauſes may be aſſigned for it. Hearing that Felix had been married to Druſilla, he might have imagined that this Druſilla was daughter to Juba and Cleopatra Selene, daughter of Mark Anthony and Cleopatra ; and did not give himſelf the trouble to examine, whether there was a Lady in Judea of that name. But on the other ſide, Felix, before he went into Judea, might have married Druſilla grand-daughter of Mark Anthony ; and this Druſilla might have died before he fell in love with the other Druſilla a Jeweſs. This laſt opinion will appear the moſt probable to thoſe who have read in Suetonius, that Felix had married three Queens (16), by which may be underſtood three Princeſſes of the Blood. But beſides, no Hiſtorian mentions a Druſilla, grand-daughter of Mark Anthony and Cleopatra. Thoſe who pretend that Druſilla the Jeweſs, ſprung from the marriage of Agrippa with a daughter of Mark Anthony and Cleopatra, will find themſelves confuted by Noldius (17).

(13) Tacit. *Hiſt.* lib. 5. cap. 9.

(14) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 12. cap. 54.

(15) Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. 20. cap. 5.

(16) *Nec minus Felicem quem conortibus & aliis provinciæque Judæa præpoſuit trium reginarum maritum.* Sueton. *in Claud.* cap. 18. *See* Grævius's beautiful remark on this.

(17) Noldius, *de Vita & Geſtis Herodum*, pag. 469.

(18) Joſeph. *Antiquit.* lib. 20. cap. 5.

[*D*] *Moreri has committed ſome miſtakes.*] I. He ſhould not have ſaid, that Epiphanes promiſed Druſilla to become a Jew. Such promiſes are not made to a child of five or ſix years of age : But it was to Druſilla's father that he thus made this promiſe, as Joſephus obſerves (18). II. He ſhould not have confounded Agrippa the father with Agrippa the ſon : but ought to have ſaid, that the former betrothed Druſilla to Epiphanes, and the latter married her to Azizus. III. It is not ſaid in the Acts of the Apoſtles, that Druſilla was preſent when Paul reaſoned in the preſence of Felix, concerning juſtice and the day of judgment.

DRUSILLA (JULIA), daughter of Germanicus and Agrippina, married Lucius Caſſius, in the year of Rome 786 (*a*).. Druſilla degenerated very much from the virtue of her parents, ſhe leading a very ſcandalous life [*A*]. Druſilla, when very young, dallied with Caligula her brother, who was ſurprized in the act before he was of age to wear the *Toga virilis* (*b*) [*B*] : ſhe continued this inceſtuous commerce all her life ; and her paſſion for Caligula was inexpreſſibly flagrant and known to the whole world. He took her from Lucius Caſſius her huſband ; lived publickly with her as though ſhe had been his lawful

(a) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 6. cap. 15.

(b) See the Remark [*D*] of the Article CALIGULA.

AN obſervation on the joke. *Et ſequitur leviter filia matris iter.*

[*A*] *Druſilla degenerated very much from the virtue of her parents, ſhe leading a very ſcandalous life.*] Should any lover of ſcandal come and tell me, that the Latin joke, *Et ſequitur leviter filia matris iter.* i. e. "As is the mother, ſuch the daughter is," is not true, except where the mother is greatly depraved ; that it is only in this caſe that a daughter treads exactly in her mother's ſteps, I would confute him at once without going out of this family. Druſilla, indeed, had not imitated the good example which Agrippina her mother, who was the moſt virtuous Lady of her time, had ſet her ; but then, on the other ſide, Agrippina had not followed the bad example of Julia her mother, who was the moſt lewd woman of her age.

[*B*] *Druſilla when very young, dallied with Caligula her brother, who was ſurprized in the act before he was of age to wear the* Toga Virilis.] One might have applied, on this occaſion, ſomething like the French Proverb, *The habit does not make the Friar.* Caligula wore the robe of childhood, and yet was not a child : tho' he did not wear the virile gown, he gave ſtrong proofs of his virility. Let us not fancy to our ſelves that he furniſhes us with one of thoſe extraordinary examples mentioned by Authors, I mean of boys who have procreated at ten or twelve years of age. We muſt draw things as they are, and do juſtice to every one. The depraved nature of Caligula might have haſtened his criminal reſolutions, but not the vigour requiſite for him to plunge into inceſt. Though he had the robe of childhood on when he was catched in the act, he yet might have been of a fit age, according to the uſual courſe of nature. He did not put on the *Toga virilis* till he was twenty. *Vigeſimo ætatis anno accitus Capreas à Tiberio, uno atque eodem die togam ſumpſit, barbamque poſuit* (1). i. e. "Being ſent for by Tiberius, to Capreæ, "in his twentieth year, on one and the ſame day, "put on the virile gown, and was ſhaved for the "firſt time," and he was eighteen when he went to live with his grandmother. Now it was at her houſe that he was catched ſporting with his ſiſter.

(1) Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 10.

lawful wife; and, when ſhe died, in the year of Rome 791, he gave into the moſt impious extravagancies to honour her memory [C]. Dion relates that ſhe was married to Marcus Æmilius Lepidus (d). Moreri has committed two errors, in advancing that Germanicus was brother to Tiberius (e), and that Druſilla was grand-daughter of Auguſtus (f).

(d) Dio, lib. 59. *ad ann.* 791.

(e) He was ſon of Druſus, brother to Tiberius.

(f) She was his great grand-daughter.

He was brought up firſt at his mother's, ſecondly at Livia's, thirdly at Antonia's. *Primum in matris, deinde ea relegata in Liviæ Auguſtæ proaviæ ſuæ contubernio manſit. Quam defunctam prætextatus etiam tum pro roſtris laudavit, tranſiitque ad Antoniam aviam. Idem, ibid.* (2). i. e. "He lived firſt with his mother, and "after her being repudiated, with Livia his grand-"mother, who dying, he ſpoke her funeral Oration "before he put on the virile gown; and after this "went and lived with Antonia his grandmother." He did not go to live with the laſt mentioned till the death of Livia, that is, in 782; and he was born in 764 (3). Nevertheleſs, far be it from me to retract what I declared above (4), *that Caligula's depravity ſhewed itſelf early*. Though he ſhould have been twenty years of age when he committed inceſt, I yet might juſtly ſay of him, that in *diſpoſitions naturally wicked, Vice does not wait for the number of years*. It is impoſſible to pronounce his name without calling up ideas of the moſt exceſſive wickedneſs that man can poſſibly commit. His life is one continued ſeries of ſuch dreadful enormities, that ſome people are of opinion that Hiſtorians drew him more wicked than he really was. It muſt be confeſſed that ſuch monſters are rarely found, and much more rarely than the greateſt Saints and the moſt accompliſhed heroes; however, Caligula is not the only man in whom nature has ſhewn to how great a height ſhe could carry her depravity and corruption. I queſtion whether ſhe ever exhibited, on the ſame throne, and in ſo ſhort a time four ſuch examples, as ſhe did on that of the Cæſars, from Tiberius to Domitian.

(2) Idem, ibid.

(3) Idem, ibid.

(4) In the text of the Article CALIGULA.

[C] *Caligula gave into the moſt impious extravagancies to honour her memory.*] Her funeral was ſolemnized with the utmoſt magnificence. He publiſhed decrees, to honour the memory of Druſilla, like to thoſe which had been made for Livia wife of Auguſtus; and beſides this, there was a public decree which declared that Druſilla was ranked in the number of the immortals. A golden ſtatue repreſenting her, was ſet up in the Senate Houſe: There was erected in her honour, in the forum, another ſtatue like that of Venus; and the ſame honours were paid to it as to that Goddeſs. A Temple was conſecrated particularly to her; and men and women were commanded to dedicate ſtatues to her; women were ordered to ſwear by her name in any ſolemn atteſtation; and it was decreed, that on the birth day, the ſame kind of games ſhould be ſolemnized as on thoſe of Cybele. She was called *Panthea* (5), and divine honours were paid her in all cities. Livius Geminus a Roman Senator declared, that he had ſeen her aſcend into heaven and there converſe with the Gods; and he called down the moſt horrid curſes both on himſelf and his children, if what he then declared was not true; and among other Divinities, he called upon that of Druſilla as a witneſs to the truth of what he ſaid. This procured him a large ſum of money. The Romans were never ſo much puzzled as on this occaſion; and they did not know what face to aſſume. If they appeared ſorrowful, they were accuſed of not acknowledging her Divinity; if they appeared gay, they were accuſed of not regretting her death (6). Caligula made uſe of the human nature of his ſiſter againſt thoſe who did not weep, and of her divine nature againſt ſuch as were afflicted. During the public mourning which was appointed in her honour, it was a crime to laugh, to go into the bath, or to eat with one's family. *Eadem defuncta juſtitium indixit, in quo riſiſſe, laviſſe, cænaſſe cum parentibus, aut conjuge liberiſve, capitale fuit* (7). A poor man was put to death, for ſelling of hot water as guilty of irreligion. Τὸν πωλήσαντα θερμὸν ὕδωρ ἀπέκτεινεν ὡς ἀσεβήσαντα (8). After her death, Caligula, even in matters of the higheſt importance, never ſwore, either in the Senate Houſe or the Army, but by Druſilla's Divinity (9). Let us add to what is here ſaid, the other marks of his mad fury which have been related in his article. Seneca has given an excellent deſcription of the frantic ſtarts and ridiculous follies of Caligula's mourning (10).

(5) i. e. *All divine.* Theſe wretched flatterers made a greater progreſs in three days, than the Chriſtians of the Eaſt did in many ages: I ſpeak of thoſe who called the Virgin Mary *All holy, Panagia.*

(6) Extracted from *Dion*, lib. 59. *ad ann.* 791.

(7) Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 24.

(8) Dio, lib. 59. *ad ann.* 791.

(9) Idem, ibid.

(10) Seneca, *de Conſol. ad Polyb.* cap. 34.

DRUSIUS (a) (JOHN), born at Audenard in Flanders June the 28th 1555, was a man of very great learning among the Proteſtants. He was deſigned for the ſtudy of Divinity, and ſent very early to Ghent to learn the Languages there, and afterwards to Louvain to paſs through a courſe of Philoſophy. His father having been outlawed on account of the Proteſtant Religion in 1567, and deprived of all his eſtate, retired to England. His wife, a good Catholic, omitted nothing to prevent our John Druſius from following the ſame ſteps; ſhe ſent for him back to Audenard, and thence to Tournay; but her regret for being at once deprived both of her huſband and eſtate having thrown her into a ſevere fit of ſickneſs, ſhe could not keep ſuch an eye over her ſon, but that he found means to eſcape to his father at London. He arrived there about the end of the year 1567. His ſtudies were taken care of, and maſters provided for him, and he ſoon had an opportunity of learning Hebrew under Anthony Cevallier, who was come over to England, and taught that language publickly in the Univerſity of Cambridge. Druſius lodg'd at his houſe, and had a great ſhare in his friendſhip. He did not return to London till 1571, and while he was preparing to go to France [A], the news of the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's day made him change his reſolution. Soon after this, he was

(a) The name of his family was *Drieſche.*

[A] *He was preparing to go to France.*] Meurſius for want of attention did not well underſtand this Latin of Curiander. *Poſtea cum Cevallerius à ſuis in Galliam revocatus abitum pararet, impetravit à patre* (Druſius) *ut ibi adhuc annum integrum commorari poſſet* (1). The chief difficulty is not here, but in the words, which I am going to cite, *Anno poſt diſceſſum Cevallerii Janus noſter profectus eſt Londinum, hac fine, ut in Galliam, Philoſophiæ ſtudium proſequendi gratiâ, denuo concederet* (2). Meurſius interpreting one of theſe paſſages by the other, imagined that he might aſſert, that Druſius accompanied Cevallier to France, and upon his return to London, was preparing for a ſecond journey to France, when the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's Day altered his reſolution. *Revocato in Galliam Cevalerio eum comitatus, ad Hebræam ſumma cum contentione animum advertens privatim quoque adoleſcentes duos Anglos docere cœpit. Inde Londinum reverſus cum recurrere eo omnino ſtatuiſſet, laniena Pariſienſis nuntiatur. Qua de cauſa mutato conſilio, &c* (3). It is certain that Druſius did not go with Cevallier to France; he ſtaid at Cambridge, and taught there the two Engliſh pupils mentioned by Meurſius. This is evident from the account of Curiander, pag. 6. It is certain likewiſe, that after the departure of Cevallier he applied himſelf to Greek and Philoſophy more than to Hebrew; whence it appears that Meurſius has not well deſcribed the employments of this young man. In the ſecond paſſage of Curiander, a comma ſhould be placed after *denuo*, and not before it; and this deceived Meurſius. The Author means, that Druſius intended to go to France, in order to proſecute again his ſtudies of Philoſophy. I am certain, that we ſhould meet with an hundred miſtakes of this kind in books, if we were to take the pains to compare abridgments with the works, from which thoſe Abridgments are taken. And we may remark by the way of what conſequence mere faults in pointing are.

(1) Curiander, *in Vita Druſii*, pag. 5.

(2) Idem, pag. 6.

(3) Meurſius, *Athen. Batav.* pag. 253.

(b) He was Profeſſor of Divinity.

was invited to Cambridge by Thomas Cartwright (b), and to Oxford by Laurence Humphrey; he accepted of the latter invitation [B], and by that means became Profeſſor of the Oriental Languages at the age of twenty two. He taught them at Oxford four years with great ſucceſs: after this he was deſirous of returning to his own country, and arriving there went to Louvain, where he ſtudied Civil Law. The troubles on account of Religion oblig'd him to return to his father at London; but upon the Pacification of Ghent (c) they both return'd to their own country. The ſon try'd his fortune in Holland, and was ſoon appointed Profeſſor of the Oriental Tongues there (d). While he continued in this ſtation at Leyden he reſolv'd to marry. He marry'd in 1580 a young Gentlewoman of Ghent, who was more than half a convert [C], and became a thorough Proteſtant after her marriage. The ſtipend allow'd to Druſius in Holland not being ſufficient for the ſupport of his family, he gave intimations, that if better terms ſhould be offer'd him elſewhere, he would accept of them (e). The Prince of Orange being inform'd that he had in a manner offer'd himſelf to the beſt bidder, wrote to the Magiſtrates of Leyden, to take care not to loſe a man of his merit. However they ſuffer'd him to remove to Friſeland, whither he had been invited to be Profeſſor of Hebrew in the Univerſity of Franeker. He was admitted into that Profeſſorſhip in June 1585, and diſcharged the functions of it with great honour till his death, which happened on the twelfth of February (f) 1616 (g). It is certain that he was well skilled in Hebrew [D], and had gained a conſiderable knowledge in the Jewiſh Antiquities, and the text of the Old Teſtament. This is evident from ſeveral works which he publiſhed [E]. His abilities in that reſpect were ſo well known, that he had orders to write upon thoſe ſubjects, and was paid for that purpoſe by the States General [F]. He was thought of for a new Tranſlation of the Bible into Low Dutch [G]; but ſome perſons ſucceeded in their endeavours to exclude him.

(c) In 1576.

(d) In 1577.

(e) *Quoniam vero familiam ex tam parco ſtipendio, quod annuatim numerabatur, alere nequit hic noſter, alio cogitare incipit, ſuique fruendi, ſi legitime vocetur, ſpem facere.* Abel Curiander, *in Vita Druſii*, pag. 8.

(f) Old Style.

(g) Extracted from his *Life* written by *Abel Curiander*, his ſon-in-law.

[B] *He was invited to Cambridge . . . and Oxford. . . . He accepted the latter invitation.*] It was that of Oxford: we may correct therefore a miſtake of Paul Freher, who writes in his Theatre of illuſtrious Men (4), *Hebrææ Linguæ Profeſſor in Univerſitate* Cantuarienſi, *an. ætatis* 22 *conſtitutus eſt.* Here are two errors for one: it is falſe, that Druſius was Profeſſor at Cambridge; and it is a miſtake, that the Univerſity of Cambridge is called *Cantuarienſis*. This laſt word is the adjective of Canterbury.

(4) Pag. 1510.

[C] *He married a young Gentlewoman of Ghent, who was more than half converted.*] Her name was Mary Vander Varent: ſhe choſe rather to renounce her patrimony and country, than her religion, and was extremely charitable to the poor. I believe that ſhe died in 1599 (6). *Hæc cum in Flandriâ virgo, guſtum melioris purioriſque doctrinæ percepiſſet, conjux in Hollandiâ ita in illa confirmata eſt, ut citius bonis luculentiſſimis privari, deque civitate & patriâ, quam de ſententia ſua dimoveri potuerit. Præter alia, hoc de illa referunt, quod inexhauſtæ in pauperes fuerit benignitatis, qui unanimi & conſona voce Franekeræ clamitant, cum ejus mentio incidit:* Erat illa parens & mater unica egeſtatis, omniſque adverſitatis ſolamen (6). He had three children by this marriage, a daughter, who was born at Leyden 22d of March 1582, and married in 1604 to Abel Curiander, who publiſhed the Life of his father-in-law (7); another daughter, born at Franeker April 1ſt 1587, and married May 29th 1608 to Abraham Valkins; and a ſon, born June 26th 1588. I ſhall ſpeak of him below. The ſecond daughter died at Ghent November 12th 1612, whither ſhe had taken a journey on the account of ſome affairs. A Prieſt knowing her to be very dangerouſly ill went to confeſs her, and give her Extreme Unction; but ſhe ſent him away, and her huſband was ready to beat him. It was with great expence and danger that her body was removed into Zeland, for at Ghent they threatned to deny it burial (8).

(5) There is among the *Arminian Letters* a *Letter of Arminius* (it is the 147th) dated in May 1599, in which he condoles with Druſius for the loſs of his wife.

(6) Curiander, *in Vita Druſii*, pag. 7, 8.

(7) Ibid. pag. 8.

(8) Ibid. pag. 14, 15.

[D] *It was certain that he was well ſkilled in Hebrew.*] To ſhew that I ſpeak without any hyperbole, I ſhall cite an Author, who cannot be ſuſpected. "Druſius, who holds the ſeventh rank among thoſe "Critics (9), ought, in my opinion, to be preferred "to all the reſt: for beſides that he was well ſkilled "in Hebrew, and could conſult the Jewiſh Books "himſelf, he had read carefully the ancient Greek "Tranſlators, ſo that he had formed a better idea of "the holy language than the other Critics, who have "only applied themſelves to the reading of the Rabbins. We may add to this, that he had alſo read "the works of St. Jerom and ſeveral other Fathers. "In ſhort, Druſius is the moſt learned and moſt judicious of all the critics in that collection (10)."

(9) That is, among thoſe who were printed in England in the *Critica ſacra*.

(10) Father Simon, *Hiſtoire Critique du Vieux Teſtament*, liv. 3. chap. 15. pag. m. 443.

[E] *He publiſhed ſeveral Works.*] Thoſe who have his life will find there an exact liſt of all that he publiſhed, and deſigned for the Preſs: and thoſe who have not that piece may conſult Meurſius (11). One cannot without aſtoniſhment conſider the labours of this learned man: he had reviſed, corrected, and enlarged before his death all the Books, which he had publiſhed (12), and had written ſeveral other new treatiſes, and prepared ſeveral additions to Works written by others, which would have been more conſiderable than thoſe Works themſelves. *Sequuntur libri à D. Druſio quamplurimis additamentis aucti, adeo quoque ut ſi recudendi eſſent cum additamentis iſtis, à Druſio potius quam ab Authoribus nomen tracturi eſſent* (13).

(11) In *Athen. Batav.*

(12) *Antedictorum nullum eſſe librum qui poſtrema authoris cura non ſit factus melior aut auctior.* Curiander, *in Vita Druſii*, pag. 20.

(13) Ibid. pag. 26, 27.

[F] *He had orders to write . . . . and was paid . . . . by the States General.*] The States General ordered him in 1600 to write Notes upon the moſt difficult paſſages of the Old Teſtament, and promiſed him a penſion of four hundred Florins a year for ſeveral years. They wrote a letter to the States of Friſeland May the 18th 1601 to deſire them to diſpenſe with all Druſius's employments, which might retard that work. *In quibus* (Literis) *humaniſſime petunt, Druſius ut omnibus iſtis oneribus & incommodis eximatur, quæ opus illud Reipub. Chriſtianæ maximè profuturum ullo modo impedire poſſent* (14). Upon the reading this Letter the Deputies of the States of Friſeland diſcharged Druſius from all his academical functions, permitted him to ſubſtitute another perſon for his ordinary Lectures, and paid his Amanuenſis. He deſired his diſcharge in 1603, but was refuſed, becauſe among other reaſons his reputation had drawn a great many foreigners to the Univerſity of Franeker (15). He laboured upon Geneſis, Exodus, Leviticus, the XVIII firſt chapters of Numbers, and particularly upon the moſt difficult paſſages of the Pentateuch, the book of Joſhuah, and the Books of Samuel; he laboured, I ſay, upon them, in conformity to the orders of the States General, but he could not publiſh any part of this work, and was frequently diſturbed in the execution of thoſe orders (16).

(14) Ibid. pag. 14.

(15) Curiander, *in Vita Druſii*, pag. 14.

(16) Idem, pag. 23, 24.

[G] *He was thought of for a new Tranſlation of the Bible into Low Dutch.*] The Deputies of the States of Friſeland (17) gave him a Commiſſion in 1596 to undertake this work in conjunction with the Sieur de Sainte Aldegonde and ſome other perſons. Several learned men judging him well qualified for this work recommended him ſtrongly to the States (18). It is proper to ſee what Sainte Aldegonde wrote to him in 1594 (19): *De Bibliorum verſione, quæ eſt, quam ad Ordines Belgii commemoras ſententia, etſi video te gravibus commotum rationibus, non poſſum tamen aſſentiri. Ego enim noſtram hanc, quæ vulgo manibus teritur verſionem ejuſmodi eſſe exiſtimo, quæ planè novas lucubrationes, novumque penitus opus requirat. Inter omnes autem omnium verſiones ego ingenuè fatebor, mihi viſam eſſe nullam tanto abeſſe ab Ebraicâ veritate intervallo, atque*

(17) They are a Body, who repreſent the States of the Province, while they are not aſſembled.

(18) Curiander, *in Vita Druſii*, pag. 12.

(19) Ibid. pag. 13.

him. He held a vaſt correſpondence by letters with learned men [*H*], and he found by this means that his works were eſteemed, and was perpetually exhorted to labour for the advantage of the public. He had occaſion for this conſolation (*b*); for he had a great many enemies, who threw a thouſand obſtacles in his way [*I*], and cruelly attack'd his reputation. His modeſty, or his freedom from prejudices made him more reſerv'd than many others in condemning and applauding; this occaſion'd him to be decried as a bad Proteſtant [K]. His

(*b*) See Note [*M*].

atque ſit Lutheri verſio è qua manavit noſtra: ex vitioſa Germanica facta vitioſior Belgico-Teutonica. De quo ſi nobis liceat aliquando familiariter conferre, pro hermæo duxerim. Id vero vehementer doleo, pleroſque noſtros homines in me videri oculos defixiſſe, qui ſatis intelligam, quanta mihi. Itaque velim Eccleſias noſtras, quod ego multis etiam ſuaſi, in te reſpicere, tibique hanc demandare provinciam. Idque ſi id tibi non ingratum fore intelligam, ero illis author quantum potero, etſi video nihil dum eos certi ſtatuiſſe. De quo ſi tuum mihi animum aperueris, facies gratum. i. e. "With regard to your "opinion concerning the Tranſlation of the Bible, "which you have obſerved to the States, tho' I ſee "you are influenced by weighty reaſons, yet I cannot "aſſent. For I think that our common verſion is "ſuch that it requires abſolutely a new work. But "among all the ſeveral Tranſlations I frankly own, "that I never have ſeen any ſo remote from the He-"brew Text, as that of Luther, from which our Ver-"ſion was taken, from a faulty German Tranſlation "a ſtill more faulty Low-Dutch one. If we ſhall ever "have the opportunity of diſcourſing familiarly up-"on this ſubject, I ſhall account it an happineſs. "But I am extremely ſorry, that moſt of our coun-"trymen ſeem to have fixed their eyes upon me; "who am ſufficiently conſcious how ſmall my abili-"ties are. I could wiſh therefore that our Churches "would pitch upon you, as I have adviſed a great "many perſons, and commit this Province to you. "And if I ſhall underſtand that it is not diſliked by "you, I will perſuade them to the utmoſt of my "power, tho' I do not find they have yet determined "any thing abſolutely. You will oblige me, if you "will tell me your mind upon this affair." This paſſage is ſevere upon Luther's Tranſlation, and ſtill more ſo upon that made uſe of by the Churches of the Low-Countries at that time. Monſr. Simon could not have ſpoken more diſadvantageouſly of it (20). I find among the *Arminian Letters* (21), that Arminius and Utenbogard recommended Druſius as well with regard to the Commiſſion granted to him by the States General in 1600, as to the new Tranſlation; but their kind offices were undoubtedly prejudicial to him in the latter affair. It was probably thought, that ſince they judged him a proper perſon for that work, he was by no means ſo. However that be, I have read in thoſe Letters (22). that one of the Synods of Holland made an Act, by which he was excluded not only from the Tranſlation, but likewiſe from reviſing it.

(20) See above Note [*B*] of the Article of AMAMA.

(21) See the 47th, 48th, 49th, 50th, and 51ſt Letters of the folio edition.

(22) In the 53d Letter.

[*H*] *He held a vaſt correſpondence by letters with learned men.*] Beſides the Letters, which he received in Hebrew, Greek, French, Engliſh, and Low-Dutch, there were found 2300 Latin Letters among his papers (23).

(23) Curiander, *in Vita Druſii*, pag. 11.

[*I*] *He had a great many enemies, who threw a thouſand obſtacles in his way.*] The Act of the Synod abovementioned relating to the Tranſlation of the Bible, was made merely to exclude Druſius. *Tu quidem illius ſolius excludendi cauſa decretum factum eſſe prudenter animadvertebas, ſed juvenis viginti annorum hoc ex ore Roggii aperte eſt profeſſus, ignarus proculdubio quo loco Druſius apud me eſſet* (24). He remarked with his own hand at the end of his Commentary on Geneſis, that he had been prodigiouſly croſſed in the execution of the orders of the States General: his words are as follow; *Abſoluta fuit hæc in Geneſin commentatio undecimo Aprilis ſtilo veteri, anno Chriſti* 1602, *quam aggreſſus eram biennio ante auſpiciis illuſtrium Ordinum Generalium Provinciarum Fœderatarum, procurantibus hoc negotium Johanne Wtenbogardo, Jacobo Arminio, Jacobo Baſelio, aliiſque verbi divini Præconibus, non tam facundis quam doctis ac piis, veritatiſque ac ſolidæ doctrinæ ſtudioſiſſimis. Deus illis & mihi largiatur; illis præmium quale merentur, mihi otium & bonam valetudinem, ut poſſim in cæteros libros ſimilia præſtare. Quod futurum puto ex uſu Eccleſiæ Orthodoxæ, quam amo ac veneror, ut contra odi Eccleſiam errantium & imperitorum, quorum illi familiam ducunt qui me in hoc opere non ſemel turbarunt. Deus illis condonet, cui laus & gloria in ævum* (25). i. e. "This Commentary on Geneſis was fi-"niſhed on the 11th of April old ſtyle in the year "1602, which I began two years before at the com-"mand of the illuſtrious States General of the Unit-"ed Provinces, at the procurement of John Utenbo-"gard, James Arminius, James Baſelius, and other "Preachers of the Goſpel, men leſs eminent for their "eloquence than their learning and piety, and ſincere "lovers of truth and ſolid doctrine. May God grant "them the reward which they deſerve, and me leiſure "and health, in order to perform the like ſervice upon "the other Books; which I believe will be of ad-"vantage to the orthodox Church, which I love and "reverence, as on the contrary I hate the Church of "the erroneous and ignorant, who are directed by "thoſe, who have more than once diſturbed me in "this work. May God forgive them, to whom be "praiſe and glory for ever." He loſt his patience at laſt; he wrote a piece againſt his perſecutors, (for I do not doubt that he called them ſo;) I have not ſeen it; and know nothing of it but by the following quotation in his life (26): *J. Druſii ad Abelum Curiandrum generum ſuum Epiſtola, in qua agitur de vehementia, qua uſus fuit in Epiſtola ſua ad Fratres Belgas. Item Speculum Theologorum miſologorum ex Eraſmo.* i. e. "A Letter of John Druſius to his ſon-in-law Abel Cu-"riander, in which he treats of the vehemence, which "he had uſed in his Letter to his brethren in the Low-"Countries. Likewiſe the Mirrour of the miſologiſt "Divines from Eraſmus."

(25) Curiander, *in Vita Druſii*, pag. 23.

(26) Pag. 26, 27.

[*K*] *He was reſerved in condemning and applauding; this occaſioned him to be decried as a bad Proteſtant.*] He was not a man, who in points of Divinity would pronounce magiſterially, *that is heretical; this is orthodox*. He troubled himſelf with nothing but Grammar, and declared frequently, that if he was miſtaken, he was at leaſt exempt from hereſy, ſince he was not confident and preſumptuous in it, but ready to hear inſtruction, and ſubmitted all his works and himſelf to the Catholic Church. *Tenuis mea ſcientia verſatur tota circa Grammaticam & Hiſtoriam (v. ſacram.) Dogmata fidei aliis me doctioribus tractanda relinquo. . . . . Pertinacia facit hæreticum, non ſimplex error, nam humanum eſt errare, humani autem à me nihil alienum ſcio. Monitus non ero pertinax, nec unquam fui. Olim profeſſus ſum quod nunc iterum repeto, me mea omnia ſubjicere judicio Eccleſiæ* (27). In another place (28) he ſpeaks thus: *Non ſum Theologus: an Grammatici nomen, quod aliquando mihi probroſe objectum, tueri poſſim neſcio. Amici quos noſti negant, ego non contradico. Quid igitur es, inquies? Chriſtianus ſum φιλαληθὴς ſum, qui ſcribendi proficio, & proficiendo ſcribo.* i. e. "I am no divine; and cannot tell "whether I can ſupport the character of a Gramma-"rian, which has been ſometimes reproachfully ob-"jected to me. The friends, whom you know, deny "it; and I do not contradict them. What are you "therefore? you will ſay. I am a Chriſtian, and a "lover of truth, who improve by writing, and write "by improving." I ſhall only add the following paſſage: *Quod ſupereſt, ſcripſi hæc animo juvandi, non lædendi. Si læſi quempiam jam nunc pœnitet. Si offendi pias aures, monitus libenter mutabo. Si erravi uſpiam, monſtretur mihi error: Non ero pertinax. Denique provoco ad judicium Eccleſiæ Catholicæ, cui me meaque omnia ſubjicio* (29), *à cujus recto ſenſu diſſentire neque volo neque debeo. Sic mihi Deus faciat, ſic addat* (30). i. e. "As for what remains, I have writ-"ten theſe things, with a deſign to do ſervice, not to "injure any perſon; and if I have done the latter, I "am now ſorry for it. If I have offended pious "ears, when I ſhall be ſhewn it, I will readily change "it. If I have been any where miſtaken, let the er-"ror

(27) Druſius, *in Libro* Haſidæis, pag. 22. *apud* Curiand. pag. 21.

(28) *In Tetragrammato*, pag. 81. *apud* Curiand. *ibid.*

(29) *Hæc & alia quæ hoc libro continentur ut & in aliis omnibus à me unquam editis aut edendis ſubjicio libens Eccleſiæ Catholicæ judicio, à cujus recto ſenſu ſi diſſentio non ero pertinax.* Thus he ſpeaks in the Preface to his *Enoch apud* Curiand. pag. 22.

(30) *In Libro* Præteritorium, pag. 454. *apud eund.* pag. 22.

(24) Arminius ad Uytenbogardum, *Epiſt.* 53. *præſt. ac eruditor. Virorum*, pag. 102.

His anſwer to this deſerves a reflection [*L*]; but it did not prevent him from groaning under his hard fate [*M*]. His ſon would have proved a prodigy of learning, if

" ror be pointed out to me, I will not be obſtinate. " Laſtly, I appeal to the judgment of the Catholic " Church, to which I ſubmit myſelf and all my " writings, and from whoſe true ſenſe I neither would " nor ought to diſſent. May God ſo do to me, and ſo " reward me." This language by no means pleaſed the zealots; they found in it the marks of Scepticiſm; they would have a perſon more deciſive and reſolute than Bartolus; they would have him act like themſelves, that is, embrace an opinion firmly, and anathematize the contrary. They could not conceive a man to be of a religion, when he continues cool in comparing it with others, and moderate againſt the followers of hereſy. Druſius was therefore a perſon, who could not fail of many dangerous enemies. And with regard to this expreſſion, *I ſubmit my ſelf and all my writings to the judgment of the Catholic Church*, is it not the ſtyle of the Court of Rome? If this gave the zealots an advantage againſt him, to what did he not expoſe himſelf by refuſing to ſign the Formulary? I have read in the *Scaligerana*, that he did not ſign the Confeſſion of the Low-Countries. *Druſius noluit unquam ſubſcribere Confeſſioni noſtræ, & propterea illi malè volunt ſui Collegæ.* i. e. " Druſius would never " ſign our Confeſſion, upon which account his col- " legues are enemies to him." *Druſius knows not what Religion is; he is not of our Confeſſion: he was always educated at Louvain among the Papiſts* (31). *Serarius had been informed, that he would not ſign our Confeſſion.* This refuſal was an indication, that he did not approve of all the Articles of the Confeſſion of the Low-Countries; but it could not juſtly be concluded, that he was a Papiſt, or did not believe the Communion of the Church in the Low-Countries preferable to that of others. The Author of *L'Eſprit de Monſr. Arnaud* was was not well verſed in his *Scaligerana*; for how would he have declaimed againſt poor Monſr. Colomies; if he could have reproached him for having cited in his *Icon Preſbyterianorum* the teſtimony of a man, who conſtantly refuſed to ſign the Confeſſion of the Low-Countries? This would have given him an opportunity of falling ſeverely upon Druſius and Colomies at the ſame time (32).

(31) Scaliger is miſtaken. Druſius left Louvain in 1567 at 17 years of age, and after that never returned thither but for a few months in the beginning of 1576. This is evident from his Life.

(32) This would not have been *una fidelia duos parietes dealbare*, but *deturpare & conſpurcare.*

[*L*] *His anſwer to this deſerves a reflection.*] He repreſented firſt, that his father had left almoſt all his eſtate for the Proteſtant Religion. He then urged, that with regard to himſelf, worldly advantages never were of weight enough with him to profeſs the Proteſtant Religion contrary to his conſcience; he had gone thro' his ſtudies at the expence of his father; the ſtipend, which he received at Leyden, was not ſufficient to ſupport him; he had only to retire into Flanders to enjoy a good income there. Laſtly, he obſerves, that thoſe, who exclaimed ſo much againſt him, were perſons, who had grown rich by profeſſing the Proteſtant Religion, while he was empoveriſhed by it. We may ſee ſtill men of this caſt: their profeſſing the Reformed Religion brings them a good revenue, free of all taxes; they enjoy a kind of Papacy, praiſes, honours, flattery, low ſubmiſſions from the people; they would loſe all theſe advantages, if they were to abandon that profeſſion; and yet they never ceaſe to charge with indifference, and perſecute furiouſly under that pretence, many perſons, who are ruined in their worldly views by the very ſame profeſſion. It brings them nothing, and cuts them off from an hundred advantages, which they might obtain by quitting it. I make this remark to ſhew how much ages and nations reſemble each other. The reader may ſee from the following paſſage whether I have rightly tranſlated Druſius's words with reſpect to which I have taken from thence. *Sparſerunt de me rumorem vaniſſimum*, ſumma eſt, me alienum eſſe ab hac religione. *Quid dicam? Poſt natam calumniam non fuit unquam major calumnia. Egone alienus à religione, cujus cauſa pater meus p. m. amiſit anno* 67. *octodecim millia florenorum? Quum autem exularet Londini una mecum, habebat penes ſe libras Flandricas, quas majores vocant, mille quingentas. Ex illis mille quadringentas impendit in cauſam publicam. Princeps Auriacus partem accepit, aliam Ordines Hollandiæ & Zelandiæ, tertiam pauperes, qui religionis ergo in Angliam confugerant. Centum quæ reſtabant poſtliminio reverſus retuli domum. Quod dico vero verius eſt. Idem propriis ſumptibus me aluit in ſtudiis. A publico nihil unquam accepi. Quum Profeſſorem agerem Leidæ, ſtipendium erat tam parvum, ut coactus fuerim ex meo impendere quotannis trecentos, aliquando quadringentos. Habeo in Flandria reditus non pœnitendos, quibus frui poſſem ſi eſſem in patriâ. Quorſum iſta inquies? Nempe ut ſcias vanum eſſe quod æmuli mei ſparſerunt, qui omnes ſimul tantam jacturam non fecerunt, quantam ego ſolus feci, quos hæc religio divites, ut me pauperem fecit, quem nunc contemnunt propterea, optimè de ipſis meritum* (33).

(33) Druſius, *Epiſtola ad Pancratium Caſtricomium*, dated Feb. 6, 1600. *apud* Curiand. *in ejus Vitâ*, pag. 34.

[*M*] *. . . . and did not prevent him from groaning under the weight of his misfortune.*] Here is what he wrote in the letter abovecited: *Jam nunc experior verum eſſe illud: homo homini Deus: ſed & alii me docuerunt verum eſſe, homo homini lupus. Per eos injecta remora, de qua ſcribis. . . . Tantam experior hominum ingratitudinem, ut propemodum in animo ſit edita prole Machabæorum poſthac quieſcere.* i. e. " I now expe- " rience the truth of that ſaying, *One man is a God* " *to another*; but others have taught me that it is " true, that *one man is a wolf to another*. They have " thrown in my way the obſtacle of which you " write. . . . I find ſo much ingratitude among men, " that I am almoſt reſolved to diſcontinue writing af- " ter I have publiſhed the genealogy of the Macca- " bees." Muſt not an Author ſo fruitful as he be very ſenſible of the perſecutions to which he was expoſed, ſince his uneaſineſs made him think of condemning his pen to a perpetual ſterility? I ſhall cite one paſſage more (34), which will furniſh us with ſeveral fine reflections of Druſius: *Turbones noſtri nunc quieſcunt, aut pudet eos præteritorum, aut expectant occaſionem novam. Mihi quidem multis de cauſis quies non ſolum optatiſſima eſt, ſed etiam neceſſaria. Sed ſi hanc perſonam Deus humanæ fabulæ choragus mihi impoſuit, partes delegatas oportet agam. In hac harena mihi video moriendum eſſe, nam ut viri iſti quieſcant nihil eſt ſpei. In eo toti ſunt ut me aut latronibus objiciant,* aut mœrore confectum occidant. Sed hactenus gratiâ Dei, nec animum à ſuo propoſito labefactare potuerunt, nec ſtudiis *meis ita multum detrimenti attulere. Conſolatur me primam conſcientia rectè factorum, deinde favor doctorum & bonorum virorum, quos hactenus æquiſſimos habui erga labores meos. Quod partim Literis, partim donis ac muneribus declararunt. . . . Quis unquam in ſole ambulavit abſque umbra; quis inſignem virtutem exercuit ſine invidiâ? quis bonas literas profeſſus eſt cum aliquâ famâ, abſque odio Theologorum? Capnio, Eraſmus, Arias, Hieronymus experti ſunt. Hunc poſtremum Româ expulſum, cum Bethlehemi in tuguriolo degeret, ne ſic quidem latentem effugit invidia. Ex priſcis Sapientibus quidam interrogatus quid ageret? Nihil, inquit, nondum enim mihi invidetur. Regium eſt, cum benefeceris audire malè, inquit ille. Et profectò ita eſt, induſtria parit virtutem, virtus gloriam, gloria invidiam, qui morbus ferè peculiaris eſt iis, qui alioqui* pietatem *profitentur, cum nihil ſit alienius à vera pietate. Obrepit enim hæc peſtis pietatis imagine, dum videri vult vitiorum odium, ac virtutis zelus.* i. e. " Thoſe who raiſed the ſtorm " againſt me are now quiet; they are either aſhamed " of what is paſt, or wait for a new opportunity. Quiet " is a thing not only deſirable to me on many ac- " counts, but even neceſſary. But if God the diſ- " poſer of human life has given me this part to act, " it is my duty to perform it. I perceive that I muſt " die in the performance, for there is no hope that thoſe " men will continue quiet. Their whole endeavour " is, either to expoſe me to ruffians, or kill me with " grief. But hitherto by the Grace of God they " have not been able either to divert my mind from " its purpoſe, or, to diſturb my ſtudies very much. " In the firſt place the conſciouſneſs of my having " acted rightly gives me comfort; and next to that " the approbation of learned and good men, who " have been hitherto extremely favourable to my la- " bours; which they have ſhewn partly by their let- " ters, and partly by their gifts and preſents. . . . " Who ever walked in the ſun without ſhadow? Who " ever was eminent for any virtue without envy? " Who

(34) In a Letter dated Decemb. 31, 1599. *apud* Curiand. pag. 32.

if he had liv'd longer [N]. Scaliger has ſpoken well of him; Scaliger I ſay, who otherwiſe was very abuſive to our Druſius [O]; for can any thing be ſaid more terrible and ſhocking againſt a Profeſſor of the Sacred Language, than that his houſe is a brothel? Druſius was ſucceeded by a ſcholar of his, who defended his memory, againſt thoſe who accus'd him of inclining towards Arianiſm (i). He likewiſe took care of the Manuſcripts, and of the daughter of the deceaſed [P]. Monſieur Boſſuet, Biſhop of Meaux, has taken advantage of a thing he read in Druſius, relating to the Pope's Mitre [Q]. A Jeſuit

(i) See above the text of the Article AMAMA between the quotations (f) and (g).

" Who has profeſſed polite Literature with reputation " without the hatred of the Divines? Capnio, Eraſ- " mus, Arias, Jerom, have experienced it. The laſt " was driven from Rome, and tho' he lived in a " little cottage at Bethlehem, even amidſt his ob- " ſcurity could not eſcape envy. One of the an- " tient ſages being aſked what he was doing? an- " ſwered, nothing, for I am not yet envied. It is " a king-like thing to be ill reported of when you " have done well, ſays the Philoſopher. And indeed " the caſe is ſo, induſtry produces virtue, virtue " glory, glory envy, which diſeaſe is almoſt peculiar " to thoſe, who profeſs piety, tho' there is nothing " more remote from true piety. For this peſt creeps " in under the appearance of piety, while it would " ſeem to be only an hatred to vice, and a zeal for " virtue."

[N] *His ſon would have proved a prodigy of learning, if he had lived longer.*] I have already obſerved, that he was born in 1588. His name was JOHN DRUSIUS as well as his father's. He began at five years old to learn the Latin and Hebrew tongues: at ſeven he explained the Hebrew Pſalter ſo exactly, that a Jew, who taught Arabic at Leyden, was prodigiouſly ſurprized at it. At nine he could read the Hebrew without points, and add the points where they were wanted according to the rules of Grammar, which the Rabbins have loſt the knowledge of at preſent. He ſpoke Latin as readily as his mother tongue; and could make himſelf underſtood in Engliſh. At twelve he wrote *ex tempore* in proſe and verſe, in the manner of the Jews. At ſeventeen he made a ſpeech in Latin to the King of Great Britain in the midſt of his Court, and was admired by all that were preſent. He had a lively genius, a ſolid judgment, a ſtrong memory, and an indefatigable ardour for ſtudy. He was likewiſe of an agreeable temper, which made him greatly beloved; and had noble inclinations, with a ſingular turn of piety. He died of the ſtone at the age of twenty one in England at the Houſe of Dr. William Thomas Dean of Chicheſter, who allowed him a very conſiderable ſalary. He left divers Works, a great many letters in Hebrew, verſes in the ſame language, and notes on the Proverbs of Solomon. He had begun to tranſlate into Latin the Itinerary of Benjamin Tudelenſis, and the Chronicle of the Second Temple; and digeſted into an alphabetical order the *Nomenclator* of Elias Levita, to which he added the Greek Words, which were not in the firſt Edition (35). Joſeph Scaliger ſaid (36), that Druſius's ſon knew more Hebrew than his father.

(35) Extracted from the Preface of *John Druſius ad lib. X. Præteritorum.* The whole account is curious; and we read there theſe words, *Quod ſi vita ei longior contigiſſet, & ad juſtam ætatem pertingere potuiſſet, dicam præſiſcine (abſit verbo invidia) fuiſſet interpres literarum ſacrarum eximius, qualem fortaſſe orbis Chriſtianus alium non habuiſſet.* This young man deſerves a place in the ſecond edition of the *Enfans celebres* of Mr. Baillet.

(36) *In Scaligeran.* pag. m. 68.

[O] *Scaliger . . . . was very abuſive on him.*] Here are ſome ſtrokes of the character, which he has drawn of him. " He is a man of bad reputation; for he " is a whoremonger and his daughter is a whore; " his houſe is a brothel. He knew more than Du- " jon (*). Druſius's judgment is contemptible; he " knows nothing but his Grammar: he does not " know ſo much as Serarius except in the Hebrew " Grammar. . . . *Druſius Lipſii ſimius habet miram* " *Latinitatem; non Latine ſcribit:* i. e. " Druſius " the Ape of Lipſius has a very odd kind of Latin " ſtyle; he does not write Latin. Druſius is nothing " in compariſon with Buxtorf. He has taught Gram- " mar theſe thirty years, and does nothing elſe, and " it would be ſurprizing, if he was not very well " ſkilled in that. *Ego bene ſcio quid ſit Druſius, eſt* " *doctus in Grammaticis & in textu Hebræo. . . . Dru-* " *ſius non eſt doctus, licet ſe putet eſſe doctiſſimum:* " i. e. I know well what Druſius is; he is well ſkilled " in Grammar and the Hebrew Text. . . . . He is " not learned, tho' he thinks himſelf a man of great " learning."

* Francis Junius.

[P] *A ſcholar of his . . . . took care of the manuſcripts and of the daughter of the deceaſed.*] See the letter, which Sixtinus Amama wrote on the third of December 1626 to Gaſpar Barlæus (37), to deſire him to prevail upon a conſiderable man, to whom the twelve leſſer Prophets of Druſius were deſigned to be dedicated, to accept of the dedication. Amama remarks, that of theſe twelve Prophets eight had been publiſhed long before, but that the other four had never ſeen the light. He repreſents to Barlæus the wretched condition of the only daughter of Druſius, who had been five years a widow of Curiander. He adds, that having publiſhed divers Works of Druſius, he had always dedicated them to ſome generous Mecænas's, who had relieved the neceſſity of that woman by ſome ſmall preſent; and that this was the reaſon why he requeſted Barlæus to engage this man of figure to accept of the Dedication. He tells him that the widow would be ſatisfied with a ſmall preſent, and that fifty Livres would make her happy. *Ago cauſam viduæ pauperculæ, quæ nunc cum bonæ mentis ſorore ſtrenue luctatur. Ea eſt filia unica Cl. Druſii quam D. Havelus Curiander ante annos quinque reliquit viduam. Ex MS. parentis ejus b. mem. multa nunc publici juris feci, quæſivique illis ejuſmodi Mecænates, qui aliquo præmiolo ejus paupertatem iverunt ſublevatum. . . . . Non expectabit magnam remunerationem: ſi quinquaginta florenos vel daleros ſimplices obtinuerit, beatam ſe judicabit. Hæc eo dico ut videas & intelligas quam anguſta res ſit hujus fœminæ, vel propter parentem meliori fortuna dignæ, & quam ſit exiguum quod illa expectat* (38). What a pity it is, that the only daughter of ſuch an Author ſhould be reduced to ſo diſtreſſed a ſtate, and that the poſterity of ſo many fools ſhould roll in their chariots! *Sic viſum numini:* i. e. " So " it has pleaſed Providence."

(37) It is the 644th among thoſe of the Arminians, pag. 723. edit. in fol.

(38) Sixt. Amama, pag. 723.

[Q] *Monſr. Boſſuet, Biſhop of Meaux, has taken advantage of a thing, which he read in Druſius relating to the Pope's Mitre.*] I ſhall firſt cite the paſſage of the Biſhop of Meaux with all that belongs to it, the Summary, Quotations, &c. and then make ſome reflections upon it. He writes thus (39): " It would " not be neceſſary to take the trouble to relate here " a ſtory current among the Proteſtants, if their de- " plorable credulity did not lead them to take for " truth whatever that party affirm. The critics of " England have inſerted among their remarks, *that* " *a perſon of credit had informed Monſr. de Montmo-* " *renci, when he was at Rome, that the Pope's Mitre* " *had in the front of it theſe letters in Gold,* MYS- " TERIUM, *butthat the inſcription was changed.* Mr. Ju- " rieu adopts this ſtory, which is very proper to impoſe " upon weak perſons, and repreſents it in ſtrong terms: " *It is not without a particular diſpoſition of Providence,* " *that God permitted formerly the Popes to bear the* " *word* MYSTERY *on their Mitres. Joſeph Scaliger* " *and divers others have teſtified, that they had ſeen* " *old Mitres with that word upon them.* This artful " Miniſter adds of his own invention, that Scaliger " had ſeen this; but we have ſeen above, that what " he wrote was only upon report, and without any " ſufficient authority. Druſius a Proteſtant Writer ac- " knowledges that Scaliger ſpoke merely on the cre- " dit of another; he pays little regard to this trifling " ſtory, for which he requires proofs and better au- " thority. It would be taking pains to no purpoſe " to ſeek for proof; it is a mere chimerical ſtory; " but Monſr. Jurieu will loſe nothing, and eſteems " every thing worthy of credit, which makes ever ſo " little againſt the Pope."

(39) Mr. de Meaux, *Avertiſſement ſur l'explication de l'Apocalypſe*, num. 6. pag. 319. edit. de Holland.

A RIDICULOUS ſtory of Scaliger rejected by Druſius a Proteſtant, and adopted by Jurieu a Miniſter.

Crit. ad cap. 17. v. 7. *col. p.* 858, *Præj. leg. I. Part. Chap.* 7. *pag.* 121.

Critic. ad Cap. XVII. v. 7. *pag.* 4857.

It is unjuſt to inſult a whole body under the pretence, that ſome Writers among them have given marks of too much prejudice. The Biſhop of Meaux ſhould have conſidered this. This is my firſt reflection. A man does a great injury to a party without

Jeſuit who undertook to criticize upon our Druſius, only expoſed himſelf to cenſure [R].

out doors, when he employs all ſorts of reaſons, good or bad, in its defence, without ever retracting what has been once ſaid: but this conduct is not at all diſadvantageous to the intereſt within doors. It nouriſhes prepoſſeſſion and confidence in the minds of people, and inſpires them with the paſſions of thoſe who diſpute. Theſe people take care not to make any ſtep, of which their parties might take an advantage; they never diveſt themſelves of any right of alledging this or that, ſuch or ſuch pretenſions. This multiplies their writings, this animates and warms them. It is not the temporal intereſt of a Communion, that all perſons in it ſhould be men of judgment: paſſionate people, who embrace it only thro' a ſpirit of faction, do it a thouſand good ſervices, humanly ſpeaking. It is of advantage therefore, to have ſome of theſe infatuated agents; they are a neceſſary evil. This is my ſecond reflection. We are not to imagine that in a large body, learned men of Druſius's character are ſo rare as they appear to be; we ſhould only ſay, that there are few who will expoſe themſelves to raſh cenſures. Moſt of the men of moderation and reaſon ſeeing that the raſh and forward carry away the applauſe and favour of the multitude, let them alone, and ſometimes ſwim with the ſtream, in order to live quiet and exempt from perverſe ſuſpicions. If they were to be aſked in the ear, why do not you write like Druſius, they would ſeek for an anſwer in the Fable (40).

(40) Hor. Epiſt. 2. lib. 1. ver. 70.

Quod ſi me populus Romanus fortè roget, cur,
Non ut porticibus, ſic judiciis fruar iiſdem;
Nec ſequar aut fugiam quæ diligit ipſe, vel odit:
Olim quod vulpes ægroto cauta leoni,
Reſpondit, referam: quia me veſtigia terrent
Omnia te adverſum ſpectantia nulla retrorſum.

That is,

" Should the crowd aſk, why ſince I live in town,
" Walk the ſame ſtreets with them, I do not own
" The ſame opinion? Why I don't approve
" And hate the things, that they do hate and love?
" My anſwer muſt be what ſly Reynard ſaid
" To the old ſickly Lion, *I'm afraid,*
" *Great King of beaſts, for all the treads I ſee*
" *Are to thy den, none back; that frightens me.*"

CREECH.

This is my third reflection, to which I ſhall add but one more. Here is therefore my fourth and laſt; I do not examine whether in the particular fact mentioned by the Biſhop of Meaux, Druſius ought to have been ſilent; but I dare venture to affirm, that what he did was better than to cite unfaithfully the teſtimony of Scaliger. This could not be done with impunity at the bar; for there is not much more difference between falſe money and good, than between a witneſs who ſpeaks only upon hearſay, and another who has actually ſeen the thing. So that Scaliger, who was a witneſs merely on report, ought not to have been cited as an eye witneſs by Monſr. Jurieu. This diſpute between a Biſhop and a Miniſter, has given occaſion to divers Books publiſhed in Germany. A Divine of the confeſſion of Augſbourg undertook to maintain that the Biſhop of Meaux was in the wrong to deny, that there had been the word *Myſterium* upon the Pope's Mitre. He publiſhed a work divided into two parts, the former of which is intitled, *Myſterium in Pontificis Romani coronâ apertum*, and the ſecond *Myſterium in coronâ Pontificis opertum & remotum*. He has collected in the former all the proofs, which he could meet with; and in the latter he conſiders for what reaſon and in what manner the inſcription in queſtion was taken away. A Doctor of Philoſophy named John Lewis Hanneman attacked this Divine in a Book, which he publiſhed at Hambourg in 1698 under the title of *Myſterium Papali coronæ adſcriptum* non ens, *ſeu Commentarius in caput XVII Apocalypſeos v. 5. quo demonſtratur Papali coronæ Myſterium nunquam fuiſſe inſcriptum*. He has done two things: 1. He refutes all the reaſons of his antagoniſt. 2. He alledges divers proofs to ſhew, that there never was ſuch an inſcription upon the Pope's Mitre (41).

[R] *A Jeſuit, who undertook to criticize upon our Druſius, only expoſed himſelf to juſt cenſure.*] Father Garaſſe, having affirmed (42), that Charron *wanted common ſenſe, in making ſuch ridiculous compariſons* (43), adds that this *put him in mind of three men very abſurd in their manner of acting: the firſt was the Emperor Heliogabalus, who . . . in the greateſt feaſts which he made, mixed horſe-dung with the beſt diſhes. . . The ſecond was the Emperor Alexander Severus . . . . who placed Jeſus Chriſt among the images of Apollonius Tyaneus, Orpheus, Abraham. . . . In ſhort, the third may be the Miniſter Druſius, who in his Centuries on the Holy Scriptures is as unhappy in his citation of Authors, as Charron in his Liſt of great Perſons; for he commonly quotes half a dozen Writers in this manner, Iſaiah c. 11, Plautus in his Amphitryo, St. Luke in the Acts of the Apoſtles, Ovid in his Book* de Remedio Amoris, *St. John Chryſoſtom in his Homilies on Geneſis, and Horace in his Book* de Arte Poetica. *I do not mean to ſay, that we ought out of too great ſtrictneſs to avoid quoting all profane Writers, and not to commend in the great men of the world the valuable qualities, which they have received from God; but what I cannot bear is, ſuch a ſtrange jumbling of perſons, as this, Socrates, Jeſus Chriſt, Papian, the Martyrs, St. John, Plautus, Jeremiah, Ariſtenetus, St. Auguſtin, and Ovid; for in theſe alternations, there is a want of judgment and ſome profaneneſs.* It would be very eaſy to ſhew, that this Critic, who charges others ſo ſtrongly with want of judgment, ſays nothing here but what ſhews him to be defective in that point; but I ſhall only inſiſt on what relates to Druſius. The Critic upon him calls him *Druſus*, and makes him a Miniſter; which ſhews, that he did not know the name or profeſſion of the perſon, whom he criticizes upon; for Druſius was no Miniſter: and we have ſeen above (44), that he declared that he meddled with nothing but Grammar and Hiſtory, and left to others the doctrines of faith, and that he was no Divine. Monſr. Baillet (45) reports, that he *was ſo confident of his own merit, that he gave himſelf the title of the* divine Grammarian. I put this in the margin (46) in the firſt Edition of this Dictionary, and added, that *I ſhould be glad to know where this particular is to be found.* Monſr. de la Roque (47) was ſo kind as to write to me, that he had read it in the *Tribæreſium* of Serarius. Not having that Book, I have recourſe to conjectures: I imagine, that Serarius advanced this upon the credit of ſome adverſary of Druſius, and without any literal proof taken from the writings of that Author. However that be, we have ſeen (48), that Druſius declared publicly, that he did not know whether he could ſupport the character of a Grammarian, which he had been ſometimes reproached with; and that ſome people had denied that he could do it, whom he would not contradict. Here is a modeſty very oppoſite to that aſſurance mentioned by Monſr. Baillet. But to return to Father Garaſſe, his cenſure is worth nothing. It is poſſible that in one and the ſame chapter of Druſius we may meet with a quotation from a ſacred Writer preceded and followed by a quotation from a profane one, but not in the ridiculous order, of which this Jeſuit complains. Druſius's method is to be very conciſe upon every ſubject, and to join together things, which have an affinity with each other. Hence it is, that in one ſhort chapter he ſometimes explains three or four things; he ſhews upon each the conformity of the ſacred Writers with the Heathen Authors; it is neceſſary therefore, that after he has cited paſſages from Scripture, he ſhould quote Greek or Latin Writers, and that afterwards entering upon another ſubject, he ſhould again introduce paſſages of Scripture, and then a Poet, an Hiſtorian, &c. This conduct has nothing amiſs in it, and has been ignorantly and impertinently condemned by the Cenſurer.

(41) Extracted from the *Utrecht Journal*, Nov. and Dec. 1698, pag. 854, & ſeqq.

(42) Garaſſe, *Somme Théologique*, pag. 847, 848.

(43) That is, naming together Socrates, Phocion, Seneca, Regulus, JESUS CHRIST, the Martyrs.

(44) In the note [K] Quotation (27).

(45) Baillet, *Jugem. des Savans*, tom. 4. pag. 226.

(46) In the Note [K].

(47) *De quo ſupra*, COLOMIES, Quotat. (30).

(43) In the note [K] quotation (28).

DRUSUS, a Roman Family, a branch of the family of Livia, which, tho' Plebeian, had a ſhare in the higheſt poſts of the Commonwealth. It had enjoyed the Dictatorſhip, and

and the office of Colonel-General of the Horſe. It poſſeſſed the Conſulſhip eight times, the Cenſorſhip twice, and had three times the honour of a triumph. It produced ſeveral perſons of great merit, and among others, Marcus Livius Salinator, and MARCUS LIVIUS DRUSUS. The latter had the ſurname of Druſus given him, becauſe he had kill'd Drauſus [*A*], the enemy's General (*a*). He is ſaid to have recovered from the Gauls the money which had been given to their Anceſtors, when they beſieged the Capital. If this be true, we muſt not believe the report, that Camillus had obliged them to reſtore it (*b*). We cannot better know when the firſt Druſus liv'd, than by recollecting that CAIUS LIVIUS DRUSUS, his ſon or grandſon, was Conſul with Scipio Africanus the younger, in the year 606 of Rome. The Emperor Tiberius was deſcended by adoption from the family of Druſus; for LIVIUS DRUSUS CLAUDIANUS his grandfather by the mother's ſide, one of the deſcendants of Appius the blind, was adopted by one Druſus (*c*). There is ſome probability that another Druſus adopted one of the family Scribonia, in which the ſurname of Libo was very common; for we find a MARCUS LIVIUS DRUSUS LIBO Conſul in 738, and a LUCIUS SCRIBONIUS LIBO DRUSUS Prætor, who killed himſelf to prevent the puniſhment which he feared, being accuſed of treaſon under Tiberius in the year 769 of Rome (*d*). We ſhall ſpeak a word of ſome of the deſcendants of the firſt DRUSUS [*B*] in the Remarks; but we ſhall give a diſtinct Article

(*a*) Taken from *Sueton. in Tiber.* cap. 3.

(*b*) *Traditur etiam Proprætore ex Provincia Gallia retuliſſe aurum Senonibus olim in obſidione Capitolii datum, nec, ut fama, extortum à Camillo.* Idem, ibid.

(*c*) Idem, ibid.

(*d*) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 31.

[*A*] *Marcus Livius . . . . had the ſurname of* Druſus *given him, becauſe he had killed Drauſus.*] This has all the air of thoſe abſurd and fabulous Traditions, which are preſerved in ancient families, and which aſcribe the original of the firſt Name and of their Coat of Arms to ſome warlike action. If the branch of the family of Druſus had owed its name to the Exploit mentioned by Suetonius, we ſhould have known when and where this happened, and againſt what enemy; and Suetonius would not have ſpoken in ſo vague a manner as he has done. *Druſus hoſtium duce Drauſo cominus trucidato ſibi poſteriſque ſuis cognomen invenit* (1). i. e. "Druſus having killed Drauſus, the enemy's Gene-"neral, hand to hand, gained that ſurname to himſelf "and his deſcendants." Add to this, that he mentions one CLAUDIUS DRUSUS, who lived before the firſt Punic War (2); which proves that this ſurname was either known, before the firſt Druſus of the family Livia ſlew the pretended Drauſus, or at leaſt did not depend upon that combat. For who would venture to ſay, that becauſe one Livius defeated Drauſus, one Claudius was ſurnamed Druſus?

(1) Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. 3.

(2) For Suetonius places him before Claudius Pulcher, who was defeated in a ſea-fight in the firſt Punic War. The Commentators upon *Suetonius* ſay nothing of this *Claudius Druſus.*

[*B*] *We ſhall ſpeak a word of ſome of the deſcendants of the firſt Druſus.*] I believe that CAIUS LIVIUS DRUSUS, who was Conſul in 606, was deſcended from him; but I cannot ſay whether he was his ſon or his grandſon. He left a ſon named MARCUS LIVIUS DRUSUS, who was Conſul in 641, and fought with great ſucceſs againſt the Scordiſci, a people of Thrace, deſcended from the Gauls (3). We ſhall ſee below, whether he triumphed. He was Cenſor with Marcus Æmilius Scaurus, and died during his office (4). I am not of opinion, that we ought to diſtinguiſh him, as Glandorp has done (5), from that Marcus Livius Druſus, a man of wit and great eloquence, who was Tribune of the people with Caius Gracchus, and ſupported him in his attempts; but changing his party, maintained the Patrician intereſts with ſuch zeal, that he was ſtyled the Protector of the Senate (6). He was *Abnepos* of the firſt Druſus (7), and had a brother named CAIUS DRUSUS, who was very eminent for his eloquence (8). I perceive, that our Grammarians are not agreed upon the ſignification of *Abnepos*; for Monſr. Danet quoting Suetonius underſtands by this term great-grand ſon: in Calepin this term is taken for the ſon of the great-grand-ſon. It is even true that Suetonius (9) and many other ancient Authors do not obſerve exactly the degrees of kindred. We find mention made of one CAIUS DRUSUS, a great Civilian, who was ſo laborious, that tho' he was blind and very old, he had always his houſe full of people, who came to conſult him. *C. autem Druſi domum compleri conſultoribus ſolitam accepimus, quum quorum res eſſet ſua ipſi non videbant cæcum adhibebant ducem* (10). i. e. "I have been informed that Caius Druſus's Houſe "was full of thoſe, who conſulted him, and who not "ſeeing themſelves what was the ſtate of their own "caſe, made uſe of a blind man for their guide." Valerius Maximus ſpeaks very honourably of him. *Conſimilis perſeverantiæ Livius Druſus qui ætatis viribus & acie oculorum defectus jus civile populo benigniſſime interpretatus eſt, utiliſſimaque diſcere id cupientibus monimenta compoſuit. Nam ut ſenem illum natura, cæcum fortuna facere potuit, ita neutra interpellare valuit ne non animo & videret & vigeret* (11). i. e. "Li-"vius Druſus was an inſtance of the like perſeverance, "who labouring under the infirmities of old age, and "the want of ſight, very generouſly explained the "Civil Law to the people, and wrote Treatiſes of "greateſt uſe to thoſe, who were deſirous to learn "it. For tho' nature had it in her power to make "him old, and fortune to deprive him of ſight; "yet neither of them could cut him off from the "perſpicuity and vigour of his mind." A Commentator (13) imagined without foundation, that this Druſus was the father of him, who occaſioned ſo many diſorders, in order to obtain the Freedom of Rome for the Latins. He is miſtaken; for the father of the latter was named Marcus Livius, and not Caius Livius. He is the ſame, who was honoured with the title of Protector of the Senate. Another Commentator (13) is ſurprized, that Pomponius ſays nothing of the Caius Druſus the Civilian. There is reaſon indeed to be ſurprized at this, ſince that Civilian was an Author, and Celſus makes honourable mention of him in the Digeſt (14). The moderns are divided upon the queſtion, whether this Caius Druſus was the ſame who was Conſul in 606, or whether he was brother of the Conſul in 641. Rutilius embraces the latter opinion: others chooſing the former, confute him by the term *accepimus*, which Cicero makes uſe of. It is very probable, that Cicero ſpeaks of a man, whom he never ſaw; for he afterwards mentions another blind man, whom he might have ſeen, who gave his vote in the Senate, and anſwered thoſe, who conſulted him, and was engaged in writing an Hiſtory. Now it ſeems that Cicero might have ſeen Caius Livius Druſus, brother of him, who was Conſul in 641. It is probable therefore, that he ſpeaks of the Conſul of the year 606 (15).

(3) Livius, *in Epit.* lib. 63.

(4) Plutarch. *in Quæſt. Rom.* pag. 276.

(5) Glandorp. *Onomaſt. Roman.* pag. 543.

(6) Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. 3.

(7) Idem, ibid.

(8) Cicero, *in Bruto*, pag. m. 204.

(9) He calls Cæſar *Avunculus* of Auguſtus; and yet Cæſar was his great uncle. Suet. *in Aug.* cap. 7.

(10) Cicero, *Tuſculan.* lib. 5. folio m. 278. B.

(11) Val. Max. lib. 8. cap. 7. num. 4.

(12) Oliverius, *in hunc locum* Val. Maxim.

(13) Colerus.

(14) *See* Guil. Grotius, *in Vitis Juriſconſult.* pag. 33.

(15) *See* Guil. Grotius, ibid.

WHETHER Marcus Livius Druſus triumphed over the Scordiſci.

Let us ſee now, whether the Conſul of the year 641 triumphed over the Scordiſci. I am not of that opinion; for all the proof, which Sigonius alledges (16), is a paſſage of Pliny miſunderſtood. Here are Pliny's words (17). *Frater ejus Allobrogicus primus omnium pondo mille habuit. At Livius Druſus in Tribunatu plebis XI* (18). *Nam propter quinque pondo notatum à Cenſoribus triumphalem ſenem* (19), *fabuloſum jam videtur.* To underſtand theſe words rightly, we muſt obſerve, that Pliny here oppoſes the frugality of the former times to the luxury of the latter. He ſhews the ſteps, by which luxury advanced. Scipio Africanus left to his heir but ſixty four marks in ſilver plate (20). His brother Quintus Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus was the firſt, who had in plate to the value of two thouſand marks. But Livius Druſus, while he was Tribune of the people, had plate to the value of two and twenty thouſand marks (21); for, adds Pliny, we look upon it as a mere fable, that an old man, who had been honoured with a triumph, ſhould be animadverted upon by the Cenſors on account of the value of ten marks in plate. *Nam propter quinque pondo notatum à Cenſoribus triumphalem ſenem, fabuloſum jam videtur.* Thus it is, that in every Age one can ſcarce credit what

(16) *In Faſtis.*

(17) Plin. lib. 33. cap. 11. pag. m. 69.

(18) Father Hardouin puts X inſtead of XI.

(19) He ſhews this in lib. 18. cap. 6. *Præcipiebant iſta qui triumphali denas argenti libras in ſupellectile crimini dabant.*

(20) *Libras* 32 *argenti Africanus ſequens hæredi reliquit.* Plin. lib. 33. cap. 11. pag. 68.

(21) Or twenty thouſand, according to the correction of Father Hardouin.

Article for each of thoſe, who were the moſt eminent. Moreri deſerves correction in ſome points [C].

When luxury is grown to the height, the accounts of the antient frugality are treated as fabulous.

Hiſtories relate of the old times, when it appears too remote from the modern cuſtoms. Thus we may ſay, that Ladies of the firſt quality will conſider it as a romance or fable, when they are told, that formerly perſons of their rank walked on foot in the ſtreets, ſuckled their own children, and ſpent but ſo much every year in clothes. The ſtory, which according to Pliny then appeared fabulous, does not belong to that Livius Druſus, of whom he had juſt been ſpeaking. The ſtory is much more ancient. It was an act of the Cenſors office exerted in the year 478 againſt Cornelius Rufinus, who had been Dictator, and twice Conſul (22). The Cenſors degraded him from the dignity of a Senator on account of his luxury, becauſe they found ten pound weight of ſilver plate in his houſe. He might have had five pound weight; he was degraded therefore for the weight of five pounds: *Propter quinque pondo notatum à Cenſoribus triumphalem ſenem.* Valerius Maximus in relating this fact falls into the ſame reflection with Pliny. He is apprehenſive leſt he ſhould be look'd upon as a relator of fables; and he owns, that it is ſcarce credible, that the ſame city, which had ſo great a contempt for poverty, ſhould puniſh a man of conſular dignity for having ſilver plate to the value of twenty marks. *Ipſæ medius fidius mihi literæ ſæculi noſtri obſtupeſcere videntur, cùm ad tantam ſeveritatem referendam miniſterium accommodare coguntur; ac vereri ne non noſtræ urbis acta commemorare exiſtimentur. Vix enim credibile eſt, intra idem pomœrium decem pondo argenti, & invidioſum fuiſſe cenſum, & inopiam haberi contemptiſſimam* (23).

(22) Aulus Gellius, lib. 4. cap. 3. & lib. 17. cap. 21. Valer. Max. lib. 2. cap. 9. num. 4.

(23) Val. Max. ibid.

I am ſurprized, that Sigonius could miſunderſtand the Text of Pliny ſo groſly as he has done. Could he imagine, that after the year 641 of Rome, the antient frugality of the Commonwealth was ſo ſtrictly obſerved, that the value of nine or ten marks in ſilver plate was ſufficient to occaſion a Senator to be degraded? Things were not upon ſuch a foot then. Corruption and luxury had already ſpread in a dreadful manner. But might not Pliny's own words have ſet Sigonius right? They expreſly affirm, that Druſus was Tribune of the people, when he had ſuch a quantity of Plate; and immediately Pliny mentions the cenſure paſſed upon an old man, who had formerly obtained the honour of a triumph. It is evident therefore, that this old man was not Druſus; for if Druſus had been cenſured on account of luxury, he muſt have been ſo during his Tribuneſhip; or elſe Pliny muſt be charged with relating things in a very abſurd manner. Nevertheleſs it is ſcarce credible how much this paſſage of Pliny has miſled Writers (24).

(24) *Plerique etiam hunc triumphaſſe volunt.* Glandorp. *Onomaſt.* pag. 543.

[C] *Moreri deſerves correction in ſome points.*] He ſays, that *the family of Druſus was a branch of that of the Claudii, and tho' Plebeian, was eminent for eight Conſulſhips . . . and illuſtrious on account of the great men, which it produced, among whom the principal were Salinator and Druſus.* I omit all the defects in his ſtyle, and his faults of omiſſion, and content my ſelf with remarking: I. That the family of Druſus was a branch, not of the Claudii, but the Livii: II. That it was the family of the Livii, and not the particular branch of the Druſi, which was eminent for eight Conſulſhips, &c: III. That Salinator was not deſcended from the family of Druſus, except in the ſame manner, that the Houſe of Bourbon is deſcended of the Houſe of Burgundy. The latter expreſſion would not be ſuffered. Two ſtreams, which flow from the ſame ſource, do not therefore proceed one from the other.

DRUSUS (MARCUS LIVIUS), ſon of him who was the Collegue of Caius Gracchus in the Tribuneſhip of the people, and who merited the title of Protector of the Senate, imitated his Father in ſupporting the intereſts of the Patricians; but the manner in which he did it, occaſioned dreadful diſorders [A]. He had eminent qualifications, great eloquence, great wit, and great reſolution; and if he did not make a good uſe of them,

[A] *The manner, in which he ſupported the intereſts of the Patricians, occaſioned dreadful diſorders.*] It is not impoſſible, that the reaſon why Paterculus has taken his part ſo zealouſly, was his deſign to pay his Court to Tiberius, who was undoubtedly deſcended from our Druſus. But perhaps he only ſpake as the affair appeared to him. However that be, he aſcribes to him the beſt intentions imaginable, and laments that the Senate ſhould form ſo blind and unreaſonable a judgment of them. He expreſſes himſelf on this point with great eloquence, and this induces me to take the liberty of tranſcribing the whole paſſage, out of regard to thoſe, who without conſulting many Books are deſirous of ſeeing the conduct of a great man diſplayed. *Tribunatum iniit Marcus Livius Druſus, vir nobiliſſimus, eloquentiſſimus, ſanctiſſimus, meliore in omnia ingenio, animoque, quàm fortuna uſus, qui, cùm Senatui priſcum reſtituere cuperet decus, & judicia ab equitibus ad eum transferre ordinem; (quippe, eam poteſtatem nacti equites Gracchanis legibus, cùm in multos clariſſimos, atque innocentiſſimos viros ſæviſſent, tum Publium Rutilium, virum non ſeculi ſui, ſed omnis ævi optimum, interrogatum lege repetundarum, maximo cum gemitu civitatis, damnaverant) in iis ipſis, quæ pro ſenatu moliebatur, ſenatum habuit adverſarium, non intelligentem, ſi qua de plebis commodis ab eo agerentur, veluti ineſcandæ, illiciendæque multitudinis cauſſâ fieri, ut minoribus perceptis, majora permitteret. Denique ea fortuna Druſi fuit, ut malefacta collegarum, quàm ejus optimè ab ipſo cogitata, ſenatus probaret magis; & honorem, qui ab eo deferebatur, ſperneret; injurias, quæ ab aliis intendebantur, æquo animo reciperet; & hujus ſummæ gloriæ invideret, illorum modicam ferret. Tum converſus Druſi animus, quando benè cœpta malè cedebant, ad dandam civitatem Italiæ: quod cùm moliens revertiſſet è foro, immenſâ illâ, & incognitâ, quæ eum ſemper comitabatur, cinctus multitudine, in atrio domus ſuæ cultello percuſſus, qui affixus lateri ejus relictus eſt, intra paucas horas deceſſit* (1). i. e. "Marcus Livius "Druſus, a man of the higheſt quality, of great elo- "quence and integrity, but more happy in the en- "dowments of his mind, than his fortune, entered "the office of Tribune. He being deſirous of reſtor- "ing to the Senate its ancient grandeur, and to tranſ- "fer the offices of Judicature from the Knights to that "Order; (for the Knights having obtained that "power by the Laws of the Gracchi, exerted the ut- "moſt cruelty upon many men of high rank and ex- "emplary probity, and particularly upon Publius Ru- "tilius, the beſt man, not only of that, but of any "other Age, whom they condemned upon a charge "of Bribery, to the vaſt regret of the City;) he met "with oppoſition from the Senate in thoſe very mea- "ſures which he took for the intereſt of the Senate, "they not perceiving, that what he did for the ſer- "vice of the people, was only with a view to gain "their favour, and draw them in in ſuch a manner, that "by procuring ſmaller advantages, they might give "way in thoſe of more importance. In ſhort, ſuch "was the fate of Druſus, that the Senate approved "the ill conduct of his collegues more than his ex- "cellent deſigns, and rejected the honour offered by "him; received patiently the indignities offer'd them by "others, and envied his ſuperior glory, while they bore "with the moderate honours of others. Druſus ſeeing "the ill ſucceſs of his honeſt attempts, turned his "thoughts to procure the Freedom of the City for "all Italy; and being engaged in this deſign, as "he returned from the Forum, ſurrounded with that "infinite multitude of perſons unknown, which al- "ways attended him, he was ſtabbed in the porch of "his houſe with a knife, which was left ſticking in "his ſide, and he died within a few hours." The reader will have a better opinion of Paterculus's ſincerity, when he knows what were Salluſt's ſentiments of this Druſus; for which reaſon I ſhall give that Hiſtorian's

(1) Velleius Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 13.

them, it was the fault of his exceſſive ambition, of which he gave proofs, even from his infancy [B]. The factions which divided the city, were that of the Senate, and that of the Knights [C]; the latter, beſides their raiſing the public monies, were poſſeſs'd of all the offices of Judicature (a), which had before belonged to the Senators. By this means they had, if I may ſo expreſs it, their foot upon the neck of the Senate. Druſus ſeeing Cepio his rival in the intereſts of the Knights [D], undertook to relieve and ſupport the cauſe of the Senate; and that he might not want creatures (b), he took meaſures to revive the laws of Gracchus concerning the diſtribution of the land among the people, and promiſed the freedom of Rome to the Latins. The Violence which he uſed towards Philippus the Conſul, who oppoſed thoſe laws, cannot be ſufficiently condemned [E]. The Promiſe which he had made to the Latins, was the ſource of a very terrible war, which was near proving fatal to the Roman People (c). He fell into a fainting fit in a public aſſembly; and whether this was real or counterfeit, he

(a) Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 13. I quote his words in Remark [A].

(b) Florus, lib. 3. cap. 17.

(c) See Remark [D], quotation (8).

ſtorian's words. *M. Livio Druſo ſemper conſilium fuit, in tribunatu ſumma ope niti pro nobilitate: neque ullam rem in principio agere intendit, niſi illi auctores fierent. Sed homines factioſi, quibus dolus, atque malitia, fide cariora erant, ubi intellexerunt, per unum hominem maximum beneficium multis mortalibus dari: videlicet & ſibi quiſque conſcius, malo atque infido animo eſſe, de M. Livio Druſo juxta, ac ſe, exiſtimaverunt* (2). i. e. "M. Livius Druſus's deſign, while he was Tribune, was always to exert his utmoſt efforts in favour of the Patricians; and he intended at firſt to do nothing, but by their authority. But factious men, who valued fraud and malice more than integrity, finding that a very general benefit was likely to be procured by one man, and being every one of them conſcious of their own ill intentions, formed the ſame judgment of Druſus as they did of themſelves."

(2) Salluſt. *Orat. 2. ad Cæſar.* pag. m. 533, 534.

[B] *He gave proofs of his exceſſive ambition even from his infancy.*] Before he had aſſumed the *Toga Virilis*, and while he was under his guardians, he took upon him to ſollicit the Judges in favour of the accuſed, and did it with ſo much force and addreſs, that he extorted more than once the ſentences which they gave. Had not he a great deal of reaſon to ſay, that he was the only perſon for whom no holyday had ever been made? Thoſe who begin ſo early to diſtinguiſh themſelves, deſerve to be feared. Let us hear Seneca. *Exſecratus inquietam à primordiis vitam, dicitur dixiſſe, Uni ſibi, nec puero quidem, unquam ferias contigiſſe. Auſus enim & pupillus adhuc & prætextatus, judicibus reos commendare, & gratiam ſuam foro interponere tam efficaciter, ut quædam judicia conſtet ab illo rapta. Quo non irrumperet tam immatura ambitio? ſcires in malum ingens, & privatum, & publicum, evaſuram illam tam præcoquem audaciam. Sero itaque querebatur, nullas ſibi ferias contigiſſe: à puero ſeditioſus, & foro gravis* (3). i. e. "He curſing his manner of life, "which had been reſtleſs from the beginning, is reported to have ſaid, that he alone, even when a "boy, had never enjoyed a holyday. For while he "was a Minor, and before he took the *Toga Virilis*, he "ventured to recommend thoſe who were accuſed, to "the Judges, and to interpoſe by his intereſt in the "Forum ſo effectually, that it is certain ſome ſentences "were extorted by him. To what pitch would not "ſo early an ambition proceed? One might determine, "that ſo early an aſſurance would prove of fatal conſequence to the public and private happineſs. He "complained therefore too late, that he had never enjoyed any holydays, ſince he was ſeditious and turbulent in the Forum while a boy." What he did in Aſia during his Queſtorſhip is mentioned as an inſtance of his pride. He exerciſed that office without inveſting himſelf with the exterior ornaments of it, reſolving to diſtinguiſh himſelf only by his perſon. The Latin expreſſes my ſenſe much better. *Quæſtor in Aſia nullis inſignibus uti voluit, ne quid ipſo eſſet inſignius* (4). A learned man (5) finds it difficult to believe that Druſus had this office, and that of Ædile (6). His reaſon is, that he died in the Tribuneſhip of the people, an office which the Romans generally exerciſed before they were Ædiles. But perhaps Druſus finding it neceſſary to be Tribune, in order to execute his deſigns, procured this office for the ſecond time the ſame year in which he died.

(3) Seneca, *de Brevitate Vitæ*, cap. 6.

(4) Aurel. Victor, *de Viris illuſtribus.*

(5) Corradus, *in Brutum Ciceronis*, pag. 332.

(6) *Ædilis munus magnificentiſſimum dedit.* Aurel. Victor. *de Viris illuſtribus.*

[C] *The Factions which divided the City, were that of the Senate, and that of the Knights.*] The paſſage of Paterculus ſhews us that the Gracchi had deprived the Senators of all the Tribunals of Juſtice, in order to gratify the Knights. Let us ſee how Florus confirms this (7). *Judiciaria lege Caij Gracchi diviſerant populum Romanum, & bicipitem ex una fecerant civitatem equites Romani, tanta poteſtate ſubnixi, ut qui fata fortunaſque patrum vitaſque principum haberent in manu, interceptis vectigalibus peculantur ſuo jure rempublicam.* i. e. "By the Judiciary "Law of Caius Gracchus, the Roman Knights had "divided the Roman People, and made two heads to "the city from one; being ſupported by ſuch a power, "that they had the lives and fortunes of the Patricians "in their hands, and by ſeizing the revenues plunder'd "the Commonwealth as they thought proper.

(7) Lib. 3, cap. 17.

[D] *Druſus ſeeing that Cepio his rival ſupported the cauſe of the Knights.*] The rivalſhip of theſe two Romans, which occaſioned ſo many diſorders, and almoſt ruined the Commonwealth, aroſe from a mere trifle. A ring ſold at an auction was the occaſion of their diviſions (8): they bid upon each other, and piqued each other in ſuch a manner, that they ſought afterwards all opportunities of croſſing one another. This confirms what many perſons have obſerved, that great revolutions of ſtate are generally occaſioned by the fancy or fooliſh caprice of ſome particular perſons (9). I cannot tell whether the inſtance which we have here before us, has ever been taken notice of. Paterculus in vain affirms, that Druſus acted out of zeal for the intereſts of the Senate, whoſe power he was deſirous of reſtoring; we ſhould rather believe thoſe, who ſay that he eſpouſed this party, becauſe he ſaw Cepio at the head of the contrary party. *In hoc ſtatu rerum pares opibus, animis, dignitate (unde & nata Livio Druſo æmulatio acceſſerat) equitem Servilius Cæpio, Senatum Livius Druſus aſſerere* (10). i. e. "In this ſtate of "affairs Servilius Cepio aſſerted the cauſe of the "Knights, Livius Druſus that of the Senate, being both "of them equal in riches, reſolution and dignity; whence a ſpirit of emulation was raiſed in Livius Druſus.

(8) *Inter Cæpionem & Druſum ex annulo in auctione venali inimicitiæ cœpere: unde origo ſocialis belli & exitia rerum.* Plinius, lib. 33. cap. 1. p. m. 12, 13. *This War coſt the lives of above three hundred thouſand men.* Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 15. *See* Florus, lib. 3. cap. 18.

(9) See *Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes*, num. 236.

(10) Florus, lib. 3. cap. 18.

[E] *The violence which he uſed towards Philippus the Conſul cannot be ſufficiently condemn'd.*] That Conſul's dignity was ſo little regarded, that his throat was ſqueezed, till the blood was ſeen to come out of his eyes and mouth. Some ſay that Druſus himſelf committed this act of violence, and that he was ſo far from relenting at the ſight of the blood, that it gave him a new occaſion to inſult him; he ſaid, that it was not blood, but the ſauce of thruſhes; by which expreſſion he reproached Philip with his gluttony. *Philippo Conſuli legibus agrariis reſiſtenti ita collum in comitio obtorſit, ut multus ſanguis effluëret è naribus, quem ille luxuriam obprobrans muriam de turdis eſſe dicebat* (11). Others ſay, that Druſus procured this act of violence to be done by one of his creatures, or by one of his officers. *Quæ* (Senatus Majeſtas) *à M. quoque Druſo trib. plebis per ſummam contumeliam vexata eſt. Parvi enim habuit, L. Philippum Conſulem, quia interfari concionantem auſus fuerat, obtorta gula, & quidem non per viatorem, ſed per clientem ſuum, adeo violenter in carcere præcipitem egiſſe, ut multus è naribus ejus cruor profunderetur* (12). i. e. "The majeſty of the Senate was violated alſo in a very contemptuous manner by Marcus Druſus Tribune "of the People. For he did not ſcruple to order L. "Philippus the Conſul, who ventured to interrupt him "when he was in his ſpeech, to be ſeized by the "throat,

(11) Aurel. Victor, *de Viris illuſtribus.* In the *Valer. Maximus Variorum* printed in Holland, pag. 778. in quoting this paſſage, we read *in convivio*, and not, *in comitio*; which is abſurd.

(12) Val. Max. lib. 9. cap. 5. num. 2.

he made advantages many ways of that accident [F]. The reputation which he had gained, did not hinder him from being himself extremely embarrassed with the State to which he had reduced affairs [G]; upon which account every body thought he was kill'd very seasonably in the court of his own house [H], as he return'd from the city surrounded

" throat, and draged to prison, not by a public officer, " but by one of his clients; and this in so violent a " manner, that the blood ran plentifully from his " nostrils." This is Valerius Maximus's account, and here is what Florus says. *Ausus tamen obrogare de legibus Consul Philippus, sed apprehensum faucibus viator non ante dimisit, quam sanguis in ora & oculos redundaret* (13). i. e. " However Philippus the Consul ven- " tured to oppose these laws, but being seized by the " throat by one of the officers, was not permitted to " depart till the blood flowed out of his mouth and " eyes."

(13) Florus, lib. 3. cap. 18.

[F] *He made advantage many ways of this swooning.*] He had procured all his laws to be passed, except that which related to the freedom of the Latins. They called upon him for his promise, and he knew not what to do, either to amuse them, or give them satisfaction. He fell down suddenly in the Assembly, and this was a just reason for putting them off till another opportunity. *Livius anxius ut Latinorum postulata differret, qui promissam civitatem flagitabant, repente in publico concidit, sive morbo comitali, seu hausto caprino sanguine, semianimis domum relatus* (14). i. e. " Livius being sollicitous how to delay the de- " mands of the Latins, who required the freedom of " the city, which he had promised, of a sudden fell " down in the Assembly, either of a fit of falling- " sickness, or having drank goat's blood; and was " carried home half dead." It is evident, that the Historian, from whom I have quoted this Latin, has committed an error; the disjunctive particle *sive* employed by him, makes him say an absurd thing; for if Drusus fell down suddenly, in order to defer the demand of the Latins till another time, it cannot be said that he fell down, either thro' the falling-sickness, or because he had drank goat's blood. A real fit of the falling-sickness is not in our power, and consequently one cannot direct it to a certain end. The other part of the disjunctive proposition is right; for one may take a drug with a design to fall into a swoon three or four hours after. The truth is, that the Authors of Abridgments, endeavouring to draw several different accounts into one period, give us frequently a mere heap of nonsense. Aurelius Victor having heard that Drusus fell down in a fit of the falling-sickness, and that he had drank goat's blood, in order that becoming pale he might complain with the more probability of being poisoned by Cepio (15), endeavoured to join these two things together, but without success. I can easily believe, that Drusus and his partisans would take advantage of the fainting fit, to cast an odium upon the Consul Philippus, as suspected of poisoning his adversary; for what pretences are not made use of in a State-Faction, to supplant an antagonist? This is sufficient to explain the text of this Remark. I have only to observe, that we find in Pliny a curious fact relating to the falling-sickness of Drusus (16).

(14) Aurel. Victor, *de Viris illustribus.*

(15) *Drusus Tribunus plebis traditur caprinum* (sanguinem) *bibisse, cum pallore & invidia veneni sibi dati insimulare Q. Cæpionem inimicum vellet.* Plin. lib. 28. cap. 9. pag. 608.

(16) *Drusum quoque apud nos Tribunorum popularium clarissimum (cui ante omnes plebs flans plausit, optimates vero bellum Marsicum imputavere) constat hoc medicamento* (elleboro) *liberatum comitiali morbo in Anticyra insula.* Plin. lib. 25. cap. 5. pag. 391. *See* Aulus Gellius, lib. 17. cap. 15.

[G] *The reputation which he had gained, did not hinder him from being extremely embarrassed with the State, to which he had reduced affairs.*] He thought that all sorts of people were obliged to him, and yet the greatest part of them complained of him. He had procured the lands to be given to the people: those to whom they fell were contented; but those who were dispossessed complained. He had obtained for the order of the Knights a power of being admitted into the senatorial rank; those who were chosen for that honour, were well satisfied; but those who had no share in the election, were uneasy. He had restored the Tribunals to the Senate. This pleased that body; but on the other hand they were dissatisfied to see the Patricians and Knights mixed together in the Senate. This threw Drusus into great perplexity. Aurelius Victor expresses this in fewer words (17). *Idem ex gratia nimia in invidiam venit. Nam plebs acceptis agris gaudebat, expulsi dolebant: equites in Senatum lecti lætabantur, sed præteriti querebantur: Senatus permissis judiciis exsultabat, sed societatem cum equitibus ægre ferebat. Unde Livius anxius, &c.* (18). Mademoiselle le Fevre has made a note on these words, *Equites in Senatum lecti lætabantur.* She says in that Note, that this passage is extremely suspected by her, and that she cannot believe that the Knights were pleased to see the jurisdictions, which they had been sole masters of, divided between the Senate and them. *Hoc certe valde suspectum est, neque adduci possum ut credam equites quæ judicia ipsi possidebant ea ad Senatum æqua parte transmissa libenter vidisse* (19). I am of the same opinion with her, that this was not the ground of their joy; but I take the liberty to observe to her, that this is also not what Aurelius Victor says. He does not speak of the general joy of the Knights, but of the particular joy of those, who were advanced to the senatorial rank. With regard to the latter, it is easy to conceive, that the change of their condition was agreeable to them; the gain of the Senate was theirs, and they lost nothing by the diminution of the Order of the Knights, since they were no longer of it.

(17) Aurel. Victor, *de Viris illustribus.*

(18) *See* Seneca's words in the following Remark.

(19) *Anna Tanaquilli Fabri filia, Not. in Aurel. Victor.* pag. 87.

[H] *It was thought that he was killed very seasonably in the court of his own house.*] Seneca informs us of this. *Livius Drusus*, says he (20), *vir acer & vehemens, cum leges novas & mala Gracchana movisset, stipatus ingenti totius Italiæ cœtu, exitum rerum non providens, quas nec agere licebat, nec jam liberum erat semel inchoatas relinquere, exsecratus inquietam à primordiis vitam dicitur dixisse, Uni sibi, nec puero quidem unquam ferias contigisse. . . . Disputatur an ipse sibi manus attulerit, subito enim vulnere per inguen accepto, collapsus est: aliquo dubitante, an mors voluntaria esset; nullo, an tempestiva.* i. e. " Livius Drusus, a " man of great resolution and vehemence, when he " attempted to introduce new Laws, and revived the " ill designs of the Gracchi, being surrounded with " a vast multitude from all parts of Italy, not fore- " seeing the event of the schemes, which he could " neither execute, nor leave, when he had once be- " gun them; cursing his manner of life which had " been restless from the beginning, is reported to " have said, that he alone, even when a boy, had " never enjoyed any holydays. . . It is disputed whe- " ther he killed himself, for having suddenly received a " wound in the groin, he fell down; some doubting " whether his death was voluntary, none whether it was " seasonable." Florus's reflection is not unlike this (21). *Sic per vim latæ, jussæque leges: sed pretium rogationis statim socii flagitavere, quum interim imparem Drusum, ægrumque rerum temere motarum, matura, ut in tali discrimine, mors absolvit.* i. e. " Thus the " laws were passed and enacted by force; but the allies " immediately required the reward of their votes, " while in the mean time, death, very seasonable in " such a perplexity, cut off Drusus, unequal to the " execution of that design, and weary of the confu- " sion which he had rashly occasioned." The perplexity of Drusus must be so much the greater, as besides his seeing no opportunity of procuring for the Latins what he had promised, he found himself accused of a conspiracy with them against Philippus the Consul. The accusation was founded upon his having advised the Consul to take care of himself. It was concluded from thence, that he knew of their designs. *Cum Latini Consulem in Albano monte interfecturi essent, Philippum admonuit ut caveret, unde in Senatu accusatus cum domum se reciperet, immisso inter turbam percussore corruit* (22). i. e. " When the " Latins had concerted a scheme for killing the " Consul upon the Albanian Mount, he advised Phi- " lippus to take care of himself, upon which being " accused in the Senate, as he returned home, he " was wounded by an assassin mixed among the crowd, " and fell down dead." Mademoiselle le Fevre has made a false note, in my opinion, upon these words of Aurelius Victor. She begins with quoting Florus (23), who says, *Primum fuit belli in Albano monte consilium, ut festo die Latinarum Julius Cæsar & Martius Philippus Consules inter sacra & aras immolarentur. Postquam id nefas proditione discussum est, &c.* i. e. " The first opening of the war was designed to " be

(20) Seneca, *de Brevitate Vitæ*, cap. 6. pag. 700, 701.

(21) Lib. 3. cap. 17.

(22) Aurel. Victor, *de Viris illustribus.*

(23) Lib. 3. cap. 18.

rounded according to cuſtom, with a prodigious number of people (*d*); part of whom were not known to him. No information was given againſt the aſſaſſin [*I*], and moſt writers ſay he was not known. Cicero I think, is the only one who names him [*K*]. Cornelia, the Mother of Druſus, ſhewed a great firmneſs of mind upon this occaſion [*L*]. His laſt words as he was dying were no leſs preſumptuous [*M*], than thoſe, which he had formerly made uſe of, to expreſs the ſervices which he had done [*N*]. The anſwer which he gave to an Architect, has been much ſpoken of [*O*]. His

(*d*) Patercul. lib. 2. cap. 12. Appian, lib. 1. *Belli Civil.* ſays that Druſus *durſt not any longer go abroad, and that the multitude, who were for him, came to his houſe.*

" be in the Albanian Mount, where Julius Cæſar and " Martius Philippus the Conſuls were determined to " be ſacrificed among the altars upon a feaſt of the " Latins. After this wicked deſign was diſcovered &c." And afterwards ſhe ſays, that Druſus, who had been killed the year before, could not inform Philippus of this: *Sed tunc Philippum admonere non potuit Druſus, quem anno ſuperiori mortuum tabulæ notant.* It is certain, that Druſus might give the information to Philippus; for according to Florus, the conſpiracy of the Latins was to have been executed under the Conſulſhip of Julius Cæſar and Martius Philippus, ſince their deſign was to have cut off both theſe Conſuls. Druſus, I own, was aſſaſſinated under that Conſulſhip, that is, in the year 662 of Rome; but he lived ſeveral months of that year, as appears from the violence, which he offered to the Conſul Philippus (24). That which might deceive Mademoiſelle le Fevre, was, that ſhe thought that the black conſpiracy, which Florus mentions, relates to the firſt year of the ſocial war. Upon this foot Druſus could not poſſibly give any information to any perſon; for the commencement of that war relates to the year 663, and the Conſulſhip of Julius Cæſar and P. Rutilius (25). The conſpiracy of the Latins ſhould be placed under the former year, ſince it was concerted againſt Martius Philippus and Sextus (26) Julius Cæſar his Collegue, as Florus obſerves. It is certain, that the Latins were big with the war during the life of Druſus (27): he might therefore be living, when they reſolved to kill the Conſul Philippus during the celebration of the Latin Feaſts.

(24) See the Remark [*E*].

(25) Patercul. lib. 2. cap. 15.

(26) Florus does not give him this Prænomen, nor any other.

(27) *Mors Druſi jam pridem tumeſcens bellum excitavit Italicum.* Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 15.

[*I*] *No information was made againſt the aſſaſſin.*] *Domi ſuæ nobiliſſimus vir, Senatus propugnator, atque illis quidem temporibus pene patronus. . . . Tribunus plebis M. Druſus occiſus eſt. Nihil de ejus morte populus conſultus, nulla quæſtio decreta à Senatu eſt* (28). i. e. " M. Druſus, a man of the higheſt rank, the Protector of the Senate, and at the time almoſt the ſupport of it, and tribune of the people, was killed " at his own houſe. The people was not at all conſulted concerning his death, nor any enquiry appointed by the Senate."

(28) Cicero, *pro Milone.*

[*K*] *Cicero, I think, is the only Writer, who names the aſſaſſin.*] It is in his IIId Book of the nature of the Gods. *Cur Sodalis meus* (29) *interfectus domi ſuæ Druſus?* i. e. " Why was my companion Druſus " killed in his own houſe?" This is an objection of the Pontiff Cotta againſt Divine Providence. A little after he ſuppoſes that an anſwer is made to him, and he replies, *Summo cruciatu ſupplicioque Varius homo importuniſſimus periit, quia Druſum ferro, Metellum veneno ſuſtulerat* (30). *Sed illos conſervari melius fuit, quam pœnas ſceleris Varium pendere.* i. e. " Varius, a man of a " moſt abandoned character, was put to death in " the moſt painful manner becauſe he had killed " Druſus with a ſword, and Metellus with poiſon. " But it would have been much better, that they " ſhould have been preſerved, than that Varius ſhould " ſuffer the puniſhment due to his crimes." Velleius Paterculus, Florus, Appian, Aurelius Victor, &c. only mention that he was killed; and we have ſeen, that according to Seneca it was abſolutely certain, that he did not kill himſelf. The Conſul Philippus and Cepio were ſuſpected of having ſuborned the aſſaſſin (31). The death of Druſus was the deſtruction of the laws, which he had eſtabliſhed with ſo much pains; for they were all abrogated under pretence, that they had been eſtabliſhed againſt the auſpices (32).

(29) Cotta ſtyles him ſo, becauſe *Druſus*, as *Cicero* aſſerts *in Orat. ad Pontific.* fol. 180, A. had been of the College of Pontiffs. If Father Leſcalopier had known this paſſage, he would not have ſpoken of this with an *opinor* in his *Commentary in Lib. III. de Naturâ Deorum*, pag. 677.

(30) Thus this word ought to be placed, and not as in the editions after it. *See* Freinſhemius on *Florus*, lib. 3. cap. 17.

(31) *Invidia cædis apud Philippum & Cæpionem fuit.* Aurel. Victor, *de Viris illuſtribus.*

(32) Aſcon. Pedianus, *in Orat. Ciceronis pro C. Cornelio*, pag. m. 131, 132.

[*L*] *Cornelia, the mother of Druſus, ſhewed a great firmneſs of mind upon this occaſion.*] I believe that nobody would have known any thing of it now, if Seneca had not mentioned it. *Cornelia*, ſays he (33), *Livium Druſum, clariſſimum juvenem, illuſtris ingenii, vadentem per Gracchana veſtigia, imperfectis tot rogationibus, intra penates interemptum ſuos amiſerat, incerto cædis auctore: tamen & acerbam mortem filii, & inultam, tam magno animo tulit, quam ipſe leges tulerat.* i. e. " Cornelia loſt Livius Druſus, a youth of great " reputation, and noble genius, who was purſuing " the ſteps of the Gracchi, and was killed within " his own walls, before he had paſſed ſeveral laws, " which he had propoſed; but ſhe bore the melancholy death of her ſon, tho' unrevenged, with as " great reſolution as he had exerted in enacting his " Laws."

(33) Seneca, *de Conſolat. ad Martiam*, cap. 16. pag. 750.

[*M*] *His laſt words were no leſs preſumptuous.*] When, ſays he, will the Commonwealth have a citizen like me? It will be better to ſee this in Latin (34). *Sed cum ultimum redderet ſpiritum intuens circumſtantium mœrentiumque frequentiam, effudit vocem convenientiſſimam conſcientiæ ſuæ, & quando, inquit,* propinqui amicique, ſimilem mei civem habebit reſpublica? i. e. " But when he was juſt expiring, looking upon " the company, who ſtood round him lamenting, he " uttered theſe expreſſions, which were very ſuitable to " the conſciouſneſs he had of himſelf; *When*, ſays he, " *O my relations and friends, will the Commonwealth " have a citizen like me?*"

(34) Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 14.

[*N*] *. . . . Than thoſe, which he had made uſe of to expreſs the ſervices, which he had done.*] I have obſerved in the remark [*G*], that he thought that the whole body of the Commonwealth, the Patricians, Knights, and People, were greatly obliged to him. Several Writers report, that he boaſted, that unleſs preſents were made of heaven or of dirt, no perſon could poſſibly ſurpaſs him in the profuſions, which he had made. *Extat vox ipſius, nihil ſe ad largitionem ulli reliquiſſe, niſi ſi quis aut cœnum dividere vellet, aut cœlum* (35). This was putting himſelf above exception and all compariſon; for no body would ever think of diſplaying his magnificence by preſents of dirt; and it was not poſſible for Druſus to imagine, that the time would ever come, when the great men of Rome would diſtribute the places in Paradiſe, and make a lottery of Heaven (36); and even if he had foreſeen this he need not have recanted, for he would have foreſeen not a free-gift, but a mere ſale.

(35) Florus, lib. 3. cap. 17. Cicero, *Orat. pro Rabirio*, cap. 7.

[*O*] *The Anſwer, which he made to an Architect, has been much ſpoken of.*] It is a beautiful one. He was promiſed, that the apartments of his houſe ſhould be diſpoſed in ſuch a manner, that no body ſhould be able to overlook him. Rather, ſaid he to the Architect, take care, that every body may be witneſs of whatever I do at my houſe. *Cùm ædificaret domum in palatio in eo loco, ubi eſt, quæ quondam Ciceronis, mox Cenſorini fuit, nunc Statilii Siſennæ eſt; promitteretque ei architectus, ita ſe eam ædificaturum, uti libera à conſpectu, immunis ab omnibus arbitris eſſet, neque quiſquam in eam deſpicere poſſet: Tu verò, inquit, ſi quid intus artis eſt, ita compone domum meam, ut, quidquid agam, ab omnibus perſpici poſſit* (37). i. e. " While he was " building an houſe in the Palatium in that place, " where Cicero's and afterwards Cenſorinus's ſtood, " and Statilius Siſenna's now ſtands, and the Architect promiſed him to build it in ſuch a manner, " that it ſhould be entirely free from being overlooked, and that no perſon ſhould be able to ſee into it; " he anſwered, But do you exert all your art in building my houſe in ſuch a manner, that whatever I " do may be ſeen by every body." Eraſmus (38) relates the ſtory, as if part of the houſe was then actually expoſed to the inconvenience of being overlooked, and the Architect had promiſed to remedy this for the ſum of five talents. Druſus's Anſwer, according to Eraſmus, was thus: *I will give thee ten, if thou wilt diſpoſe my houſe ſo, that whatever is done in all parts of it may be ſeen by every body.* Eraſmus calls this Druſus *Julius Druſus Publicola*: the firſt of theſe words is an error, and the laſt is ſo too; and proceeded from not knowing that Δημαγωγος ought to be tranſlated *Tribune of the People*, or rather Favourite of the People.

(36) *Venalia nobis Templa, Sacerdotes, altaria, ſacra, coronæ, Ignis, thura, preces, cœlum eſt venale, Deuſque.* Baptiſta Mantuanus, *de Calamit. ſuor. temporum*, lib. 3.

(37) Paterc. lib. 2. cap. 14.

(38) Eraſm. *Apophth.* lib. 6. pag. m. 491.

His ſiſter Livia was mother of Cato of Utica [P].

DRUSUS (NERO (a) CLAUDIUS), brother of Tiberius, was deſcended by his father's and mother's ſide from Appius Claudius the blind [A]. He was a man of great merit: to ſpeak more properly, he was one of the greateſt men, whom the Roman Commonwealth ever produced [B]; a thunderbolt of war, very capable of managing the affairs of the cabinet, who in the higheſt fortune, and poſſeſſed of all the glory, which a man of his rank and age could obtain, preſerved a ſurprizing modeſty, civility, and integrity.

(a) Sueton. *in Claud.* cap. 1.

[A] *He was deſcended both by the father's and mother's ſide from Appius Claudius the Blind.*] Appius Claudius the Blind left among other children two ſons, one of whom was named *Tiberius Nero* (1). From him was deſcended the father of the Emperor Tiberius. The other was named *Appius Pulcher*. From him was deſcended Livia the mother of that Emperor. The father of that Livia, who was the adopted ſon of Livius Druſus, took the name of Livius Druſus Claudianus. He followed the republican party, and would not be obliged for his life to Octavius and Marc Anthony, but killed himſelf in his tent, when they gained the battle at Philippi (2). I cannot tell whether he left any children beſides Livia, and I believe, that her adopted father had no natural children (3). All the males therefore of the Druſian Branch, both natural and adopted, ended in the perſon of Livius Druſus Claudianus, father of Livia; and this was probably the reaſon why Livia revived the ſurname of Druſus by giving it to her ſecond ſon, while the eldeſt bore the name of his father; for every one knows, that Livia, before her marriage with Auguſtus, was married to Tiberius Nero. He was a man, who had been of both parties. He was Queſtor under Julius Cæſar during the Alexandrian War, and commanded the Fleet with ſo much conduct, that he greatly contributed to the victory. Cæſar was not ungrateful; he made him Pontiff in the room of Scipio, and gave him a Commiſſion to conduct into Gaul the Colonies of Arles, Narbonne, and ſeveral others. After Cæſar's death our Tiberius gave his vote for decreeing rewards to the conſpirators. *Cunctis turbarum metu abolitionem facti decernentibus, etiam de præmiis tyrannicidarum referendum cenſuit* (4). He was afterwards Prætor, and joined with the party of Marc Anthony, when the Triumviri had a conteſt with each other. He attended Lucius Anthony the Conſul, brother to the Triumvir, to Perugia, and was the only perſon, who would not ſurrender. He eſcaped firſt to Præneſte, and afterwards to Naples, and not being able to engage the ſlaves by promiſe of liberty to take arms, went over to Sicily. He was diſpleaſed that Sextus Pompey would not immediately admit him to an audience, with the Enſigns of the Prætorſhip; and therefore abandoned him, and went to Marc Anthony in Achaia. Peace being made he returned to Rome, and reſigned his wife Livia to Auguſtus. He had by her a ſon, who was the Emperor Tiberius (5), and he had another three months after Auguſtus married her; this was Druſus, who is the ſubject of this article. Thoſe who were fond of ſcandal, were very pleaſant upon Livia's lying in ſo ſoon. They pretended that Auguſtus was the real father of the child. *Livia, cum Auguſto gravida nupſiſſet, intra menſem tertium peperit: fuitque ſuſpicio, ex vitrico per adulterii conſuetudinem procreatum. Statim certe vulgatus eſt Verſus:*

Τῷ εὐτυχῆσι γὴ τρίμηνα παιδία (6).

i. e. "Livia having married Auguſtus, while ſhe was "big with child, lay in of a ſon within three months "after; and it was ſuſpected, that his father-in-"law got him in adultery. It is certain that this "verſe was immediately ſpread about:

"*Great men have ſons at the end of three months.*"

But as we are not to depend upon ſuch ſtories with regard to genealogical matters, I here mention Livia's firſt huſband, Tiberius Nero, as the father of our Druſus. The Emperor ſent to him the new-born infant, and noted down in his Diary this act of diligence. Livia's firſt huſband died ſoon after, and left by will his two ſons under the Guardianſhip of Auguſtus (7).

I cannot but obſerve here an error of Monſ. Dacier. He ſays (8), that *Druſus and Tiberius were deſcended from the two Conſuls, who defeated Aſdrubal. On the father's ſide*, continues he, *they were deſcended from Claudius Nero, and on the mother's from Livius Salinator.* It is certain, as I have already obſerved upon the credit of Suetonius, that they were equally deſcended from Appius Claudius the Blind, as well by the mother's as the father's ſide (9). It is true, that their mother's father was adopted into the family *Livia*; but he did not enter into the branch of Livius Salinator, but into that of Livius Druſus. All the deſcendants of Salinator took this ſurname, and never that of Druſus.

[B] *He was one of the greateſt men, which the Roman Commonwealth ever produced.*] Here is his elogium in Latin: it comes from the pen of Paterculus, and ought not to be ſuſpected, tho' the Hiſtorian flatters Tiberius without any bounds. *Cura deinde, atque onus Germanici belli delegata Druſo Claudio, fratri Neronis, adoleſcenti tot tantarumque virtutum, quot & quantas natura mortalis recipit, vel induſtria percipit; cujus ingenium utrum bellicis magis operibus, an civilibus ſuffecerit artibus, in incerto eſt. Morum certè dulcedo ac ſuavitas, & adverſus amicos æqua ac par ſui æſtimatio inimitabilis fuiſſe dicitur. Nam pulchritudo corporis proxima fraternæ fuit. Sed illum, magna ex parte domitorem Germaniæ, plurimo ejus gentis variis in locis profuſo ſanguine, fatorum iniquitas, conſulem, agentem annum triceſimum, rapuit* (10). i. e. "The "care and burthen of the German War was after-"wards committed to Druſus Claudius, the brother "of Nero, a youth of as many great virtues, as hu-"man nature is capable of, or human induſtry can "attain. It is doubtful, whether his genius qualified "him more for war, or the management of civil af-"fairs. The ſweetneſs of his temper, and his love "for his friends equal to that of himſelf, were ini-"mitable. The gracefulneſs of his perſon approach-"ed neareſt to that of his brother. But he, after he "had ſubdued the greateſt part of Germany, and "ſhed great quantities of the blood of that Nation in "divers places, was cut off by the cruelty of the fates, "during his Conſulſhip, when he was in the thirtieth "year of his age." What induces me to think, that Paterculus does not flatter Druſus in order to make his court, is, that he might aſſure himſelf, that Tiberius would never have proſecuted him under the pretext of Druſus's Elogium not being magnificent enough; ſince that Emperor could not ſee without regret the flouriſhing ſtate of his brother. This was placed among the misfortunes of his youth. *Caſus prima ab infantia ancipites: nam proſcriptum patrem exſul ſecutus; ubi domum Auguſti privignus introiit multis æmulis conflictatus eſt, dum Marcellus & Agrippa, mox Cajus Luciuſque Cæſares viguere, etiam frater ejus Druſus proſperiore civium amore erat* (11). i. e. "The ſeries of his life from his infancy was ex-"poſed to many misfortunes: for he followed his "father, when he was proſcribed, into baniſhment; "when he enter'd into Auguſtus's family, as his ſon-"in-law, he had many rivals to contend with, while "Marcellus

(1) Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. 3.

(2) Paterc. lib. 2. cap. 71.

(3) I uſe this word in the ſenſe of the Latin Writers, who do not oppoſe it, as we do, to legitimate, but to adopted children.

(4) Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. 4.

(5) Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. 4.

(6) Sueton. *in Claudio*, cap. 1. *See likewiſe* Dion Caſſius, lib. 48. *ad ann.* 716.

(7) Dio, ibid.

(8) *Remarques ſur la IV Ode du Livre IV d'Horace*, pag. m. 127. [*M. Dacier has rectified this in his 3d edit. printed at Paris in* 1709. ADD. *de l'Ed. d'Amſt.*]

(9) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 5. cap. 1. confirms this. *Pater ei Nero*, ſays he ſpeaking of Tiberius, & *utrimque origo gentis Claudiæ, quanquam mater in Liviam & mox Juliam familiam adoptionibus tranſierit.*

(10) Paterc. lib. 2. cap. 97.

(11) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 6. cap. 51.

(40) *In Orat. pro Milone.*

(41) *In Bruto*, pag. m. 329. In lib. 4. *de Finib.* fol. 237, A. he calls the father of our Druſus, *avum Catonis.*

(39) *See* Leopard. *Emendat.* lib. 10. cap. 17.

tegrity. He procured a diſpenſation of age, in order that he might be advanced to places five years ſooner than the laws allowed (*b*). He was ſent during his Queſtorſhip (*c*) with his brother (*d*) in the year 739 of Rome into the country of the Rhetians (*e*), in order to ſubdue that nation. Theſe were his firſt exploits in arms, and they were glorious [*C*]. He afterwards marched into Gaul (*f*), where he reduced ſome provinces, which had revolted; he defeated the Germans which had advanced on this ſide of the Rhine, he paſſed that river, routed the Sicambri in their own territories, gained a naval victory againſt the Bructeri on the Ems (*g*), ſubdued the people of Frieſeland [*D*], and was the firſt Roman General who embarked upon the northern ocean (*b*). Upon his return to Rome in 743 he obtained the Prætorſhip (*i*), but did not ſtay long there; he departed in the beginning of ſpring to purſue his glorious ſucceſſes in Germany. He ſubdued there ſeveral nations as far as the Weſer, and built forts in divers places. This gained him at Rome triumphal ornaments, the honour of an ovation, and the dignity of Proconſul (*k*). He was raiſed to the Conſulſhip in the year 745 (*l*), and returned to Germany, where he puſh'd his conqueſts as far as the Elbe. He endeavoured to paſs that river, but without ſucceſs (*m*); however it is thought, that if a ſuperior force had not ſtopped him [*E*], he would have ſurmounted all other obſtacles. He march'd back towards the Rhine, and died of ſickneſs,

(*b*) Dio, lib. 54. *ad ann.* 735, pagm. 604.

(*c*) *In quæſturæ honore dux Rhætici belli.* Sueton. *in Claudio*, cap. 1.

(*d*) Dio, lib. 54. pag. 613.

(*e*) It is now called the country of the Griſons.

(*f*) Livius *in Epitome* lib. 137, *& ſeq.*

(*g*) Strabo, lib. 7, *circa init.*

(*b*) Sueton. *in Claudio*, cap. 1.

(*i*) Dio, lib. 54. pag. 613.

(*k*) Idem; ibid. *See alſo* Sueton. *in Claudio*, cap. 1.

(*l*) Monſieur de Larrey in the *Hiſtory of Auguſtus*, pag. 405. pretends that Druſus ſpent the whole year of his Conſulſhip at Rome, and went to Germany in 745 as Proconſul.

(*m*) Dio, lib. 55, *init.*

" Marcellus and Agrippa, and afterwards Caius and
" Lucius Cæſar flouriſhed, and his brother Druſus en-
" joyed a greater ſhare in the people's affection."
We ſhall ſee in the laſt remark a paſſage of Suetonius, which ſhews the advantageous opinion, which the world had of the virtue and probity of Druſus. We ſhall ſee likewiſe there an inſtance of the perfidiouſneſs of Tiberius towards him. We are not therefore to believe all that Valerius Maximus relates of the fraternal tenderneſs of Tiberius (12). That Author has carried his flattery with regard to that Prince to a great exceſs in more places than one.

(12) Val. Max. lib. 5. cap. 5. num. 3.

[*C*] *His firſt exploits in arms .... were glorious.*] I ſhall cite Horace, but not as a witneſs, which amounts to a proof. All the proof, which I ſhall give, is, that the Hiſtorians (13) agree that the Rhetians were forced to paſs under the yoke, though their valour, and the advantages of their ſituation rendered them very capable of reſiſting for a long time. I ſhall quote Horace's verſes only becauſe they are beautiful and grand: if they contain nothing but the truth, that muſt be ſuppoſed accidental; for a Poet who ſings of the victories and triumphs of a Prince, does not renounce the fabulous Hyperbole, except when he has no occaſion for it. Thoſe who read the modern Poets, will not diſpute this, but will readily believe that the poets of the court of Auguſtus were animated with the ſame ſpirit as thoſe of the preſent age. I am even of opinion that the Devotees to Antiquity, who are the moſt averſe to the Sect of Monſieur Perrault, will allow, that our age ſurpaſſes that of Alexander and Auguſtus in point of Panegyric; for the modern Panegyric-Writers puſh their ideas much beyond the Antients, though the latter had a more copious ſubject. But let us return from this digreſſion, and cite Horace (14).

(13) Dio, lib. 54. pag. 613, 614. Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 95.

(14) Horat. Od. 4. lib. 4. ver. 1. *ſeqq.* ver. 14. & 22.

Qualem miniſtrum fulminis alitem
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Qualemve lætis caprea paſcuis
Intenta, fulvæ matris ab uberè
Jam lacte depulſum leonem
Dente novo peritura vidit;
Videre Rhæti bella ſub Alpibus
Druſum gerentem & Vindelici - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - *ſed diu*
Lateque victrices catervæ
Conſiliis juvenis revictæ
Senſere, quid mens rite, quid indoles
Nutrita fauſtis ſub penetralibus
Poſſet, quid Auguſti paternus
In pueros animus Nerones.

" Such as the Royal Bird of Jove
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
" Such as the Lyon, which his Dam forſakes,
" And through the ſhaggy herd wild ſlaughter makes,
" Chacing ſome Goat along the Plain,
" That flies, but flies in vain;
" Such Druſus did in arms appear,
" When near the Alps he urged the war.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
" At length, when cruſhed by the young warrior's hand,
" They knew what Heroes under Cæſar train'd
" Could do: to whom the Sire bequeaths
" His ſoul, in whom he breathes."

It muſt be owned, that theſe praiſes are not overſtrained, and I ſhould think it very ſurprizing that Horace did not inſiſt a little more upon the great actions of Druſus, if it were true, that he wrote this Ode after the year of Rome 740 (15); for in this caſe he muſt have known the prodigious things which that young General had done beyond the Alps. How then could the Poet poſſibly confine himſelf to the Rhetian war alone?

(15) Monſ. Dacier aſſerts this in his *Remarques ſur la IV Ode du IV Livre d'Horace*, p. m. 110.

[*D*] *He ſubdued the people of Frieſeland.*] Dion is not the only writer, who obſerves this; Tacitus likewiſe mentions it, and adds that Druſus impoſed only a ſmall Tribute on them. He obliged them to furniſh a certain number of Ox-Hides. *Eodem anno Friſii tranſrhenani populus pacem exuere, noſtra magis avaritia quam obſequii impatientes. Tributum iis Druſus juſſerat modicum pro anguſtia rerum, ut in uſus militares coria boum penderent* (16). i. e. " The ſame year the
" Friſii, a people beyond the Rhine revolted; rather
" through our avarice, than becauſe they were impa-
" tient of the yoke. Druſus had laid on them a
" ſmall tribute ſuitable to the neceſſity of their cir-
" cumſtances, and obliged them to furniſh a certain
" number of Ox-Hides for the ſervice of the army."
They revolted ſome time after, becauſe the Collectors of that tribute did a great many acts of injuſtice to them, with all the rigour of the moſt unrelenting Exciſemen.

(16) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 4. cap. 72. *ad ann.* 781.

[*E*] *It was thought that if a ſuperior force had not ſtopped him.*] Thus I call the viſion, which it is pretended he ſaw. It is ſaid, that while he was purſuing his conqueſts from place to place, without fixing any where, a woman ſuperior to the common ſize of mortals, cloathed in the Barbarian Habit appeared to him, and commanded him to ſtop. *Hoſtem etiam frequenter cæſum, ac penitus in intimas ſolitudines actum non prius deſtitit inſequi, quam ſpecies barbaræ mulieris humana amplior victorem tendere ultra ſermone Latino prohibuiſſet* (17). Suetonius and Dion ſpeak of this adventure; but Dion forgot to obſerve, that the ſpectre ſpoke in Latin; which was a capital circumſtance, and which an exact Hiſtorian would never have omitted in his account, if he had known it. On the other hand, Suetonius has forgot a circumſtance, which is no leſs eſſential: he does not tell us, that this woman, after having reprov'd Druſus for not being ſatisfied with any conqueſt, ordered him to retire, and informed him that he ſhould die ſoon after. If Druſus had ſeen ſuch a viſion, I ſhould not be at all ſurpriz'd that he turned back, and even fell ſoon after into a fit of ſickneſs, which proved mortal. I cannot tell whether the moſt reſolute warriors at preſent in the world, whatever their religion may be, would be proof againſt ſuch an Apparition. What dread therefore muſt it occaſion in the mind of Druſus who was accuſtomed to hear at Rome of Auſpices, Prodigies, and good and evil Genii? Let us ſee Dion's words.

(17) Suet. *in Claudio*, cap. 1.

neſs, before he had gained that river (n), in the year 746, at the age of about thirty years. Some ſay that he died of a fracture of his Leg [F], occaſioned by his horſe falling under him. His brother, who haſtened to him upon the firſt rumour of his illneſs, found him in the agonies of death (o) [G]. He conducted his body to Rome, where he pronounc'd a funeral oration on the deceaſed (p). Auguſtus pronounced another. All kinds of honours were paid to the memory of Druſus, and the ſirname of Germanicus was given him on account of the victories which he had gained in Germany (q). He had cauſed a canal to be dug between the Sea and the Rhine [H]. We have ſpoken elſewhere

(n) Idem, ibid.

(o) Idem, ibid. Livius, *Epitome* lib. 140.

(p) Sueton. *in Claudio*, cap. 1. *See likewiſe* Seneca, *Conſolat. ad Marc.* cap. 3.

(q) Sueton, ibid.

(18) Dio, lib. 55, *init.*

words (18). Γυνὴ γάρ τις μείζων ἢ κατὰ ἀνθρώπου φύσιν ἀπαντήσασα αὐτῷ, ἔφη, Ποῖ δῆτα χωρεῖς Δροῦσε ἀκέρτως; οὐ πάντα σοι ταῦτα ἰδεῖν συμβήσεται· ἀλλ' ἄπιθι. καὶ γὰρ σοι καὶ τῶν ἔργων καὶ τοῦ βίου τὸ τέλος ἐνθένδε ἦδη. *Etenim mulier quædam humana amplior forma ei obviam facta: Druſe, inquit, quo tandem nullum tuæ cupiditati modum ſtatuens contendis? Non tibi fatis conceſſum hæc omnia videre. Quin tu abi; jam enim & operum tuorum & vitæ inſtat tibi terminus.* i. e. "A woman above the human ſize met him, and ſaid, O Druſus, whither "are you proceeding without limiting your deſires "of conqueſt? the fates will not permit you to ſee "all theſe things. Depart therefore, for the end of "your labours and life is near at hand."

Who knows, whether the Germans were not politic enough to dreſs up ſome man of their nation who could ſpeak Latin, and was of an uncommon ſize, in a woman's habit; and direct him to appear like a ſpectre to Druſus on the road. I do not doubt but recourſe has more than once been had to ſuch a ſtratagem.

[F] *Some Authors write that he died of a fracture of his leg.*] We ſhould have ſeen the particulars of this accident, if we had the laſt book of Livy; for the ſummary, which is ſtill remaining, contains theſe words. *Ipſe* (Druſus) *ex fractura equo ſuper crus ejus collapſo triceſimo die quam id acciderat mortuus eſt.* i. e. "He died of a fracture in his leg, occaſioned by his "horſe falling on him; the 30th day after it happened." Moreri has committed a miſtake here, *Druſus* ſays he, *was preparing to purſue his conqueſts at the time when he fell from his horſe, and broke his thigh, of which he died 13 days after.* His putting *thirteen* inſtead of *thirty*, is not his only miſtake: he is contradicted by Dion in another point; for Dion aſſures us that Druſus returned towards the Rhine, ſo far was he from *preparing to purſue his conqueſts.* I paſs over his defects in ſtyle: Gentlemen of ſkill do not want them to be pointed out; but if I leave them the trouble of remarking thoſe, which are to be found in the words quoted by me, I cannot do the ſame with regard to the beginning of the Article. *Druſus was ſon of Tiberius, Nero and Livia, who afterwards married Auguſtus, brother to the Emperor Tiberius.* Thus Moreri begins, Now the words are ſtrangely miſplaced: the word *brother* may equally refer to three perſons, either Druſus, or Tiberius Nero, or Auguſtus. A perſon not well verſed in the Hiſtory could not tell which of the three relatives to fix on. But here is an error of another kind. Moreri ſays, that Druſus *made war* in Germany *for many years.* There are few readers but will underſtand by this ten or twelve compaigns at leaſt; but this is too much by half: I do not think that Druſus made five campaigns in that country. This is the fineſt jewel in his crown. He performed more in one year, than other warriors during their whole life (19).

(19) See another error of Moreri in the Remark [H].

[G] *His brother, who haſtened to ſee him upon the firſt rumour of ſickneſs, found him in the agonies of death.*] He haſtened with ſuch expedition, that Pliny has placed this Journey among the ſpeedieſt that were ever made. He affirms (20), that Tiberius travelling day and night, and changing horſes but thrice, rode two hundred miles. Valerius Maximus agrees with Pliny with reſpect to the diſtance of the way, but he ſays, that Tiberius changed his horſes frequently (21). I cannot tell how we can acquit Dion Caſſius in this point, who ſays that there was no great diſtance between the place where Auguſtus received the news of Druſus's ſickneſs, and the place where Druſus lay; for though we ſhould ſuppoſe that Pliny and Valerius Maximus have not given us the juſt diſtance, it is ſtill true, that Lombardy is remote from Wetteravia. Auguſtus was at Pavia when he heard that Druſus was ſick. Druſus fell ſick as he was returning from the Banks of the Elbe towards the Rhine, and died before he reached the Banks of the Rhine. Let us ſuppoſe, in order to favour Dion as much as poſſible, that Druſus had a deſign to return to Mentz; it muſt be ſaid according to this ſuppoſition that he fell ſick in Wetteravia. What does this Hiſtorian therefore mean by this Parentheſis (ἐ γὰρ ἦν πόρρω)? *Auguſtus*, ſays he, *being informed of the ſickneſs of Druſus, (for he was not far diſtant) ſent Tiberius immediately to him.* The Tranſlators of Dion clear him from this miſtake; for they make him ſpeak in ſuch a manner as may ſignify that Auguſtus ſent immediately for Tiberius, who was at no great diſtance from him. Περυθόμενος δ' ὁ Αὔγυστος ὅτι νοσεῖ (ἐ γὰρ ἦν πόρρω) τὸν Τιβέριον κατὰ τάχος ἔπεμψε. *Ad famam ægrotantis Druſi Auguſtus, qui non ita procul ab eo aberat, celeriter Tiberium accerſiit* (22). But Caſaubon refutes this Tranſlation by two ſolid remarks (23). I. The Greek Language will not ſuffer ἔπεμψε to be tranſlated *ſent for*. II. Auguſtus and Tiberius were then at Pavia, as we learn from Valerius Maximus. We muſt therefore conclude, that Dion has expreſſed himſelf like a bad Geographer, or as a man, who did not know the circumſtances of the fact. Let us add another thing, which renders this journey of Tiberius very remarkable. He travelled from Pavia into Germany with all the haſte of a poſt-boy, and returned on foot from Germany to Italy (24) with all the ſlowneſs of a funeral proceſſion. Druſus died during the Summer, and his corps did not reach Padua till the depth of the Winter. It is Tacitus who informs us of this. *Ipſum quippe* (Auguſtum) *aſperrimo hyemis Ticinum uſque progreſſum neque abſcedentem à corpore ſimul Urbem intraviſſe* (25). i. e. "Auguſtus himſelf "went as far as Pavia in the midſt of the winter, "and never left the body till it was brought into "the City."

(22) Dio, lib. 55, *initio.*

(23) Caſaub. *in Sueton. Claud.* cap. 1.

(24) *Druſum fratrem in Germania amiſit, cujus corpus pedibus toto itinere prægrediens Romam uſque pervexit.* Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. 7.

(25) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 3. cap. 5.

[H] *He ordered a canal to be dug between the ſea and the Rhine.*] Suetonius ſpeaks in this manner: *Trans Rhenum foſſas novi & immenſi operis effecit, quæ nunc adhuc* DRUSINÆ *vocantur* (26). Tacitus calls it *foſſam Druſianam*, and it is a common name among the Latin Authors. It was not a work of a ſhort duration; for it not only ſerved Druſus's ſon, but remains to this day. The paſſage, in which Tacitus ſpeaks of Germanicus's embarking on this canal, is too beautiful to be omitted. *Jamque claſſis advenerat, cum præmiſſo commeatu, & diſtributis in legiones ac ſocios navibus foſſam cui* DRUSIANÆ *nomen ingreſſus, precatuſque Druſum patrem ut ſe eadem auſum libens placatuſque exemplo ac memoria conſiliorum atque operum juvaret, lacus inde & Occanum uſque ad Amiſiam fluvium ſecunda navigatione pervehitur* (27). i. e. "And "now the fleet was arrived with the proviſions, and "the legions and auxiliary troops being put on board "the ſeveral ſhips, Germanicus embarked on "the *Druſian* Canal, and addreſſed his prayers to his "Father Druſus, that he would be propitious to him, "and by his example and the memory of his advice "and actions, aſſiſt him in the ſame attempt, in which "he had led the way before; and then had a ſucceſsful voyage thro' the lakes and ſea as far as the "river Amiſia." The invocation of the dead was ſo much uſed among the Pagans, that we have here a ſon, who offers up ſolemn prayers to the ghoſt of a father, who had never been deified. I own that an altar had been raiſed to him in Germany, but this was no apotheoſis. *Tumulum tamen nuper Varianis legionibus ſtructum & veterem aram Druſo ſitam diſjecerant. Reſtituit aram* (Germanicus) *honorique patris princeps ipſe cum legionibus decucurrit: tumulum iterare haud viſum* (28). i. e. "Yet they had deſtroyed the monu- "ment lately erected to Varius's legions, and an "antient Altar conſecrated to Druſus. Germanicus "reſtored

(26) Sueton. *in Claudio*, cap. 1.

(27) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 8. *ad ann.* 769.

(28) Idem, ibid. cap. 7.

(r) In the Article of ANTONIA, Remark [B].

where (r) of the extraordinary chaſtity aſcribed to him. He left two ſons and one daughter: one of his ſons was that illuſtrious Prince, who was known under the name of Germanicus; the other was that ſtupid Prince, who was the Emperor Claudius. Their ſiſter Livia was married to Druſus, the ſon of Tiberius, and was a Lady of no reputation (s). It is not at all probable, that Druſus died of poiſon through the guilt of the Emperor his father-in-law [I]. The conſolation, which Ovid wrote to Livia, mother of this illuſtrious deceaſed, is a Poem which deſerves to be read. We ſhall ſee in the Remark [F] the errors of Moreri: they are inconſiderable.

(s) See the following Article, Remark [B].

" reſtored the Altar, and the Prince himſelf with his " legions run the courſes in honour of his father; but " it was not thought proper to repair the monument." Obſerve, that in order to form a juſt idea of the country, which at Rome was conſidered as beyond the Rhine, we ought to repreſent the Hiſtorians, as tranſcribers of the relations, which the Generals ſent to Rome. The Generals marched with their troops into the Provinces of Gaul near the Rhine. With reſpect to them Germany was beyond the river. Suetonius and Tacitus have followed their manner of expreſſion, for in reality Germany with reſpect to Rome is rather on this ſide than beyond the Rhine. I do not propoſe this as a conſiderable remark; but how many are there not more important in Commentaries? For the reſt, we are not to imagine, as Moreri does, that all that is now called the Iſſel was the work of the antient Romans; for Druſus did not join the Rhine to the ocean, that is, with what is now called the *Zuider-Zee*, but by making a Canal between the River Iſſel and the Rhine (22). I ſhall obſerve occaſionally that he began to make dikes upon the banks of the Rhine, which were finiſhed ſixty three years after (30).

(29) *See* Cluver, *in Germania antiqua.*

(30) *Ne ſegnem militem attinerent,* Paulinus Pompejus *inchoatum ante tres & ſexaginta annos à Druſo aggerem coërcendo Rheno abſolvit.* Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 13. cap. 53.

[I] *It is not at all probable, that he died by poiſon given him by order of the Emperor his father-in-law.*] Slander is a terrible thing. The ſame people who had moſt propagated the report, that Auguſtus was the father of Druſus, were perhaps thoſe who accuſed him of having poiſoned him. Since Suetonius rejects this as a mere fable without any ground, we may conclude, that he ſaw not the leaſt trace of probability in it: for he is not much inclined naturally to juſtify his twelve Emperors, or to conceal their faults. He informs us of the remarkable tenderneſs, which Auguſtus always had for Druſus, and he mentions two particularities, which I cannot omit. Auguſtus wrote the Epitaph in verſe, which was inſcribed on the tomb of *Druſus*, and compoſed in proſe an hiſtory of that great man. I am not ignorant that the greateſt Princes and the moſt ambitious Monarchs are ſubject to furious jealouſies towards thoſe of their own blood, which make them do things very prejudicial to their intereſt, when they are apprehenſive leſt a riſing glory, which grows apace, ſhould too much charm the people. But I do not perceive in the conduct of Auguſtus ſufficient ſigns of this paſſion, to incline me to think, that he ever ceaſed his affection toward this Prince, of whom he probably imagined himſelf father, and perhaps thought ſo not without good reaſons. However that be, let us ſee Suetonius's words, in which we ſhall find an admirable ſketch of the character of Druſus. *Fuiſſe autem creditur non minus glorioſi quam civilis animi. Nam ex hoſte ſuper victorias, optima quoque ſpolia captaſſe, ſummoque ſæpius diſcrimine duces Germanorum tota acie inſectatus: ne diſſimulaſſe unquam priſtinum ſe Reipublicæ ſtatum quandoque reſtituturum, ſi poſſet. Unde exiſtimo nonnullos tradere auſos, ſuſpectum eum Auguſto, revocatumque ex provincia: & quia cunctaretur, interceptum veneno. Quod equidem magis, ne prætermitterem, retuli, quam quia verum aut veriſimile putem: cum Auguſtus tantopere & vivum dilexerit, ut coheredem ſemper filiis inſtituerit, ſicut quondam in Senatu profeſſus eſt; & defunctum ita pro concione laudaverit, ut Deos precatus ſit,* Similes ei Cæſares ſuos facerent; ſibique tam honeſtum quandoque exitum darent, quam illi dediſſent. *Nec contentus elogium tumulo ejus verſibus à ſe compoſitis inſculpſiſſe, etiam vitæ memoriam proſa oratione compoſuit* (31). i. e. " But he is thought to have " been no leſs fond of glory in war than peace. For be- " ſides his conqueſts over the enemies, he took the " *opima ſpolia* from them, and purſued the German " Generals with his whole army and with the utmoſt " peril; and he never diſſembled, that he would re- " ſtore the ancient ſtate of the Republic, if ever he " ſhould have it in his power. Whence I imagine " that ſome perſons have ventured to affirm, that he " was ſuſpected by Auguſtus, and recalled from the " Province, and becauſe he delayed, was taken off " by poiſon. I have mentioned this, rather that I " might not omit it, than becauſe I think it true or " probable; ſince Auguſtus had ſo great an affection " for him, while he was living, that he appointed " him joint-heir with his ſons, as he formerly de- " clared in the Senate; and when he died, pronounced " a funeral oration on him, in which he entreated " the Gods, *That they would make his Cæſars like him, " and grant him as honourable an exit, as they had done " to the deceaſed.* And not ſatisfied with this, he " wrote an epitaph in verſe to be inſcribed on his mo- " nument, and compoſed an Hiſtory of his life in " proſe." He was more fond of glory than command, and was entirely actuated by the Roman Spirit. He reſolved to employ all his credit for the reſtoration of the liberty of the Commonwealth, though his private intereſt engaged him to maintain the imperial uſurpation, which was then predominant. It is even pretended, that he wrote to Tiberius to exhort him to join with him, in a deſign to oblige Auguſtus to replace things on their former foot. If any reaſon could render probable the ſlander rejected by Suetonius, it would undoubtedly be this, that Tiberius ſhewed the letter, which he had received from Druſus upon this ſubject. It is Suetonius himſelf, who relates this (32). In general, they were ſo well perſuaded at Rome of this noble and incomparable inclination of Druſus, that it was the firſt cauſe of the prodigious affection, which the people ſhewed towards Germanicus. *Druſi magna apud populum Romanum memoria, credebaturque ſi rerum potitus foret, libertatem redditurus, unde in Germanicum favor & ſpes eadem, nam juveni civile ingenium, mira comitas* (33). i. e. " The Roman people had a " regard for the memory of Druſus, and it was thought, " that if he had been advanced to the Empire, he " would have reſtored liberty, on which account there " was the ſame eſteem ſhewn to Germanicus, and the " ſame hopes conceived of him; for the youth had " a gentle and mild temper."

(31) Sueton. *in Claudio*, cap. 1.

(32) *Odium adverſus neceſſitudines in Druſo primum fratre detexit* (Tiberius) *prodita ejus epiſtola, qua ſecum de cogendo ad reſtituendam libertatem Auguſto agebat.* Idem, *in Tiber.* cap. 50.

(33) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 1. cap. 33.

DRUSUS, the ſon of Tiberius, by his firſt wife Vipſania, daughter of Agrippa, did not reſemble his father in diſſimulation (a); but he was not unlike him in impurity, drunkenneſs, and cruelty (b). He was Quæſtor in the year 764 (c): he was ſent into Pannonia after the death of Auguſtus, in order to appeaſe the legions which had mutinied. He ſucceeded very well in this affair, and was created Conſul ſoon after his return to Rome (d). He commanded an army in Illyricum in 770. This poſt was given him, as well that he might gain the affection of the ſoldiery, as to remove him from the purſuit of pleaſures, in which he plunged himſelf at Rome (e). He fomented with great addreſs the diviſions, which ſprung up among the Germans, and made conſiderable advantage of them (f): the Senate decreed him the honours of an *Ovation*. He returned to Rome in the year 773 (g), and was Conſul with the Emperor his father the year following (h). He had in this poſt a dignity ſuperior even to the Conſulſhip, in which he was

(a) Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. 3. cap. 8.

(b) Dio, lib. 57. pag. m. 699, 701.

(c) Idem, lib. 56. pag. 672.

(d) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 1. *ad ann.* 767.

(e) Idem, lib. 2. cap. 44.

(f) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 2. cap. 62, 63, 64.

(g) Idem, lib. 3. cap. 11.

(h) Ibid. cap. 31.

was the Emperor's Collegue; it was the Tribunitian Power [*A*]. Having obtained this important office of the Senate, he would infallibly have ſucceeded Tiberius, if Sejanus had not prevented it (*i*). The ambition of that favourite was boundleſs; and beſides the box on the ear, which he had received from Druſus, urged him to all manner of wicked attempts. The execution of them was ſo much the more eaſy, as he had a criminal correſpondence with Druſus's wife [*B*]. Thus in concert with that Lady he procured Druſus to be poiſoned by the eunuch Lygdus (*k*). The poiſon had its effect: Druſus died in the year 766. He left ſome children [*C*], as we ſhall ſee in the remarks. Tiberius

(*i*) Ibid. cap. 56, & ſeq.

(*k*) Not *Ligius*, as Moreri ſays.

[*A*] *He . . . had . . . the Tribunitian Power.*] Auguſtus would call the ſupreme authority ſo, in order to avoid the odious titles of King and Dictator, and at the ſame time poſſeſs one ſuperior to all others. He took for his collegue in that office his ſon-in-law Agrippa, and after the death of Agrippa his ſon-in-law Tiberius. After his example Tiberius would have an aſſociate in that power, and choſe his own ſon. The letters which he wrote to the Senate concerning this aſſociation, had all the force of a command. *Mittit literas ad Senatum, queis* poteſtatem tribuniciam *Druſo petebat. Id ſummi faſtigii vocabulum Auguſtus repperit, ne* regis *aut* dictatoris *nomen adſumeret, ac tamen appellatione aliqua cætera imperia præemineret. M. deinde Agrippam ſocium ejus poteſtatis, quo defuncto, Tiberium Neronem delegit, ne ſucceſſor in incerto foret. Sic cohiberi pravas aliorum ſpes rebatur: ſimul modeſtiæ Neronis, & ſuæ magnitudini fidebat. Quo tunc exemplo, Tiberius Druſum ſummæ rei admovet: cum incolumi Germanico integrum inter duos judicium tenuiſſet* (1). i. e. " He ſends letters to the Senate, in which he demands the Tribunitian Power for Druſus. Auguſtus " found out this word to expreſs the ſupreme authority, " that he might not aſſume the name of *King* or " *Dictator*, and yet be diſtinguiſhed by a title ſuperior to all others. He then choſe M. Agrippa his " Collegue in that dignity, and upon his death Tiberius Nero, leſt his ſucceſſor might continue doubtful. By this means he thought the ambitious hopes " of others would be reſtrained; and he had a great " confidence in Nero's modeſty, and his own greatneſs. After this example Tiberius raiſes Druſus to " this dignity, though during Germanicus's life, he " had carried an even hand between them." If Moreri had underſtood this, he would not have ſaid, that Druſus *upon his return from Germany exerciſed the office of Tribune*. This does not expreſs what Tacitus has juſt told us. I omit two other errors of Moreri contained in theſe words; Druſus *was ſent into Illyricum to learn the art of war, afterwards into Germany*. The firſt of Druſus's expeditions was that into Pannonia, and the ſecond that into the Illyricum. I do not think, that he was in perſon in Germany with an army, tho' he fomented the diviſions there.

(1) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 3. cap. 56. *ad ann.* 775.

Mistakes of Moreri.

[*B*] *Sejanus . . . had a criminal converſation with Druſus's wife.*] Her name was Livia, and ſhe was ſiſter of Germanicus. She was firſt married to Caius Cæſar, grand-ſon of Auguſtus, and after the death of that Prince to Druſus the ſon of Tiberius. She had been at firſt very ordinary in her perſon, and afterwards became extremely beautiful. Sejanus had a bad opinion enough of this Lady, to imagine, that by making love to her, he might engage her to ſecond him in his deſign to deſtroy her huſband. He therefore courted her, and eaſily gained the enjoyment of her, and then propoſed to her, that if ſhe would poiſon Druſus, he would marry her, and make her Empreſs. This uncertain hope induced her to renounce by an abominable crime a certain hope; ſo true it is, that a woman, who has proſtituted her honour, will ſuffer herſelf to be turned any way, according to the caprice of him, to whom ſhe has abandoned herſelf. This reflection is not mine, but Tacitus's. Read the following paſſage, in which you will find an account of a blow of the ear, which Druſus gave Sejanus (2). *Druſus impatiens æmuli, & animo commotior, orto forte jurgio, intenderat Sejano manus, & contra tendentis os verberaverat. Igitur cuncta tentanti promptiſſimum viſum ad uxorem ejus Liviam convertere. Quæ ſoror Germanici, formæ initio ætatis indecoræ, mox pulchritudine præcellebat. Hanc, ut amore, incenſus, adulterio pellexit: & poſtquam primi flagitii potitus eſt (neque fœmina amiſſa pudicitia alia abnuerit,) ad conjugii ſpem, conſortium regni, & nectm mariti impulit. Atque illa, cui avunculus Auguſtus, ſocer Tiberius, ex Druſo liberi, ſeque ac majores & poſteros municipali adultero fœdabat; ut pro honeſtis & præſentibus, flagitioſa & incerta expectaret* (3). i. e. " Druſus impatient of a rival, and being a man " of warm temper, upon a quarrel, which happened " to ariſe, laid hands on Sejanus, who reſiſting Druſus, ſtruck him on the face. Sejanus therefore a- " mong all his ſchemes of revenge, thought the readieſt way was to have recourſe to Livia Druſus's " wife, and ſiſter of Germanicus, who having been " very homely when ſhe was young, was afterwards diſtinguiſhed for her beauty. Sejanus being " deeply in love with her, had engaged her in a criminal converſation, and having drawn her into this " firſt crime (for a woman having loſt her honour " will not refuſe any thing elſe) engaged her by the " hopes of marriage, and a ſhare in the Empire, to " diſpatch her huſband. This Lady, who had Auguſtus for her uncle, Tiberius for her father-in-law, " and had children by Druſus, diſgraced herſelf, her " anceſtors, and her poſterity, by adultery with a man " of mean quality, ſacrificing her preſent honours for " ſhameful and uncertain views." A ſlow poiſon was given to Druſus, in order that he might be ſuppoſed to die of ſickneſs (4). Livia's Phyſician, whoſe name was Eudemus, and who had alſo been her adulterer, was made privy to the ſecret (5). The widow called upon Sejanus to perform his promiſe (6). Sejanus aſked her in marriage of Tiberius, but could not obtain her. After he was puniſhed for his crimes, Apicata his wife, who had been divorced, informed the Emperor of the poiſoning of Druſus, and the crimes of Livia; upon which Tiberius ordered, that Livia ſhould be put to death. Others ſay, that out of regard to her mother he did not puniſh her; but that her mother ſuffered her to be ſtarved to death (7). The Senate paſſed very ſevere Decrees againſt the memory and the ſtatues of that wicked woman (8). I obſerve, that Sejanus did not marry her; however Glandorp relates the contrary: *Primum repulſam patitur, poſtea tamen cum non abſiſteret, ſit voti compos* (9). But Suetonius is more to be depended upon, who repreſents to us Tiberius as alluring him with the hopes of his alliance, at the ſame time that he was preparing to deſtroy him, as he did ſoon after. *Spe affinitatis ac Tribunitiæ poteſtatis deceptum incipientem criminatus eſt pudenda miſerandaque oratione* (10).

(3) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 4. cap. 3. *ad ann.* 776.

(4) Idem, ibid. cap. 8.

(5) Idem, ibid. cap. 39.

(6) Ibid. cap. 3. *See likewiſe* Plin. lib. 29, cap. 1.

(7) Dio, lib. 58. pag. 721, *ad ann.* 784. *See likewiſe* Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. 62.

(8) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 6. cap. 2.

(9) Glandorp. *Onomaſt.* pag. 452.

(10) Sueton. *in Tiber.* cap. 65.

The Hiſtory of Livia, the daughter of Nero Claudius Druſus, brother of Tiberius.

(2) If we believe Dio, lib. 58. pag. 709. it was Sejanus who gave the blow to Druſus.

[*C*] *He left ſome children.*] His daughter Julia was firſt married to Nero her couſin-german, the eldeſt ſon of Germanicus; and afterwards to Caius Rubellius Blandus (11). Soon after the death of Germanicus, his ſiſter Livia, Druſus's wife, had twins, which was ſo agreeable to Tiberius, that he congratulated himſelf in a full Senate (12). One of theſe twins died ſoon after his father; the other, named Tiberius, was to have ſucceeded to the Empire with Caius Caligula; for the Emperor Tiberius declared them both equally his heirs (13): but, as Tiberius had foretold (14), Caligula diſpatched his co-heir (15). We muſt not omit to obſerve, that he procured the Will of Tiberius to be cancelled; by which means he reigned alone. He afterwards adopted Tiberius the grand-ſon. *Fratrem Tiberium die virilis togæ adoptavit, appellavitque principem juventutis* (16). i. e. " He adopted his " brother Tiberius on the day, when he aſſumed the " *Toga Virilis*, and ſtiled him Prince of the youth." I find ſome difficulty in this paſſage. If Tiberius the grand-ſon was born ſoon after the death of Germanicus, as Tacitus aſſures us, he was eighteen years old, when his grand-father died. How comes it then, that his grand-father had not made him aſſume the *Toga Virilis*? This would not have been uſeleſs in ſecuring to him the ſucceſſion. It will certainly be

(11) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 6. cap. 27.

(12) Idem, lib. 2. cap. 84. *ad ann.* 772.

(13) Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. ult.

(14) Dio, lib. 58. pag. 729.

(15) Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 23.

(16) Ibid. cap. 15. *See alſo* Dio, lib. 59 *init.*

berius ſhewed upon this occaſion all the inſenſibility, which the Stoics require [*D*]. Nothing appears to me more commendable in Druſus, than the friendſhip which he preſerved for Germanicus [*E*], his couſin german, and adopted brother.

" anſwered me, that he thought him illegitimate on " account of Livia's adulteries, and that this was the " occaſion of his neglecting him (17). For the reſt, " this youth was put to death for a very ſlight cauſe." He had taken a remedy for a violent cough. It was pretended to be an antidote, and that by this conduct he accuſed Caligula of a deſign to poiſon him. *Fratrem Tiberium inopinantem repente immiſſo Tribuno militum interemit . . . . cauſſatus . . . quod antidotum oboluiſſet, quaſi ad præcavenda venena ſua ſumtum, cum . . . propter aſſiduam & vehementem tuſſim medicamento uſus eſſet* (18). i. e. " He put to death his brother Tibe- " rius of a ſudden by means of a military Tribune, " whom he ſent to diſpatch him . . . . alledging . . . " that he ſmelled of an antidote, which it was pre- " tended he had taken by way of precaution againſt " poiſon from him, whereas it was only a medicine " on account of a violent cough, under which he had " long laboured."

(17) Dio, lib. 58. pag. 729. Sueton. *in Tiber.* cap. 62.

(18) Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 22. *See alſo* Philonem, *de Legat.*

[*D*] *Tiberius ſhewed . . . . all the inſenſibility, which the Stoics required.*] He did not appear at all uneaſy while Druſus was ſick, nor forbore to go to the Senate even during the interval between his ſon's death and interment. While the whole Senate was in tears, he alone continued calm and undiſturbed. *Tiberius per omnes valetudinis ejus dies nullo metu (an ut firmitudinem animi oſtentaret) etiam defuncto necdum ſepulto curiam ingreſſus: Conſuleſque ſede vulgari per ſpeciem mœſtitiæ ſedentes honoris locique admonuit, & effuſum in lacrymas Senatum, victo gemitu ſimul oratione continua erexit.* i. e. " Tiberius, to make a ſhew of the " firmneſs of his mind, appeared without any uneaſy " apprehenſion all the time of Druſus's ſickneſs; and " even after his death, and before his interment went " to the Senate; and when the Conſuls ſate in the " common ſeats, as a mark of their ſorrow, he re- " minded them of their dignity and place, and by a " continued ſpeech without the leaſt ſigh comforted " the Senate, which was diſſolved in tears." He preſerved in his diſcourſe the character of his diſſembling ſpirit in ſuch a manner, that it was eaſy to perceive, that he was not diſordered by the leaſt ſentiment of grief. Read this account in Tacitus; you will not loſe your labour: but I greatly doubt whether in Treatiſes of Conſolation ſuch an example can properly be introduced (20). Tiberius acted thus merely becauſe he had no natural affection. He thought Priam happy, becauſe he had ſurvived all his ſons (21).

(19) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 4. cap. 8. *See alſo* Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. 52.

(20) Seneca, *de Conſol. ad Marciam*, cap. 15. and many others have made uſe of it.

(21) Sueton. *in Tiber.* cap. 6.

[*E*] *Nothing apears to me more commendable in Druſus, than the friendſhip, which he preſerved for Germanicus.*] Germanicus had been adopted by the Emperor: he was therefore preſumptive ſucceſſor as well as Druſus; he was likewiſe the delight of the people; he had done many glorious actions, and was maſter of very excellent qualifications. Druſus poſſeſſed none of theſe advantages. How could he avoid hating ſuch a rival? How could a mind ſo ill diſpoſed do juſtice to Germanicus, and love Germanicus? We muſt own that there was in this a ſtrange power of conſtitution: vices have not that connection with each other, which we imagine; and there are certain virtues, which are better preſerved in a mind actuated by many enormous vices, than in another leſs vicious. I have not mentioned all the reaſons, which might raiſe jealouſy in the ſoul of Druſus. I have even forgot the principal ones, which the reader will immediately find in the words of Tacitus. The Court was divided between Druſus and Germanicus: their friends had mutual conteſts with each other; and the Heads of the two factions were the only perſons, who agreed. *Diviſa & diſcors aula erat: tacitis in Druſum, aut Germanicum ſtudiis. Tiberius ut proprium, & ſui ſanguinis Druſum fovebat: Germanico alienatio patrui amorem apud cæteros auxerat, & quia claritudine materni generis anteibat, avum Marcum Antonium, avunculum Auguſtum ferens. Contra Druſo proavus eques Romanus, Pomponius Atticus, dedecere Claudiorum imagines videbatur, & conjux Germanici Agrippina, fœcunditate ac fama Liviam uxorem Druſi præcellebat: ſed fratres egregie concordes, & proximorum certaminibus inconcuſſi* (22). i. e. " The Court was divided; ſome ſecretly favour- " ing Druſus, ſome Germanicus. Tiberius inclined " to Druſus as his own, and of his own blood; but " the little affection, which Germanicus's uncle had " for him, endeared him the more to others; eſpe- " cially as by the mother's ſide he was the more nobly " deſcended, having Marc Anthony for his grandfa- " ther, and Auguſtus for his uncle; whereas on the o- " ther hand Pomponius Atticus, who was only a Ro- " man Knight, and great grandfather to Druſus, " ſeemed to leſſen the honour of the Claudian family, " and Agrippina, wife of Germanicus, ſurpaſſed Li- " via Druſus's wife, in fruitfulneſs and reputation. " However the two brothers continued in perfect " friendſhip, without being ſhaken in any manner " by the conteſts of their parties." Here is likewiſe another paſſage of Tacitus, in which Tiberius highly commends to the Senate Druſus's friendſhip towards the ſons of Germanicus. *Addidit orationem Cæſar multa cum laude filii ſui, quod patria benevolentia in fratris liberos foret, nam Druſus (quamquam arduum ſit eodem loci potentiam & concordiam eſſe) æquus adoleſcentibus, aut certe non adverſus habebatur* (23). i. e. " Cæſar made likewiſe a ſpeech, in which he " greatly extolled his ſon for his paternal affection to- " wards the children of his brother; for Druſus (tho' " it is difficult for power and concord to reſide in the " ſame place) appeared a friend, at leaſt no enemy " to the young men." The Hiſtorian touches upon the reaſon why we ought to think that Druſus performed a very difficult thing in this; which reaſon was, their rivalſhip in power. Upon this principle when Piſo found himſelf accuſed of the death of Germanicus, he went to Druſus, and hop'd to engage him eaſily in his intereſts (24); he thought that a man, who ſhould have delivered Druſus from a dangerous rival, would not be look'd on with an evil eye, but he received only a very doubtful anſwer, which was conſidered as a leſſon of Tiberius; for it had nothing in it of the frank and uncircumſpect temper of Druſus. *Neque dubitabantur præſcripta ei à Tiberio, cum incallidus alioqui & facilis juventa ſenilibus tum artibus uteretur* (25). i. e. " And it was not doubted but that " this was done by the directions of the Emperor, " ſince Druſus, who was in other reſpects averſe to " cunning, and eaſy thro' youth, at that time made " uſe of the artifice of old age."

(22) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 2. cap. 43.

(23) Idem, *Ann.* lib. 4. cap. 4.

(24) *Piſo præmiſſo in urbem filio datiſque mandatis per quæ principem molliret, ad Druſum pergit, quem haud fratris interitu trucem, quam remoto æmulo æquiorem ſibi ſperabat.* Idem, lib. 3. cap. 8.

(25) Idem, ibid.

DRUSUS, ſon of Germanicus and Agrippina, was at firſt advanced to public poſts before he was of competent age, and that by the recommendation of Tiberius himſelf (*a*); but he was afterwards oppreſſed by the artifices of Sejanus [*A*]. That unjuſt favourite

(*a*) Compare Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. 3. cap. 29. with *Annal.* lib. 4. cap. 4.

[*A*] *He was oppreſſed by the artifices of Sejanus.*] We are going to ſee a deteſtable piece of management. Sejanus had ſpies every where, and ſcrupled no meaſures to aggrandize himſelf. As he aſpired to the Empire, he began with taking off Druſus, who as Tiberius's ſon was the firſt in order of ſucceſſion. Nero the eldeſt ſon of Germanicus was next to Druſus; and for this reaſon he was the ſecond object of the machinations of Sejanus. Every thing, which he ſaid, was reported to the favourite, and this frequently furniſhed matter of accuſation; for tho' Druſus had no ill intentions, he let fall ſome imprudent expreſſions, to which the raſh advice of his friends too much contributed. Theſe men, more out of regard to their own intereſt, than his, being weary of his ill fortune, adviſed him to make uſe of ſome threats, telling him, that this was the true way to power. Upon this ſome words eſcaped him, which were repreſented as criminal.

vourite had the ſatisfaction of procuring him to be impriſoned, but not of ſeeing him dead; for he died himſelf before Druſus. The condition of the latter was not at all mended by this: he was abandoned in ſuch a manner to the rage of hunger, that he gnawed the flocks of his mattreſs [*B*]. He dragged on life thus till the ninth day. After his death, Tiberius had the cruelty to accuſe him in the Senate, and the imprudence to diſcover by that means the ſeverity which had been uſed againſt that unhappy Prince [*C*]. While he lay in priſon, there was a rumour that he had been ſeen in the Iſlands of

minal. *Maximeque inſectarentur Neronem proximum ſucceſſioni, & quamquam modeſta juventa, plerumque tamen quid in præſentiarum conduceret oblitum; dum à libertis & clientibus adipiſcendæ potentiæ properis exſtimulatur*, ut erectum & fidentem animi oſtenderet: velle id populum Romanum: cupere exercitus: neque auſurum contra Sejanum, qui nunc patientiam ſenis, & ſegnitiem juvenis juxta inſultet. *Hæc atque talia audienti, nihil quidem pravæ cogitationis; ſed interdum voces procedebant contumaces, & inconſultæ; quas adpoſiti cuſtodes exceptas auctaſque cum deferrent, &c* (1). i. e. "They particularly aimed at Nero, who was "next in ſucceſſion, and tho' a modeſt youth, yet for "the moſt part forgetful of his preſent intereſt, while "he was hurried on by his freedmen and clients, who "were impatient for power, *to ſhew himſelf a man of "ſpirit; that the people of Rome deſired it; and that "Sejanus would not venture to make any oppoſition, tho' "he now inſulted the patience of the old man* (Tiberius,) "*and the inactivity of Druſus's youth*. Theſe and other "things of that kind being ſuggeſted to him, he ſaid "nothing indeed, which ſhewed any ill deſign, but "let fall ſome reſolute and imprudent expreſſions, "which the ſpies placed about him reported with ad-"dition &c." He was never free from informers; for his ſighs, and his behaviour, both waking and ſleeping, were reported to the favourite: his wife informed her mother, and ſhe informed Sejanus. *Ne nox quidem ſecura, cum uxor vigilias, ſomnos, ſuſpiria matri Liviæ, atque illa Sejano patefaceret* (2). His brother Druſus (3) became his enemy; Sejanus had the addreſs to engage him, by letting him know, that he would be ſecure of the firſt place by the death of Nero. At the ſame time he laid the foundation of the ruin of this Druſus, who fell into the ſnare, not only thro' ambition, but likewiſe, becauſe according to cuſtom he hated his brother, and envied him the preference, which he ſaw him favoured with by Agrippina their common mother. *Qui* (Sejanus) *fratrem quoque Neronis Druſum traxit in partes, ſpe objecta principis loci, ſi priorem ætate & jam labefactum dimoviſſet. Atrox Druſi ingenium ſuper cupidinem potentiæ, & ſolita fratribus odia, accendebatur invidia, quod mater Agrippina promptior Neroni erat. Neque tamen Sejanus ita Druſum fovebat, ut non in eum quoque ſemina futuri exitii meditaretur; gnarus præferocem, & inſidiis magis opportunum* (4). i. e. "Sejanus engaged alſo in his party Druſus "Nero's brother, by repreſenting to him, that he "would poſſeſs the firſt place, if he could take him off. "Druſus's temper was fiery, and beſides his ambition, "and the hatred uſual among brothers, he was en-"flamed with envy, becauſe his mother Agrippina "was more favourable to Nero. However Sejanus "did not ſupport Druſus, but with a view to deſtroy "him ſome time or other, knowing that he was of a "violent temper, and more open to be cenſured." Monſr. de Tillemont is miſtaken, when he ſays, that Nero's *own wife endeavoured his ruin, by giving the Empreſs Livia an account of his moſt ſecret actions* (5). It was to Livia her mother, the wife of Druſus, ſon of Tiberius, that ſhe gave this account, and not to Livia the Empreſs. I forgot to remark, that Sejanus procured Guards to be given Nero and his mother Agrippina, which Guards only took an account of every thing, which they obſerved (6). He ſuborned alſo perſons, who adviſed that Lady and her ſon to go to the army in Germany, or implore the protection of the public. Theſe counſels were rejected, and yet they were accuſed of having given ear to them.

(1) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 4. cap. 59. *ad ann.* 779.

(2) Idem, ibid. cap. 60.

(3) He was the ſon of Germanicus.

(4) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 4. cap. 60.

(5) Tillemont, *Hiſtoire des Empereurs*, tom. 1. pag. m. 146.

(6) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 4. cap. 67.

[*B*] *He was abandoned in ſuch a manner to the rage of hunger, that he gnawed the flocks of his mattreſs.*] The artifices mentioned in the preceding remark could not fail of ſucceſs in the hands of Sejanus, ſince Tiberius deſired nothing better than to have an occaſion of deſtroying thoſe Princes. He ſuborned people, who excited them to complain and curſe him; and when he had collected a great many heads of accuſation, he filled a Letter with them with exceſſive bitterneſs, and got Nero and Druſus declared enemies to the public good. Upon this one of them was ſent to the Iſle of Pontia, where he was forced to kill himſelf, an executioner coming to him with the inſtruments of capital puniſhment, and declaring to him that he was ſent to execute the orders of the Senate; the other, who was our Druſus, was impriſoned in the palace, where he was ſuffered to periſh with hunger. Let us hear Suetonius (7): *Ut comperit ineunte anno pro eorum quoque ſalute publica vota ſuſcepta: egit cum Senatu*, Non debere talia præmia tribui, niſi expertis & ætate provectis: *atque ex eo, patefacta interiore animi ſui nota, omnium criminationibus obnoxios reddidit: varioque fraude inductos, ut & concitarentur ad convitia & concitati perderentur, accuſavit per literas, amariſſime congeſtis etiam probris, & judicatos hoſtes fame necavit: Neronem in inſula Pontia: Druſum, in ima parte Palatii. Putant Neronem ad voluntariam mortem coactum, cùm ei carnifex, quaſi ex Senatus auctoritate miſſus, laqueos & uncos oſtentaret: Druſo autem adeo alimenta ſubducta ut tomentum e culcitra tentaverit mandere* (8): *amborum ſic reliquiis diſperſis, ut vix quandoque colligi poſſent*. i. e. "As ſoon as he ſaw at the beginning of "the year public vows offered for their ſafety, he re-"monſtrated to the Senate, that *ſuch rewards ought to "be conferred only upon thoſe, who had given proofs of "their merit, and were advanced in years*; and from "this having diſcovered the ſecret ſentiments of his "heart, he rendered them obnoxious to the accuſa-"tions of every body; and they being drawn in by "artifice to uſe reproachful language againſt him, in "order that this might be a pretence for deſtroying "them, he accuſed them by Letter, having heaped "up thoſe reproaches with great bitterneſs, and ſen-"tence being given againſt them as enemies of the "State, he ſtarved them to death; Nero in the Iſle "of Pontia, Druſus in the loweſt part of the palace. "It is thought that Nero was obliged to kill himſelf; "becauſe an Executioner, who pretended to be ſent by "the Senate, ſhewed him the halter and hook. Dru-"ſus was deprived of food in ſuch a manner, that "he endeavoured to eat the ſtuffing of his bed; "and the remains of both their bodies were ſo diſperſ-"ed, that it was with great difficulty that they were "afterwards collected." Tacitus goes much farther (8): he ſays, that Druſus ſupported himſelf nine days with this nouriſhment. *Druſus deinde extinguitur cum ſe miſerandis alimentis mandendo è cubili tomento nonum ad diem detinuiſſet.* This happened two years after Sejanus's death (9). We muſt not forget, that Tiberius was ſtruck with ſuch conſternation, when he was acquainted with the machinations of this favourite, that he had thoughts of taking Druſus out of priſon, to oppoſe him to Sejanus. *Tradidere quidam deſcriptum fuiſſe Macroni, ſi arma ab Sejano tentarentur extractum cuſtodia juvenem (nam in palatio attinebatur) ducem populo imponere* (10). i. e. "Some have related that "Macro received orders, that if Sejanus attempted to "uſe force, the young Prince ſhould be delivered out "of his confinement (for he was impriſoned in the "palace), and appointed to command the people."

(7) Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. 64.

(8) *Annal.* lib. 6. cap. 23. *ad ann.* 786.

(9) In the year of Rome 786.

(10) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 6. cap. 23. *See alſo* Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. 65.

[*C*] *Tiberius .... accuſed him .... and had the imprudence to diſcover by this means the ſecurity which had been uſed againſt this young Prince.*] Thoſe who guarded Druſus wrote a Journal of his actions, and of all that he ſaid during his confinement. This Journal was ſo exact, that it mentioned the names of the ſlaves, who had beaten or terrified the Priſoner, when he went out of his chamber. It mentioned the curſes which he uttered at his death againſt the author of his cruel perſecution, the refuſal of a morſel of bread to him, the blows which he received from the ſlaves, and other circumſtances of that kind. All theſe particulars Tiberius was not aſhamed to read in the Senate.

of the Ægean Sea. Tacitus, while he informs us by whom this pretended Druſus was taken, does not fail to touch upon the ſecret ſprings, which ſet to work ſuch kinds of impoſtures [D]. I do not find that Druſus had ever any other office than that of Augur (b), and that of Governor of Rome (c). He was very unhappily married [E].

(b) Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 12.

(c) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 4. cap. 36. *ad ann.* 778.

Quin & invectus in defunctum, probra corporis, exitiabilem in ſuos, infenſum Reipublicæ animum *objecit:* recitarique factorum dictorumque ejus deſcripta per dies juſſit. *Quo non aliud atrocius viſum: adſtitiſſe tot per annos, qui vultum, gemitus, occultum etiam murmur exciperent; & potuiſſe avum audire, legere, in publicum promere, vix fides; niſi quod Actii Centurionis, & Didymi liberti epiſtolæ, ſervorum nomina præferebant, ut qui egredientem cubiculo Druſum pulſaverat, exterruerat; etiam ſua verba centurio ſævitiæ plena, tanquam egregium, voceſque deficientis adjecerat* (11). i. e. "He likewiſe in-
(11) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 6. cap. 24. "veighed againſt the deceaſed, repreſenting the deformity of his body; and that he had been cruel towards "his friends and relations, and an enemy to the State: "and ordered the diary of his words and actions to be "read. Nothing appeared more ſhocking, than that perſons had for ſo many years been ſet about him to watch "his countenance, ſighs, and ſecret murmurs; and it "would be ſcarce credible that his Grandfather could "hear, read, and publickly expoſe it; if the letters "of Actius the Centurion, and Didymus the Freedman did not mention the names of thoſe ſlaves who "had either ſtruck or terrified Druſus, when he went "out of his chamber; and if the Centurion had not "ſet down his own words full of cruelty, as if he "had done ſome very meritorious thing, and related "the dying expreſſions of the Prince." Had not the Senators great reaſon to admire and dread Tiberius, who ſo boldly took off the maſk, and abandoned ſo evidently his uſual diſſimulation? *Obturbabant quidem patres ſpecie deteſtandi, ſed penetrabat pavor, & admiratio, callidum olim & tegendis ſceleribus obſcurum huc confidentiæ veniſſe, ut tamquam dimotis parietibus oſtenderet nepotem ſub verbere centurionis, inter ſervorum*
(12) Idem, ibid. *ictus, extrema vitæ alimenta fruſtra orantem* (12). i. e. "Some of the Senators interrupted the reading under "pretence of deteſting Druſus's behaviour; but they "were ſtruck with fear and ſurprize, that the Emperor, who had been before ſo cunning and ſecret in "concealing his crimes, ſhould come to that pitch of "confidence, as in a manner to throw down the "walls, and ſhew his grandſon ſtruck by a centurion, "and beaten by ſlaves, and calling for food to ſupport "him, but in vain."

[D] *Tacitus when he gives an account of this pretended Druſus .... does not omit to touch upon the ſecret ſprings, which ſet to work ſuch Impoſtures.*] Thoſe who were diſcontented with the government, gave ear to the rumour of Druſus's having eſcaped out of priſon; and thoſe who were fond of novelties, revolutions, and adventures were no leſs attentive to it. The freedmen who attended the counterfeit Druſus, and pretended to believe, that he was the real ſon of Germanicus, eaſily found credit. There was nothing talked of, but the great deſigns of this Druſus: this was ſufficient to put all Greece in motion. Every body flocked to this Idol; and they ſo earneſtly wiſhed it to be true, that at laſt they came to believe their own fictions. *Per idem tempus Aſia atque Achaia exterritæ ſunt, acri magis quam diuturno rumore,* Druſum Germanici filium apud Cyclades inſulas, mox in continenti viſum; & *erat juvenis haud diſpari ætate, quibuſdam Cæſaris libertis, velut agnitus, per dolumque comitantibus. Allicie-bantur ignari, fama nominis, & promptis Græcorum animis ad nova & mira:* quippe lapſum cuſtodia pergere ad paternos exercitus, Ægyptum aut Syriam invaſurum, *fingebant ſimul, credebantque: jam juventutis concurſu, jam publicis ſtudiis frequentabatur, lætus præſentibus, & inanium ſpe* (13). "At the ſame time, (13) Idem, *Ann.* lib. 5. cap. 10. *ad ann.* 784. "Aſia and Achaia were alarmed by a terrible tho' "ſhort-lived rumour, that Druſus the ſon of Germanicus was ſeen in the Iſlands of the Cyclades, and "afterwards in the Continent; and there was a youth "there of about the ſame age, who was pretended "to be acknowledged for the real Druſus by ſome of "the Freedmen of Auguſtus, who attended him out of "a treacherous deſign. Ignorant people were drawn in "through the reputation of his name, and the readings of the Greeks, to engage in any thing new "or wonderful; for they feigned a ſtory, which they "afterwards believed; that he had eſcaped from priſon, and was going to his father's armies with a "reſolution to invade Egypt or Syria. He had now "a vaſt reſort of the youth and others to him; and "was pleaſed with his preſent condition, and his future though vain hopes." Poppeus Sabinus Governor of Macedonia, was not indolent with regard to this affair; and he had no reaſon to treat it as a thing of no importance. The Seditious might make great advantages of ſuch an Impoſture. He uſed ſuch expedition, that he ſeized the Impoſtor himſelf. We may remember, that at the beginning of the XVII Century, almoſt all the Princes who were at enmity with Spain, were well pleaſed that the Impoſtor, who called himſelf Sebaſtian King of Portugal, was not believed to be an Impoſtor; and if things had been once put in a right train, we ſhould have ſeen all the Powers, who were jealous of the Houſe of Auſtria, haſten to the relief of the counterfeit Sebaſtian. There were ſome people in England, who maintained, that the Duke of Monmouth was not taken (14), and that (14) In the year 1686. the perſon who was beheaded for him, was not he. This fooliſh ſtory was ſeed ſown at that time, and might have brought forth fruit at a proper ſeaſon. Factious ſpirits were well pleaſed that this notion was not extinguiſhed: the time will come, ſaid they, when perhaps we ſhall have occaſion for this Duke to draw in the populace. The Reader will find a great many remarkable things concerning the care, which is taken to foment this deluſion in the Hiſtorical Letters for October 1689 (15).

(15) Pag. 457, & ſeqq.

[E] *He was very unhappily married.*] We have loſt the place where Tacitus gave an account of Druſus's marriage with Æmilia Lepida (16.) If we had all the annals of that incomparable writer, we ſhould have ſeen the horrid perſecution which Druſus ſuffered from that Lady. She was his accuſer, loaded as ſhe was with a thouſand crimes, which rendered her incapable of being a witneſs. She continued unpuniſhed during her father's life; but upon her father's deceaſe the Informers accuſed her: and it being certain that ſhe had committed adultery with a ſlave, ſhe did not attempt to defend her ſelf; but thought the ſhorteſt way was to put an end to her life (17). Druſus's curſe was viſible upon that race. Germanicus himſelf, and his illuſtrious wife were involved in it.

(16) *Æmilia Lepida quam juveni Druſo nuptam retuli.* Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 6. cap. 40. *ad ann.* 788. We find nothing of this in the preceding books.

(17) Idem, ibid.

DRYADES. This is the name given by the Pagans to certain female Deities, of the ſecond rank, who preſided over woods [A]. Their condition was much more happy than that of the Hamadryades, who, as I ſhall obſerve in their Article, were united ſo cloſely each to her tree, that they ſprung up and died with it. But the Dryades had the liberty of walking about, and diverting themſelves [B], and could ſurvive the deſtruction

[A] *Who preſided over Woods.*] This name is derived from thence; for the greek word δρῦς, which properly ſignifies an Oak, ſignified alſo in a leſs ſtrict and more general ſenſe all kinds of trees. Servius ſtops at the former ſignification; *Dryades,* ſays he, *a quercubus* (1). He had ſaid in another place, *Dryades ſunt, quæ inter arbores habitant: Oreades in montibus* (2). i. e. "The Dryades are thoſe Nymphs, which dwell "among the trees; the Oreades, which inhabit the "mountains."

(1) Servius, *in hæc verba* Virgil. *Georg.* lib. 1. ver. 11. *Ferte ſimul Faunique pedem Dryadeſque puellæ.*

(2) Idem, *in Virg. Eclog.* 10. ver. 62.

[B] *The Dryades had the liberty of walking about, and diverting themſelves.*] If we believe Ovid, they danced frequently round the Oak, which the impious Eryſichthon then cut down.

Sæpe

ſtruction of the woods, of which they had the ſuperintendence.

Sæpe ſub hac Dryades feſtas duxere choreas:
Sæpe etiam, manibus nexis ex ordine, trunci
Circumiere modum (3).

(3) Ovidius, *Metam.* lib. 8. ver. 752.

" Full oft the Dryades, with Chaplets crown'd,
" Danc'd in his ſhade, full oft they tript around
" About his Bole." SANDYS.

They had likewiſe the liberty of marrying. Pauſanias tells us, that the wife of Arcas the ſon of Jupiter and Calliſta was a Dryad (4). Some aſſert that Eurydice was one alſo (5), and ground this upon thoſe words of Virgil:

(4) Pauſan. lib. 8. pag. 604. edit. 1696.

(5) Servius *in Georg.* lib. 4. ver. 460.

At chorus æqualis Dryadum clamore ſupremos
Implerunt montes (6).

(6) Virg. *Georg.* lib. 4. ver. 460.

" Her fellow Dryades the mountains tear,
" With loud laments, and break the yielding air."

Virgil ſays this, after having related the misfortune of Eurydice the wife of Orpheus. Obſerve that the Poets often confound the Dryades with the Naiades &c, and that there were ſome Hamadryades who lay with men. We ſhall treat more fully of this in another place (7).

(7) In the Article HAMADRYADES.

DRYANDER (a) JOHN a Proteſtant Martyr, was of Burgos in Spain. John Dias, whom the barbarity of his brother has made very famous [A], owed to him the inſtructions which led him to abandon the Church of Rome, and embrace the Reformation. Dryander was obliged to continue at Rome in obedience to his father; but he could not forbear ſpeaking upon ſome occaſions his ſentiments concerning the diſorders of the Church. He was juſt upon the point of going to Germany to join his brother FRANCIS DRYANDER [B], when he was accuſed as an Heretic. The Pope aſſiſted by the Cardinals thought proper to examine him: Dryander did not at all ſubmit, but declared his faith boldly, upon which he was condemned to the flames. He was burnt at Rome in the year 1545 (b).

(a) His Spaniſh name was *Enzinas*, which he turned into the word *Dryander*. The Spaniards call a ſort of oak *Enzina*.

(b) Taken from Theodore Beza *in Iconibus*, and Criſpinus's *Acta Martyrum*. Obſerve that Criſpinus, fol. m. 152. places his martyrdom in 1546.

[A] *John Dias, whom the barbarity of his brother has made very famous.*] Sleidan relates at length the manner in which this unhappy man was murdered (1). Alphonſus Dias his brother went to Germany purpoſely to murder him; and uſed ſo many artifices, that at laſt he found an opportunity to get him knocked on the head with an axe by his ſervant on the 26th of March 1546. The Proteſtant Martyrology (2) ſuppoſes that our Dryander was burnt after the murder of John Dias. I have followed Beza, who places the martyrdom of Dryander before that fact.

(1) Sleid. lib. 17. pag. m. 433.

(2) *Acta Martyrum*, pag. 331. edit. 1556, in 8°, and folio 152. edit. 1560, in 4to. *L'Hiſtoire des Martyrs*, 159. edit. 1582, in fol.

[B] *His brother Francis Dryander.*] He is Author of a Spaniſh Tranſlation of the New Teſtament. Mr. Simon (3) calls him Francis Enzinas, and tells us that this verſion was dedicated to Charles V, which made a great noiſe in the Low Countries. It was printed at Antwerp in 1543. He has given his judgment of it very fully in his new obſervations upon the text and tranſlations of the New Teſtament (4). This Dryander was recommended to Cranmer with a great encomium by Melancthon in 1548. See the 43d Letter of Melancthon. He was impriſoned at Bruſſels, after he had dedicated his work to Charles V, and continued there fifteen months. He eſcaped February the 1ſt 1545, by taking an opportunity which was offered; which was ſeeing the priſon door open about eight a' clock in the evening (5).

(3) *Hiſtoire Critique du Nouv. Teſt.* tom. 2. chap. 41. pag. 494.

(4) Chap. 2. of the 2d Part, pag. 151, & *ſeqq.*

(5) Criſpin. *Act. Mart.* folio m. 151.

☞ DRYDEN (JOHN), one of the moſt eminent Engliſh Poets of the ſeventeenth Century, was deſcended of a worthy family in Huntingtonſhire, often ſerving as Repreſentatives for that County (a). He was ſon of Eraſmus Dryden of Tichmerſh in Northamptonſhire, third ſon of Eraſmus Dryden of Canons Aſhby in the ſame County Baronet (b). He was born at Oldwincle or Aldwincle near Oundle in that County, Auguſt the 9th 1631, and educated in Grammar Learning in Weſtminſter School under Dr. Richard Buſby, being one of the King's Scholars upon the Royal Foundation, as he tells us himſelf in an Advertiſement prefixed to his Tranſlation of the *Third Satyr* of *Perſius*, where he obſerves, that he had tranſlated that Satyr, while he was at that ſchool, for a Thurſday-night's exerciſe, and believed that this and many other of his exerciſes of that nature in Engliſh Verſe were ſtill * in the hands of Dr. Buſby. While he was here likewiſe in 1649 he wrote a Poem *upon the death of the Lord Haſtings* [A]; and the year following was elected thence a Scholar of Trinity College in the Univerſity of Cambridge (c). In 1658 he publiſhed *Heroick Stanza's on the late Lord Protector: written after his Funeral* [B]; and in 1660 a Poem, intitled *Aſtræa redux, a Poem on the happy Reſtoration*

(a) A Letter to the Author of *Reflexions Hiſtorical and Political*, occaſioned by a Treatiſe in Vindication of General *Monk* and Sir *Richard Glanville*, &c. By the Right Honourable *George Granville*, Lord *Lanſdowne*, pag. 6. edit. London 1732, in 4to.

* Mr. Dryden wrote this about the year 1692.

(b) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 414. 2d edit. London 1721.

(c) Idem, ibid.

[A] *In* 1649 *he wrote a Poem* upon the death of the Lord Haſtings.] It is reprinted in the *Firſt Part of Miſcellany Poems publiſhed by Mr.* Dryden (1). In this Poem there is a great deal of fancy; but the verification is rough. The following lines, in which he ſpeaks of the diſeaſe, of which the Lord Haſtings died, would ſcarce have paſt him in his more mature age:

(1) Pag. 116, 117, 118, 119. 4th edit. London 1716, in 24mo.

Was there no milder way but the ſmall-pox,
The very filth'neſs of Pandora's *box?*
So many ſpots, like Næves, *our* Venus *ſoil?*
One jewel ſet off with ſo many a foil?
Bliſters with pride ſwell'd, which through's fleſh did ſprout,
Like Roſe-buds ſtuck i'th' Lilly-ſkin about.
Each little pimple had a tear in it,
To wail the fault it's riſing did commit:
Who rebel-like, with their own Lord at ſtrife,
Thus made an inſurrection 'gainſt his life.
Or were theſe gems ſent to adorn his ſkin,
The Cabinet of a richer ſoul within?
No Comet need foretell his change drew on,
Whoſe corps might ſeem a conſtellation.

[B] *In* 1658 *he publiſhed* Heroick Stanza's on the late Lord Protector: written after his Funeral.] We ſhall give the reader a few of theſe *Stanza's*.

VI.

" His Grandeur he deriv'd from heaven alone,
" For he was great e'er fortune made him ſo;
" And wars like miſts that riſe againſt the ſun
" Made him but greater ſeem, not greater grow.

VII.

" No borrow'd bays his temples did adorn,
" But to our crown he did freſh jewels bring;
" Nor was virtue poiſon'd ſoon as born
" With the too early thoughts of being King.

IX.

" He private mark'd the faults of others ſway,
" And ſet as ſea-marks for himſelf to ſhun;
" Not like raſh Monarchs, who their youth betray,
" By acts their age too late would wiſh undone.

tion and Return of his ſacred Majeſty Charles *the Second* [C]; and a *Panegyric* to the King on his *Coronation* the ſame year. On New-Year's-Day 1662 he preſented a Poem to the Lord Chancellor Hyde [D]. In 1665 he wrote a Poem to *her Royal Highneſs the* Ducheſs *on the memorable Victory gained by the* Duke *againſt the Hollanders, June the 3d 1665: and on her journey, afterwards into the North* [E]; and the year following he publiſhed his *Annus Mirabilis: The Year of Wonders* 1666. *An Hiſtorical Poem* [F]. In 1668, upon the death of Sir William D'Avenant, he was made Poet Laureat (d), and the ſame year publiſhed *an Eſſay of Dramatick Poeſy*, London 1668 in 4to [G]. In 1669

(d) Idem, ibid.

X.

" And yet dominion was not his deſign;
" We owe that bleſſing not to him, but heaven,
" Which to fair acts unſought rewards did join;
" Rewards that leſs to him than us were given.

XI.

" Our former Chiefs like ſticklers for the war,
" Firſt ſought t'inflame the parties, then to poiſe;
" The quarrel lov'd, but did the cauſe abhor,
" And did not ſtrike to hurt, but made a noiſe.

XII.

" War, our conſumption, was their gainful trade;
" He inward bled, whilſt they prolong'd our pain;
" He fought to hinder fighting, and aſſay'd
" To ſtanch the blood by breathing of the vein.

XXXIII.

" Such was our Prince, yet own'd a ſoul above
" The higheſt acts it could produce to ſhew:
" Thus poor mechanick arts in publick move
" Whilſt the deep ſecrets beyond practice go."

XXXIV.

" His lateſt victories ſtill thickeſt came,
" As near the center, motion doth encreaſe;
" Till he preſs'd down by his own weighty name,
" Did, like the Veſtal, under ſpoils decreaſe.

XXXV.

" But firſt the ocean as a tribute ſent
" That giant Prince of all her watry herd;
" And th' Iſle, when her protecting genius went,
" Upon his obſequies lough ſighs conferr'd.

XXXVII.

" His aſhes in a peaceful urn ſhall reſt,
" His name a great example ſtand, to ſhew
" How ſtrangely high endeavours may be bleſt,
" Where *Piety* and *Valour* jointly go."

[C] *His Poem, intitled,* Aſtræa redux &c.] It is reprinted in the *Firſt Part of the Miſcellany Poems* (2). In this Poem is the famous line, which has been treated with great ridicule. We ſhall give the verſes, which introduce it, as they ſtand in the *Miſcellany Poems:*

(2) Pag. 241, & ſeqq.

Thus when black clouds draw down the lab'ring ſkies,
E'er yet abroad the winged thunder flies,
An horrid ſtillneſs *firſt* invades *the* Ear,
And in that ſilence *we a tempeſt fear.*

Capt. Alexander Radcliff alludes to this in the following lines (3).

(3) *News from Hell*, reprinted in the *Miſcellany Poems*, Part 2. pag. 100.

" *Laureat* (4), who was both learned and florid,
" Was damned long ſince for *ſilence horrid:*
" Nor had there been ſuch clutter made
" But that his *ſilence* did *invade:*
" *Invade!* and ſo 't might well, that's clear;
" But what did it *invade?* an *Ear.*
" And for ſome other things, 'tis true,
" *We follow fate that does purſue.*"

(4) Dryden.

[D] *In* 1662 *on New-Year's day he preſented a Poem to the Lord Chancellor Hyde.*] It is reprinted in the *Firſt Part* of the *Miſcellany Poems publiſhed by Mr. Dryden* (*).

(*) Pag. 253, & ſeqq. 4th edit. London 1716.

[E] *In* 1665 *he wrote a Poem* to her Royal Highneſs the Ducheſs &c.] This is inſerted in his *account of* his Poem intitled *Annus Mirabilis, in a Letter to Sir Robert Howard*; where he tells us, that ſome who had ſeen thoſe verſes to the Ducheſs, accuſed them of *that only thing*, ſays he, *I could defend in them; they ſaid I did* humi ſerpere; *that I wanted not only height of fancy, but dignity of words to ſet it off. I might well anſwer with that of* Horace, Nunc non erat his locus: *I knew I addreſſed them to a Lady, and accordingly I affected the ſoftneſs of expreſſion, and the ſmoothneſs of meaſure, rather than the height of thought; and in what I did endeavour, it is no vanity to ſay I have ſucceeded.*

[F] *His Annus Mirabilis:* The Year of Wonders, 1668: An Hiſtorical Poem.] It was printed at London 1667 in 12mo. There is prefixed to it an *Account of the Poem* in a Letter to Sir *Robert Howard*, dated at Charlton in Wiltſhire, Nov. the 10th, 1666. In the Letter he obſerves, that he choſe to write in *Quatrains* or Stanza's of four in alternate rhyme, becauſe he ever judged them more noble and of greater dignity both for the ſound and number, than any other verſe in uſe amongſt us. The learned languages have certainly a great advantage of us in not being tied to the ſlavery of any rhyme; and were leſs conſtrained in the quantity of every ſyllable, which they might vary with ſpondees or dactyles; beſides ſo many other helps of grammatical figures for the lengthening or abbreviation of them, than the modern are in the cloſe of that one ſyllable, which often confines, and more often corrupts the ſenſe of all the reſt. " But " in this neceſſity of our rhymes, *continues our Author*, " I have always found the couplet verſe moſt eaſy " (though not ſo proper for this occaſion,) for there " the work is ſooner at an end, every two lines con- " cluding the labour of the Poet. But in *Quatrains* " he is to carry it farther on; and not only ſo, but " to bear along in his head the troubleſome ſenſe of " four lines together. For thoſe who write correctly " in this kind, muſt needs acknowledge, that the laſt " line of the Stanza is to be conſidered in the com- " poſition of the firſt. Neither can we give our- " ſelves the liberty of making any part of a verſe " for the ſake of rhyme, or concluding with a word, " which is not current Engliſh, or uſing the variety " of female rhymes; all which our fathers practiſed; " and for the female rhymes, they are ſtill in uſe " amongſt other nations; with the *Italian* in every " line, with the *Spaniard* promiſcuouſly, with the " *French* alternately; as thoſe who have read the *Ala-* " *rique*, the *Pucelle*, or any of their late Poems will " agree with me. And beſides this, they write in " *Alexandrins*, or verſes of ſix feet, ſuch as amongſt " us is the old tranſlation of *Homer* by *Chapman*; all " which by lengthening of their chain makes the ſphere " of their activity the larger." He afterwards remarks, that Virgil was his Maſter in this Poem; and that he has followed him every where, *I know not*, ſays he, *with what ſucceſs; but I am ſure with diligence enough. My images are many of them copied from him, and the reſt are imitations of him. My expreſſions alſo are as near as the idiom of the two languages would admit of in tranſlation.* However the XVIth Stanza of this Poem is hardly ſuitable to the ſimplicity of his *Maſter Virgil:*

" To ſee this fleet upon the ocean move,
" Angels drew wide the curtain of the ſkies.
" And heav'n, as if there wanted lights above,
" For tapers made two glaring Comets riſe."

[G] *His* Eſſay of Dramatick Poeſie.] There was another Edition printed at London 1693 in 4to. and dedicated by the Author to Charles Earl Dorſet and Middleſex; in which dedication he obſerves, that the writing of this *Eſſay* ſerved as an amuſement to him in the country, when the violence of the laſt plague in 1665 had driven him from the town; and that he finds many things in it, which he does not now approve, his judgment being not a little altered ſince the writing of it; *but whether*, ſays he, *for the better or worſe*

1669 his Comedy, intitled, *The Wild Gallant*, was acted at the Theatre-Royal; after which he wrote a great number of dramatick performances, which we ſhall give a liſt of in the note [*H*], and which Mr. Gerard Langbaine (*e*) has for the moſt part treated with great ſeverity, and repreſented our Poet as a Plagiary; upon which account Mr. Langbaine has been cenſured by the anonymous writer of *the lives and characters of the Engliſh Dramatick Poets* (*f*); tho' the latter owns, that "Mr. Dryden has borrowed from "the French, at the ſame time that he ſeems to contemn them; unleſs it may be pre- "tended

(e) *Account of the Engliſh Dramatic Poets*, pag. 230, & ſeqq.

(f) *Lives and Characters of the Engliſh Dramatic Poets, &c. Firſt begun by Mr.* Langbain, *improved and continued down to this time by a careful Hand*, pag. 40, 41. edit. London in 8vo.

worſe I know not; neither indeed is it much material in an Eſſay, where all I have ſaid is problematical. For the way of writing Plays in verſe, which I have ſeemed to favour, I have ſince that time laid the practice of it aſide, till I have more leiſure, becauſe I find it troubleſome and ſlow. But I am no way altered from my opinion of it, at leaſt with any reaſons, which have oppoſed it. For your Lordſhip may eaſily obſerve, that none are very violent againſt it, but thoſe who either have not attempted it, or who have ill ſucceeded in their attempt. In the Preface to the Reader, he informs us, that the drift of this *Eſſay* was chiefly to vindicate the honour of our *Engliſh* Writers from the cenſure of thoſe, who unjuſtly prefer the French before them. This he intimates, leſt any ſhould think him ſo exceeding vain, as to teach others an art, which they underſtand much better than himſelf. "But "if this incorrect Eſſay, ſays he, written in the "country without the help of Books, or advice of "friends, ſhall find any acceptance in the world, I "promiſe to my ſelf a better ſucceſs of the *Second* "*Part*, wherein I ſhall more fully treat of the vir- "tues and faults of the *Engliſh* Poets, who have writ- "ten either in this, the epique, or the lyrique way." Sir *Robert Howard* in the Preface to his *Great Favourite, or the Duke of Lerma*, printed at London 1668 in 4to. made ſome animadverſions upon this *Eſſay*; to which Mr. Dryden replied in his *Defence* of it prefixed to the ſecond Edition of his *Indian Emperor: but upon ſome conſiderations*, ſays Mr. *Langbaine* (5), *our Author was obliged to retract it.* In this *Defence* he tells us, that his chief endeavours are to delight the age, in which he lives. "If the humour of this age, "ſays he, be for Low Comedy, ſmall accidents and "raillery, I will force my genius to obey it, tho' "with more reputation I could write in verſe. I "know I am not ſo fitted by nature to write *Comedy*. "I want that gaiety of humour, which is required in "it. My converſation is ſlow and dull, my humour "ſaturnine and reſerved. In ſhort, I am none of "thoſe, who endeavour to break jeſts in company, "or make repartees. So that thoſe, who decry my "Comedies, do me no injury, except it be in point "of profit: Reputation in them is the laſt thing, to "which I ſhall pretend." Mr. Gildon tells us (6), ihat in this *Eſſay*, as well as in his *Prefaces*, *there is ſcarce one juſt criticiſm in ten.*

(5) *Account of the Engliſh Dramatic Poets. By Gerard Langbaine*, pag. 165. edit. Oxford 1691 in 8vo.

(6) *Laws of Poetry, as laid down by the Duke of Buckinghamſhire in his Eſſay of Poetry. By the Earl of Roſcommon &c.* pag. 61. edit. London 1721.

[*H*] *He wrote a great number of Dramatic Performances, which we ſhall give a Liſt of in the Note.*] *The Indian Emperor: or The Conqueſt of Mexico by the Spaniards; being the ſequel of the Indian Queen.* London 1667 in 4to. The Dedication to Anne Ducheſs of Monmouth and Bucclugh is dated October 12th 1676. *Tyrannick Love: or The Royal Martyr*, a Tragedy. London 1670 in 4to. He tells us in the Preface, that it was contrived and written in ſeven weeks. *The Tempeſt; or The Inchanted Iſland*, a Comedy. This Play was originally Shakeſpear's, and was alter'd by Mr. Dryden and Sir William D'avenant. The comical parts of the Sailors were of Sir William's invention, and for the moſt part of his writing. *An Evening's Love, or The Mock-Aſtrologer*, a Comedy. London 1671 in 4to. *Secret Love: or The Maiden-Queen*, a Tragedy. *Amboyna*, a Tragedy. London 1673 in 4to. *Marriage a la mode*, a Comedy. London 1673 in 4to. *The Miſtaken Huſband*, a Comedy. London 1675 in 4to. Mr. Langbaine tells us (7), that our Poet "was not the Author "of it, tho' it was adopted by him, as an orphan, "which might well deſerve the charity of a ſcene, "which he beſtowed on it." *Aureng-zebe*, a Tragedy. London 1676 in 4to. *All for Love: or The World well loſt*, a Tragedy. London 1678 in 4to. *The State of Innocence: or The Fall of Man*, an Opera in Heroic Verſe. London 1678 in 4to. To this piece is prefixed an *Apology for Heroic Poetry, and Poetick Licence.* Mr. Nath. Lee in his Verſes to our Author upon this Opera has the following lines:

(7) *Account of the Engliſh Dramatick Poets*, pag. 166.

"To the dead Bard your fame a little owes,
"For *Milton* did the wealthy mine diſcloſe.
"And rudely caſt what you could well diſpoſe:
"He roughly drew on an old-faſhioned ground,
"A chaos; for no perfect world was found,
"Till through the heap your mighty genius ſhin'd:
"He was the golden ore, which you refin'd."

But theſe lines will, as Mr. Dryden himſelf obſerves (8), *rather be eſteemed the effect of Mr. Lee's Love to him, than his deliberate and ſober judgment. Feigned Innocence; or Sir Martin Mar-all*, a Comedy. London 1678 in 4to. *The Aſſignation: or Love in a Nunnery*, a Comedy. London 1678 in 4to. *The Conqueſts of Granada*, in two parts. London 1678 in 4to. To the firſt part is prefixed *An Eſſay on Heroick Plays*; and to the latter he has ſubjoined *a Defence of the Epilogue, or an Eſſay on the Dramatick Poetry of the laſt Age. Troilus and Creſſida: or Truth found out too late*, a Tragedy. London 1679 in 4to. This Play was originally written by Shakeſpear; but the plot is new modelled by our Author. The Preface to it contains a Diſcourſe concerning *the Grounds of Criticiſm in Tragedy. Oedipus*, a Tragedy. London 1679 in 4to. It was written by Mr. Dryden in conjunction with Mr. N. Lee. Mr. Langbaine affirms (9), that "this "Play is certainly one of the beſt Tragedies we have, "the Authors having borrowed many ornaments, not "only from Sophocles, but alſo from Seneca." *The Rival Ladies*, a Tragi-Comedy. London 1679 in 4to. *The kind Keeper: or Mr.* Limberham, a Comedy. London 1680 in 8vo. This Play was ſuffered to be acted but thrice. *The Spaniſh Fryar: or The Double Diſcovery*, a Tragi-Comedy. The Epilogue, ſaid to be *writtten by a friend of the Author*, is, as well as the Play, very ſevere upon the Romiſh Clergy. *The Duke of Guiſe*, a Tragedy. London 1683 in 4to. It was written by our Author in conjunction with Mr. Lee. *Albion and Albanius*, an Opera performed at the Queen's Theatre in Dorſet-Garden. London 1685 in fol. In the *Preface* he tells us, that it was originally intended only for a Prologue to a Play of the nature of the *Tempeſt*, and that "the ſubject of it is wholly al- "legorical; and the Allegory itſelf ſo very obvious, "that it will no ſooner be read than underſtood." Mr. Langbaine obſerves upon this (10), that "by the "man on the pedeſtal, who is drawn with a long, "lean, pale face, with fiends wings, and ſnakes twiſt- "ed round his body, and encompaſſed by ſeveral fa- "natical rebellious heads, who ſuck poiſon from him, "which run out of a tap in his ſide, is meant the "Lord Shafteſbury (11) and his adherents." *Don Sebaſtian King of Portugal*, a Tragedy. London 1690 in 4to. *Amphytrion; or the two Soſias*, a Comedy. London 1691 in 4to. *King Arthur; or The Britiſh Worthy*, a Tragedy. London 1691 in 4to. *Cleomenes, the Spartan Heroe*, a Tragedy. London 1692 in 4to. In the Preface he tells us, that it was then ſeven or eight years ſince he deſigned to write this Play. It was at firſt prohibited by the Lord Chamberlain to be acted; but upon examination being found innocent of any deſign to ſatirize the Government, was ſuffered to be repreſented, and had great ſucceſs. He obſerves, that "a fooliſh objection was raiſed a- "gainſt him by the ſparks for Cleomenes not accept- "ing the favours of Caſſandra. They would not "have refuſed a fair Lady. I grant, ſays he, they "would not; but let them grant me, that they are "not Heroes; and ſo much for the point of honour. "A man might have pleaded an excuſe for himſelf, if "he had been falſe to an old wife, for the ſake of a "young miſtreſs; but Cleora was in the flower of her "age, and it was yet but honey-moon with Cleome- "nes;

(8) *Apology for Heroick Poetry and Poetick Licence.*

(9) Pag. 167.

(10) Pag. 152.

(11) Lord High Chancellor in the reign of King Charles II.

" tended that he has uſed them as Virgil did Ennius of old, to extract gold out of their " dung. For I never found him, *continues that writer*, in any theft indeed, but what he " gave a new luſtre to, when taken even from the beſt of the antients." The ſame Author likewiſe is of opinion that our Poet's *Dramatick Pieces, if we take our ſtandard of their excellence from the antients, are the moſt incorrect of any of his productions. There is generally indeed the ſublime, but very rarely the pathetic; for in all his Plays he has not touched Compaſſion above thrice, and that but weakly. Terror he has often hit on.* Mr. Gildon has alſo criticiſed upon his Tragedies [*I*]. But perhaps his greateſt defects aroſe from his conforming himſelf to the popular taſte [*K*]; and he tells us himſelf (*b*) that his *Spaniſh Friar* was *given to the people*; and that *he never wrote any thing to pleaſe himſelf, but Anthony and Cleopatra.* In 1671 he with ſome other writers was ridiculed with great pleaſantry in the *Rehearſal* a Comedy [*L*]. The year following there was publiſhed *the Hiſtory of Henry IV, ſurnamed the Great, King of France and Navarre. Written originally in French by the Biſhop of Rodez, once Tutor to his now moſt Chriſtian Majeſty; and made Engliſh by* J. D. (*i*), whom ſome have ſuppoſed to be our Poet; but it was probably *John Davies* of Kidwelly, a great Tranſlator of that time. In 1673 his *Conqueſt of Granada* was attacked by Mr. Richard Leigh a Player belonging to the Duke of York's Theatre, in a Pamphlet intitled, *a Cenſure of the Rota: on Mr.* Dryden's Conqueſt of Granada, Oxford 1673 in 4to; which occaſioned ſeveral other Pamphlets, particularly, *The friendly Vindication of* Mr. Dryden *from* the Cenſure of the Rota. Cambridge 1673, in 4to. Mr. Dryden *vindicated in a Reply to the* Friendly Vindication of Mr. Dryden; *with Reflections on the* Rota. London 1673 in 4to; and *A Deſcription of the Academy of the Athenian Virtuoſi, with a Diſcourſe held there in Vindication of* Mr. Dryden's Conqueſt of Granada *againſt the Author of* the Cenſure of the Rota. London 1673 in 4to. Mr. Elkanah Settle likewiſe criticiſed on this Play of our Author

(*b*) *Preface* to this *Tranſlation* of Du Freſnoy's *Art of Painting*, pag. 68. edit. London 1716, in 8vo.

(*i*) London 1672, in 8vo.

" nes; and ſo much for nature. Some have told me, " that many of the fair ſex complain for want of " tender ſcenes and ſoft expreſſions of love. I will " endeavour to make them ſome amends, if I write " again; and my next Heroe ſhall be no Spartan." *Love triumphant: or Nature will prevail*, a Tragi-Comedy. London 1694 in 4to.

[*I*] *Mr. Gildon alſo has criticized upon his Tragedies.*] That Writer having obſerved (12), that Otway, who was a perfect maſter of the Tragic Paſſions, every where draws them with that natural ſimplicity recommended in the Duke of Buckinghamſhire's *Eſſay on Poetry*, tells us, that Mr. Dryden, " who affects a " quite different ſtyle, that ſtyle which is condemned by " the *Eſſay*, ſeldom or never touches the *Paſſions*, at " leaſt till he had left off in a great meaſure that uni- " formity of *Diction*, that perpetual ſwelling, and " continual *tropological* expreſſion, and endeavoured " here and there more nearly to imitate nature, in a " juſt ſimplicity of the language. But this was not " his natural inclination, nor a road, that he was fond " of travelling, but only deviated ſometimes into it by " a happy chance. That this was his true *Guſto* " is pretty plain from two inſtances; the firſt is, that " when the Tranſlation of *Euripides* was recommend- " ed to him, inſtead of that of *Homer*, he replied, " *That he confeſſed that he had no reliſh of that Poet*, " who was a maſter of the *Tragic Simplicity*. The " other is, that for the moſt part of his time he com- " monly expreſſed a very mean, if not contemptible " opinion of Otway; tho' at laſt, eſpecially in his " *Preface* to *Freſnoy*, he declared in his favour; and " yet even here he could not but throw in ſome ex- " ceptions againſt his *Diction*." Mr. Gildon afterwards remarks (13), that *pompous expreſſion (to give it no worſe a name) was brought into Tragedy ſoon after the Reſtoration by Mr.* Dryden, *and ſome other Poets, by which they did more injury to Tragedy than they did good to it by their nearer approaches to a regularity in other particulars: for that affectation of fine language (as they call it) and idle deſcriptions, leads the Poets from nature, which ought more to be their ſtudy, than thoſe* Dalilah's of the Stage, *as* Dryden *calls them, which have given ſucceſs to Plays above theſe fifty years. The occaſion of Mr.* Dryden's *taking up this way was his great converſation with French Romances, and little acquaintance with and reliſh of the true and beautiful ſimplicity of nature.*

(12) *Laws of Poetry, as laid down by the Duke of* Buckinghamſhire *in his* Eſſay on Poetry; *by the Earl of* Roſcommon *in his* Eſſay on Tranſlated Verſe; *and by the Lord* Lanſdowne *on* unnatural Flights in Poetry, *explained and illuſtrated*, pag. 211. edit. London 1721, in 8vo.

(13) Pag. 212, 213.

[*K*] *But perhaps his greateſt defects aroſe from his conforming himſelf to the popular taſte.*] The late Lord Lanſdowne (14) has the following lines on this ſubject:

" *Dryden* himſelf, to pleaſe a frantic Age,
" Was forc'd to let his judgment ſtoop to rage:
" To a wild audience he conformed his voice,
" Comply'd to cuſtom, but not err'd thro' choice.
" Deem then the people's, not the writer's ſin,
" *Almanzor's* rage, and rants of *Maximin*.
" That fury ſpent, in each elaborate piece
" He vies for fame with antient Rome and Greece."

(14) *Concerning unnatural Flights in Poetry.*

Mr. Gildon obſerves upon theſe Verſes (15), that Mr. Dryden in one of his *Prologues* has theſe two lines;

He's bound to pleaſe, not to write well, and knows,
There is a mode in Plays, as well as cloaths.

(15) *Laws of Poetry*, pag. 350.

" Let the cenſurers of Mr. Dryden therefore, *ſays Mr.* " Gildon, be ſatisfied, that where he has ex- " poſed himſelf to be criticized, it has been only when " he has endeavoured to follow the faſhion, to humour " others, and not to pleaſe himſelf." Mr. Dryden likewiſe cenſures himſelf in the following paſſage (16): *I remember ſome Verſes of my own,* Maximin *and* Almanzor, *which cry vengeance upon me for their extravagance, &c. All I can ſay for thoſe paſſages, which are, I hope, not many, is, that I knew they were bad enough to pleaſe, even when I writ them. But I repent of them among my ſins: and if any of their fellows intrude by chance into my preſent writing, I draw a ſtroke over all thoſe* Dalilah's *of the Theatre, and am reſolved I will ſettle myſelf no reputation by the applauſe of fools. 'Tis not that I am mortified to all ambition, but I ſcorn as much to take it from half-witted judges, as I ſhould to raiſe an eſtate by cheating of bubbles; neither do I diſcommend the lofty ſtyle in Tragedy, which is naturally pompous and magnificent. But nothing it truly ſublime, that is not juſt and proper.*

(16) *Epiſtle Dedicatory* to the *Spaniſh Fryar.*

[*L*] *The Rehearſal.*] This was the firſt time acted on the 7th of December 1671, and ſeveral times after printed in 4to, and the 4th edition was publiſhed in 1683. It is ſaid, that the Duke of Buckingham in writing this Play had the aſſiſtance of Dr. *Thomas Sprat*, his Chaplain, afterwards Biſhop of Rocheſter, Mr. *Martin Clifford*, Maſter of the Charter-Houſe, and Mr. *Samuel Butler*, Author of *Hudibras* (17). Mr. Wood obſerves (18), that in this piece he ſatyrizes Mr. Dryden, and ſeveral of his Plays; among which Mr. Langbaine (19) particularly mentions the *Conqueſt of Granada, Tyrannick Love, and Love in a Nunnery*. Mr. Dryden tells us (20), that he *anſwered not the* Rehearſal, *becauſe I knew*, ſays he, *the Author ſate to himſelf, when he drew the picture, and was the very* Bays *of his own farce; becauſe alſo I knew, that my betters were more concerned than I was in that Satyr: and laſtly becauſe Mr.* Smith *and Mr.* Johnſon, *the main pillars of it, were two ſuch languiſhing Gentlemen in their converſation, that I could liken them to nothing but to their own relations, thoſe noble characters of men of wit and pleaſure about the town.*

(17) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 804.

(18) Ibid.

(19) Pag. 546, 547.

(20) *Dedication of the Satyrs of* Juvenal *and* Perſius, *tranſlated into Engliſh Verſe by Mr.* Dryden *and ſeveral other eminent Hands*, pag. 12. 6th edit. London 1735.

Author [*M*]. And it is remarkable that ſo inconſiderable a Poet as Mr. Settle was the mighty rival of Mr. Dryden; and for many years bore his reputation above him (*). In November 1679 an *Eſſay on Satyr* being ſpread about the city in manuſcript, in which many groſs reflections were made upon the Ducheſs of Portſmouth and John Wilmot Earl of Rocheſter, and they ſuſpecting Mr. Dryden to be the Author of it, "one or both hiring three men to "cudgel him, they effected their buſineſs in Will's Coffee-Houſe in Covent-Garden at eight "of the clock at night on Dec. 16, 1679; yet afterwards John Earl of Mulgrave was ge-"nerally thought to be the author (*k*)." In 1680 he publiſh'd a Tranſlation of Ovid's Epiſtles into Engliſh Verſe by ſeveral hands, ſeveral of which Epiſtles were done by himſelf; and he wrote the Preface to it. In 1681 he publiſhed his Abſalom and Achitophel [*N*], in which having expoſed the Duke of Buckingham under the character of Zimri, it occaſioned a ſtory that his Grace had procured him to be beaten; but this, as Mr. Wood aſſures us (*l*), was falſe; ſince the Duke only wrote or cauſed to be written *Reflections* on that Poem. The ſame year he likewiſe publiſhed his Poem, intitled *The Medall, a Satyr againſt Sedition. By the Author* of *Abſalom and Achitophel* [*O*]. In 1682 his *Religio Laici* was printed [*P*]; and the year following the Tragedy of *The Duke of Guiſe*, written by him and Mr. Nathaniel Lee, gave great offence to the Whigs, and was attacked by ſeveral writers. [*Q*]. In the reign

(*) *Diſſertation concerning the Perfection of the Engliſh Language, the State of Poetry, &c.* prefixed *to Epiſtles, Odes, &c. written on ſeveral Subjects. By Mr.* Welſted, pag. 41. 2d edit. London 1725, in 12mo.

(*k*) Wood, col. 805, 806. *See likewiſe* the Earl of Mulgrave's *Eſſay on Poetry*, in that part which relates to Satyr.

(*l*) Ibid.

[*M*] *Mr.* Elkanah Settle *likewiſe criticized on this Play of our Author.*] Mr. Settle having written a Tragedy, intitled, *The Empreſs of Morocco*, London 1673 in 4to, it was attacked in a Pamphlet intitled, *Notes and Obſervations on* The Empreſs of Morocco; *or ſome few Errata's to be printed inſtead of the Sculptures with the ſecond Edition of that Play.* London 1674 in 4to, which was ſuppoſed by Mr. Settle to be written by Mr. Dryden in conjunction with Mr. Thomas Shadwell and the Author of *Pandion* and *Amphigenia.* Upon this Mr. Settle wrote *Notes and Obſervations on* The Empreſs of Morocco *reviſed with ſome few Errata's to be printed inſtead of the Poſtſcript, with the next Edition of* The Conqueſt of Granada. London 1674 in 4to. This Pamphlet is probably the ſame with that publiſhed in 1687 in 4to under the title of *Reflections on ſeveral of Mr. Dryden's Plays; particularly the* firſt *and* ſecond *part of the* Conqueſt of Granada. *By* E. Settle Gent.

[*N*] *In* 1681 *he publiſhed his* Abſalom and Achitophel.] There were ſeveral editions of it printed in a ſhort time; and commendatory verſes written to the then *unknown* and *concealed Author* of it by Mr. Nathaniel Lee, Mr. Richard Duke, and Mr. N. Tate. It was tranſlated into Latin by Mr. William Coward, afterwards an eminent Phyſician in London, and printed at Oxford 1682 in 4to; and by Mr. Francis Atterbury, afterwards Biſhop of Rocheſter, in conjunction with Mr. Francis Hickman, and printed at Oxford the ſame year in 4to. In the Preface to the *Second Part* of this Poem (21), reprinted in the *Miſcellany Poems publiſhed by Mr.* Dryden (22), we are informed, that our Author undertook the firſt Part of this Poem in 1680 *upon the deſire of King Charles II*; and that *the performance was applauded by every one*; and that ſeveral perſons preſſing him to write a *ſecond Part*, he upon declining it himſelf, ſpoke to Mr. *Tate* to write one, and gave him his advice in the direction of it; and that part beginning,

(21) It was firſt printed at London 1682, in fol.

(22) Part 2. 4th edit. London 1716.

Next theſe a troop of buſy ſpirits preſs,

and ending,

To talk like Doeg, *and to write like thee,*

containing near two hundred verſes, were entirely of Mr. *Dryden*'s compoſition, beſides ſome touches in other places. In anſwer to the *firſt Part* was publiſhed *Azaria and Huſhai, a Poem.* London 1682 in 4to. ſaid to be written by Mr. Elkanah Settle.

[*O*] *His Poem, intitled,* The Medal, a ſatyr againſt Sedition.] It was written upon occaſion of a Medal ſtruck on account of the indictment againſt Anthony Earl of Shaftſbury being found *Ignoramus* by the Grand Jury at the Old Bailey London in November 1681. Mr. Elkanah Settle wrote in anſwer to this Poem another, intitled, *The Medal revers'd.* London 1681 in 4to.

[*P*] *In* 1682 *his* Religio Laici *was printed.*] It is intitled, Religio Laici; *or, a Layman's Faith. A Poem.* In the *Preface* he informs us, that it was written for an ingenious young Gentleman, his friend, upon his tranſlation of father *Simon's Critical Hiſtory of the Old Teſtament*; and that the *verſes are addreſſed to the Tranſlator of that Work, and the ſtyle of them is, what it ought to be, Epiſtolary. If any one be ſo lamentable a critick as to require the ſmoothneſs, the numbers, and the turn of Heroick Poetry in the Poem; I muſt tell 'em that if he has not read Horace, I have ſtudied him, and hope the ſtyle of his Epiſtles is not ill imitated here.* He obſerves likewiſe, that it had always been his thought, "that Heathens, who never "did, nor without a Miracle could hear of the name "of Chriſt, were yet in all poſſibility of ſalvation. "Neither will it, *continues he*, enter eaſily into my "belief, that before the coming of our Saviour, the "whole world, excepting only the Jewiſh nation, "ſhould lie under the inevitable neceſſity of everlaſting "puniſhment for want of that Revelation, which was "confined to ſo ſmall a ſpot of ground as that of "Paleſtine." He proceeds then to juſtify the following lines in that Poem:

Then thoſe, who followed reaſon's dictates right,
Liv'd up, and lifted high their natural light;
With Socrates *may ſee their Maker's face,*
While thouſand Rubrick Martyrs want a place.
Nor doth it haulk my charity, to find
*Th' Egyptian Biſhop * of another mind:*
For tho' his Creed *eternal truth contains,*
'Tis hard for man to doom to endleſs pains
All who believ'd not all his zeal requir'd;
Unleſs he firſt could prove he was inſpir'd.
Then let us either think he meant to ſay
This Faith, *where* publiſh'd, *was the only way;*
Or elſe conclude, that Arius to confute,
The good old man, too eager in diſpute,
Flew high, and as his Chriſtian fury roſe,
Damn'd all for heretics, who durſt oppoſe.

* St. Athanaſius.

[*Q*] *The Tragedy of the* Duke of Guiſe.] This Play was immediately attacked in a Pamphlet, intitled, *A Defence of the Charter and Municipal Rights of the City of London, and the Rights of other Municipal Cities and Towns of England. Directed to the Citizens of London. By* Thomas Hunt. London in 4to. In this Piece Mr. Hunt tells us (23), that the Charter and City of London were already condemned, and the Magiſtrates executed in effigy in Mr. Dryden's *Duke of Guiſe*, "frequently acted and applauded, intended "moſt certainly to provoke the rabble into tumults "and diſorders:" He then makes ſeveral remarks upon the deſign of the Play, and aſſerts (24), that our Poet's Province was *to corrupt the manners of the nation, and lay waſte their morals*; and that his endeavours were *more happily applied to extinguiſh the little remains of the virtue of the age by bold impieties, and befooling Religion by impious and inept rhimes; to confound virtue and vice, good and evil, and leave us without conſciences.* About the ſame time were printed likewiſe *Some Reflections upon the Pretended Parallel in the Play called,* The Duke of Guiſe (25). London 1683 in 4to. The Author of this Pamphlet tells us (26) that he was *wearied with the dulneſs* of this Play, *and extreamly incenſed at the wicked and barbarous deſign it was intended for*; and that the fierceſt "*Tories* "have been aſhamed of this Piece;" in ſhort that he "never

(23) Pag. 24.

(24) Pag. 30.

(25) Mr. Dryden in his *Vindication of the Parallel &c.* pag. 40. tells us, that Mr. *Tho. Shadwell* the Poet, made the rough draught of this Pamphlet, and that Mr. *Tho. Hunt* finiſhed it.

(26) Pag. 1, 2.

reign of James II he reconciled himſelf to the Church of Rome [*R*]; and in 1686 wrote *a Defence of the* Papers *written by the late King of bleſſed memory, and found in his ſtrong box* [*S*], in oppoſition to Dr. Edward Stillingfleet's *Anſwer to ſome papers lately printed, concerning the Authority of the Catholick Church in Matters of Faith, and the Reformation of the Church of England.* London 1686 in 4to. Upon which Dr. Stillingfleet publiſhed *A Vindication of the Anſwer to ſome late Papers* [*T*]. London 1687 in 4to. In 1687 Mr. Dryden publiſhed his *Hind and Panther: A Poem* [*V*]; which was immediately

" never ſaw any thing that could be called a *Play*, " more deficient in wit, good character, or entertain- " ment, than this is." He remarks, that he was informed, that it was written by another Gentleman with an intention to expoſe the villany of the Papiſts in the maſſacre at Paris; " and Mr. *Bays* himſelf, as " I am told, *continues he*, expreſſed then an intention " of writing the ſtory of the *Sicilian Veſpers*, to lay " open the treacherous, inhumane, bloody principles " of the Diſciples of that Scarlet Whore. But he " is ſince fallen from all modeſty and good ſenſe, and " is not content with his own devil-like fall, but like " old Satan, he tempts his friend, poiſons and per- " verts his good intentions, and by his wicked ma- " nagement of the Play turns it from the honeſt aim " of the firſt Author to ſo diabolical an end, as me- " thinks it ſhould make a civil government bluſh to " ſuffer, or not to put the higheſt mark of infamy " upon it. But it is obſervable, though this could " not be acted as it was firſt written againſt the Papiſts, " yet when it was turned upon Proteſtants it found " reception. . . . It is not enough, when he meets " ſome of his old acquaintance (whom he knows to " be of an opinion, which he once profeſſed to be " of, and much different from what he now pretends) " that *he thinks as they do ſtill, but he muſt write as* " *he does, he is put upon it*, &c. For certainly moſt " exemplary puniſhment is due to him for his devi- " liſh parallel; and methinks Magiſtrates, that reſpect " their oaths and office, ſhould put the Law in execu- (27) Ibid. pag. 2, 3. " tion againſt this lewd ſcribler (27)." In anſwer to this and Mr. Hunt's Pamphlet, Mr. Dryden publiſhed, *The Vindication: or the Parallel of the* French Holy League, and the Engliſh League and Covenant, *turned into a Seditious Libell againſt the* King *and his* Royal Highneſs *by* Thomas Hunt *and the Authors of the* Reflections upon the pretended Parallel in the Play called *The Duke of Guiſe*. London 1683 in 4to. In this *Vindication* he tells us, that in the year of the Reſtoration the firſt Play he undertook was *The Duke of Guiſe*, as the faireſt way, which *The Act of Indemnity* had then left, *of ſetting forth the riſe of the late Rebellion*. As this was his firſt Eſſay, ſo it met with the fortune of an unfiniſhed Piece; that is to ſay, it was damned in private by the advice of ſome friends to whom he ſhewed it; who freely told him, that it was an excellent ſubject, but not ſo artificially wrought, as they could have wiſhed. The ſcene of the Duke of Guiſe's return to Paris againſt the King's poſitive command was then written. He afterwards informs us, that it was at Mr. Lee's earneſt deſire, without any ſollicitation of our Author's, that this Play was produced betwixt them; and that after the writing of *OEdipus*, he paſſed a promiſe to join with Mr. Lee in another; and *he happened*, ſays Mr. Dryden, *to claim the performance of that promiſe juſt upon the finiſhing of a Poem, when I would have been glad of a little reſpite before the undertaking of a ſecond taſk. . . . . Two thirds of it belonged to him; and then to me only the firſt ſcene of the Play, the whole fourth act, and the firſt half or ſomewhat more of the fifth.*

[*R*] *He reconciled himſelf to the Church of Rome.*] Mr. Thomas Browne wrote upon this occaſion, *The Reaſons of Mr.* Bays's *changing his Religion conſidered, in a Dialogue between* Crites, Eugenius, *and Mr.* Bays. London 1688 in five ſheets and a half in 4to. The ſame Writer afterwards publiſhed another Pamphlet, intitled, *The late Converts expoſed: or the Reaſons of Mr.* Bays's *changing his Religion conſidered, in a Dialogue. Part the ſecond* (28). London 1690 in 4to. There was another Pamphlet likewiſe written againſt our Author, intitled, *The Revolter: a Tragi-Comedy acted between the* Hind *and* Panther, *and* Religio Laici. London 1687 in 4to. pagg. 32.

(28) It was licenſed Jan. 8, 1689.

[*S*] *His* Defence of the Papers written by the late King of bleſſed memory, and found in his ſtrong Box.] The Author of *the Continuation of the preſent State of the Controverſy between the Church of England and the Church of Rome; being a full account of the Books that have been of late written on both ſides* (29), tells us, that this tract of Mr. Dryden " is very light, and " in ſome places even ridiculous, and which ſhews, " that the Author's talent lies towards controverſy no " more in *proſe*, than it appears by the Hind and " Panther, that it does in *verſe*." In this Piece Mr. Dryden aſſerts (30), that *the Church is more viſible than Scripture, becauſe the Scripture is ſeen by the Church*, for which he brings St. Auguſtin's authority. And if by ſaying that *the Scripture is in print*, be underſtood a thing out of queſtion, then he denies it *to be viſible, that the Scripture is in print, becauſe many men do call Scripture in queſtion at this day; and to queſtion whether the Book in print be Scripture, is manifeſtly to queſtion whether Scripture be in print.* He affirms likewiſe (31), " that the Pillars of the Church eſtabliſh'd by " Law are to be found but broken ſtaffs by their own " conceſſions. For after all their undertaking to heal a " wounded conſcience, they leave their Proſelytes fi- " nally to the Scripture, as our Phyſicians, when they " have emptied the pockets of their Patients, with- " out curing them, ſend them at laſt to Tunbridge " Waters, or the air of Montpellier;" that *we are reformed from the virtues of good living*, i. e. *from the devotions, mortifications, auſterities, humility, and charity, which are practiſed in Catholick Countries, by the example and precept of that lean mortified Apoſtle St.* Martin Luther (32); that the Reformation in England " was erected on the foundation of luſt, ſa- " crilege, and uſurpation; and that no paint is ca- " pable of making lively the hideous face of the pre- " tended Reformation (33)."

(29) Pag. 28. edit. London 1688 in 4to. The *Imprimatur* of this piece is date! June the 7th 1688.

(30) *Defence*, pag. 2, 3.

(31) Ibid. pag. 94.

(32) Ibid. pag. 98.

(33) Ibid. pag. 117, 122.

[*T*] A Vindication of the Anſwer to ſome late Papers &c.] The Author treats Mr. Dryden with ſome ſeverity. *If I thought*, ſays he*, *there were no ſuch thing in the world as true Religion, and that the* Prieſts of all Religions are alike, *I might have been as nimble a Convert, and as early a Defender of the* Royal Papers, *as any one of theſe Champions. For why ſhould not one who believes no Religion, declare for any?* Mr. Dryden refers to this *Vindication* in the *Preface* to his *Hind* and *Panther*; where he writes thus: " I " refer my ſelf to the judgment of thoſe who have " read the *Anſwer to the Defence of the late King's* " *Papers* and that of the *Ducheſs* (in which laſt I " was concerned) how charitably I have been repre- " ſented there. I am now informed both of the Au- " thor and Superviſors of his Pamphlet, and will re- " ply when I think he can affront me; for I am of " *Socrates*'s opinion, that all creatures cannot. . . . . " He would have inſinuated to the world, that her " late Highneſs died not a Roman Catholick. He " declares himſelf to be now ſatisfied to the contrary; " in which he has given up the cauſe; for matter of " fact was the principal debate betwixt us. In the " mean time he would diſpute the motives of her " change: how prepoſterouſly let all men judge, when " he ſeemed to deny the ſubject of the controverſy, " the change itſelf. And becauſe I would not take up " this ridiculous challenge, he tells the world, I can- " not argue. But he may as well infer that a Catho- " lick cannot faſt, becauſe he will not take up the " cudgels againſt Mrs. *James*, to confute the Prote- " ſtant Religion."

* Pag. 2.

[*V*] *His* Hind and Panther: A Poem.] It was licenſed for the Preſs April the 11th 1687. In the *Preface* he tells us, that it was *neither impoſed on him, nor ſo much as the ſubject given him by any man.* " It was written, *ſays he*, during the laſt winter, and " the beginning of this ſpring, though with long in- " terruptions of ill health, and other hindrances.

" About

diately attacked by Mr. Charles Mountague's afterwards Earl of Halifax, and Mr. Matthew Prior, in a Pamphlet intitled *The Hind and the Panther tranverſed to the Story of the Country-Mouſe and the City Mouſe* [*W*]. London 1687 in 4to; and by *Some Reflections upon the* Hind and Panther, ſubjoined [*X*] to a Pamphlet intitled *Some Notes upon* Mr. Dryden's *Poems, in four Letters. By* Mr. Clifford, *late Maſter of the Charter-Houſe London* [*Y*]. London 1687 in 4to. Not long before this, our Author was ſuppoſed to be engaged in tranſlating Monſieur Varillas's *Hiſtory of Hereſies* [*Z*]; but this Tranſlation never appeared in print, though in the year 1688, he publiſhed *The Life of St. Francis Xavier*, tranſlated from the French of Father Bohours. Upon the Revolution he loſt his Place of Poet Laureat and Hiſtoriographer Royal; in which he was ſucceeded by Thomas Shadwell Eſq; againſt whom he entertained an implacable reſentment, as appears from his *Mac Flecknoe*, one of the ſevereſt Satyrs in any Language. In 1693 he publiſhed at London in folio a Tranſlation of Juvenal's Satyrs by ſeveral hands (*m*), and a Tranſlation of Perſius, done entirely by himſelf; and to the whole prefixed a long and

(*m*) Mr. Dryden tranſlated the 1ſt, 3d, 6th, 10th, and 16th Satyrs.

" About a fortnight before I had finiſhed it, his " Majeſty's declaration for liberty of conſcience came " abroad, which if I had ſo ſoon expected, I might " have ſpared my ſelf the labour of writing many " things, which are contained in the *third part* of it. " But I was always in ſome hope that the Church " of England might have been perſuaded to have " taken off the *Penal Laws* and the *Teſt*, which was " one deſign of the Poem, when I propoſed to my- " ſelf the writing of it. 'Tis evident, that ſome " part of it was only occaſional, and not firſt intend- " ed; I mean that defence of myſelf, to which every " honeſt man is bound, when he is injuriouſly attack- " ed in print."

[*W*] *Immediately attacked . . in a Pamphlet, intitled,* The Hind and the Panther tranſverſed to the ſtory of the Country-Mouſe and the City-Mouſe.] The Authors in the *Preface* obſerve, that the favourers of the *Hind and Panther* will be apt to ſay in its defence, that the beſt things are capable of ridicule; that *Homer* has been burleſqued, and *Virgil* traveſted, without ſuffering any thing in their reputation from that buffoonry; and that in like manner the *Hind and Panther* may be an exact Poem, tho' it is the ſubject of raillery in this Piece. To this it is anſwered, that *there is this difference, that thoſe Authors are wreſted from their true ſenſe, and this naturally falls into ridicule: there is nothing repreſented here as monſtrous and unnatural, which is not equally ſo in the original.* They afterwards remark, that we have this comfort under the ſeverity of Mr. Dryden's Satyr, " to ſee his abilities " equally leſſened with his opinion of us; and that " he could not be a fit champion againſt the *Panther*, " till he had laid aſide all his judgment. But we " muſt applaud his obedience to his new mother " *Hind*; ſhe *diſciplined* him ſeverely (34); ſhe com- " manded him it ſeems, *to ſacrifice his darling fame*, " and to do it effectually, he publiſhed this learned " Piece. This is the favourable conſtruction we would " put on his faults, though he takes care to inform " us (35), that it was done from no impoſition, but " out of a natural propenſity he has to malice, and a " particular inclination of doing miſchief. What elſe " could provoke him (56) to *libel the Court*, blaſ- " pheme *Kings*, abuſe the whole *Scotch Nation*, rail at " the greateſt part of his own, and lay all the indig- " nities imaginable on the only eſtabliſhed Religion? " And we muſt now congratulate him this felicity, " that there is no ſect or denomination of Chriſtians, " whom he has not abuſed.

" *Thus far his arms have with ſucceſs been crown'd.* " Let *Turks*, *Jews*, and *Infidels*, look to themſelves; he " has already begun the war upon them. When once a " Conqueror grows thus dreadful, it is the intereſt of all " his neighbours to oppoſe him; for there is no alliance " to be made with one that will fall about and de- " ſtroy his friends, and like a ſecond *Almanzor*, " change ſides merely to keep his hand in uſe. This " heroic temper of his has created him ſome ene- " mies, that did by no means affect hoſtility; and he " may obſerve this candour in the management, that " none of his Works are concerned in theſe Papers, " but his laſt Piece; and I believe he is ſenſible this " is a favour."

(34) *Hind and Panther*, pag. 90.

(35) *Preface* to *Hind and Panther.*

(36) *Hind and Panther*, pag. 87.

[*X*] *And by* Some Reflections upon the Hind and Panther.] The Author conſiders the ſeveral points inſiſted on by Mr. Dryden in his Poem, and for the ſake of brevity and diſtinction, he denominates them after this manner, and in this order: I. Tranſubſtantiation. II. Reformation. III. Infallibility. IV. Novelty and Schiſm. V. The paſſive Church. He treats Mr. Dryden with great ſeverity, and obſerves (37), that *the Proteſtant Poets ſay, that Mr.* Bays *could never have been an Author without ſtealing from* Milton, *and many others, that have been* helps for his wit *to furniſh out the ſtage. And how many good thoughts hath he made his own, as he phraſes it in the* Rehearſal, *by* tranſproſing *and* tranſverſing; *as now he hopes, theſe arguments for Popery may paſs for his, becauſe he hath put them into an* unuſual dreſs, *and hath tagged them with rhimes. And to ſpeak the truth, there is very little of* his own *in any Book, that he hath publiſhed but the arrogance and unparallelled cenſoriouſneſs, which he exerciſes over all other Writers.*

(37) Pag. 32.

[*Y*] *A Pamphlet intitled,* Notes upon Mr. *Dryden's* Poems, in four Letters. By *M. Clifford, &c.*] The fourth Letter is dated at the Charter-Houſe July 1, 1672; but the former Letters have no date. In the firſt Letter he aſſures Mr. Dryden, that he will detect his *thefts, letting the world know*, ſays he, *how great a plagiary you are; and that for all your pretences to wit and judicious cenſure, you do live in as much ignorance and darkneſs as you did in the womb; that your writings are like a Jack of all Trades Shop; they have variety, but no value.* In the *ſecond* and *third* Letters he criticizes on the *Conqueſt of Granada*; and in the *fourth* animadverts upon Mr. Dryden's Similes; and concludes with theſe words: " Canſt thou after this " have the confidence to ſay, thy Plays are written " with more flame than art? I vow to thee, I can- " not perceive either art, flame, or the leaſt ſpark of " fire in thy Poetry. I muſt acknowledge it has all " the qualities of another element, I mean the earth; " 'tis cold, dry, and ſo heavy, that at the hearing " of it, the judicious part of thy company fall aſleep; " one would have thought thou hadſt done ſo too at " the writing."

[*Z*] *Not long before this our Author was ſuppoſed to be engaged in tranſlating Monſr.* Varillas's Hiſtory of Hereſies.] Dr. G. Burnet has the following paſſage (38): " I have been informed from England, that a Gen- " tleman, who is famous both for Poetry and *ſeveral* " *other things*, had ſpent three months in tranſlating " Mr. Varillas's *Hiſtory*; but that as ſoon as my *Re-* " *flections* appeared, he diſcontinued his labour, find- " ing the credit of his Author was gone. Now if " he thinks it is recovered by his Anſwer; he will per- " haps go on with his Tranſlation; and this may be, " for ought I know, as good an entertainment for " him as the converſation, that he had ſet on between " the *Hinds* and *Panthers*, and all the reſt of animals, " for whom Mr. Varillas may ſerve well enough as an " Author; and this *Hiſtory* and that *Poem* are ſuch " extraordinary things of their kind, that it will be " but ſuitable to ſee the Author of the *worſt Poem* be- " come likewiſe the Tranſlator of the *worſt Hiſtory*, " that the Age has produced. If his grace and his wit " improve both proportionably, we will hardly find, " that he has gained much by the change he has " made, from having no Religion to chooſe one of " the worſt. It is true, he had ſomewhat to ſink from " in matter of *wit*; but as for his *morals*, it is ſcarce " poſſible for him to grow a worſe man than he was. " He has lately wreaked his malice on me for ſpoil- " ing

(38) *Defence of the* Reflections *on the Ninth Book of the firſt Volume of Mr. Varillas's* Hiſtory of Hereſies. *Being a Reply to his* Anſwer. *By* G. Burnet, *D. D.* pag. 138, 139. 140. edit. Amſterdam 1687, in 24mo.

and beautiful diſcourſe by way of Dedication to the Earl of Dorſet (*n*). Mr. Congreve wrote to him a Poem on his Tranſlation of Perſius. In 1695 he publiſhed a Tranſlation of *Monſieur Du Freſnoy's Art of Painting* [*AA*]; and in 1697 a Tranſlation of Virgil's works [*BB*]. His laſt work was his Fables, which were printed at London in folio. He died on the 1ſt of May 1701 at his houſe in Gerard-ſtreet, where he had lived many years, and was interred in Weſtminſter-Abbey [*CC*], where

(*n*) This Dedication is dated Auguſt the 18th 1692.

" ing his three months labour; but in it he has done " me all the honour that any man can receive from " him, which is to be railed at by him. If I had " ill nature enough to prompt me to wiſh a very bad " wiſh for him; it ſhould be that he would go on " and finiſh his *Tranſlation*. By that it will appear, " whether the Engliſh Nation, which is the moſt " competent judge in this matter, has upon the ſeeing " our Debate, pronounced in Mr. Varillas's favour or " in mine. It is true Mr. *D.* will ſuffer a little by it, " but at leaſt it will ſerve to keep him in from other " extravagancies; and if he gains little honour by this " work, yet he cannot loſe ſo much by it as he has " done by his laſt employment."

[*AA*] *His Tranſlation of Monſr.* Du Freſnoy's Art of Painting.] It was printed in 1695 in 4to under the following title: De Arte Graphicâ: *The Art of Painting by* C. A. Du Freſnoy, *with Remarks, and a Parallel between Painting and Poetry, by Mr. Dryden. With the Lives of the Painters.* The ſecond Edition, printed at London 1716 in 8vo, has the following title: *The Art of Painting by* C. A. Du Freſnoy, *with Remarks: tranſlated into Engliſh, with an original Preface, containing a Parallel between Painting and Poetry. By Mr.* Dryden. *As alſo a ſhort account of the moſt eminent Painters, both ancient and modern. By* R. G. Eſq; *The ſecond Edition corrected and enlarged.* This Edition is dedicated to Richard Earl of Burlington by Richard Graham Eſq; who obſerves in the Dedication, that ſome liberties have been taken with Mr. Dryden's *excellent Tranſlation*, becauſe for want of a competent knowledge in painting, he ſuffered himſelf to be miſled by an unſkilful guide. " Monſr. de Piles told him in his Preface, that his " French Verſion was made at the requeſt of the Au- " thor himſelf; and altered by him, till it was wholly " to his mind. This Mr. Dryden taking upon con- " cent, thought there was nothing more incumbent on " him, than to put it into the beſt Engliſh he could; " and accordingly performed his part here (as in every " thing elſe) with accuracy. But it being manifeſt, " that the French Tranſlator has frequently miſtaken " the ſenſe of his Author, and very often alſo not " ſet it in the moſt advantageous light; to do juſtice " to Monſr. Du Freſnoy, Mr. *Jervas* (a very good " Critick in the language, as well as in the ſub- " ject of the Poem) has been prevailed upon to cor- " rect what was found amiſs; and his amendments " are every where diſtinguiſhed with proper marks." To this edition are prefixed Mr. Pope's Verſes *to Mr. Jervas with* Freſnoy's Art of Painting *tranſlated by Mr.* Dryden. Mr. Dryden in his *Preface* tells us (39) that when he undertook this work, he was already engaged in the Tranſlation of *Virgil*, *from whom*, ſays he, *I borrowed only two months*; and he afterwards obſerves (40), that this *Preface containing a Parallel of Poetry and Painting, was begun and ended in twelve mornings; and perhaps*, ſays he, *the judges of Painting and Poetry, when I tell them how ſhort a time it coſt me, may make me the ſame Anſwer, which my late Lord* Rocheſter *made to one, who, to commend a Tragedy, ſaid it was written in three weeks*, How the Devil could he be ſo long about it? *For that Poem was infamouſly bad; and I doubt this parallel is little better; and then the* ſhortneſs of time *is ſo far from being a commendation, that it is ſcarcely an excuſe.*

(39) Pag. 4. 2d edit. London 1716.

(40) Ibid. pag. 60.

[*BB*] *His* Tranſlation of Virgil's Works.] It was attacked with great ſeverity by the Reverend Mr. Luke Milbourn in a piece printed at London 1698 in 8vo; but " he did Mr. Dryden juſtice, in printing at the " ſame time his own Tranſlations of him, which were " intolerable (41)." Dr. Henry Felton tells us (42), that if our Author has failed in ſome parts of his Tranſlation of *Virgil*, " we may in part aſcribe it to " his uſing, as it is ſaid, ſome French and foreign " aſſiſtance, and partly to ſome defects of our language, " for he was an abſolute maſter of its whole reach and " compaſs; but chiefly to the inimitable perfections " and elegance of the Author, who hath weighed and " choſen every word, that is moſt beautiful and ſig- " nificant, and beſt adapted to the purpoſe it is uſed for. " Virgil is not only the greateſt and correcteſt of the " Roman Poets, but of the Roman Writers; and as " he is numerous, various, and rich in his verſe and " expreſſions, his expreſſions are ſo full and abundant " with his ſenſe, his ſenſe is ſo crowded, and yet ſo " clear in the admirable choice of his words, that unleſs " the Engliſh were equal to the Roman, and the " Tranſlator to the Poet, it is impoſſible but that the " natural diſadvantages of our Tongue muſt appear in " the Tranſlation. And yet, my Lord (43), give me " leave to ſay in commendation of Mr. Dryden, we " ſhall never ſee it better performed in the whole; and " thoſe who may excel him, where they obſerve he " hath failed, will fall below him in a thouſand inſtances " where he hath excelled." Mr. Gildon is of opinion (44), that this Tranſlation, *if we allow for the time Mr.* Dryden *did it in, is better done than any Poet in any other language has performed, and I am apt*, ſays he, *to believe than any one will do in our own.* Dr. Joſeph Trapp (45) having obſerved in general, that our Author's *writings have their dark as well as their bright ſide; and that what was ſaid of ſomebody elſe may be as well applied to him*, Ubi benè, nemo melius; ubi malè, nemo pejus; tells us, that with regard to his Tranſlation of the Æneis, " as he was the great " Refiner of our Engliſh Poetry, and the beſt Mar- " ſhaller of words, that our Nation had then at leaſt " produced; and all, who have followed him, are " extremely indebted to him, as ſuch; his verſificati- " on here, as every where elſe, is generally flowing " and harmonious, and beauties of all kinds are ſcat- " tered through the whole." *But then*, continues the Doctor, *beſides his often groſly miſtaking his Author's ſenſe; as a Tranſlator he is extremely licentious. Whatever he alledges to the contrary in his Preface, he makes no ſcruple of adding or retrenching, as his turn is beſt ſerved by either. In many places, where he ſhines moſt as a Poet, he is leaſt a Tranſlator; and where you moſt admire Mr.* Dryden, *you ſee the leaſt of* Virgil. *Then whereas my Lord* Roſcommon *lays down this juſt rule to be obſerved by a Tranſlator with regard to his Author,*

Fall as he falls, and as he riſes, riſe;

nothing being more abſurd than for thoſe two counterparts to be like a pair of ſcales, one mounting as the other ſinks; Mr. Dryden *frequently acts the contrary to this precept, at leaſt to the latter part of it. Where his Author ſoars, and towers in the air, he often grovels and flutters upon the ground. Inſtances of all theſe kinds are numerous*, Dr. Trapp produces ſome few; and with regard to Mr. Dryden's ſinking where Virgil moſt remarkably riſes, he makes this general remark (46); that " it is acknowledged by every body, that " the firſt ſix Books in the original are the beſt, and " the moſt perfect; but the laſt ſix in Mr. *Dryden's* " Tranſlation. Not that even in theſe *Virgil* properly " ſinks or flags in his genius, but only he did not " live to correct them, as he did the former. However " they abound with beauties in the original; and they " have many indeed in the Tranſlation; more, as I " ſaid, than in the firſt ſix; which is viſible to any " one that reads the work with application."

(43) Dr. Felton's *Diſſertation* is addreſs'd to the preſent Duke of Rutland.

(44) *Laws of Poetry*, pag. 303.

(45) Preface to the *Æneis*, pag. 83. See *the Works of Virgil tranſlated into Engliſh Blank Verſe with large explanatory Notes and critical Obſervations. By* Joſeph Trapp, *D. D. late Fellow of Wadham College, and Profeſſor of Poetry in the Univerſity of Oxford*, vol. 1. 2d edit. London 1735, in 12mo.

(46) Ibid. pag. 89.

(41) *The Dunciad with Notes* Variorum, *and the* Prolegomena *of Scriblerus.* In the Remark on ver. 325. B. 2. pag. 166. edit. London in 12mo.

(42) *Diſſertation on reading the Claſſics, and forming a juſt Style.* pag. 128, 129, 130. 4th edit. London 1730.

[*CC*] *Interred in Weſtminſter-Abbey.*] A very remarkable ſtory concerning his funeral, is related in the *Memoirs of the Life of* Mr. Congreve (47); in which we are informed, that Mr. Dryden dying on the Wedneſday morning, Dr. Thomas Spratt then Biſhop of Rocheſter, and Dean of Weſtminſter, ſent the next day to the Lady Elizabeth Howard, Mr. Dryden's Widow, that he would make a preſent of the ground, which was 40 pound, with all the other Abbey Fees. The Lord Halliſax likewiſe ſent to the Lady Elizabeth, and Mr. Charles Dryden her ſon, that

(47) *Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Amours of* William Congreve *Eſq; Interſperſed with miſcellaneous Eſſays &c. Compiled from their reſpective Originals by* Charles Wilſon *Eſq;* Part 2. pag. 3, *& ſeqq.* edit. London 1730, in 8vo.

where a monument is erected to him by John late Duke of Buckinghamshire. He married the Lady Elizabeth Howard, daughter of the Earl of Berkshire, and sister to Sir Robert Howard, Colonel Philip Howard, and Edward Howard Esq; Author of the *British Princes*. She survived Mr. Dryden about eight years. He had by this Lady three sons, *Charles*, *John*, and *Henry*; the last of whom entered into a religious Order. *Charles* was Usher of the palace to Pope Clement XI, and upon his return to England, left his brother *John* to officiate in his room, and was drowned in swimming cross the Thames near Windsor in 1704. He wrote several pieces, and translated the sixth Satyr of Juvenal. His brother John translated the 14th Satyr of Juvenal, and was Author of a Comedy intitled, *The Husband his own Cuckold*, printed at London 1696. He died at Rome not many months after his father. Mr. Dryden's *Ode on St. Cecilia's Day* is perhaps one of the most perfect pieces in any language [*DD*]; and he observes in an original

that if they would give him leave to bury Mr. Dryden, he would inter him with a Gentleman's private funeral, and afterwards bestow 500 pound on a monument in the Abbey; which, as they had no reason to refuse, they accepted. On the Saturday following the company came, the Corps was put into a Velvet Hearse, and eighteen Mourning Coaches filled with company attended. When they were just ready to move, the Lord Jefferies, Son of the Lord Chancellor Jefferies, with some of his rakish companions coming by, asked whose funeral it was? and being told Mr. Dryden's, he said; "What shall Dryden, the greatest honour "and ornament of the nation be buried after this "private manner? No, Gentlemen, let all that loved "Mr. Dryden, and honour his memory, alight and "join with me in gaining my Lady's consent, to let "me have the honour of his interment, which shall "be after another manner than this; and I will "bestow a thousand pounds on a monument in the "Abbey for him." The Gentlemen in the coaches not knowing of the Bishop of Rochester's favour, nor of the Lord Hallifax's generous design, (they both having, out of respect to the family, enjoined the Lady Elizabeth and her son to keep their favour concealed to the world, and let it pass for their own expence;) readily came out of the coaches, and attended Lord Jefferies up to the Lady's bed-side; who was then sick: he repeated the purport of what he had before said; but she absolutely refusing, he fell on his knees, vowing never to rise till his request was granted. The rest of the company by his desire kneeled also; and the Lady being under a sudden surprize fainted away. As soon as she recovered her speech she cryed *No, No.* "Enough Gentlemen, *replied he*; my Lady is very "good, she says *Go, Go.*" She repeated her former words with all her strength, but in vain; for her feeble voice was lost in their acclamations of joy; and the Lord Jefferies ordered the Hearsemen to carry the corps to Mr. Russel's an Undertaker's in Cheapside and leave it there till he should send orders for the embalment, which he added, *should be after the royal manner.* His directions were obeyed, the company dispersed, and Lady Elizabeth and her son remained inconsolable. The next day Mr. Charles Dryden waited on the Lord Hallifax and the Bishop, to excuse his mother and himself by relating the real truth. But neither his Lordship nor the Bishop would admit of any plea; especially the latter, who had the Abbey lighted, the Ground opened, the Choir attending, an Anthem ready set, and himself waiting for some hours without any corps to bury. The Undertaker, after three days expectance of orders for embalment, without receiving any, waited on the Lord Jefferies, who pretending ignorance of the matter turned it off with an ill-natured jest, saying, "that those who observed the "orders of a drunken frolick, deserved no better; "that he remembered nothing at all of it; and that "he might do what he pleased with the corps." Upon this, the Undertaker waited on the Lady Elizabeth and her son, and threatened to bring the corps home, and set it before the door. They desired a day's respite, which was granted. Mr. Charles Dryden wrote a handsome letter to the Lord Jefferies, who returned it with this cool answer, that *he knew nothing of the matter, and would be troubled no more about it.* He then addressed the Lord Hallifax and the Bishop of Rochester, who absolutely refused to do any thing in it. In this distress Dr. Garth sent for the corps to the College of Physicians, and proposed a funeral by subscription, to which himself set a most noble example. At last a day, about three weeks after Mr. Dryden's decease, was appointed for the interment. Dr. Garth pronounced a fine Latin Oration at the College, over the corps; which was attended to the Abbey by a numerous train of coaches. When the funeral was over, Mr. Charles Dryden sent a challenge to the Lord Jefferies, who refusing to answer it, he sent several others, and went often himself, but could neither get a letter delivered, nor admittance to speak to him; which so incensed him, that he resolved, since his Lordship refused to answer him like a Gentleman, that he would watch an opportunity to meet, and fight off hand, though with all the rules of honour; which his Lordship hearing, left the town: and Mr. Charles Dryden could never have the satisfaction of meeting him, though he fought it till his death with the utmost application. Mr. Dryden had no monument erected to him for several years; which Mr. Pope alludes to in his *Epitaph intended for Mr. Rowe*, where he says (48)

Beneath a rude and nameless stone he lies.

In the note upon which verse he tells us, that "the "Tomb of Mr. Dryden was erected upon this hint "by the Duke of Buckingham, to which was origi-"nally intended this Epitaph,

"*This* Sheffield *rais'd. The sacred Dust below*
"*Was* Dryden *once; the rest who does not know?*

"Which the Author since changed into the plain "inscription on it, being only the name of that great "Poet.

"J. Dryden.
"*Natus Aug.* 9, 1631.
"*Mortuus Maii* 1, 1701.
"*Johannes Sheffield, Dux Buckinghamiensis, fecit.*

Mr. Welsted, in his *Epistle to the late* Dr. Garth, *occasioned by the death of the Duke of* Marlborough (49), alludes to this monument in the following Lines;

From Joys of Paradise witheld too long,
A moment yet attend the ling'ring song,
While thy low'd Poet's marble I explore,
And the proud Fane, but half adorn'd before!
Without a tomb, 'till late, forgot he lay,
While the Muse mourn'd, and Ages wore away;
At length the Stone, so long delay'd, is rear'd;
An awful Image, and a Front rever'd!
No verse engrav'd, records at length his fame,
But Dryden's epitaph, is Dryden's name (50)

[*DD*] *His* Ode on St. Cecilia's Day *is perhaps one of the most perfect Pieces in any Language.*] Mr. Gildon having observed (51) "that one of the greatest obsta-"cles perhaps to the perfection of our songs, is the "slavish care or complaisance of the writers to make "their words to the gout of the Composer or Musi-"cian; being obliged often to sacrifice their sense to "certain sounding words, and feminine rhymes, or "the like, because they seem most adapted to furnish "the composer with such cadences which most easily "slide into their modern way of composition:" tells us, that of instances to the contrary, the most eminent is Mr. Dryden's *Ode* abovementioned; *admirable in its sense, and the most harmonious in its numbers of any thing in the English Tongue; numbers so harmonious, that had*

(48) *The Works of Alexander Pope Esq;* vol. 2. pag. 166. edit. London 1735, in 12mo.

(49) *Epistles, Odes, &c. written on several subjects: with a Dissertation concerning the Perfection of the English Language, the State of Poetry, &c. By Mr. Welsted.* pag. 43, & *seqq.* 2d edit. London 1725, in 12mo.

(50) Ibid. pag. 51.

(51) *Laws of Poetry*, pag. 83, 84.

original Letter of his (o) that he was almoſt a fortnight in compoſing and correcting it. It has been ſeveral times ſet to muſic, and particularly in the winter of the year 1735 by Mr. Handel, and publickly exhibited on the Theatre in Covent-Garden with great ſucceſs. Mr. Congreve, in the Dedication of our Poet's Dramatic Works to the Duke of Newcaſtle, has drawn his character to great advantage [*EE*]. Biſhop Burnet having ſtiled him *a Monſter of Immodeſty and Impurities of all ſorts* (p), occaſioned a reflection upon that paſſage by the late Lord Lanſdown, which was ſoon after anſwered by Tho. Burnet Eſq; [*FF*]. It is ſaid, that he had once a deſign of entering into holy Orders, but was refuſed; and

(o) Communicated by the very learned and ingenious *Richard Graham*, Jun. Eſq;

(p) *Hiſtory of his own Time*, vol. 1.

one of the antient Maſters been to compoſe it, it had been one of the moſt tranſporting and raviſhing pieces of Muſic, that had been ſeen in the world theſe thouſand years. Mr. Pope has the following beautiful lines on this Ode (52):

" Hear how *Timotheus*' vary'd Lays ſurprize,
" And bid alternate paſſions fall and riſe!
" While at each change, the ſon of Libyan Jove
" Now burns with Glory, and then melts with love,
" Now his fierce eyes with ſparkling fury glow,
" Now ſighs ſteal out, and tears begin to flow:
" Perſians and Greeks like turns of nature found,
" And the world's Victor ſtood ſubdu'd by ſound.
" The power of muſic all our hearts allow,
" And what *Timotheus* was, is *Dryden now*."

(52) *Eſſay on Criticiſm*, ver. 376, & ſeqq.

[*EE*] *Mr.* Congreve . . . . *has drawn his character to great advantage.*] He tells us, that Mr. Dryden had *perſonal qualities to challenge both love and eſteem from all who were truly acquainted with him. He was of a nature exceeding humane and compaſſionate, eaſily forgiving injuries, and capable of a prompt and ſincere reconciliation with them, who had offended him. Such temperament is the only ſolid foundation of all moral virtues and ſociable endowments. His friendſhip, where he profeſſed it, went much beyond his profeſſions; and I have been told of ſtrong and generous inſtances of it by perſons themſelves, who received them; tho' his hereditary income was little more than a bare competency. As his reading had been very extenſive, ſo was he very happy in a memory tenacious of every thing that he had read. He was not more poſſeſſed of knowledge, than he was communicative of it. But then his communication of it was by no means pedantic, or impoſed upon the converſation, but juſt ſuch, and went ſo far, as by the natural turns of the diſcourſe, in which he was engaged, it was neceſſarily promoted or required. He was extreme ready and gentle in his correction of the errors of any Writer, who thought fit to conſult him; and full as ready and patient to admit of the reprehenſion of others, in reſpect of his own overſight or miſtakes. He was of very eaſy, I may ſay, of very pleaſing acceſs. But ſomething ſlow, and as it were diffident in his advances to others. He had ſomething in his nature that abhorred intruſion into any Society whatſoever. Indeed it is to be regretted, that he was rather blameable in the other extream; for by that means he was perſonally leſs known, and conſequently his character might become liable both to miſapprehenſions and miſrepreſentations. To the beſt of my knowledge and obſervation, he was, of all men that ever I knew, one of the moſt modeſt, and the moſt eaſily to be diſcountenanced in his approaches either to his ſuperiors or his equals. . . .* " As to his writings, I may " venture to ſay in general terms, that no man hath " written in our language ſo much, and ſo various " matter, and in ſo various manners, ſo well. Another " thing I may ſay was very peculiar to him; which " is, that his parts did not decline with his years; " but that he was an improving Writer to the laſt, " even to near ſeventy years of age; improving even " in fire and imagination, as well as in judgment. " Witneſs his *Ode on St. Cecilia's Day*, and his *Fables*, " his lateſt performances. He was equally excellent " in verſe and in proſe. His proſe had all the clear- " neſs imaginable, together with all the nobleneſs of " expreſſion, all the graces and ornaments proper and " peculiar to it, without deviating into the language " or diction of Poetry. I make this obſervation only to " diſtinguiſh his ſtyle from that of many poetical Wri- " ters, who meaning to write harmoniouſly in proſe, " do in truth often write mere blank verſe. I have " heard him frequently own with pleaſure, that if he " had any talent for Engliſh Proſe, it was owing to " his having often read the writings of the great Arch- " biſhop *Tillotſon*. His Verſification and his Numbers " he could learn of nobody; for he firſt poſſeſſed " thoſe talents in perfection in our Tongue. And " they who have beſt ſucceeded in them ſince his time, " have been indebted to his example; and the more " they have been able to imitate him, the better have " they ſucceeded. As his ſtyle in proſe is always " ſpecifically different from his ſtyle in Poetry; ſo on " the other hand in his Poems his diction is, where- " ever his ſubject requires it, ſo ſublimely and ſo " truly poetical, that its eſſence, like that of pure " gold, cannot be deſtroyed. Take his Verſes, and " diveſt them of their rhimes, diſjoint them in their " numbers, tranſpoſe their expreſſions, make what " arrangement and diſpoſition you pleaſe of his words; " yet ſhall there eternally be poetry, and ſomething " which will be found incapable of being reſolved in- " to abſolute proſe: an inconteſtable characteriſtick of " a truly poetical genius. I will ſay but one word more " in general of his writings, which is, that what he " had done in any one ſpecies or diſtinct kind, would " have been ſufficient to have acquired him a great " name. If he had written nothing but his *Prefaces*, " or nothing but his *Songs*, or his *Prologues*, each of " them would have entitled him to the preference and " diſtinction of excelling in his kind." Mr. Congreve had for many years reſolved to vindicate the character of our Author, as appears from the following paſſage in a Letter of Mr. Pope to Mr. Wycherley, dated December 26th 1704 (53): *It was certainly a great ſatisfaction to me to ſee and converſe with a man, whom in his writings I had ſo long known with pleaſure. But it was a high addition to it, to hear you at our very firſt meeting doing juſtice to your dead friend Mr.* Dryden. *I was not ſo happy as to know him*; Virgilium tantum vidi. *Had I been born early enough, I muſt have known and loved him. For I have been aſſured, not only by yourſelf, but by Mr.* Congreve, *and Sir* William Trumball, *that his perſonal qualities were as amiable as his poetical, notwithſtanding the many libellous miſrepreſentations of them; againſt which the former of theſe Gentlemen has told me he will one day vindicate him. I ſuppoſe thoſe injuries were begun by the violence of party; but 'tis no doubt they were continued by envy at his ſucceſs and fame. And thoſe ſcribblers, who attacked him in his latter times, were only like gnats in a ſummer's evening, which are never very troubleſome, but in the fineſt and moſt glorious ſeaſon; for his fire, like the Sun's, ſhined cleareſt towards its ſetting.*

(53) *Letters of Mr. Pope and ſeveral eminent Perſons from the year* 1705 *to* 1735, vol. 1. pag. 9, 10. edit. London 1735, in 12mo.

[*FF*] *Occaſioned a reflection upon that paſſage by the late Lord* Lanſdown, *which was ſoon after anſwered by* Thomas Burnet *Eſq;*.] " Why, *ſays his Lordſhip* (54), " is Mr. *Dryden* ſtigmatized as a Monſter of *Immodeſty*, " and *Impurities* of all ſorts? He was ſo much a " ſtranger to *Immodeſty*, that *Modeſty* in too great a " degree was his failing. *A Monſter of Impurities of* " *all ſorts?* Good God! what an idea muſt that give? " Is there any wickedneſs under the Sun, but what is " comprized in thoſe few words? But as it happens, " he was the reverſe of all this, a man of regular life " and converſation, as all his acquaintaintance can " vouch. And I cannot but grieve that ſuch raſh expreſ- " ſions ſhould eſcape from a Biſhop's pen. If bearing " falſe witneſs againſt one's neighbour is a breach of the " commandment, can there be a more flagrant one than " this?" Then follows an honourable account of Mr. Dryden's Birth, Parentage, Alliance, and Behaviour; and my Lord Lanſdowne concludes with obſerving, that *his writings will do immortal honour to his name and country, and his Poems laſt as long as the Biſhop's Sermons, ſuppoſing them equally excellent in their kind.* Mr. Burnet, the Biſhop's ſon, replies to this paſſage of Lord

(54) Letter to the Author of the *Reflections Hiſtorical and Political &c.* pag. 5, 6.

and that he follicited for the Provoſtſhip of Eaton-College, in which he likewiſe failed [GG]. A great number of his pieces are publiſhed in the ſix volumes of *Miſcellany Poems* [HH]. It appears from the Dedication of his *Aureng-Zebe* to the Earl of Mulgrave, that he had

(54) *Remarks upon the Right Honourable the Lord Lanſdowne's Letter to the Author of the* Reflections &c. *as far as it relates to Biſhop Burnet*, edit. London 1732 in 4to, pag. 25, 26, 27.

(55) Pag. 26.

Lord Lanſdowne (54), and obſerves, that the Biſhop's *own words*, and *one matter of fact* avowed from Mr. Dryden's own pen, will decide the point. "The "Stage, *ſays the Biſhop*, was defiled beyond all example, "Dryden the great Maſter of Dramatic Poeſy, being "a monſter of immodeſty and impurities of all ſorts." *This*, ſays Mr. Burnet (55), *is all that is ſaid of Mr.* Dryden *throughout the whole Hiſtory. And is it not evident, firſt that* Immodeſty *is not here oppoſed to* Modeſty, *but chaſtneſs; and that this expreſſion as well as that of* Impurities of all ſorts *(which perhaps a Writer more accurate in his ſtyle would have termed* obſcenities) *can only be meant of his* Dramatic Poeſy, *of which alone the Biſhop was ſpeaking, by which alone the* Stage could be defiled. *His life and converſation, his parentage and alliance have nothing ſure to do with this. Are not* Dryden's Comedies *then full of* obſcenities, *of* immodeſty, *and* impurities? *Does not he in one of them introduce a whole* Bawdy-houſe *upon the* Stage; *or does it after that remain pure and undefiled? What does he himſelf ſay of his Play, called* Limberham or the Kind Keeper, *in his Dedication of it to my Lord Vaughan?* "How it would have ſucceeded, I can but "gueſs; for it was permitted to be acted only thrice. "The crime for which it ſuffered, was that which is "objected againſt the *Satyrs* of *Juvenal* and the *Epi-* "*grams* of *Catullus*, that it exprett too much of the vice "which it decry'd. Your Lordſhip knows what an- "ſwer was returned by the elder of theſe Poets, "whom I laſt mentioned, to his accuſers:

"*Caſtum eſſe decet pium Poetam*
"*Ipſum, Verſiculos nihil neceſſe eſt;*
"*Qui tunc denique habent ſalem at leporem,*
"*Si ſunt molliculi & parum pudici.*

"But I dare not make that apology for my ſelf; and "therefore have taken a becoming care, that thoſe "things, which *offended on the Stage*, might be either "altered or omitted in the preſs." *And yet where is the Clergyman, who would not merit his Lordſhip's eſteem inſtead of cenſure, for calling this very* printed Comedy, *thus reformed and garbled*, a Monſter of Immodeſty and Impurities of all Sorts? *And this, this only is Dr.* Burnet's *crime, for which he is to be unbiſhoped, unchriſtianed, and ſtigmatized as a* flagrant falſe witneſs againſt his neighbour.

[GG] *It is ſaid, that he had once a deſign of entering into holy Orders, but was refuſed; and ſollicited the Provoſtſhip of Eaton-College, in which he likewiſe failed.*] Mr. Thomas Browne, the ſuppoſed Author of *The late Converts expoſed: or the Reaſons of Mr.* Bays's *changing his Religion conſider'd, in a Dialogue.* Part the *ſecond*; has the following paſſage in the *Preface.* "But prithee why ſo ſevere always upon the Prieſt- "hood, Mr. *Bays?* . . . . You, I find, ſtill continue "your old humour, which we are to date from the "year of *Hegira*, the loſs of *Eaton*, or ſince *Orders* "were refuſed you." Mr. Langbaine likewiſe ſpeak-

(56) Pag. 171.

ing of our Author's *Spaniſh Fryar*, tells us (56), that "the truth is, ever ſince a certain worthy Biſhop *re-* "*fuſed Orders* to a certain Poet, Mr. Dryden has de- "clared open defiance againſt the whole Clergy; and "ſince the Church began the war, he has thought it "but juſtice to make reprifals on the Church."

[HH] *A great number of his pieces are publiſhed in the ſix volumes of* Miſcellany Poems.] In the 1ſt vol. I, *Mac Flecknoe*. II, Amaryllis, *or the third Idyllium of Theocritus paraphraſed*. III, *Tears of* Amynta *for the death of* Damon. IV, *Epilogue intended to have been ſpoken by the Lady* Hen. Maria Wentworth, *when* Caliſto *was acted at Court*. V, *A Prologue*. VI, *An Epilogue*. VII, *A Prologue to the King and Queen upon the Union of two Companies in the year* 1689. VIII, *An Epilogue on the ſame occaſion*. IX, *An Epilogue to* Conſtantine *the Great*. X, *A Prologue, ſpoken by Mr.* Betterton. XI, *An Epilogue*. XII, *The entire Epiſode of* Niſus *and* Euryalus. *Tranſlated from the fifth and ninth Book of* Virgil's Æneid's. XIII, Theocritus's *Idyllium the XVIII. The Epithalamium of* Helen *and* Menelaus. XIV, *Idyllium the XXIII. The Deſpairing Lover*. XV, Horace, Ode 3. Lib. 1. *Inſcribed to the Earl of* Roſcommon *on his intended Voyage to Ireland*. XVI, *The fourth and ninth Eclogues of* Virgil *tranſlated into Engliſh*. In the *ſecond* Volume are the following pieces. XVII, *The entire Epiſode of* Mezentius *and* Lauſus, *out of the tenth Book of* Virgil's *Æneids, tranſlated into Engliſh*. XVIII, *The Speech of* Venus *to* Vulcan, *tranſlated out of the eighth Book of* Virgil's *Æneids*. XIX, *The Beginning of the firſt Book of* Lucretius, *tranſlated into Engliſh*. XX, *The Beginning of the ſecond Book of* Lucretius, *tranſlated into Engliſh*. XXI, *Tranſlation of the latter part of the third Book of* Lucretius, *againſt the Fear of Death*. XXII, *The fourth Book of* Lucretius, *concerning the Nature of Love, tranſlated into Engliſh*. XXIII. *Tranſlation from the fifth Book of* Lucretius. XXIV, Daphnis. *From* Theocritus *Idyllium XXVII*. XXV, Horace Lib. 1. Ode 9. *tranſlated into Engliſh*. XXVI, Horace, Ode 29. Book 3. *paraphraſed into Pindarique Verſe, and inſcribed to the Right Honourable* Laurence *Earl of Rocheſter*. XXVII, *From* Horace, *Epod.* 2. XXVIII, *A Song*. XXIX, *A Letter from Mr.* Dryden *to Sir* George Etheridge. XXX, *Prologue to the Univerſity of Oxford, ſpoken by Mr.* Hart, *at the acting of the* Silent Woman. XXXI, *Epilogue to the ſame*. XXXII, *Prologue to the Univerſity of* Oxford, 1674. *Spoken by Mr.* Hart. XXXIII, *Epilogue, ſpoken at Oxford by Mrs.* Marſhall. XXXIV, *Prologue to the Univerſity of* Oxford. XXXV, *The Prologue at* Oxford, 1680. XXXVI, *The Prologue to* Albumazar. XXXVII. *Prologue to* Avirogus *reviv'd. Spoken by Mr.* Hart. XXXVIII, *Prologue ſpoken the firſt day of the King's Houſe acting after the Fire*. XXXIX, *Prologue for the women, when they acted at the Old Theatre in* Lincoln's-Inn-Fields. XL, *A Prologue ſpoken at the opening of the New Houſe, March* 26*th* 1674. XLI, *Epilogue upon the ſame occaſion*. XLII, *An Epilogue*. XLIII, *An Epilogue for the King's Houſe*. XLIV, *Prologue to the* Princeſs of Cleves. XLV, *Epilogue to the ſame*. XLVI, *Prologue to his Royal Highneſs upon his firſt Appearance at the Duke's Theatre, ſince his return from Scotland*, 1682. In the *third* Volume are the following pieces. XLVII, *The laſt parting of* Hector *and* Andromache; *from the ſixth Book of* Homer's *Iliads. Tranſlated from the original*. XLVIII, Threnodia Auguſtalis; *a funeral Pindaric Poem ſacred to the happy Memory of King* Charles II. In the *fourth* Volume are the following. XLIX, *To Sir* Godfrey Kneller, *principal Painter to his Majeſty*. L, *The Art of Poetry: written in French by the Sieur de* Boileau. *Made Engliſh by Sir* William Soame. *Bar. And reviſed and altered by Mr.* John Dryden. In the *Advertiſement* prefixed to it we are informed, that this Tranſlation of Monſr. *Boileau's Art of Poetry* was made in the year 1680 by Sir *William Soame* of Suffolk Bart.; who being intimately acquainted with Mr. *Dryden*, deſired his Reviſal of it. Mr. *Dryden* made very conſiderable alterations in it, particularly in the beginning of the fourth *Canto*; and it being his opinion, that it would be better to apply the Poem to Engliſh Writers, than keep to the French names, as it was firſt tranſlated, Sir *William* deſired he would take the pains to make that alteration; and accordingly that was entirely done by Mr. *Dryden*. This Poem was firſt publiſhed in 1683. Sir *William* was afterwards ſent Embaſſador to Conſtantinople in the reign of King James II, but died in the voyage. LI, *Prologue to the* Propheteſs; *ſpoken by Mr.* Betterton. LII, *To my honoured Friend* Sir Robert Howard *on his excellent Poems. By Mr.* John Dryden. LIII, *To the Lady* Caſtlemain, *upon her encouraging his firſt Play*. In the *fifth* Volume are the following pieces. LIV, *On the Death of* Amyntas: *a paſtoral Elogy*. LV, *On the Death of a very young Gentleman*. LVI, *To my honoured Friend Dr.* Charleton *on his learned and uſeful Works; but more particularly his Treatiſe of* Stone-Heng, *by him reſtored to the true friends*. VII, *Upon the Death of the Earl of* Dundee. LVIII, *The Lady's Song*. LIX, *Upon young Mr.* Rogers *of* Glouceſterſhire. LX, *To* Henry Higden Eſq; *on his Tranſlation of the*

had formed a plan for an Heroic Poem [*II*]. The Author of the *Spectator* Num. 341 (*q*) obſerves, "that if he was not the beſt Writer of Tragedies in his time, he was allowed "by every one to have the happieſt turn for a Prologue or an Epilogue." He has been charged with engaging Mr. Creech in his Tranſlation of Horace, (in which that Gentleman had very ill ſucceſs) out of jealouſy of his riſing reputation [*KK*]. Beſides the Works already mentioned, he wrote the *Life of Lucian*, and that of *Plutarch* prefixed to the Tranſlations of thoſe Authors by ſeveral hands; the *Life of Polybius*, publiſhed before Sir Henry Sheer's Tranſlation of that Hiſtorian; the *Preface* to *A Dialogue concerning women, being a defence of the ſex*, written by William Walſh Eſq; and printed at London 1691 in 8vo. He tranſlated alſo Maimbourg's *Hiſtory of the League*. Dr. Henry Felton (*r*) obſerves, that our Author "at once gave the beſt rules, and broke them in ſpite "of his own knowledge, and the *Rehearſal*. His prefaces are many of them admirable upon "Dramatic Writings; he had ſome peculiar notions, which he maintains with great addreſs; "but his judgment in diſputed points is of leſs weight and value, becauſe the inconſtancy of his temper did run into his thoughts, and mixed with the conduct of his "writings, as well as his life." Monſieur de Voltaire ſtyles (*s*) him "a Writer whoſe "genius was too exuberant, and not accompanied with judgment enough;" and tells us, that *if he had writ only a tenth part of the works he left behind him, his character would have been conſpicuous in every part; but his great fault is his having endeavoured to be univerſal.* Mr. Dennis among his *Letters* (*t*) has one (*u*) on *the Conſpiracy againſt the Reputation of Mr. Dryden*; in which he tells us, that he "infinitely eſteemed him for the ſolidity of his "thought, for the ſpring, the warmth, and the beautiful turn of it; for the power, and "variety, and fulneſs of his harmony; for the purity, the perſpicuity, the energy of "his expreſſion, and (whenever the following great qualities are required) for the pomp, "and ſolemnity, and majeſty of his ſtyle."

(*q*) Vol. 5. pag. 86. edit. London 1713, in 12mo.

(*r*) *Diſſertation on reading the Claſſics, and forming a juſt ſtyle, written in the year* 1709. Preface, pag. 17, 18. 4th edit. 1730.

(*s*) *Letters concerning the Engliſh Nation*, Letter XVIII.

(*t*) *Original Letters familiar, moral and critical. By Mr. Dennis*, vol. 2. pag. 289, & *ſeqq.* edit. London 1721, in 8vo.

(*u*) It is dated June 4, 1715.

10th *Satyr of* Juvenal. LXI, *A Song*. LXII, *A Song*. LXIII, *An Epitaph on the Lady* Whitmore. LXIV, *An Epitaph on Sir* Palmes Fairborne's *Tomb in* Weſtminſter-Abbey. LXV, Eleonora: *A Panegyrical Poem, dedicated to the Memory of the late Counteſs of* Abingdon. LXVI, *Rondelay*. LXVII, *To the pious Memory of the accompliſh'd young Lady, Mrs.* Anne Killigrew, *excellent in the two Siſter Arts of Poeſie and Painting. An Ode*. LXVIII, Veni Creator Spiritus, *tranſlated in paraphraſe*. LXIX, *Song to a fair young Lady going out of town in the ſpring*. LXX, *To the Ducheſs on her Return from Scotland in the year* 1682. LXXI, *To his dear Friend Mr.* Congreve *on his Comedy call'd,* The Double Dealer. LXXII, *To the Earl of* Roſcommon, *on his excellent* Eſſay on Tranſlated Verſe. LXXIII, *Prologue to the Univerſity of* Oxford, 1681. LXXIV, *A Prologue*. In the *ſixth* Volume are the following pieces. LXXV, *A Familiar Epiſtle to Mr.* Julian, *Secretary to the Muſes*. LXXVI, *Upon Mr.* Milton's *Picture, before his* Paradiſe loſt.

[*II*] *It appears from the Dedication of his Aureng-Zebe to the Earl of Mulgrave, that he had formed a plan for an Heroic Poem.*] We ſhall give the paſſage, wherein he mentions it, at length. "The truth is, "the conſideration of ſo vain a creature as man is "not worth our pains. I have fool enough at home "without looking for it abroad; and am a ſufficient "theater to myſelf of ridiculous actions, without ex"pecting company, either in a court, a town, or "play-houſe. It is on this account I am weary with "drawing the deformities of life, and Lazars of the "people, where every figure of imperfection more "reſembles me than it can do others. If I muſt "be condemned to rhyme, I ſhould find ſome eaſe "in my change of puniſhment. I deſire to be no "longer the *Siſyphus* of the ſtage, to rowl up a ſtone "with endleſs labour, (which, to follow the Proverb, "gathers no moſs,) and which is perpetually falling "down again. I never thought myſelf very fit for an "employment, where many of my Predeceſſors have "excelled me in all kinds; and ſome of my con"temporaries, even in my own partial judgment, "have outdone me in *Comedy*. Some little hopes I "have yet remaining, and thoſe too, conſidering my "abilities, may be vain, that I may make the world "ſome part of amends for many ill Plays by an He"roic Poem. Your Lordſhip has been long acquaint"ed with my deſign; the ſubject of which you know "is great, the ſtory *Engliſh*, and neither too far diſ"tant from the preſent age, nor too near approach"ing it. Such it is in my opinion, that I could not "have wiſhed a nobler occaſion to do honour by it "to my King, my country, and my friends; moſt "of our ancient Nobility being concerned in the ac"tion. And your Lordſhip has one particular rea"ſon to promote this undertaking, becauſe you were "the firſt who gave me the opportunity of diſcourſing "it to his Majeſty and his Royal Highneſs. They "were then pleaſed both to commend the deſign, and "to encourage it by their commands. But the un"ſettledneſs of my condition has hitherto put a ſtop "to my thoughts concerning it. As I am no ſucceſ"ſor to *Homer* in his wit, ſo neither do I deſire to "be in his poverty. I can make no Rhapſodies, "nor go a begging at the Grecian doors, while I "ſing the praiſes of their anceſtors. The times of "Virgil pleaſe me better, becauſe he had an *Auguſ"tus* for his Patron. And to draw the allegory nearer "you, I am ſure I ſhall not want a Mecænas with "him. It is for your Lordſhip to ſtir up that remem"brance in his Majeſty, which his many avocations "of buſineſs have cauſed him, I fear to lay aſide. "And (as himſelf and his Royal Brother are the "Heroes of the Poem) to repreſent to them the "images of their warlike predeceſſors; as *Achilles* is "ſaid to be rouſed to glory with the ſight of the "combat before the ſhips. For my own part, I am "ſatisfied to have offered the deſign, and it may be "to the advantage of my reputation to have it re"jected."

[*KK*] *He has been charged with engaging Mr.* Creech *in his tranſlation of Horace, (in which that Gentleman had very ill ſucceſs,) out of jealouſy of his riſing reputation.*] Mr. Dryden is ſaid to have written a copy of verſes to Mr. Creech prefixed to the tranſlation of Lucretius by the latter, in which he adviſed him to tranſlate Horace. But Mr. Gildon obſerves (57), that thoſe verſes were not written by Mr. Dryden, but by a Right Reverend Prelate, *whom*, ſays Mr. Gildon, *I ſhall not name, though dead, becauſe he thought fit to conceal his name, when alive. In the next place, there is no impartial judge (let Mr.* Creech's *reputation be what it will for his tranſlation of* Lucretius,) *who can believe that Mr.* Dryden *had the leaſt cauſe to be apprehenſive of Mr.* Creech's *growing applauſe, when he has given us his tranſlation of ſeveral parts of that Latin Poet ſo much beyond what Mr.* Creech *has done*. T.

(57) *Laws of Poetry*, pag. 319, 320.

DUAREN (FRANCIS) Profeſſor of Civil Law at Bourges in the ſixteenth Century, was of St. Brien, a City of Bretagne. He was the firſt of the French Civilians, who cleared the Civil Law Chair from the barbariſm of the Gloſſators, in order to introduce the pure ſources of the antient juriſprudence. As he was deſirous not to ſhare this honour

nour with any perſon, he viewed with an envious eye the reputation of his collegue Eguinard Baron, who blended likewiſe polite Literature with the ſtudy of the Law. This jealouſy prompted him to write a book, in which he endeavoured to leſſen the eſteem which the world had for his collegue (*a*) [*A*]. We find the maxim, *Paſcitur in vivis livor, poſt fata quieſcit*, verified in him; for after the death of Baron he ſhewed himſelf one of the moſt zealous to immortalize his memory, and erected a monument in honour of the deceaſed at his own expence (*b*). He had other collegues, who revived his uneaſineſs. He could not ſee without regret, that the reputation of Baudouin, who was younger than he, roſe to a great height (*c*); and after he was delivered from that thorn, he perceived, that Cujas, who ſucceeded that dangerous rival (*d*), had ſtill greater merit. He did not at all love this new comer, and there aroſe between them ſuch conteſts, that the conſequences of them might have occaſioned great diſorders in the Univerſity of Bourges, if Cujas had not left the field and retired to Valence, in order to teach Civil Law there (*e*). Duaren died in 1559 at the age of fifty years, without having ever married (*f*). You will find in Moreri many particulars, which I have omitted to avoid repetition; but it will be neceſſary that I ſhould explain, better than he has done, what relates to Duaren's want of memory [*B*]. He has ſaid nothing of a remarkable incident, which I ſhall not paſs over in ſilence; it is, that Duaren was a Proteſtant, and that he never had the courage to ſeparate from the Church of Rome. Baudouin treated him as a Nicodemite and Prevaricator [*C*], and reproached him with being a plagiary from Calvin.

(*a*) *Ex* Sammarthano, *in Elogiis*, lib. 1. pag. m. 38.

(*b*) *Poſito ſua pecunia in ejus honorem monumento.* Sammarth. *in Elogiis*, lib. 1. pag. m. 38.

(*c*) Papyr. Maſſo, *Elog.* Part. 2. pag. 257.

(*d*) Bullart, *Academ. des Sciences*, tom. 1. pag. 228. See the Article BAUDOUIN Remark [*L*].

(*e*) Thuanus, *Hiſt.* lib. 23. pag. m. 471.

(*f*) Sammarth. *Elog.* lib. 8. pag. 38.

[*A*] *He wrote a Work, in which he endeavoured to leſſen the reputation of his Collegue.*] This deſign has been expreſſed in very ſtrong terms by Sammarthanus. *Hominum opinioni de Baronis doctrina conceptæ nonnihil detrahere conatus eſt, edita in eum de juriſdictione & imperio apologia malevoli animi teſte in poſterum futura* (1). i. e. "He endeavoured to detract a little "from the opinion, which mankind had entertained "of the learning of Baron, having publiſhed againſt "him an apology concerning juriſdiction and empire; "which will be a witneſs of his malevolent diſpoſition "to poſterity." I ſought for this treatiſe among Duaren's Works, and have been ſurprized to find it ſo ſhort (2), that it does not quite fill five pages; but it appears from the preamble that the Author had reduced his apology to what is called *Summa Capita*; and that he had ſuppreſſed the reſt in order to ſhew ſome kind of complaiſance to Baron. He addreſſes this Abridgment to him, and dates it January the 1ſt 1549. He obſerves, that the Apology had been printed without his knowledge the year before, under the name of *Ambroſius Lætus*. Monſr. Teiſſier divides this Work into two; he diſtinguiſhes the Treatiſe *de Juriſdictione & Imperio* from the *Apologia adverſus Eguinarium Baronem*.

(1) Sammarth. *Elog.* lib. 1. pag. m. 38.

(2) In the edition of Geneva 1608, in fol.

[*B*] *It will be neceſſary, that I ſhould explain better than Moreri has done, what relates to Duaren's want of memory.*] Moreri tells us, that *Francis Duaren was obliged to read the Speeches which he made; that this want of memory prevented him from communicating to the* learned men of Germany *his knowledge in the Civil Law, which was the reaſon that they loſt ſome part of the eſteem, which they had entertained of him.* He ſhould have ſaid, that Duaren not having a very good memory, he never recited his lectures by heart, but read them from his papers; ſo that when he travelled in Germany without his collections, he never would venture to go up into the pulpit. He was requeſted to do ſo in divers places; his refuſal led ſeveral ignorant perſons, and incompetent judges of things, to doubt of his capacity. *Erat Duarenus acerrimo quidem judicio, ſed memoria minus felici, neque unquam niſi ex ſcripto prælegebat. Quo factum eſt ut in Germanico itinere cùm paſſim à doctiſſimis viris ad prælegendum provocaretur, nec eorum utique deſideriis obtemperare (quòd à ſuis commentariis deſtitutus omninò ſibi diffideret) à nonnullis rerum imperitis & iniquè judicantibus habitus ſit indoctior* (4). i. e. "Duaren had an excellent "judgment, but a bad memory, upon which account "he always read his lectures from his notes. And "therefore in his travels in Germany, when he was "frequently importuned by learned men to give them "ſome lectures, and was not able to gratify their "deſire, (being diffident, becauſe he wanted his notes,) "he was accounted a man of little learning by ſome "ignorant and perverſe judges." This is the original, which Moreri endeavoured to tranſlate, and has ſpoiled in three places. He has put *Speeches* inſtead of *Lectures*; he has communicated his knowledge (5) in *the Civil Law*, inſtead of *reading Lectures in Civil Law*; he has applied to the learned what belonged only to the ignorant. Theſe were in effect none but the ignorant, who were capable of deſpiſing a famous Doctor upon pretence, that he did not mount the Pulpit, when he paſſed as a traveller thro' a place, where there was an Academy. Suſpect as much as you pleaſe, that he is diffident of his memory, and that it depends on the collections, which he has left in his cloſet; you cannot poſſibly conclude, if you know how to judge of things rightly, that he is not a man of abilities. Obſerve, that Sammarthanus inſinuates, that Duaren refuſed to mount the pulpit, not becauſe he would have been obliged to read, but becauſe not having his Papers, he was apprehenſive of not being able to draw up a Lecture, in which every thing would be exactly quoted. Moſt Profeſſors have their Notes under their eyes, when they read a Lecture: their office does not require them to do otherwiſe; and hence it is that the title of Reader in ſuch a ſcience is ſynonomous to that of Profeſſor. We muſt therefore believe, that the Profeſſors and Students of Germany would not have been ſurprized to ſee Duaren read. Thoſe then who judged amiſs of him, did not proceed upon this ſuppoſition, that his memory would not enable him to pronounce by heart a diſcourſe of an hour long, but that he had not memory enough to compoſe ſuch a diſcourſe without the aſſiſtance of his Papers. It ſignifies little whether he reads, or recites by heart; one is as good as the other. They are appointed to enlighten the underſtanding, and not to move the paſſions. If the queſtion was about preaching, the difference would be very conſiderable, and yet at preſent the greateſt part of the Engliſh Preachers read their Sermons to the people.

We may obſerve by the way, that modes change even in Univerſities. It was a general cuſtom in the XVIth Century for Profeſſors, who were ſtrangers, when they paſſed through a city, where there was an Academy, to be deſired to give public Lectures. This cuſtom, I think, is now diſcontinued. But among Miniſters, civility abſolutely requires thoſe of the place to offer the pulpit to ſtrangers. And hence it is, that a Miniſter never travels without carrying in his Portmanteau his beſt Sermons; for he knows well enough, that he ſhall be deſired to preach in other towns. Jokers call theſe Sermons *Pocket Piſtols*.

(3) See pag. 283. Part 2. of de Duaren's *Works*, edit. Aurel. Allobrog. 1608.

(4) Sammarth. *Elog.* lib. 1. pag. m. 38.

(5) One may communicate by writing; ſo that Moreri puts the genus for the ſpecies.

[*C*] *Duaren was a Proteſtant* (§ α) *Baudouin treated him as a Nicodemite and Prevaricator.*] Mr. Catherinot, the King's Advocate at Bourges, obſerves that in 1550 Duaren *publiſhed his Treatiſe of Benefices* (§ β), *in which he made himſelf ſuſpected of hereſy by his doctrines and raillery. It was inſerted in the* Index Expurgatorius *at Rome* (6). Baudouin having retired from Bourges, and making an open profeſſion of the Proteſtant Religion at Straſbourg, wrote againſt Duaren under the name of the Chriſtian Civilian (7), and reproach-him with being a Papiſt only in appearance, and oppoſing the Religion of his heart. Thoſe, who have not this Book, will find ſome extracts from it at the beginning of Theodore Beza's Anſwer to the railings

(6) Catherinot, *Calviniſme de Berri*, pag. 4.

(7) This book was printed at Strasburg in 1556.

Calvin [*D*]. There are very few who remark what I am going to relate. Duaren having quitted his office of Profeſſor, it was given to Baudouin, who three years after adviſed them to recall him, and reſigned to him the firſt place [*E*]. I ſhall mention ſome other particulars,

of Baudouin, who had deſcribed himſelf in the re-reproaches, which he caſt upon Duaren. We find in theſe extracts, that the Sorbonne obliged Duaren to recant. *Tu nos fortaſſe alio trahere vis auribus conſtrictos. Ecquonam? an ad tribunal Sorbonicum ubi palinodiam turpem & nefariam canere tuo exemplo & more nobis perſuadeas? Ignoſce, Duarene, non poſſumus, malumus (ut ille olim Philoxenus) ad Latumias.* i. e. " You would perhaps drag me by the ears to ſome " other quarter. But whither? To the Tribunal of " the Sorbonne, where you would perſuade us after " your example and cuſtom to make a ſhameful and " wicked Recantation? Pardon me, O Duaren; we " cannot do it; I had rather (as Philoxenus ſaid for- " merly) dig in a quarry." We ſhall ſee in the following remark the correſpondence, which he had with Calvin.

(8) Balduinus, fol. 112. *apud* Theodor. Bezam, pag. 199. tom. 2. Operum.

§ [α] Teiſſier, Tom. I. pag. 376 of his *Elogies*, laſt Edition, remarks from Catherinot, that in 1535 Duaren, and all the reſt of the Profeſſors at Bourges, to the number of eight, were ſuſpected of being Lutherans; and it is well known, that this ſuſpicion with regard to Duaren, particularly related to his Treatiſe *of Benefices*. But every body is not acquainted with another particular, which muſt neceſſarily have increaſed the ſuſpicion which Duaren had already given of his attachment to the Catholick Religion. Henry Stephens in the 38th chap. of his *Apology for Herodotus*, mentions certain ſcandalous Leonine Verſes, engraved on a free-ſtone table, which had been for a long time fixed with iron hooks over the poor's box, to a pillar of the Cathedral Church of Bourges; which table in 1566 had been ſome years before taken down, in order to remove that ſtone of offence from the eyes of the Lutherans. It was Duaren, who by his reiterated remonſtrances, at laſt prevailed to have the table removed and deſtroyed. The contents of it are to be ſeen in Hofman's *Fulmen brutum*, pag. 58 of the Leyden Edition enlarged (*), in 8vo, large paper, and in a bigger character than the Edition of Geneva, *Ex eodem genere* (*Traditionum*) ſays the Addition which follows immediately after the eight verſes in praiſe of the Agnus Dei, *illud eſt carmen impium, ac plane nefarium, quod non multis ante annis Biturigæ in ſummo Epiſcopali in tabula lapidea inciſum, & ad caput trunci ſive tigilli pauperum affixum erat: ſed* Franciſci Duareni *admonitu, qui tum in illa Academia Jus Civile profitebatur, exemptum ac diſturbatum eſt.*

(*) *Scaligerana*, under the word *Hotomanni Franco-Gallia.*

CRIT. REM.

§ [β] A miſtake: the licence for publiſhing of this treatiſe is dated November the 19th of the following year 1551.

CRIT. REM.

[*D*] *Reproached him with being a Plagiary from Calvin.*] Baudouin affirmed, that what is contained in Duaren's book relating to the Prieſthood, was taken out of Calvin's works. It is ſaid, that he made this remark merely to expoſe him to the rage of Perſecutors. Duaren was prodigiouſly enraged at this fraud; he complained by letter and word of mouth to Calvin, who pacified him. *In ea pugna quum veris armis deſtitui ſe videret Balduinus, ad illiberales inſidias deſcendit, & Duareno ex puræ orthodoxæ fidei approbatione invidiam conflando, carnificum furori eum objecit. Capitale, ut ſcitur, in Gallia erat, non tantùm doctrinæ noſtræ ſubſcribere, ſed libros etiam noſtros furtim legere. Bonus hic pietatis ſectator, dum oſtendere conatur Duarenum ex me didiciſſe, & ex meis libris eſſe mutuatum quicquid in libro De ſacerdotiis probè & ſincerè docuerat, non aliò ſpectavit quam ut furioſis Eccleſiæ hoſtibus gladium homini jugulando porrigeret. Si barbara hæc immanitas mihi diſplicuerit, nihil mirum: quin potius hoc uno ſtratagemate deteſtabilem ſe piis omnibus reddidit. Et tamen cùm de ea per litteras, & coràm conqueſtus eſt Duarenus, hominem ingenio, facundia, eruditioneque ſic inſtructum, ut in certamine longè futurus eſſet ſuperior, mitigavi* (10). i. e. " In that conteſt, when Baudouin found himſelf " deſtitute of a juſt defence, he had recourſe to a diſho- " nourable artifice; and by raiſing an odium againſt " Duaren on account of his approbation of the pure " and orthodox doctrine, expoſed him to the fury of " the Perſecutors. It is known to have been capital " in France, not only to ſubſcribe to our doctrine, but " likewiſe to read our books privately. This honeſt " Friend of Religion, while he endeavours to ſhew " that Duaren had learned from me, and borrowed " from my writings what he had rightly taught in " his book concerning the Prieſthood, had no other " view but to furniſh the furious enemies of the Church " with a ſword for the deſtruction of that gentleman. " It is no wonder, that this barbarity of his diſpleaſed " me; and by this ſtratagem he made himſelf deteſta- " ble to all pious men. However when Duaren com- " plained to me of it by letters, and in perſon; I ap- " peaſed him, who was ſo eminent for his genius, " eloquence and learning that he would have been " much ſuperior in the conteſt." Add to this a paſſage of his in the anſwer of Theodore Beza to the ſame Baudouin (10).

(9) Calvinus, *Reſponſ. ad Balduin.* pag. 368. *Tractat. Theol.*

(10) It is in pag. 231. of the 2d volume of *Beza's Works.*

[*E*] *Duaren having quitted his office of Profeſſor, it was given to Baudouin, who three years after adviſed them to recall him, and reſigned to him the firſt place.*] Here is my proof (11): *Certe tam habitus jam tunc fuit pro Juriſconſulto minime vulgari, ut non ſolum Gratianopolitani talem profeſſorem requirerent (tametſi quia iſtic* (12) *vixerat exiſtimationem ſuam minuiſſet) ſed & Bituriges eum accerſerunt ut Duareno qui tunc abdicarat ſuccederet.* i. e. " It is certain, that even " then he was eſteemed a Civilian ſo much above the " common rank, that he was not only deſired by the " city of Grenoble for their Profeſſor, (though he had " leſſened his reputation by living there) but likewiſe " was invited to Bourges to ſucceed Duaren, who had " reſigned his place." This relates to Baudouin in the year 1538. *Cum Barone conjunctiſſimus quamdiu is deinde vixit, hoc eſt, triennium docuit totum Jus Civile Balduinus .... mortuo Barone auctor fuit ut Duarenus revocaretur, atque ut illi redeunti ultro conceſſit priorem, in quo conſiſtere poterat, locum, ſic habuit toto quadriennio ſine ullius ſimultatis ſignificatione bonum collegam* (13). i. e. " Baudouin lived in the ſtricteſt friendſhip with Baron " as long as the latter lived; that is, for three years, " and taught Civil Law .... upon the death of Baron, " Duaren was recalled upon his ſollicitations, and " Baudouin yielded to him at his return the firſt place, " which he might have inſiſted upon; and found him " a good Collegue without the leaſt ſign of envy or " reſentment, for four years together." I omit the remainder of this paſſage, in which he owns, that at laſt there aroſe a conteſt between theſe two Profeſſors, after Baudouin was retired. I paſs over the contradiction which we meet with in the other ſide of the page: it is a very groſs one. *Neque vero dubito quin ſi nunc* Duarenus *viveret Balduinum tam complecteretur à vobis nunc vexatum, quam ob eo veſtratum partium ſuſpecto fuit interdum* ABALIENATUS (14). i. e. " I " do not doubt, but that if Duaren was living, he " would as cordially embrace Baudouin, now he is " perſecuted by you, as he was AVERSE to him, when " he ſuſpected him to be of your party." He had juſt ſaid, that while Baudouin taught at Bourges, he did not receive any marks of enmity from Duaren, and afterwards he owns that he had received ſome, becauſe he was ſuſpected of Calviniſm. Theſe ſuſpicions cannot relate to the time which followed Baudouin's departure; for he went to Geneva upon his leaving Bourges, and afterwards to Straſbourg, and declared himſelf openly of the Reformed Religion (15). They relate therefore to his ſtay at Bourges, during which, as he owns himſelf, he was greatly ſuſpected of favouring the Proteſtants. His contradiction then is manifeſt and inexcuſable. *Illud vere dicere poſſum Balduinum in ea urbe ſæpe veſtro nomine in periculum veniſſe dum vobis amicior eſſe credebatur, & erat fortaſſe quam eſſe debebat, neque certe aliud habebant illi quos laudas, inimici quod huic odioſe objectarent* (16). i. e. " I can truly affirm " this, that Baudouin was frequently in danger in " that city on your account, being ſuppoſed to be in- " clined

(11) *Reſponſ. ad Calvinum & Bezam pro Franciſco Balduino*, fol. 83. See other proofs in the following Remark.

(12) That is at Geneva.

(13) *Reſponſ. ad Calv. & Bezam*, folio 84.

(14) Ibid. folio 84 *verſo.*

(15) See his Article, Remark [*B*].

(16) *Reſponſio ad Calvinum & Bezam*, folio 83 *verſo.*

particulars, which will ſerve as a ſupplement to Moreri [*F*]. An edition of his works was

" clined to your party, as he was perhaps more than " he ſhould have been; and thoſe enemies which you " extoll, had nothing elſe to object againſt him." One of the paſſages which I have tranſcribed, diſcovers an error in the writer, who has made the elogium on Baudouin. *Reverjus Lutetiam* (Balduinus) ſays he (17), *magna jam quæſita fama accerſitur à Biturigibus ad docendi munus ſuſcipiendum futurus collega Baronis & Duareni Juriſconſultorum.* i. e. " Baudouin returning to " Paris, and having now raiſed himſelf a great repu- " tation, was invited to Bourges to be Profeſſor and " Collegue of Baron and Duaren the Civilians." This ſignifies that the Univerſity of Bourges ſent for Baudouin to be Collegue with Baron and Duaren. This is a palpable miſtake, for he was invited to the Chair which Duaren had quitted. We muſt not forget that Baudouin read Lectures in that Univerſity, before he received the Degree of Doctor. *Cum publice Juris civilis obſcuriores titulos interpretatus fuiſſet, incredibili omnium ſtudio Doctor eſt renunciatus voce Baronis* (18). i. e. " When he had publicly explained " the obſcure titles of the Civil Law, he was created " Doctor by Baron with univerſal applauſe." Now he received that Degree March 12th 1549 (19). It ſhould be ſaid therefore that he began his Lectures the year before; for he taught Civil Law at Bourges for ſeven years (20), and left that Univerſity in 1555. We muſt remark this, in order to correct an error relating to the time when Eguinaire Baron died. Some ſay that he died in 1556 (21). They are miſtaken; for he lived but three years after Baudouin became his Collegue. If Mr. Spondanus has rightly fixed his death on the 22d of Auguſt 1550 (22), we have new reaſon to conclude, that Baudouin entered on his Profeſſorſhip at Bourges in 1548. If he had entered on in it in January, there would be above two years and an half between his firſt Lecture and the death of Baron; and this is ſufficient to ſay that they were Collegues three years; for in ſuch books exact calculations are not regarded. It is certain, that Baron died September the 22d 1550, aged 55 years (23).

[*F*] *I ſhall mention ſome other particulars, which will ſerve as a ſupplement to Moreri.*] Francis Duaren was the ſon of John Duaren, who exerciſed a place of judicature in Bretagne. He ſucceeded him in that place, and performed the functions of it for ſome time. *Juriſdictioni ante annos quindecim in Celtica noſtra Britannia non omnino infeliciter præfui, eoque magiſtratu in quo patri jam ſeni ſucceſſeram vixdum adoleſcentiæ annos ingreſſus ita functus ſum ut &c* (24). i. e. " Fifteen " years ago I diſcharged an office of judicature in our " country of Bretagne, not without ſucceſs; and in " that poſt in which I ſucceeded my father, who was " advanced in years, when I was very young, I acted " in ſuch a manner, that &c." He read Lectures on the Pandects at Paris in 1536, and among other ſcholars he had three ſons of the learned Budeus (25). He was ſent for to Bourges in 1538 (26) to teach Civil Law, three years after Alciat was retired (27). He quitted his place in 1548, and went to Paris in order to frequent the Bar; for he was deſirous to join the practice to the theory of the Law. This he declares, in a letter written to Francis Baudouin who had ſucceeded him. *Cooptatum te in juris doctorum collegium & unum ex omnibus delectum cui nos velut emeriti lampadem curſu traderemus valde ita me Deus amet lætor* (28). i. e. " I proteſt, I ſincerely rejoice that " you are choſen into the College of the Civilians, and " ſelected from all the Candidates to ſucceed me, who " am worn out in the ſervice." This letter is dated January the 13th 1549; but we muſt remark that the year began then at Eaſter, ſo that in comparing that date with the letter which he wrote to Sebaſtian de l'Aubeſpine, we ſhall not find any contradiction in his calculations. He ſays in his letter to Francis Baudouin, that he had for two years frequented the Bar of the Parliament of Paris (29). He affirms in the other letter dated November the 4th 1550, that he had frequented it for three years: *In Baſilica Pariensi ad tres annos libenter verſatus ſum* (30). Theſe two dates relate to the ſame year 1550, if we begin the year at January. He was tired with the chicanery of the Court, and was very glad that the advantageous offers made him by the Ducheſs of Berri ſiſter of Henry II, gave him a favourable opportunity to retire from the bar, and to reſume with honour the employment at Bourges, which he had there. He returned to his Profeſſorſhip of Civil Law there in 1551. No Profeſſor except Alciat had ever ſo large a ſtipend in this Univerſity as our Duaren. *Decretum mihi eſt ex ærario publico ſtipendium annuum ad vicena milla ſeſtertiorum nummum, id eſt longe amplius & honorificentius (ſi unum Alciatum excipias) quam Juriſconſultus adhuc ullus habuiſſe in ea civitate dicatur* (31). Beſides this he was Maſter of the Requeſts to the Ducheſs of Berri (32). Obſerve that in his Letter to Sebaſtian de l'Aubeſpine dated Nov. the 24th 1550, he mentions the funeral of Eguinaire Baron, which was an authentic proof of the reſpect, which the ſcholars had for the memory of the deceaſed. Obſerve likewiſe, that in 1554 he had a ſtrong inclination to go to Valence, where he was offered a Profeſſorſhip of Civil Law. *Dum enitor, elaboro, contendo ut vobis morem geram cum bona hereæ meæ . . . venia . . . interim vobis hunc quaſi arrhabonem quendam propenſi mei in vos animi ac voluntatis mitto* (33). i. e. " While I uſe my utmoſt efforts to gratify your " requeſts with the good leave of my Miſtreſs. . . I " ſend you in the mean time a pledge of my ſin- " cere regard for you, and diſpoſition to ſerve you." Thus he ſpeaks in the dedication of a Book in 1554 to the Curators of the Univerſity of Valence.

I have only touched by the bye upon his averſion to the Chicanery of the Bar: but as he has given a very eloquent deſcription of it, I think my ſelf obliged to tranſcribe here part of his words (34). *In Baſilica Pariſienſi ad tres annos libenter verſatus ſum: tametſi (ut verum fateor) immodicos ac prope inexplicabiles litium amfractus, quibus illud forum præ cæteris abundat magis quam lites ipſas ac judicia, quibus humanum genus carere non poſſe videtur, perinvitus nec abſque ingenti faſtidio illic viderim. Vix enim credibile eſt quanta ibi hominum eorumque graviſſimorum & lectiſſimorum multitudo quàm minutis, ac puſillis in rebus quotidie occupata ſit. Ac ut de ampliſſimo purpuratorum Patrum ordine & conventu loquar, num tibi videntur pleraque eorum judicia, quæ ſtatis legitimiſque diebus ὡς ἐν τάξει palam eduntur, non dicam auguſto illo conceſſu, ſed infimo aliquo tribunali ſatis digna eſſe? Nam cum &c.* i. e. " For three years I thought proper to frequent the " Parliament of Paris; (tho' to ſpeak the truth) it " was with great reluctance and diſſatisfaction " that I ſaw the exceſſive and almoſt inextricable la- " byrinth of controverſies, which that Court abounds " in above all others, rather than the Law-Proceedings, " which ſeem as it were neceſſary to mankind. For " it is ſcarce credible how great a number of men " even of the beſt quality are daily engaged in the " moſt minute and trifling diſputes. And to ſpeak " of the moſt venerable order of the Senators, do " you think that moſt of their deciſions delivered on " ſtated days, are worthy, I will not ſay of that au- " guſt Aſſembly, but even of the meaneſt Tribunal? " For when &c." All this is full of good ſenſe. Thoſe auguſt Aſſemblies, which are ſtiled Parliaments, are too important for the inconſiderable cauſes, determined by them; and one cannot but regret a fine genius, who employs a great deal of time in preparing to plead a cauſe there. What muſt he ſtudy and examine? The Phraſes made uſe of by a Notary in a will or contract of marriage to expreſs the mind of a mean private perſon. I have heard a Counſellor of the Parliament of Mets obſerve, that this ſort of ſtudy is the more diſagreeable, as it does not in the leaſt improve the genius, or enlarge its ideas. Let us inſert here the Verſes of Monſr. Perrault concerning the diſadvantage of our advocates compared with thoſe of antiquity (35):

Je la voy s'applaudir de ſes grands Orateurs,
Je voy les Cicerons, je voy les Demoſthenes,
Ornemens eternels & de Rome & d'Athenes,
Dont le foudre éloquent me fait déja trembler,
Et qui de leurs grands Noms viennent nous accabler.
Qu'ils viennent, je le veux, mais que ſans avantage
Entre les combatans le terrain ſe partage;

Que

(17) Papyr. Maſſo, *Elog.* tom. 2. pag. 257.

(18) Idem, ibid.

(19) Catherinot, *Calviniſme de Berri*, pag. 4.

(20) Balduin, *Reſponſ. ad Calvin. & Bezam*, folio 86.

(21) Menage, *Remarques ſur la Vie de Pierre Ayrault*, pag. 157.

(22) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1550. num. 12.

(23) Mr. Pinſon de Riolles, *whom I have conſulted, informs me of this.*

(24) Franc. Duarenus, *Epiſt. ad Sebaſt. Albaſpinæum*, pag. m. 297. Part. 2. Oper. It is dated Novemb. 24, 1550.

(25) Gulielm. Budæus, *Epiſt. ad Jo. Duarenum.* It is amongſt Duaren's Works, pag. m. 300. Part 2.

(26) *Annus jam agitur nonus ex quo in hanc civitatem Juris docendi cauſa publice accitus ſum.* Duaren. *Præf.* Diſput. anniv. dated at Bourges in 1547.

(27) *Triennio poſt diſceſſum Alciati profiteri Jus civile hic cæpi.* Duarenus, *in* Orat. *recitata in cooptatione Buguerii*, pag. m. 305 Oper. Part 2. Obſerve that he is miſtaken in his calculation; for Alciat left Bourges in 1534.

(28) Idem, ibid. pag. me 297.

(29) *Studia jam biennium interміſſa.* Idem, pag. 294.

(30) Idem, *Epiſt. ad Sebaſt. Albaſpin.* pag. 297.

(31) Idem, ibid. pag. 298. See Remark [*B*] of the Article BAUDOUIN.

(32) Idem, ibid.

(33) Duaren. *Epiſt. Dedicat. Comment. in Titul. de Verborum Obligationibus.* It is in the beginning of the 1ſt vol. of his Works.

(34) Idem, *Epiſt. ad Sebaſt. Albaſp.* pag. 297.

(35) Perrault in his Poem intitled, *Le Siecle de Louïs le Grand*, pag. m. 175. of the 1ſt vol. of his *Parallele des Anciens & des Modernes.*

was publiſhed at Francfort in 1561 in folio [G]. His Treatiſe of Plagiaries is not omitted in it: it is a very curious diſcourſe, but too ſhort for ſo copious a ſubject. It might be enlarged with many other thoughts [H]. I ſhall give ſome extracts from a letter which he wrote againſt Baudouin [I].

DUELLIUS

Que dans noſtre Barreau l'on les voye occupez
A défendre d'un champ trois ſillons uſurpez;
Qu'inſtruits dans la Couſtume, ils mettent leur eſtude
A prover d'un egouſt la juſte ſervitude;
Ou qu'n riche appareil la force de leur Art
Eclatte à ſouſtenir les droits de Jean Maillart.

That is,

"I ſee antiquity applauding herſelf on account of "her great Orators; I ſee the Cicero's and Demoſthe- "nes's, the eternal ornaments of Rome and Athens, "the thunder of whoſe eloquence ſtill makes me trem- "ble, and who confound me with their great names. "Let them enter; but let the fields be impartially "divided between the combatants. Let us ſee them "at our Bar engaged in defending three ridges of "land uſurped by ſome other perſon; let them being "will ſkilled in cuſtom employ their ſtudies to prove "the right of a drain; and let them exhibit the "whole pomp of their art in ſupporting the cauſe "of ſome mean Client."

[G] *An Edition of Duaren's Works was publiſhed at Francfort in 1592 in fol.*] The catalogue of the Oxford Library, Sir Thomas Pope Blount (36) and ſeveral others mention only this Edition; but I add that during the life of Duaren there was printed a collection of his Writings at Lyons in 1554 in fol. printed by Rouille; and that after his death another Edition more compleat was publiſhed in the ſame city and by the ſame Bookſeller in 1579 in fol. Nicholas Ciſner, who had been his ſcholar, and was afterwards Profeſſor of Civil Law at Heidelberg, furniſhed the Printer with ſeveral Pieces. This appears from the little Preface, which he prefixed to that Edition, and wrote at Spires in 1578. I call it *little*, to diſtinguiſh it from that which he prefixed to the ſecond part of Duaren's Works, and which may be conſidered as a juſt Diſſertation *de modo & arte docendi atque diſcendi jura*. He wrote it at Spires in 1575. I have not ſeen the Edition mentioned in the text of this Remark; but I know that it was reprinted at Francfort in 1607. I make uſe of that of Geneva in 1608 *apud Petrum de la Roviere*, and am very ſorry not to find in it the two Pieces of Duaren againſt Baudouin (37).

(36) Pope Blount, *Cenſ. Author.* pag. m. 466.

(37) *Epiſtola de Franciſco Balduino. Defenſio adverſus Balbini Sycophantæ maledicta.*

[H] *It might be enlarged by a great many other thoughts.*] I am going to furniſh one. Theſe perſons are ſcarce ſpoken of without being compared to Eſop's Daw (38).

(38) Or rather Jay. See Monſ. Dacier, *ſur la III Epitre du I Livre d'Horace*, pag. m. 207.

We find this thought in Horace:

Quid mihi Celſus agit? monitus, multumque monendus,
Privatas ut quærat opes, & tangere vitet
Scripta, Palatinus quæcunque recepit Apollo:
Ne, ſi fortè ſuas repetitum venerit olim
Grex avium plumas, moveat cornicula riſum,
Furtivis nudata coloribus (39).

That is,

------ "And how doth Celſus do?
"Whom ſtill I warn, as I have often done,
"To get ſome ſtock, ſome riches of his own:
"And not from others labours, kept for fame
"In wiſe Apollo's temple, ſteal a name;
"Leſt all the Birds ſhould come and claim their "own,
"And th' chough be his, when her ſtol'n plumes "are gone. Creech.

(39) Horat. *Epiſt.* 3. lib. 1. ver. 15.

Duaren made uſe of this; for he boaſts, that he is able to reduce eaſily the Plagiary to the condition of that Bird. *Corniculam Horatianam plane mihi deprehendiſſe videor, quam furtivis nudare coloribus nihilo mihi difficilius eſſe puto quàm Ariſtophani illi poëtarum Alexandrinorum furta detegere ac convincere* (40). i. e. "I think I have plainly diſcovered Horace's Daw, "which it is as eaſy for me to ſtrip of his ſtolen fea- "thers, as it was for Ariſtophanes to detect the Pla- "giariſm of the Alexandrian Poets." But I have not yet ſeen any perſon compare Plagiaries to Partridges. *As the Partridge ſitteth on eggs and hatcheth them not; ſo he that getteth riches, and not by right, ſhall leave them in the midſt of his days, and at his end ſhall be a fool* (41). Theſe are the words of the Prophet Jeremiah, and declare that thoſe who enrich themſelves with the ſubſtance of others, ſhall not keep their ill-gotten wealth to their death. Interpreters obſerve upon this paſſage, that the Partridge ſteals the eggs of other Birds, and ſits on them, but that the young ones, which ſhe hatches, do not own her for their mother, but leave her and go to the birds which laid the eggs (42). This is the uſual fate of Plagiaries. They reap what they had not ſown; they educate other people's children; they raiſe themſelves a ſurreptitious family: but theſe ſtolen children do like ill-gotten wealth, *malè parta malè dilabuntur*, they take wings and fly to their real father. An Author who has been robbed, claims his own property; and if he be prevented by death, his ſon, relation, or friend, purſues his right. A perſon likewiſe, who is no friend of his, will do him this good office, in order to have the honour of diſcovering the theft, or to cover the Plagiary with confuſion. What the love of juſtice would not inſpire him with, vanity, ill-nature, deſire of revenge will ſuggeſt to him; ſo that ſooner or later ſtolen productions abandon the thief. Obſerve, that ſome Plagiaries do not imitate the Partridge in all points; they do not take the pains to ſit on them; they ſeize on the ſentiments and expreſſions of another ready formed: it is true, they ſometimes torment themſelves, in order to give them another air, to prevent the theft being ſo eaſily diſcovered; and then they may the more properly be compared to the Partridge. I am ſurprized, that the name of this bird has not been given to thoſe men who bring up the children, which another has gotten at their houſe. It is more ſuitable to them than the name of that bird (43), which goes and lays in another bird's neſt, and leaves it to hatch and breed the young one. Perhaps they were perſuaded of the truth of this ſtory of the Partridge. A learned critic has long ago inſinuated, that St. Jerom is miſtaken in citing the teſtimony of three excellent Naturaliſts (44): *Hieronymus teſtes citat hujus rei ſanè luculentos, & quos, ut minus idoneos, rejicere nemo poſſit, Ariſtotelem videlicet, Theophraſtum, & Plinium; ſed an verè, fides penes ipſum eſto, ego ſanè apud illos authores nihil tale legere memini. Locus Hieronymi eſt in commentariis ad eum locum* (45): Aiunt, *inquit*, ſcriptores naturalis hiſtoriæ tam beſtiarum & volucrum, quàm arborum herbarumque, quorum principes ſunt apud Græcos Ariſtoteles & Theophraſtus, apud nos Plinius ſecundus, hanc perdicis eſſe naturam, ut ova alterius perdicis, id eſt, aliena furetur, & eis incubet foveatque: cumque fœtus adoleverit, avolare ab eo, & alienum parentem relinquere. i. e. "St. Jerom "alledges in proof of this ſome witneſſes, whoſe "authority I can by no means reject, viz. Ariſtotle, "Theophraſtus, and Pliny; but whether truly, muſt "be left to his credit. For my part, I do not re- "member to have read any ſuch thing in thoſe Writers. "The paſſage of St. Jerom is in his Commentaries "on that place: *The Writers*, ſays he, *of the "Natural Hiſtory of beaſts and birds, as well as trees "and herbs, the chief of whom among the Greeks are "Ariſtotle, and Theophraſtus, among the Latins Plinius "Secundus, tell us, that it is the nature of the Par- "tridge to ſteal the eggs of another Partridge, and "ſit upon them; and that when the young ones are "grown up, they fly away from their foſter-parent.*"

(40) Duaren. *Epiſt. de Plagiar.* pag. 296. Part 2. Oper.

(41) Jeremiah xvii. 11.

(42) *See* Druſius, *Obſervation.* lib. 4. cap. 24. pag. 100.

(43) The Cuckow.

(44) Druſius, *Obſervat.* lib. 4. cap. 24. pag. 100.

(45) That is, the 11th verſe of the 17th chap. of Jeremiah.

[I] *I ſhall give ſome extracts of a Letter, which Druſius wrote againſt Baudouin.*] I found it among the pieces, which are joined to Calvin's Anſwer *ad Balduini Convicia* (46). Duaren wrote it after he had ſeen an Oration, which Baudouin had publiſhed in Germany, and which was very ſevere upon the Profeſſors of Bourges. No perſon was named in it, but it was eaſily ſeen whom the Orator meant, and that Duaren in particular was ill treated in it. If we credit this Letter of Duaren, thoſe who were moſt favourable to Baudouin, who loved and eſteemed his talents, commended him in ſuch a manner, that an unlucky *But* generally entered into their commendations;

(46) See the Remark [H] of the Article of BAUDOUIN.

DUELLIUS (a) (CAIUS) Conſul in the year of Rome 493, vanquiſhed the Carthaginian Fleet, and was the firſt Roman to whom a naval triumph was granted (b). A column was erected in honour of him with a fine inſcription. It was one of the columns which were called *roſtratæ* (c), on account of the prows of the ſhips, with which they were adorned. A fragment of this column was dug up at Rome about the end of the XVI Century. The learned have employed themſelves in decyphering the inſcription (d). Some Authors ſay that Duellius, in acknowledgement of his victory, had the privilege granted him of being conducted to his houſe with the ſound of flutes, and by the light of flambeaux; when he ſupped in the city [A]; but others aſſert, that he aſſumed this by his own authority [B]: the latter opinion is more

(a) Others write it *Duillius*.

(b) Florus, lib. 2. cap. 2.

(c) Pliniur, lib. 34. cap. 5.

(d) Peter Ciaconius wrote a Treatiſe on this ſubject, which was printed at Rome in 1608.

ons; that is to ſay, but he is vain, ambitious, and a diſſembler; we are ſorry that this blemiſh appears on ſo fair a face. *Ita eum laudant fere ut in ejus laudibus excipiant ἀλαζονίαν, faſtum, ambitionem, φιλαυτίαν: præterea mirum ſimulandi diſſimulandique artificium, & hoc veluti nævo decoram admodum ſpecioſamque faciem nonnihil deformari doleant* (47). When he was at Paris in 1548 or thereabouts (48), he paid a viſit to Duaren, and preſented to him a Book, which he had dedicated to him (49). He wanted to ſucceed Duaren in the Profeſſorſhip, which he had juſt quitted in the Univerſity of Bourges, and deſired Letters of Recommendation of him. He obtained them, and they were of advantage to him, for the Magiſtrates of Bourges immediately granted him a penſion, and ſoon after he was admitted Profeſſor of Civil Law without the leaſt expence in the ceremony of admiſſion. He was obliged to ſurmount the oppoſition made to him by Eguinaire Baron and ſome other adverſaries, and from that time was upon ill terms with that Collegue, and raiſed ſuch diſturbances againſt him, that it is ſuppoſed he died of grief. *Nec ulla fuit ex eo tempore ſimultatis inter eum & Baronem intermiſſio . . . . adverſus quem* (Baronem) *iſte vindictæ cupiditate flagrans tantas excitavit tragœdias, ut à pleriſque credatur Baro ob mœrorem ex ea re conceptum deceſſiſſe* (50). Duaren returned to Bourges after the death of Baron, and received all kinds of civility and reſpect from Baudouin; but he was adviſed not to truſt him, ſince he had by a thouſand artifices endeavoured to prevent his return, or at leaſt his recovering the rank, which he had held before. The diſtruſt, which they had endeavoured to infuſe into him, was eaſily removed by the proteſtations, which Baudouin made of his ſincerity; but at laſt he opened his eyes, and expoſtulated with him very ſtrongly; and from that time there was a real enmity between them, tho' there was the appearance of an agreement. *Nihil amplius diſſimulandum ratus cum homine, expoſtulavi & de jure amicitiæ neceſſitudiniſque violato conqueſtus ſum paulo liberius ac ſtomachoſius* (51). i. e. "I thought proper to diſſemble "no longer with him, but expoſtulated with him, "and complained with great freedom and reſent- "ment of his violation of the rights of friendſhip." The outward appearance of their friendſhip was likewiſe laid aſide upon three or four occaſions, when Baudouin broke out into an exceſſive rage againſt Duaren. This was the ground of the firſt quarrel. Baudouin diſcontinued his public Lectures upon pretence that he could contribute more to the advantage and reputation of the Univerſity and the City by his Writings than his Lectures. He was cenſured by the Magiſtrates after Duaren had informed them of this neglect of his (52). Some time after there happened a ſedition in the Civil-Law-Schools. Baudouin being obliged to anſwer for it before the Magiſtrates, pleaded that cauſe, and loſt it very diſhonourably. He thought that Duaren had done him this ill turn. The affair happened thro' Baudouin's having choſen the time of his Lectures according to his own convenience, and not according to the hours aſſigned to each Profeſſor. This occaſioned the tumults; for Baudouin would not change the hour, which he had choſen, though it was that of another, who would not relinquiſh it. *Horam ſubinde mutabat arbitrio ſuo & in aliorum poſſeſſionem non minus ſuperbe & inſolenter quam turbulentè & ſeditioſè invadebat. Qua ex re ii motus atque tumultus excitati ſunt, ut, &c* (53). Soon after he again broke out againſt Duaren, when he was deprived of his ſtipend for ſome months, in which he had diſcontinued his Lectures; for we may obſerve that about three months before he quitted Bourges, he left off reading without ſaying one word to his collegues to excuſe the intermiſſion of his Lectures. This was aſcribed to his reſentment on account of the ſentence pronounced by the Judges againſt him. *Quod hominis ſtudium plerique ſic interpretabantur, ut dolori acerbiſſimo & ægritudini ex recente illa damnatione judicioque ſuſceptæ, vulgo tribuerent* (54). His anger for being refuſed his ſtipend during the time, in which he had diſcontinued his Lectures, made him fall outragiouſly upon his collegues, and he left the city two days after without taking his leave of them (55). But he promiſed the Magiſtrates to return. Obſerve that for two years he had been very importunate for the enlargement of his ſtipend, but that all his ſollicitations were ineffectual. He could not obtain half the ſtipend, which Duaren enjoyed. The latter declares (57), that after he had ſeen that the Proteſtants gave ear to the ſlanderous diſcourſes of ſuch a deſerter, he found his inclination of going over to them abated. He quotes a ſaying of Simonides, that we ought to conſider thoſe as ſlanderers, who eaſily give credit to ſlander. *Scitum eſt illud Simonidis*, Non deſines me auribus calumniari, *cum oſtendere vellet eos quoque calumniatores habendos eſſe, qui aures calumniatoribus faciles præberent* (58). His Letter is dated July 15, 1555. I muſt not forget, that he obſerves there (59) that Baudouin, who quitted Bourges on account of the inſupportable uneaſineſs, which he ſuffered there, perſuaded thoſe of the Reformed Religion, that he left this Univerſity merely to procure liberty of conſcience. Such is the way of mankind: they give other people falſe reaſons of their conduct, and conceal the true ones. They all deſerve, ſome more, ſome leſs, to have the pun, made upon the famous Aſtrologer of Provence, applied to them:

Noſtra damus cum verba damus, nam fallere noſtrum eſt,
Et cum verba damus nil niſi noſtra damus..

[A] *Some Authors ſay that Duellius . . . had the privilege granted him of being conducted to his houſe with the ſound of flutes, and by the light of flambeaux, when he ſupp'd abroad.*] Livy is very expreſs on this point (1): *C. Duillius Conſul adverſus claſſem Pœnorum proſpere pugnavit, primuſque omnium Romanorum ducum navalis victoriæ duxit triumphum: ob quam cauſſam ei perpetuus honos habitus eſt, revertenti à cœna tibicine canente funale præferretur.* i. e. "C. Duillius the "Conſul fought with ſucceſs againſt the Carthaginian "Fleet, and was the firſt of all the Roman Generals, "who had the honour of a Naval Triumph; and "had this perpetual privilege granted him, that "when he returned from ſupper, he was conducted "with muſic and flambeaux." After a witneſs of ſo much weight, it is not neceſſary to introduce Aurelius Victor, who ſays, *Duilio* CONCESSUM *eſt ut prælucente funali & præcinente tibicine à cœna publice rediret* (2). i. e. "It was granted to Duillius, that he ſhould re- "turn publicly from ſupper with flambeaux and "muſic."

[B] *Others aſſert, that he aſſumed this by his own authority.*] Cicero is as expreſs in this point as poſſible. *C. Duillium M. filium qui Pœnos claſſe primus devicerat redeuntem à cœna ſenem ſæpe videbam puer, delectabatur crebro funali & tibicine quæ ſibi nullo exemplo* PRIVATUS *ſumſerat; tantum* LICENTIÆ *dabat gloria* (3). i. e. "When I was a boy, I have often "ſeen Duillius the ſon of Marcus, who gained the "firſt naval victory over the Carthaginians, returning "from ſupper; he was pleaſed with the flambeaux "and muſic, which attended him, which honour "he, though a private man, had aſſumed to himſelf "without any example, ſo much liberty did his re- "putation procure him." Florus is of the ſame opinion. *Duillius Imperator non contentus unius dici triumpho,*

(47) Duaren. *Epiſt. de Fr. Balduino*, pag. m. 58.

(48) Ibid. pag. 61.

(49) He had printed at Lyons.

(50) Duaren. *Epiſt. de Fr. Balduino*, pag. 61.

(51) Ibid. pag. 63.

(52) Ibid.

(53) Ibid. pag. 64.

(54) Ibid.

(55) Ibid. pag. 65.

(56) Ibid.

(57) Ibid. pag. 68.

(58) Ibid.

(59) Ibid. pag. 66.

(1) T. Livius, *in Epit.* lib. 17.

(2) Aurel. Victor, *de Viris illuſtribus.*

(3) Cicero, *de Senectute*, cap. 13.

more probable than the former [C]. He built a temple to Janus in the herb-market (e). One thing is related of him, which appears to me more remarkable than all the honours which he poſſeſſed in the Commonwealth. It is ſaid, that his wife lived to old age without knowing that her huſband, who had a ſtinking breath, differed in that point from other men [D]. Her name was Bilia: it was juſt to preſerve her name; and yet it would have been entirely loſt to us, if St. Jerom had not inſerted it in his works. Coſtar had no reaſon to quote Eraſmus concerning this Lady's Anſwer [E].

(e) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 2. cap. 49.

pho, per vitam omnem ubi à cœna rediret prælucere funalia, præcinere ſibi tibias JUSSIT, *quaſi quotidie triumpharet* (4). i. e. "Duellius the Admiral not being "content with one day's triumph, as long as he lived "had flambeaux and muſic attending him by his or- "der, whenever he returned from ſupper, as if he "reſolved to triumph every day."

(4) Florus, lib. 2. cap. 2. *See alſo* Val. Maximus, lib. 3. cap. 6. num. 4.

[C] *The latter opinion is more probable than the former.*] For it is more eaſy to imagine falſely, that there have been public Decrees upon certain points, than to be ignorant of a Decree actually made public. Livy thought it ſo probable, that the Senate or people had decreed peculiar honours to *Duellius*, that he was eaſily led to believe, that all the privileges enjoyed by Duellius, were grants of his Country; and it is not to be doubted, but the deſcendants of Duellius countenanced this error: theſe flutes and flambeaux would be a greater honour to them, if they were a public gift, than if they were only an uſurpation. An Hiſtorian might therefore be deceived in this point. two hundred years after; but it would not have been eaſy to be miſtaken, if there had been a public Decree for it: the family would have been ſo careful in preſerving the titles of it, that Cicero and ſo many other Writers could not have pretended any plea of ignorance. However I am ſurprized not to find in any Commentator (5) any reflection upon the two different accounts of Duellius's nocturnal Honours. The difference does not conſiſt in trifles; Duellius had a great deal to gain or loſe by it; and yet this is not the occaſion of my making this remark; it is with a view to accuſtom young people to ſeek, among the variations of Hiſtorians, the ground of the greateſt probabilities.

(5) I do not pretend to have conſulted all.

[D] *His wife lived to old age, without knowing that her huſband, who had a ſtinking breath, differed in that point from other men.*] Duellius complained one day to his wife, that ſhe had not told him of a defect, which he had been juſt reproached with, that is, having a ſtinking breath. I thought, anſwered ſhe, that all men were like you. St. Jerom relates this ſtory more at large. *Duellius qui primus Romæ navali certamine triumphavit Biliam virginem duxit uxorem tantæ pudicitiæ, ut illo quoque ſæculo pro exemplo fuerit, quo impudicitia monſtrum erat, non vitium. Is jam ſenex & trementi corpore in quodam jurgio audivit exprobari ſibi os fœtidum, & triſtis ſe domum contulit. Cumque uxori queſtus eſſet quare nunquam ſe monuiſſet, ut huic vitio mederetur, feciſſem, inquit illa, niſi putaſſem omnibus viris ſic os olere* (6). i. e. "Duellius, who was the "firſt who triumphed for a naval victory, married Bi- "lia, a virgin of ſuch modeſty, that ſhe was a pat- "tern even in that Age, when immodeſty was a "monſter, not a vice. He being now old, and his "body feeble, was reproached in a conteſt, which he "had, with having a ſtinking breath. He went home "melancholy upon it, and complaining to his wife, "that ſhe had never told him of it, that he might "have procured ſome remedy for it; ſhe anſwered, "I would have told you, if I had not thought, that "all men had ſtinking breath as well as you."

(6) Hieron. *adver. Jovin.* lib. 1.

[E] *Coſtar had no reaſon to quote Eraſmus concerning this Lady's Anſwer.*] He had aſcribed to Cicero what related only to Brutus, and had been cenſured for it. He vindicates himſelf, among other reaſons, by the example of ſeveral great men, who had committed miſtakes of the ſame kind. Seneca, ſays he (7), has aſcribed to Stilpo a ſaying of Bias, and to Ovid a verſe of Tibullus (8). "According to Plutarch, it was "Hiero, the Uſurper of Syracuſe, to whom his wife an- "ſwered ſo modeſtly, *You are in the wrong to complain "of me; I do not underſtand men's breath; I imagined "all men had been ſo too.* And yet according to "Eraſmus that wiſe and witty reply was made by the "wife of that Duellius, who firſt defeated the Car- "thaginians at ſea." Girac did not fail to obſerve to him, that Eraſmus had no concern here (9): in ſhort, we have ſeen that St. Jerom aſcribes this Anſwer to Duellius's wife; ſo that Eraſmus did not miſtake one name for the other. It was Coſtar, who was ignorant of what the antients had ſaid concerning the Roman Lady. He was right in ſaying that Plutarch mentions this adventure as applied to other perſons, as Hiero and his wife; but Eraſmus was not at all ignorant of this; he takes notice of it in another part of this Book (10). What I think is too ſtrong and unjuſt in Girac's reply, is, that he accuſes Coſtar of having pretended that Eraſmus committed a *groſs blunder*, which extremely diſgraced his memory, Coſtar pretended nothing leſs than this: his own intereſt obliged him to repreſent it as a very ſlight miſtake.

(7) Coſtar, *Suite de la Defenſe de Voiture*, pag. 55.

(8) That verſe is *Arida nec pluvio ſupplicat herbi Jovi.* *See* Senec. *Quæſt. Natur.* lib. 4. cap. 1.

(9) Girac, *Replique*, chap. 15. pag. m. 130.

(10) He mentions the Anſwer of Hiero's wife, *Apothegm.* lib. 5. pag. 341. and that of Duellius's wife, ibid. lib. 8. pag. 619.

☞ DUGDALE (Sir WILLIAM), an eminent Engliſh Antiquary in the XVII Century, was ſon of Mr. John Dugdale, and grandſon of Mr. James Dugdale of Cletherow in Lancaſhire Gent. His mother was Elizabeth daughter of Mr. Arthur Swynſon, a younger ſon of William Swynſon of Swynſon in Staffordſhire Eſq; (a). He was born at Shuſtock in Warwickſhire September the 12th (b) 1605, and was educated in grammar-learning till he was ten years of age under Thomas Sibley, Curate of Nether Whitacre near Shuſtock; and afterwards ſent to the Free-School of Coventry, where he continued under Mr. James Cranford till he was near fifteen years of age, when he was taken home and inſtructed by his father in the Law, in which by his indefatigable application he ſoon made a conſiderable progreſs. March the 17th 162$\frac{2}{3}$ he married Margery daughter of John Huntbache of Seawell in Staffordſhire Gent. his father being then grown infirm, and willing to ſee him ſettled; and upon his death in 1625 he purchaſed the manor of Blythe in the pariſh of Shuſtock, at which place he ſoon after ſettled, and wrote moſt of his books. His inclination leading him chiefly to the ſtudy of antiquity and hiſtory, eſpecially that of his own country, he contracted an acquaintance with thoſe perſons, who could be moſt aſſiſtant to him in that affair [A]; and

(a) *Life of Sir William Dugdale, written by himſelf*, and prefixed to his *Hiſtory of St. Paul's Cathedral at London, 2d edit. corrected and enlarged by the Author's own Hand. Publiſhed by Edward Maynard D. D. Rector of Boddington in Northamptonſhire.* London 1716, in fol.

(b) Father Niceron, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſt. des Hommes Illuſtres*, tom. 15. pag. 383. edit. Paris 1731, *ſays the 22d of that month*, meaning very probably according to the New Style.

[A] *His inclinations leading him chiefly to the ſtudy of Antiquity and Hiſtory, eſpecially that of his own country, he contracted an acquaintance with thoſe perſons, who could be moſt aſſiſtant to him in that affair.*] He was encouraged in thoſe ſtudies by Samuel Roper Eſq; a Barriſter of Lincoln's-Inn, who was eminent for his knowledge in that way, and with whom (by reaſon he was couſin-german to Mr. Richard Seawell, who had

and particularly Sir Henry Spelman, to whom he was introduced at London in the beginning of the year 1638; and by him recommended to Thomas Earl of Arundel, then Earl Marſhal of England; who in September following appointed him a Purſevant at Arms Extraordinary by the title of *Blanch Lyon* (c). Upon the removal of Mr. Edward Walker to the office of Cheſter Herald, his Lordſhip obtained his Majeſty's letters patents for creating our Author Rouge-Croix Purſevant in Ordinary, bearing date March 18th $16\frac{39}{40}$. By this means he had a lodging aſſigned him in the Herald's office at London, and an annual ſalary of 20 pound out of the Exchequer, beſides the perquiſites of his office. Mr. Dugdale continued at London augmenting his collections out of the records in the Tower and other places in or near the city, till the breaking out of the civil wars; when his Majeſty by a warrant under his royal ſignet manual dated at York June the 1ſt 1642, commanded him to repair thither; where he continued till the middle of July, when he received his Majeſty's command to attend Spencer Earl of Northampton, Lord Lieutenant of the county of Warwick, who was then endeavouring to ſecure the chief places of that county, and diſperſe the forees under the Lord Brook; and Mr. Dugdale was employed to ſummon the adherents of the Parliament-Party to ſubmit to the King. He attended his Majeſty at the battle of Egehill on the 23d of October 1642 [*B*] and afterwards to Oxford (d), where he was created Maſter of Arts on the 1ſt of November (e), and thence to Reading and Brainford. Upon his return to Oxford he continued there by his Majeſty's command till the ſurrender of that Garriſon to the Parliament, on the 24th of June

(c) He was created ſo at Richmond Sept. 24. *Life of Sir William Dugdale, ubi ſupra.*

(d) *Life of Sir William Dugdale,* ubi ſupra.

(e) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 7. 2d edit. London 1721.

had married his ſiſter) he became firſt acquainted in 1618. After Mr. Dugdale was ſettled at Blythe-Hall. he read the *Deſcription of Leiceſterſhire* (1), written by William Burton (2) of Lindley (3) in that County Eſq; and being pleaſed with that work, reſolved to undertake one of the ſame kind for Warwickſhire, and was introduced into Mr. Burton's acquaintance by Mr. Fiſher Dilke of Shuſtock, a near relation of Mr. Burton, who encouraged our Author in his deſigns. By this Gentleman's means Mr. Dugdale in the year 1630 became acquainted with Sir Simon Archer of Umberſlade in the Pariſh of Tamworth in Warwickſhire Knt.; who being much pleaſed with the ſtudies of Heraldry and Antiquities, and having made very choice and conſiderable collections out of divers antient Writings relating to the ſaid County and the Families thereof, not only communicated to Mr. Dugdale theſe Collections, but procured him the acquaintance of moſt of the Gentlemen of Note in the County. Theſe Gentlemen having peruſed Mr. Burton's Book abovementioned, were deſirous, thro' Sir Simon Archer's incitement, to preſerve the honour of their families by ſuch a work, for which purpoſe they communicated to Mr. Dugdale their antient deeds and evidences; and particularly Sir Simon Clarke of Brome-Court in the pariſh of Salford, who imparted to him not only divers old writings of importance, but likewiſe the Leiger-Book of the Priory of Kenelworth, in which he found a great variety of materials, as appears from his frequent quotation of it in his *Antiquities of Warwickſhire*. He was very aſſiduous in cultivating his friendſhip with theſe Gentlemen, and eſpecially Sir Simon Archer, who in Eaſter-term 1638 intending with his Lady to go to London, importuned our Author to accompany them in that journey, aſſuring him, that it would be worth his labour, if he could ſpare ſo much time from his beloved ſtudy. This being readily aſſented to, they had ſeveral diſcourſes on the way for the promotion of his deſigns; and when they came to London Sir Simon introduced him to Sir Henry Spelman, then near eighty years of age; who received him with great humanity, and after ſome diſcourſe and ſight of ſome of his Collections relating to the *Antiquities of Warwickſhire*, entertained ſo high an opinion of him, that he told him, that he thought him a very fit perſon to ſerve the King in the *Office of Arms*, and accordingly recommended him to Thomas Earl of Arundel, then Earl Marſhal of England. He informed him likewiſe, that Mr. Roger Dodſworth a Gentleman of Yorkſhire had taken indefatigable pains in ſearching of Records and other antient Memorials relating to the Antiquities of that County, but eſpecially concerning the Foundations of the Monaſteries there and in the Northern parts of the Kingdom; which work he did not a little commend to the care of ſome induſtrious ſearchers into Antiquities, affirming, that in his younger years he had procured tranſcripts of the Foundation-Charters of divers Monaſteries in Norfolk and Suffolk (himſelf being of Norfolk;) and importuning Mr. Dugdale to join with Mr. Dodſworth in that work, which, by reaſon of his youth, and readineſs to proſecute thoſe ſtudies, might in time be brought to ſome perfection. Mr. Dugdale a few days after accidentally meeting with Mr. Dodſworth at the lodgings of Mr. S. Roper at Lincoln's-Inn, and they acquainting each other with their deſigns, they readily engaged to proceed mutually in their collections for the work abovementioned; but ſtill with this reſervation, that Mr. Dugdale ſhould not neglect his collections relating to the *Antiquities of Warwickſhire*, wherein he had now made a conſiderable progreſs. During his ſtay in London, he became acquainted with Mr. Richard Gaſcoigne a Yorkſhire Gentleman, who was much inclined to theſe ſtudies, eſpecially with relation to pedigrees, wherein he had taken ſome pains for divers Northern Families; and having great intereſt with Sir Chriſtopher Hatton of Kirby in Northamptonſhire Knt. of the Bath, afterwards created Lord Hatton, a perſon highly affected to Antiquities, and who had not ſpared any expence in obtaining ſeveral choice collections from public Records, Leiger-Books, and antient Charters, and divers old Manuſcripts, he introduced Mr. Dugdale to that Gentleman at London, who received him with great civility, and promoted his ſtudies. For which purpoſe Sir Chriſtopher brought him acquainted with Sir Thomas Fanſhaw, then the King's Remembrancer in the Exchequer, by reaſon of which office he had the cuſtody of divers Leiger-Books and other valuable Manuſcripts, eſpecially that curious Record call'd the *Red-Book*, as alſo *Teſta de Nevill*, *Kerby's Queſt*, *Nomina Villarum*, and others; to which Mr. Dugdale, by his favour, had free acceſs. He procured him likewiſe acceſs to the Records in the Tower of London, by his intereſt with Mr. Collet, then chief Clerk under Sir John Burroughs. Mr. Roper alſo introduced him into the acquaintance of Sir Thomas Cotton Bart., by which means he had the uſe of the incomparable Library begun by his father Sir Robert Cotton; and of Mr. Scipio Squire, then one of the Vice-Chamberlains of the Exchequer, by whoſe means he had the liberty of conſulting Domeſday-book, and the Fines, Plea-Rolls, and other Records there (4).

(1) It was publiſhed at London 1621 in fol.

(2) He was born Aug. 24, 1575, and died April 6, 1645.

(3) It is about eight miles diſtant from Blythe-Hall.

(4) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 7, *& ſeqq.* and *Life of Sir Will. Dugdale,* ubi ſupra.

[*B*] *He attended his Majeſty at the battle of Edgehill on the 23d of October* 1642.] Soon after this he committed to writing the moſt remarkable paſſages in that battle; and that the relation of all particulars might be the better underſtood, he went to the place in February following, being accompanied with ſome Gentlemen of note, and took with him a ſkillful Surveyor, and exactly ſurveyed the field of battle, noting where each army was drawn up, where the canons were placed, and the graves where the ſlain perſons were buried; and obſerving from the relation of the neighbouring inhabitants the certain number, which lay buried in each pit or grave, which by a juſt computation did not amount to full one thouſand, though the report of the vulgar made them at leaſt five thouſand.

June 1646, having been created Cheſter Herald on the 16th of April 1644, upon the promotion of Sir Edmund Walker to the place of Norroy. After the ſurrender of Oxford he went to London, where he compounded for his eſtate, which had been ſequeſtered, paying 168 pound for his compoſition at Goldſmith's Hall. In May 1648 he attended the Lady Elizabeth Hatton to France, where he continued three months; and having made ſeveral curious collections there [*C*], returned to England, having letters of ſafe conduct from Henrietta the Queen-Mother, dated Auguſt the 3d. He now began to prepare ſeveral works for the preſs; which when publiſhed gained him a very great reputation [*D*]. June the 18th 1660 he procured by the intereſt of the Lord

[*C*] *Having made ſeveral curious Collections there.*] Through the favour of Francis du Cheſne, ſon of the learned Andrew du Cheſne, he had a view of divers excellent Collections made by the latter relating to ſeveral Monaſteries in France, Normandy, and other parts of that Kingdom; among which diſcovering divers remarkable things touching ſeveral Religious Houſes in England, formerly called *Priories Aliens*, (which had been cells to ſeveral great Abbies in foreign parts) he took copies of them, of which he made good uſe in his *Monaſticon Anglicanum*.

[*D*] *He began now to prepare ſeveral Works for the preſs, which when publiſhed gained him a very great reputation.*] His Works are as follow. I. *Monaſticon Anglicanum; ſive Pandectæ cœnobiorum Benedictinorum, Cluniacenſium, Ciſtercenſium, Carthuſianorum, à primordiis ad eorum uſque diſſolutionem, ex MSS. ad Monaſteria olim pertinentibus, Archivis Turrium Lond. Ebor.* &c. London 1655 in fol. The ſecond Volume was printed in 1661 in fol. under this title: *Monaſtici Anglicani Volumen alterum, de Canonicis Regularibus Auguſtinianis, ſcilicet Hoſpitaliariis, Templariis, Gilbertinis, Præmonſtratenſibus, & Maturinis ſive Trinitariariis. Cum Appendice ad Volumen primum de Cœnobiis aliquot Gallicanis, Hibernicis, Scoticis, necnon quibuſdam Anglicanis antea omiſſis, à primordiis &c.* Tho' theſe two volumes were publiſhed under the names of *Roger Dodſworth* of Yorkſhire and *William Dugdale* of Warwickſhire, yet Mr. Wood aſſures us (5), that the principal perſons in the *College of Arms* had informed him, that *they were both collected and totally written by* Dodſworth, *as the original, which they had ſeen, did teſtify.* " And Dr. Barlow (6), *continues Mr.* Wood, hath ſeveral times told me, that much about the time of " the death of Dodſworth they were offered to him " to be bought, that he might take ſome order to " have them publiſhed. Howſoever it is, ſure I " am, that Sir *William* did take great pains to " have them publiſhed, did methodize and order them, " correct them when at the Preſs, and made ſeveral " Indexes to them." This Roger Dodſworth was the ſon of Matthew Dodſworth Eſq; Regiſter of the Church of York, by Eleanor, daughter of Ralph Sandwith Eſq; and was born July the 24th 1585 at Newton-Grange in the Pariſh of St. Oſwald in Ridale in Yorkſhire, which was the ſeat and eſtate of his mother's father. Mr. Dodſworth having a natural inclination to the ſtudy of Hiſtory and Antiquities, began early to make Collections of them, eſpecially ſuch as related to Yorkſhire; and afterwards was much encouraged in his labours by Sir Thomas Fairfax, afterwards Lord Fairfax, who for ſeveral years allowed him a penſion. He was a perſon of wonderful induſtry, but leſs judgment and was always collecting and tranſcribing, but never publiſhed any thing. He died in Auguſt 1654, and was interred in the Church of Rufford in Lancaſhire. After his death the Lord Fairfax took into his poſſeſſion not only all the old manuſcripts, which Mr. Dodſworth had obtained from ſeveral hands, but likewiſe all his Collections, and communicated them to Dr. Nat. Johnſon, a Phyſician of Yorkſhire, with hopes that he would extract from them a compleat account of the antiquities of the Weſt Riding of that county. The Lord Fairfax by his laſt will bequeathed theſe manuſcripts and collations, which amounted to 122 Volumes at leaſt, to the public Library in Oxford, to which they were conveyed in June 1673 (7). But to return to the *Monaſticon*, after the collections of the two Volumes were compleated, an offer was made to ſeveral Bookſellers of the copy, upon ſuch terms, as might have defrayed the charge of the tranſcripts from the records. But the Bookſellers not being willing to venture on them, Mr. Dodſworth and Mr. Dugdale joined together, and hired ſeveral ſums of money to defray the expence of the Edition. The care of printing the Work lay on Mr. Dugdale, becauſe Mr. Dodſworth died before the tenth part of the firſt Volume was printed. The firſt Volume being finiſhed in 1655, the publication of the ſecond was ſuſpended for ſome years, till the greateſt part of the impreſſion of the former was ſold, whereby the expence of the ſecond might be ſupported (8). In 1673 he publiſhed a third Volume under this title, *Monaſtici Anglicani Volumen tertium & ultimum: Additamenta quædam in Volumen primum ac Volumen ſecundum jampridem edita; necnon Fundationes ſive Dotationes diverſarum Eccleſiarum Cathedralium ac Collegiatarum continent, ex Archivis regiis, ipſis autographis, ac diverſis Codicibus Manuſcriptis decerpta.* London 1673 in fol. Mr. Wood obſerves (9), that as ſoon as this Volume was publiſhed, " the faction common-" ly reported, that it was made extant purpoſely to " introduce Popery, they being then exaſperated a-" gainſt it." Mr. Dugdale's name alone is prefixed to this, without any mention of Mr. Dodſworth; tho' ſome of the collections of the latter were undoubtedly made uſe of in it (10). Some time before it was publiſhed, Mr. Dugdale defired Mr. Wood, that if in his ſearches with relation to his Work of the *Hiſtoria & Antiquitates Univerſitatis Oxonienſis* he could meet with any materials towards the compleating of the third Volume of the *Monaſticon*, he would ſupply him with them; upon which Mr. Wood ſent him ſeveral curious Collections (11). Mr. Dugdale was likewiſe aſſiſted in that Volume by Sir Thomas Herbert Bart. (12). II. *The Antiquities of* Warwickſhire *illuſtrated from Records, Leiger-Books, Manuſcripts, Charters, Evidences, Tombes and Arms: beautified with Maps, Proſpects, and Portraitures.* London 1656 in folio. Mr. Dugdale was at the whole charge of publiſhing this Work, and continued in London to correct the Preſs himſelf, becauſe the ordinary Correctors were not ſkilled at all in the pedigrees (13). Mr. Wood (14) ſtiles this Work his *Maſter-piece*; and Archdeacon Nicholſon tells us (15), that our Author was *Maſter of all the advantages requiſite for ſuch performance*; and that *no man can ſo well judge of the great labour and pains beſtowed on the bringing of this excellent Work . . . . to perfection, as he that has viewed the many Volumes of Materials* (16), *which he gathered in order to the compiling of it. His great zeal againſt the ſacrilegious deſtruction of ſome religious ſtructures carried his ſearches into every corner of the Hiſtory, that related to that matter; and his early inclination to the ſtudy of Heraldry obliged him carefully to preſerve whatever might be grateful on that head to the Nobility and Gentry of the country.* Another Writer (17) likewiſe gives this Work the title of *the beſt methodized and moſt accurate account that ever was wrote of this nature.* III. *The Hiſtory of St.* Paul's *Cathedral* in London *from its foundation till theſe times: extracted out of original Charters, Records, Leiger-books, and other Manuſcripts: Beautified with ſundry proſpects of the Church, figures of Tombes, and Monuments.* London 1658 in fol. There was a *ſecond Edition* of this Book *corrected and enlarged by the Author's own Hand. To which is prefixed his life written by himſelf. Publiſhed by* Edward Maynard *D. D. Rector of Boddington in Northamptonſhire* London 1716 in fol. IV. *The Hiſtory of imbanking and draining of divers fens and marſhes, both in foreign parts and in this Kingdom, and of the improvement thereby. Extracted from Records, Manuſcripts, and other authentic inſtruments.* London 1662 in fol. adorned with ſeveral Cuts. V. Origines Juridiciales; *or Hiſtorical Memorials of the Engliſh Laws, Courts of Juſtice, Forms of Tryal, Puniſhment in Caſes Criminal, Law-Writers, Law Books, Grants and Settlements of Eſtates, Degrees of Serjeant, Inns of Court and Chancery. Alſo a Chronology*

(5) Col. 14.

(6) Biſhop of Lincoln in the reign of King Charles II &c.

(7) Idem, col. 14, 15.

(8) Idem, col. 11, 12.

(9) Col. 15.

(10) Idem, ibid.

(11) Idem, ibid.

(12) Idem, ibid. and *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 692.

(13) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* col. 12.

(14) Col. 15.

(15) *Engliſh Hiſtorical Library*, Part 1. pag. 63. edit. London 1696, in 8vo.

(16) In the Aſhmolean Muſeum at Oxford.

(17) *The Engliſh Topographer: or an Hiſtorical Account (as far as can be collected from printed Books and Manuſcripts) of all the pieces that have been written relating to the Antiquities, Natural Hiſtory, or Topographical Deſcription of any part of England, By an impartial Hand*, pag. 233. edit. London 1720, in 8vo.

Lord Chancellor Hyde letters patents under the great ſeal for the place of Norroy vacant by the promotion of Sir Edward Walker to the office of Garter King at Arms; and upon Sir Edward's deceaſe February the 20th $167\frac{6}{7}$ (*f*) he ſucceeded him in the poſt of Garter [*E*]; his patent being paſſed on the 26th of April 1677, and being ſolemnly created Garter in the College of Arms May the 24th (*g*) by Henry Earl of Peterborough,

(*g*) *Memoirs of the Life of Elias Aſhmole*, pag. 57. *and* Wood, col. 14.

(*f*) *Memoirs of the Life of that learned Antiquary* Elias Aſhmole *Eſq; drawn up by himſelf by way of Diary. With an Appendix of Original Letters. Publiſhed by Charles Burman, Eſq;* pag. 56. edit. London 1717 in 24°. Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 17. *ſays that Sir Edward died on the* 19*th.*

nology of the Lord Chancellors and Keepers of the Great Seal, Lord Treaſurers, Juſtices of the King's Bench, &c. London 1666, 1672 and fol. Mr. Wood tells us (18), that in the *Chronology* or *Chronica ſeries* are many faults. VI. *The Baronage of England: or an Hiſtorical Account of the lives and moſt memorable actions of our Engliſh Nobility in the Saxon's time to the Norman Conqueſt; and from thence of thoſe who had their riſe before the end of King Henry the IIId's Reign. Deduced from public Records, ancient Hiſtorians, and other Authorities.* London 1675 in fol. The *ſecond* Volume was printed in 1676 in a thin fol. under this title: *The Baronage of England, or an Hiſtorical Account &c. from the end of Henry the Third's Reign, and before the eleventh of King Richard II. deduced &c.* The *third* Volume was printed at London the ſame year in a thin fol. under this title: *The Baronage of England, or an Hiſtorical Account &c. from the tenth of Richard II untill this preſent year* 1676, *deduced* &c. Theſe two laſt Volumes were printed, and always go together. Auguſtin Vincent, formerly Windſor Herald, and Clerk of the Records in the Tower of London, had laid a foundation of a Baronage of England; but he dying before it was finiſhed, it was undertaken and continued by his ſon John Vincent, who intitled it, *Heroologia Anglica: or a Genealogical Hiſtory of the Succeſſion and Creation of all our Princes, Dukes, Earls, and Viſcounts ſince the Norman Conqueſt to this day.* "This, *ſays Mr.* Wood (19), I have ſeen in a thick "folio Manuſcript, (for it is not yet publiſhed) con"taining many quotations from the Records in the "Tower of London; but it is a very ſlight and trite "thing in compariſon of that of Sir William Dug"dale's. The ſaid three Tomes of the *Baronage of* "*England* he gave, with other of his Books, to the "College of Arms; but two of the Kings, and other "Heralds there, tell me, that there are a world of "faults in them; and they dare not depend upon "the generality of matter relating to pedigree there"in." Mr. Dugdale ſent to Mr. Wood copies of all the Tomes, with an earneſt deſire, that he would peruſe, correct, and add to them what he could obtain from Records and other Authorities; upon which Mr. Wood *ſpending a whole long vacation in that matter, drew up at leaſt ſixteen ſheets of corrections, but more additions; which being ſent to the Author he remitted a good part of them into the margin of a copy of large Paper of his three Tomes of the* Baronagium. VII. *A Short View of the late Troubles in England; briefly ſetting forth their riſe, growth, and tragical concluſion. As alſo ſome parallel thereof with the Baron's Wars in the time of King Henry III; but chiefly with that of France, called the Holy League, in the Reign of Henry III and Henry IV. late Kings of that Realm.* Oxford 1681 in fol. To this Book is added *A perfect Narrative of the Treaty at* Uxbridge. This *Short View* was preſented by the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, in the name of that Univerſity, to Queen Catherine on the 27th of Sept. 1681, at which time their Majeſties were entertained there (20). VIII. *The ancient Uſage in bearing of ſuch Enſigns of Honour as are commonly called Arms.* Oxford in 8vo. There are two Editions of this Book, one of which was publiſhed at Oxford February the 4th 1681, and the other in the beginning of the year 1682. It is chiefly taken from Mr. William Wyrley's Book, intitled, *The true uſe of Armory, ſhewed by Hiſtory, and plainly proved by example*, London 1592 in 4to. IX. *A true and perfect catalogue of the Nobility of England.* Printed with *The antient Uſage &c.* To this is added, *A true and perfect Liſt of all the preſent Knights of the Garter &c. as they now ſtand in St. George's Chapel in Windſor-Caſtle, Sept. the* 10*th.* 1681. X. *A Catalogue of the Baronets of England, from the firſt erection of that Dignity until the* 4*th of July* 1681 *inclusive.* Printed alſo with *The antient Uſage &c.* The ſecond Edition reacheth to the 6th of December the ſame year. To both theſe Editions are added, I, *An exact alphabetical Catalogue of all the Shires, Cities, Borough-Towns, Cinque-Ports in England; ſpecifying the Number of the Knights of the Shires, Citizens, Burgeſſes, and Barons of the Cinque-Ports, they do reſpectively elect to ſerve as their Repreſentatives in Parliaments*; &c. collected and written by Charles Hatton Eſq; ſon of Chriſtopher Lord Hatton. 2. *A true and perfect Catalogue of the Nobility of Scotland, with a Liſt of the Royal Burroughs therein*, &c. collected and written by the ſame hand. 3. *A true and perfect Catalogue of the Nobility of Ireland, with a liſt of all the Shires, Cities, and Burroughs of Ireland, which make Returns of Parliament* &c. collected and written by the ſame hand. XI. *A perfect copy of all the Summons of the Nobility to the great Councils and Parliaments of this Realm from the* 49*th of Henry III. to this preſent; with Catalogues of ſuch Noblemen as have been ſummoned to Parliament in right of their wives.* London 1686 in fol. Our Author likewiſe took great pains in publiſhing Sir Henry Spelman's *Concilia, Decreta, Leges, & Conſtitutiones in re Eccleſiarum Orbis Britannici, Tomus II.* London 1664 in fol. which he undertook at the requeſt of Dr. Gilbert Sheldon, Archbiſhop of Canterbury, and the Earl of Clarendon, and made Collections out of the Cotton-Library and other places, and methodized the whole Work; and the whole Volume amounting to 200 ſheets, all of it except fifty ſeven was entirely of Mr. Dugdale's collecting. The Edition is full of faults occaſioned by the abſence of that Gentleman. Mr. William Somner of Canterbury took a great deal of pains to correct a printed copy of it with his pen in the margin; which copy is ſtill remaining in the Library belonging to the Cathedral of Canterbury (21). About the ſame time the ſecond part of Sir Henry Spelman's *Gloſſary* which begins with the letter M, was brought to Mr. Dugdale to have it fitted for the Preſs, Sir Henry having left it imperfect, and a great deal being on looſe pieces of paper; upon which Mr. Dugdale digeſted them into proper order, and reviſed and prepared the firſt part for the Preſs (22), which was publiſhed with the ſecond part at London 1687 in fol. under the following title; *Gloſſarium Archaiologicum, continens Latino-Barbara, peregrina, obſoleta, & novæ ſignificationis Vocabula.*

(18) *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 15.

(19) Ibid. col. 16.

(20) Idem, col. 16.

(21) Idem, col. 12.

(22) Idem, col. 12, 13.

[*E*] *Upon Sir Edward Walker's deceaſe February the* 19*th* $167\frac{6}{7}$, *he ſucceeded him in the poſt of Garter.*] Upon the death of Sir Edward there aroſe a great diſpute between Henry then Earl of Norwich, and afterwards Duke of Norfolk, as Earl Marſhal of England, and the King, about the nomination of a perſon to ſucceed in the office of Garter: the Chancellor of the Garter on the King's part, as Sovereign of the Order, ſtrenuouſly inſiſting upon his Majeſty's right to nominate, by reaſon the ſaid office of Garter was an employment merely belonging to that Order, and chiefly for attending at all inſtallations and feſtivals, and performing other ſervices unto the Sovereign and Knights Companions thereof. The Earl on his part as Earl Marſhal and chief Superintendent of the Officers of Arms, pleading the uſage of his Predeceſſors in that honourable office of Earl Marſhal to nominate and recommend to the King, upon the death and vacancy of any King at Arms, Herald or Purſevant, ſuch perſon or perſons to ſupply the place, as he ſhall think moſt fit, and moſt properly qualified for that ſervice. In this conteſt Sir William Haward Knight, a Gentleman well accompliſhed with learning, eſpecially in points of Heraldry, having obtained the favours of ſeveral great men to move his Majeſty on his behalf; the King inclined to confer that office on him. The Earl of Norwich, on the other hand, thinking it a conſiderable derogation to his office of Earl Marſhal to be refuſed the privilege which his Predeceſſors had enjoyed, and for which he produced ſome late precedents, obtained the favour of the Duke of York to ſpeak to his Majeſty in his behalf. The King therefore aſked the Earl, whom he deſigned to nominate and recommend? who anſwered, Mr. Dugdale; *though it is well known*, ſays

borough, who then exerciſed the office of Earl Marſhal, or Deputy to the Earl of Norwich; and the day following he was knighted by his Majeſty at Whitehall. December the 18th 1681 his Wife died; as he did himſelf ſuddenly in his chair at Blythe-Hall on the 10th of February $168\frac{5}{6}$, and was interred at the Pariſh Church of Shuſtock on the 12th of that month, where he had in his life-time erected a monument for himſelf of free-ſtone in form of an altar, with an epitaph written by himſelf. By his laſt will he left all his manuſcripts and collections to the Muſæum of Elias Aſhmole Eſq; who had ſeveral years before married Elizabeth one of his daughters. Mr. Wood obſerves (*b*), that "had this indefatigable perſon ſequeſtered himſelf from "wordly troubles, and totally addicted himſelf to his ſtudies, and had minded the "public more than his private concerns; the world might have juſtly enjoyed more of his "lucubrations, and thoſe more true and accurate than ſuch as are already publiſhed, "eſpecially thoſe in his latter days. Yet however what he hath done is prodigious, "conſidering the great troubles that he had endured for his loyalty, and the cumbrances "of this world, that he had run through; and therefore his memory ought to be vene-"rated and had in everlaſting remembrance for thoſe things, which he hath already "publiſhed; which otherwiſe might have periſhed and been eternally buried in ob-"livion." He had a ſon named JOHN, who was created Maſter of Arts in the Univerſity of Oxford September the 9th 1661, being then chief Gentleman in the chamber of Edward Earl of Clarendon Lord High Chancellor of England (*i*); and was afterwards appointed Windſor Herald October the 26th 1675, upon the reſignation of Elias Aſhmole Eſq; (*k*) [*F*], and at laſt Norroy King of Arms in the beginning of March $168\frac{5}{6}$ [*G*], about which time he was knighted by his Majeſty. He publiſhed *A Catalogue of the Nobility of England, according to their reſpective precedencies, as it was preſented to his Majeſty on New-years day, ann.* 1684. To which is added, *The Blazon of their paternal Coats of Arms, and a Liſt of the preſent Biſhops.* Printed at London 1685, on the broad ſide of a large ſheet of paper; and reprinted with additions in 1690.

(*b*) *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 17.

(*i*) Ibid. col. 143.

(*k*) *Memoirs of the Life of Elias Aſhmole Eſq;* pag. 54.

(23) Col. 13. Mr. Wood (23) *that he had another perſon* (Thomas Leigh, Cheſter Herald) *in his eye, againſt whom ſuch objections might have been juſtly taken, as that he would have failed of his aim had he ſtuck to him.* His Majeſty immediately replied, *Nay then I am content.* So that the affair being thus concluded, the Earl Marſhal ordered his Secretary to inform Mr. Dugdale of it by the poſt that night, and to deſire him to come up as ſoon as poſſible to London from Blythe-Hall. This news did not a little ſurprize him, becauſe he was ſo far from any thought of that office, that upon ſome letters from ſeveral perſons of honour after Sir Edward Walker's death, earneſtly urging him to come immediately to London in order to ſollicit for that office; he excuſed himſelf on account of his age, he being then twenty years older than any other Officer in the College of Arms. After ſerious conſideration what to reſolve upon, having a far greater deſire to wave than accept it, he grew apprehenſive leſt his Majeſty ſo readily aſſenting to the Earl Marſhal's nomination of him, ſhould be offended in caſe he refuſed the favour offered him; and leſt the Earl Marſhal ſhould be diſpleaſed with his not complying; upon which he determined to accept it (24). Mr. Aſhmole tells us (25), that upon Sir Edward Walker's deceaſe, the Biſhop of Saliſbury (26) wrote to him on the 22d of February $167\frac{3}{4}$ that he had ſollicited the King to beſtow the Garter's place on him; who wrote back to excuſe his acceptance of it. On the the 26th the Earl Marſhal ſent his Secretary Mr. Hayes to have Mr. Aſhmole's opinion whether that place was in the King's or Earl's diſpoſal; and Mr. Aſhmole gave his opinion that it was in the King's Diſpoſal. March the 6th the Biſhop of Saliſbury came to his houſe to acquaint him with the King's command, that he ſhould aſſiſt him in making good the King's title to that place. On the 30th of that month there was an hearing before ſome of the Lords of the Council, and ſome Knights of the Garter, between the King and Earl Marſhal; at which the Garter's place was adjudged to be ſolely in the King's diſpoſal. The day following Mr. Bartie earneſtly preſſed Mr. Aſhmole to accept of that place, which he refuſed; and on the 2d of April Mr. Dugdale was pitched upon to be Garter, and the King gave his conſent; whereupon the Earl Marſhal ſent for him out of Warwickſhire by that night's poſt; who came to London on the 10th (27).

(24) Idem, col. 13, 14.

(25) *Memoirs of the Life of that learned Antiquary* Elias Aſhmole *Eſq; drawn up by himſelf by way of Diary. With an Appendix of original Letters Publiſhed by Charles Burman Eſq;* pag. 57.

(26) Dr. Seth Ward.

(27) Ibid. pag. 56, 57.

[*F*] *Appointed Windſor Herald October the 26th* 1675, *upon the reſignation of Elias Aſhmole Eſq;*] Mr. Aſhmole tells us (28), that on the 25th of February $167\frac{4}{5}$ he deſired Mr. Hayes, the Earl Marſhal's Secretary, to move his Lord to give him leave to reſign his Herald's place; and October the 28th following, Mr. Aſhmole ſollicited his Lordſhip for that purpoſe (29). January the 29th $167\frac{4}{5}$ he obtained the Earl's leave to reſign (30); and April the 17th his brother-in-law Mr. John Dugdale having agreed with him for that place, moved the Earl that he might ſucceed him, which his Lordſhip granted (31). July the 21ſt Mr. Aſhmole ſurrendered his place of Windſor Herald to his Majeſty, before one of the Maſters in in Chancery (32); and October the 26th Mr. Dugdale was created Windſor Herald in his room (33).

(28) Ibid. pag. 49.

(29) Ibid. pag. 51.

(30) Ibid. pag. 52.

(31) Ibid. pag. 52, 53.

(32) Ibid. pag. 53, 54.

[*G*] *At laſt Norroy King of Arms in the beginning of March* $168\frac{5}{6}$.] On the 14th of February Mr. Aſhmole ſollicited the Duke of Norfolk on his brother-in-law Mr. Dugdale's behalf, for his Grace's intereſt with the King, that he might ſucceed his father Sir William Dugdale in the place of Garter: the Duke promiſed his favour, tho' he ſeemed more inclinable to prefer Sir Thomas St. George. On the 19th his Grace propoſed to Mr. Aſhmole to give Mr. Dugdale the place of Noroy; and the next day gave him aſſurance of it (34).

(33) Ibid. pag. 54.

(34) Ibid. pag. 77.

T

DURANT (SAMUEL), Miniſter of Charenton, gained the love and reſpect of his flock by the ſeveral excellent qualities of which he was poſſeſſed. He was eſteemed a great Preacher. He died, I think, in the year 1626, and was ſucceeded by Monſieur Daillé (*a*). Among his friends was Monſieur Arnauld Counſellor and Secretary of the King, and Comptroller General of the *Reſtes* [*A*]. This we learn from the Epiſtle Dedicatory

(*a*) *See the Life of Monſ. Daillé,* pag. 12.

[*A*] *Among his friends was Monſr. Arnauld, Counſellor and Secretary of the King, and Comptroller General of the Reſtes.*] I have remarked this, in order to ſhew, that the ſeveral perſons of the family of Arnaud were of the Reformed Religion. The Gentleman, of whom I am ſpeaking, *was very careful to go to Charenton,* and *contributed very readily both his pains and money for the advancement of the ſervice of God.*

Dedicatory of ſeven of his ſermons printed in 1627. Frederic Spanheim his kinſman (*b*), and heir to his books, publiſhed theſe ſeven ſermons at Geneva, and wrote the Dedication.

(*b*) See the Remark [*B*] of the Article SPANHEIM.

(1) Spanhem. *Epit. Dedic. de* Sept Sermons de Durant.

God. Some of his relations having turned Papiſts, he expreſſed his diſpleaſure at it in ſtrong terms. He and his ſiſters *particularly aſſiſted* Samuel Durant *to the end* (1). The Epiſtle Dedicatory, which I quote, mentions Monſr. de Montfermeil his nephew. This may be added to the latter part of the Remark [*D*] of the article ANTHONY ARNAUD the Advocate.

DURER (ALBERT) deſcended of an Hungarian family [*A*], and born at Nuremberg May the 20th 1471 (*a*), was one of the beſt Engravers and Painters of his age. "Having (*b*) made a ſlight beginning with the pencil in the ſhop of his father, who "was a Goldſmith, he aſſociated himſelf with an indifferent Painter, named Martin "Hupſe, who taught him to engrave on copper, and to manage colours. Albert pro- "cured himſelf likewiſe to be inſtructed in Arithmetic, Perſpective, and Geometry; "and then he undertook at twenty ſeven years of age (*c*) to exhibit ſome of his works "to the public. The firſt works of his graver was the three Graces repreſented by "three naked women, perfectly well ſhaped, having over their heads a globe, in which "was engraved the date of the year 1497. He engraved..... ſeveral pieces of the "paſſion, which were ſo highly eſteemed, that Marc Antonio of Bologna, an experi- "enced Engraver at Venice, took the liberty to copy them [*B*], and put the Author's "mark to them, in order to make them paſs for originals.... As he did not make ſo "much uſe of the pencil as the graver, we meet with few of his pictures except in the "palace of the Emperor and ſome ſovereign Princes; they are done in ſo elegant a "manner, that nothing can be more beautiful or better expreſſed [*C*]." The particular account

(*a*) Melch. Adam. *in Vitis Phil. Germ.* pag. 66.

(*b*) Bullart, *Academ. des Scienc.* tom. 2. pag. 383, 384.

(*c*) He ſhould have ſaid 26; for the year 1497 is not the 27th of his age, as *Bullart* ſuppoſes, who makes him born in 1470. Mr. Felibien has committed the ſame miſtake in his *IV Entretien ſur les Vies & ſur les Ouvrages des Peintres*, pag. 330, 351.

[*A*] *He was deſcended of an Hungarian Family.*] His father was born at Cula, a village near Waradin. Thus I venture to tranſlate theſe words of Melchior Adamus: *Fuit ejus pater Albertus ex vico Cula prope Voradium civitatem Hungariæ, natus* (1). I ſuſpect, that there is an error of the preſs of *Voradium* inſtead of *Varadium* in this Author. This error has been faithfully tranſcribed by Paul Freher: See page 1439 of his *Theatrum*. Moreri did not underſtand what I am going to quote. *Albertum Durerum è Pannonia oriundum accepimus, ſed cujus majores in Germaniam commigrarint* (2). i. e. "We have been informed "that Albert Durer was deſcended originally from an "Hungarian Family, but that his Anceſtors removed "into Germany." He thought the ſenſe of this was, that our Albert *was the ſon of an Hungarian, whoſe Family was notwithſtanding originally German*. Nothing is more falſe. Vaſari did not know the Country of Albert Durer; he ſuppoſes him to have been a Fleming, and makes him begin his copper-plates at Antwerp. *E nel vero*, ſays he (3), *ſe queſt' huomo ſi raro, sì diligente e sì univerſale haveſſe havuto per patria la Toſcana*, COM' EGLI HEBBE LA FIANDRA, *e haveſſe potuto ſtudiare le coſa di Roma, come habbiamo fatto noi, ſarebbe ſtato il miglior Pittore de' paeſi noſtri, ſi come fù il più raro, e più celebrato, che habbiano mai havuto i* FIAMMINGHI. i. e. "It is certain, that if "this extraordinary, induſtrious, and univerſal man "had had Tuſcany for his Country, as HE HAD "FLANDERS, and could have ſtudied at Rome, as "we have done, he would have been the beſt Painter "of our Country, as he is the moſt extraordinary and "famous one, which the FLEMINGS ever had." He had ſaid in the preceding page: *Dopo queſto Martino, comincio Alberto Duro in Anverſa, con più diſegno, e miglior giudicio, e con più belle inventioni a dare opera alle medeſime ſtampe*. i. e. "After this Martin, Al- "bert Durer begun at Antwerp with better deſigns "and more judgment, and much finer invention, to "apply himſelf to the ſame kind of prints."

(1) Melch. Adam. *in Vitis German Philoſoph.* pag. 66.

(2) Idem, ibid.

(3) Giorgio Vaſari, *Vite de Pittori*, Part 3. pag. m. 301.

[*B*] *His pieces of the Paſſion were ſo highly eſteemed, that Marc Antonio of Bologna . . . took the liberty to copy them.*] Mr. Bullart has committed here a groſs blunder: he confounds Marc Antonio of Bologna with another Marc Antonio, who from his having been the diſciple of Franceſco Francia was ſurnamed Franci (4). Marc Antonio of Bologna was ſo far from attempting to counterfeit this work of Albert Durer, that he joined with him both in the impreſſion and ſale of it (5). It was Marc Antonio Franci, who plaid the tricke here mentioned. Vaſari ſpeaks at large of this; but he does not ſay, that Durer, who proſecuted this Copyer, was obliged to ſollicit his pardon. He ſays expreſly, that the Plaintiff obtained only, that this Marc Antonio ſhould no longer put Albert Durer's name and mark to his works. *Havendo dunque contrafatto in ramo d'intaglio groſſo, come era il legno, che haveva intagliato Alberto, tutta detta Paſſione, e vita di Chriſto in* 36 *carte, e fattovi il ſegno, che Alberto faceva nelle ſue opere, cioè queſto A E* (6), *riuſcì tanto ſimile di maniera, che non ſapendo niſſuno, ch' elle fuſſero fatte da Marc' Antonio, erano credute d' Alberto, e per opere di lui vendute, e comperate: La qual coſa eſſendo ſcritta in Fiandra ad Alberto e mandatogli una di dette Paſſioni contrafatte da Marc' Antonio, venne Alberto in tanta collera, che partitoſi di Fiandra, ſe ne venne a Venetia, e ricorſo alla Signoria, ſi querelò di Marc' Antonio, ma però non ottenne altro, ſe non che Marc' Antonio non faceſſe più il nome, e ne il ſegno ſopradetto d' Alberto nelle ſue opere* (7). i. e. "Having therefore counterfeited upon copper- "plates with rude graving, as Albert Durer had done "on wood, the whole Paſſion and Life of Chriſt in "thirty ſix cuts, and put the mark uſed by Albert "in his work, viz. *A E*, they were ſo much like his, "that no body knowing they were done by Marc An- "tonio, they were thought to be Albert's, and ſold "as his. An account of this being written to Albert "in Flanders, and one of the counterfeit cuts of the "Paſſion by Marc Antonio being ſent to him, Albert "was ſo enraged, that he immediately left Flanders, "and came to Venice, where he applied himſelf to "the Government, complaining of Marc Antonio; "but he obtained no other ſatisfaction, but that Marc "Antonio ſhould not again put the name and mark "abovementioned of Albert to his works." See margin (8).

(6) This is a miſtake; it ſhould be A. D. See quotation (12)

(7) Vaſari, *Vite de Pittori*, Part 3. pag. 301.

(8) Bullart. *Academ. des Scienc.* tom. 2. pag. 384. is therefore miſtaken; for he ſays, *that the Senate of Venice would have puniſhed this impoſtor with great rigour, if Albert had not obtained his pardon.*

[*B*] *His pictures are done in ſo elegant a manner . . . that nothing can be better expreſſed.*] His picture of Adam and Eve is one of the moſt conſiderable of his paintings: it is in the palace at Prague. Gaſpar Velius commended it in a fine manner; for he wrote two verſes in which he ſuppoſes, that an Angel admiring this repreſentation of Adam and Eve, cries out, You are more beautiful than when I drove you out of the Garden of Eden.

Angelus hos cernens, miratus dixit: ab horto
Non ita formoſos vos ego depuleram.

Mr. Bullart, from whom I borrow thoſe particulars (9) adds (10), I. "That there is ſtill to be ſeen in the pa- "lace a picture of Chriſt bearing his Croſs, which "the City of Nuremberg preſented to the Emperor; "an Adoration of the Wiſe Men; and two pieces of "the Paſſion. II. That he made for a Monaſtery at "Francfort an Aſſumption, the beauty of which was "a good income to the Monks by the preſents made to "them for the ſight of ſo exquiſite a piece. III. "That the people of Nuremberg carefully preſerve "in

(4) Vaſari, *Vit. de Pittori*, Part 3. pag. 302.

(5) Idem, ibid.

(9) Bullart. *Academ. des Sciences*, tom. 2. pag. 384.

(10) Ibid.

account which we find in Vaſari (*d*) of his engravings, is very curious; and it is no ſmall compliment to him, that this Italian Author owns, that the prints of Albert Durer being brought to Italy, excited the Painters of that country to perfect that part of the art, and ſerved them for an excellent model. He is infinitely copious in his extolling the delicacy of this admirable Engraver, and the fruitfulneſs of his fine imagination. It is certain that Albert Durer had an inexhauſtible fund of deſigns; and as he could not flatter himſelf with the hopes of executing them all while he worked on copper, ſince every piece of that kind coſt him a great deal of time, he bethought himſelf of working on wood (*e*). The two firſt works which he performed in that way, are the beheading of St. John Baptiſt, and the head of that Saint preſented to Herod in a charger. They were publiſhed in 1510 (*f*). His St. Euſtachius is one of his beſt pieces [*D*]. I cannot tell whether we can eaſily reconcile thoſe, who ſay that Albert Durer was very unhappily married, with thoſe who relate, that in painting the Virgin Mary he took his wife's face for his model and original [*E*]. The Emperor Maximilian had a great affection for him, and treated him with a particular regard, and gave him good penſions (*g*), and letters of

(*d*) Giorgio Vaſari, *Vite de Pittori*, Part 3. pag. m. 300, & *ſeq.*

(*e*) Idem, ibid. pag. 301.

(*f*) Idem, ibid.

(*g*) Melch. Adam, *Vitæ Philoſ. German.* pag. 67.

" in the Senators-Hall his portraits of Charlemagne, " and ſome Emperors of the Houſe of Auſtria, with " the twelve Apoſtles, whoſe Drapery is very agree- " able. IV. That he ſent to Raphael his portrait " done by himſelf upon canvas, without any colours, " or touch of the pencil; only heightened with ſhades " and white, but with ſuch ſtrength and elegance, " that Raphael was ſurprized at the ſight of this ex- " cellent piece, which coming afterwards into the " hands of Julio Romano, was placed by him among " the curioſities of the palace of Mantua."

[*D*] *His St. Euſtathius is one of his beſt pieces.*] Let us ſee what Vaſari ſays. *Et appreſſo un S. Euſtachio inginocchiato dinanzi al Cervo, che hà il Crocifiſſo frà le corna, la qual carta è mirabile, e maſſimamente per la bellezza d'alcuni cani in varie attitudini: che non paſſono eſſere più belli* (11). i. e. " And a St. Euſta- " chius kneeling before a ſtag, which has a crucifix " between its horns: this cut is wonderful, and par- " ticularly for the beauty of the dogs repreſented in " various attitudes, which cannot poſſibly be finer." John Valentin Andreas, Doctor of Divinity in the Duchy of Wirtemberg, ſent this piece to a Prince of the Houſe of Brunſwic, with whom he had the honour of a long correſpondence by Letters. Let us ſee the thanks, which were returned for this preſent. *Beaſti me iterum novo munere*, ſculptura *magis quàm æruâ*, *inſignis illius* pictoris Norici, *quod litera A. D. ad Baſin initiali incarceratâ inuit, cui facile nihil deeſſe crederem, niſi ut Zeuxis aut Parrhaſius, aut alius aliquis, cui æquè prona favet Minerva, colores adderet, & nativam formam* (12). i. e. " You have extremely ob- " liged me by your new preſent, a cut which merits a " nobler metal than braſs, done by the celebrated " Painter of Nuremberg, as appears from the Letters " A. D. at the foot of it; and which, I think, wants " nothing, unleſs Zeuxis or Parrhaſius, or ſome per- " ſon equally favoured by Minerva, ſhould add co- " lours, and the native form." Let us alſo mention the praiſes, which the ſame Divine gave to Durer in his Anſwer to the Letter of this Prince. *Euſtachium Dureri, ſi non à meâ, certè ſummi artificis manu non ingratum Tibi fore, facilè divinare potui, in quo Viro illud mirandum eſt, quòd ex rudi & barbaro ſeculo primus Germanorum, non tantùm artis ſuæ perfectione, ad naturæ imitationem emerſerit, ſed nec ſecundum poſt ſe reliquerit, omnibus ejus partibus, ſcalptura, ſculptura, ſtatuaria, architectonica, optica, ſymmetria, & ſimilibus ita abſolutis, ut niſi* Mich. Angelum Bonarotum, *Italum, coævum & æmulum ſuum, parem, non habuerit, iis operibus, (quorum maximam partem olim poſſedi) poſt ſe relictis, quæ unius hominis ætatem facilè ſuperent, & paupertate in frugali etiam vitâ, perpetuâ comite. Hunc Itali hodie plurimi faciunt, nobiſque ſuccenſent, qui domeſtica noſtra bona & ornamenta non agnoſcamus* (13). i. e. " I could eaſily gueſs, that the Euſtachius of Du- " rer would not prove an unacceptable preſent to you, " from whatever hand a performance of that admirable " Artiſt came. It is very ſurprizing with regard to " that man, that in a rude and barbarous age he was " the firſt of the Germans, who not only arrived to " an exact imitation of nature by the perfection of his " art, but likewiſe left no ſecond, being ſo abſolute " a maſter of it in all its parts, in etching, engraving, " ſtatuary, architecture, optics, ſymmetry, and the " reſt, that he had no equal, except Michael Angelo " Buonaroti the Italian, his contemporary and rival, " and left behind him ſuch works (the greateſt part " I formerly was poſſeſſed of) as were too much for " the life of one man. He lived always in a frugal " manner in mean circumſtances. The Italians high- " ly eſteem him, and reproach us for not ſetting a due " value on the ornaments of our own country." Let us not forget the care, which the Emperor Rodolphus II took to get the plate of St. Euſtachius gilded; and we ſhall ſee at the ſame time that Durer corrected in it a fault which Pirkheimer had pointed out to him; it was, that the horſe's ſtirrups were too ſhort. *Dureriana manu Te apprimè delectari crediderem*, theſe are the words of John Valentin Andreas (14), *cum pro accurato judicio diſcernas, quantum hic unus omnibus aliis artificio, diligentiâ, & naturæ æmulatione antecellat. Ex omnibus verò ejus ſpeciminibus* Euſtachium *in Cælatura primas tenere, à peritis rerum acceptum, cujus cupream laminam cum Imperator* RUDOLPHUS II *fel. mem. magno redemiſſet, inaurari voluit, ne amplius atteretur. Memini tamen legiſſe, à* Bilibaldo Pirkheimero, *Viro nobili, & in Repub. Noribergenſi Triumviro clariſſimo* Dureri *Mecænate, & Nutricio prope unico, cùm nihil haberet, quod in Euſtachiana tabula improbaret, tamen notaſſe*, Stapedes *breviores eſſe, quàm ut* Euſtachius *huic equo inſidere commodè poſſit, pœnamque artifici indixiſſe, ut equum inſtructum depingeret, ad equiſonum inſtitutum, quod ille egregiè præſtitit, quem ſæpe cum voluptate vidi.* i. e. " I ſhould believe, that you are greatly delighted " with Durer's performances, ſince from exquiſite " judgment you perceive how much ſuperior he is to " all others in art, induſtry, and imitation of nature. " But of all his cuts, I have heard men of taſte ſay, " that his St. Euſtachius claims the firſt rank; the " copper-plate of which being purchaſed for a great " ſum by the Emperor Rodolphus II, he ordered it to " be gilded, to prevent it from being worn any " longer. But I remember to have read, that Bili- " bald Pirkheimer, a man of quality, and one of the " Magiſtrates of Nuremberg, the patron of Durer, " and almoſt his only benefactor, was not able to object " to any thing elſe in that plate, but that the ſtirrups " were too ſhort for Euſtachius to ſit commodiouſly " on horſeback; and that by way of puniſhment he " ordered the Artiſt to paint a manag'd horſe accord- " ing to the direction of the Jockeys, which he per- " formed admirably well; and I have often ſeen it " with great pleaſure."

[*E*] *I cannot tell whether we can eaſily reconcile thoſe, who ſay, that Albert Durer was very unhappily married with thoſe, who relate that in painting the Virgin Mary he took his wife's face for his model and original.*] I find the firſt of theſe two facts in a Letter of Prince Anthony Ulric of Brunſwick (15). *Quod addis, non ſolùm memorabile, ſed & admirabile fuiſſe, inſignem illum* Pictorem Noricum, *(quem meritò majuſculâ literâ hic veneror) deſperato etiam illo, abortivoque tempore, ad tantam perfectionem, & artis ſuæ excellentiam pervenire potuiſſe, id non minus & me afficit, dum inſuper illud memoriâ repeto, quod à Studiorum noſtrorum Ductore chariſſimo, non ita pridem mihi dictum*, ipſum domi Xantippen habuiſſe peſſimam, ac divinæ ſuæ mentis flagellatricem acerrimam. *Sed uti* multos magnos Viros calamitas facit, *ita non obſtante hoc, fama de* Durero *noſtro apud exteros nihilominus adeò percrebuit, ut plurimi, Italorum cumprimis, ductum ipſius artificioſiſſimum ſequi,*

(11) Vaſari, *Vite de Pittori*, Part 3. pag. 303.

(12) See the book intitled, *Seleniana Auguſtalia*, printed at Ulm. This I collect from pag. 201. in a Letter dated Nov. 10, 1646.

(13) Ibid. pag. 203.

(14) Ibid. pag. 308.

(15) *Seleniana Auguſtalia*, pag. 309.

of Nobility, and for a coat of arms three escutcheons argent in a field azure (*h*). Charles the Vth and Ferdinand King of Hungary his brother followed this example of the Emperor Maximilian in favour and liberality (*i*). Notwithstanding this it is said, that this great Painter died very poor [*F*], and was forced to be buried at the public expence. His conversation was charming (*k*); he was fond of mirth and diversions, but in a manner not the least opposite to good manners. He was virtuous and wise, and never employed his art in obscene representations [*G*]. He wrote several books, which were printed. That which he undertook to write upon the rules of Painting, is one of them; but as it was difficult for him to please himself, he proceeded slowly in it, and did not live to see the edition of that work finished [*H*]. He died at Nuremberg April the 6th 1528 (*l*), and was interred in the Church-yard of St. John's Church, where Bilibaldus Pirckheimer his good friend erected a very honourable sepulchral inscription to him. Vasari

(*b*) Bullart, *Acad. des Sciences*, tom. 2. pag. 385.

(*i*) See the Epitaph of Albert Durer, Melchior Adam, *Vitæ Philos. German.* pag. 70.

(*k*) Idem, ibid. pag. 66.

(*l*) Melch. Adam. *in Vitis Philosph. Germanor.* pag. 70. *But according to* Reusnerus *in Diario*, pag. 35. it was in 1527.

sequi, impari tamen conatu & successu, ausi fuerint, neque adhucdum erubescant, aliorum picturas camino propius admovere, fumosa quadam caligine, ut vetustatem eò melius mentiantur; obducere, atque addito Dureri consuetò signo non rarò simplicioribus pro genuino ipsius artificio malè vendere. i. e. "What you add, that it is "very remarkable and surprizing, that this famous "Painter of Nuremberg, (whom I here profess my "due regard to by the great Letter, which I make "use of,) in so barbarous and unseasonable an Age "should arrive to so great perfection in his art, no less "affects me likewise, while I likewise consider what I "heard not long ago of my dear Tutor, *that he had "at home a Xantippe, who was a perpetual torment to "his divine mind.* But as *Calamity makes many great "men*, so notwithstanding this the reputation of our "Durer is so high among foreigners, that many, especially of the Italians, have attempted, tho' with "unequal success, to pursue his excellent plans, and "are not yet ashamed to place the pictures of other "men in chimnies, in order that they may have the "air of antiquity, and by adding Durer's usual mark "sell them frequently for his genuine performances to "the bad judges." You see here our Durer exposed to the same fate with Socrates, to the continual persecution of his wife, which however did not hinder him from producing works, that are still the admiration of the Italians. The other fact is to be found in a Letter of Dr. John Valentin Andreas to the same Prince. *De morioſiore ejus* Conjuge, *nihil mihi prius auditum: hoc verò accepi ab artificibus desiderari, quòd in effingenda* Virgine Matre, *cum puerulo* Jesu, unam suam uxorem, *quæ tamen minus elegantis & formæ & vultus fuerit, subinde expresserit, cùm cætera* Symmetriæ *humani corporis observantissimus fuerit. Ego tamen contrarium ipse possedi, & maximo dolore meo in Calvensi busto perdidi, faciem sc.* Deiparæ, *vivis coloribus, justâ* humani vultus *magnitudine depictam, quâ elegantius, concinnius & formosius excogitari nihil potuit, & quam magno ære meo redemptam velim* (16). i. e. "I "never heard any thing before of the perverseness of "his wife's temper; but I have been informed, that "Artists have complained, that in painting the Virgin Mary with the Child Jesus he frequently copied "his wife, who was far from being a beauty, tho' in "other respects he was very careful in observing the "Symmetry of the human body. But I had in my "possession the reverse of this, but lost it to my great "regret in the fire of Calva, viz. the face of the blessed Virgin in lively colours, as large as the life, "than which nothing could be imagined more elegant and beautiful; and which I would give a great "deal of money to recover." The Doctor does not refute what he had undertaken to refute; for tho' he had a very beautiful picture of the Virgin by Durer, it does not follow, but that several other pictures of that Saint might have the defects, which were complained of, and for which this reason was assigned, that Albert Durer had a fancy to draw his wife, who was far from a beauty.

(16) Ibid. pag. 311.

[*F*] *It is said, that this great Painter died very poor.*] Fiovaranti has inserted this in one of his books, and pretends that the prodigality of this Painter occasioned that misfortune. Our Doctor has confuted him in this manner (17). *Sed & alia Viro egregio exprobrantur, quæ Noriberga constanter pernegat, ex quibus est, quod* Fioravanti *in memorabilibus refert, tam* malæ frugis Oeconomum *fuisse, ut tot operum confector, defunctus* ex publico *efferendus fuerit, cum mihi probatis documentis sit assensum, non contemnendam æris & supellectilis sortem post se reliquisse. Quod si ex publico ipsi funus decretum, id* virtutis *potius precium, quam* infamiæ *notam Sen. populusque Nuribergensis prudentiss. haud dubio voluit.* i. e. "Other things are likewise "objected to this excellent man, which are constantly "denied by the City of Nuremberg; among the rest "is what Fioravanti relates, that Durer was so bad "an Oeconomist, that tho' he made so many works, "he was obliged to be buried at the public charge; "whereas I have seen authentic proofs, that he left "no small sum in money and effects. If he was "buried at the public expence, it was undoubtedly "intended by the prudent Senate and people of Nu-"remberg as a reward of his virtue, rather than a "mark of his shame."

(17) Ibid. Observe that he confesses above quotation (13), that Albert Durer was always poor, though he lived frugally.

[*G*] *He never employed his art in obscene representations.*] There were too many Painters who took this liberty at that time; but he never followed such bad examples. *Cui autem obscurum est non paucos laudem & admirationem vulgi quæsivisse obscœnitate pingendi, dum quæ non nisi occultè fieri honestè nequeant, imò quæ ne occultè quidem facta, nefario scelere & probro vacent, tabulis expressa publicarunt: hos ne pudicos quisquam credet, quorum mens & dextera talia fugerit molita . . .* (18). *Hoc igitur loco optimo jure admirabimur Durerum sanctimoniæ & pudoris diligentissimum custodem . . . . .* (19). *Nulla spurcities, nullum dedecus, in ipsius operibus extat, refugientibus scilicet talia omnia castissimi animi cogitationibus.* i. e. "Who does not know, that not a few "hunted after the praise and admiration of the vulgar "by painting obscenely, exhibiting publickly in their "pictures not only those actions, which cannot be decently done except in private, but also those which "when done secretly are enormously scandalous. Can "such persons be thought chaste, whose head and "hand are employed in such works? . . . . Upon this "occasion therefore we may justly admire Durer, "who was always an inviolable observer of decency "and modesty. . . . No kind of obscenity appears in "his performances, his chaste mind being wholly averse to such things."

(18) Melch. Adam. *in Vitis Philosoph. Germ.* pag. 67.

(19) Idem, ibid. pag. 69.

[*H*] *His Treatise on the rules of painting was printed: but as it was difficult for him to please himself, he did not live to see the edition of that work finished.*] Let us continue to cite Joachim Camerarius; for it is from him that Melchior Adamus borrows all that he relates concerning Albert Durer. *Priusquam absolvere omnia & correcta edere, ut cupierat, posset, morte est ereptus, placida illa quidem & optabili, sed profecto multorum judicio præmatura. Erat autem si quid omnium in illo viro quod vitii simile videretur, unica infinita diligentia & in se quoque inquisitrix sæpe parum æqua. Hinc igitur mors ab incepta editione operis sustulit, quam tamen consummarunt amici ex illius præscriptione* (20). i. e. "Before he could compleat the whole, and correct it "in such a manner as he desired, he was cut off. His "death indeed was calm and to be wished for; but in "the opinion of many too early. If any thing in him "had the appearance of a fault, it was his excessive "application and too great rigour with regard to his "own performances. Hence it was that he died be-"fore the Edition of his work was compleated; tho' "his friends afterwards finished it suitably to his di-"rections." The Edition was published after his death. Observe that Durer wanted learning, and that he wrote his book in High-Dutch; and what we have of his in Latin is a translation done by others. The treatise abovementioned was translated into Latin by Joachim Camerarius, and is intitled, *De Symmetria Partium in rectis formis humanorum corporum.* It was printed at Nuremberg

(20) Melch. Adam. *in Vitis Philosoph. German.* pag. 70. *Ex Præfat.* Joach. Camerarii, *in Librum* de Symmetria Partium.

Vaſari calls him DURO. Mr. Felibien, who calls him Durer in the place where he ſpeaks of him at large, calls him *Dure* in other places (*m*).

(*m*) *Entretien* 2. pag. 224. *See alſo* pag. 383, & *ſeq.*

Nuremberg in folio in 1532, and at Paris in 1557 (21). An Italian verſion was publiſhed at Venice in 1591. The other works of Durer are *Inſtitutiones Geometricæ*, printed at Paris by Wechel 1532 (22): *De Urbibus, arcibus, caſtelliſque condendis & muniendis*, printed at Paris by the ſame in 1531 (23); *De Varietate figurarum, & flexuris partium, ac geſtibus imaginum*, Nuremburg 1534 (24). A Diſcourſe of his concerning the ſymmetry of the parts of an horſe, was ſtolen from him. He knew well enough who had ſtolen it; but he choſe rather to bear the loſs and trouble ſecretly, than to deviate from his uſual moderation and mildneſs, as he muſt have done, if he had proſecuted thoſe thieves (25).

(21) *Epit. Bibliotb. Geſner.* pag. 19.
(22) Geſner. *in Biblioth.* folio 17 *verſo.*
(23) Idem, ibid.
(24) *Epit. Bibliotb. Geſneri*, pag. 19.
(25) Melch. Adam. *in Vitis Philoſ. Germ.* cap. 70.

DURY (JOHN) in Latin *Duræus*, a Proteſtant Divine, a Scot by Nation, in the 17th Century, laboured with great zeal for the reunion of the Lutherans and Calviniſts. The ſtrong inclination which he had for this *great work*, and the hopes of ſucceſs in it, induced him to let his ſuperiors know, that he could employ his talents to better advantage by travelling through the world, than if he was confined to the care of one flock. They agreed to his propoſals, and permitted him to go from place to place, to negotiate an accommodation between the Proteſtant Churches. He obtained likewiſe the approbation and recommendation of the Archbiſhop of Canterbury (*a*). I have obſerved in another place (*b*) that he was aſſiſted by the Biſhop of Kilmore; and alſo by Dr. Joſeph Hall Biſhop of Exeter, as he acknowledges in the Preface to his *Prodromus*. He began by publiſhing his plan of a reunion [*A*], and he appeared at a famous Aſſembly of the Evangelics in Germany at Francfort in 1634 (*c*). The Churches of Tranſylvania ſent to him their advice and counſel the ſame year (*d*). He negotiated afterwards with the Divines of Sweden and Denmark; he turned himſelf every way, he conſulted the Univerſities, he communicated their anſwers, and was not deterred by the unſucceſsfulneſs of the pains, which he had taken, even in the year 1661 [*B*]. But at laſt he was diſcouraged in 1674; and he had no longer any hopes of ſerving the Church by the methods which he had till then taken; he raiſed new batteries; he had recourſe to another expedient, which was to labour on a new Explication of the Apocalypſe [*C*], as a ſure method of reuniting

(*a*) See the *Prodromus Tractatuum Irenicorum Joh. Duræi*, pag. 122.
(*b*) See the Article BEDELL, Remark [*D*].
(*c*) *Prodromus Tract. Irenicor.* pag. 111.
(*d*) Ibid. pag. 50, & *ſeq.*

[*A*] *He began by publiſhing his Plan of Re-union.*] I find in the Catalogue or the Library of Oxford, his *Aliquot Theologorum Galliæ & trium Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ Epiſcoporum* (ſc. *Davenantii, Mortoni, & Halli*) *Sententia de pacis rationibus inter Evangelicos uſurpandis*, printed in 1634. I omit the Treatiſes which followed that, as his *Hypomnemata de ſtudio pacis Eccleſiaſticæ*, à Amſterdam, 1636. *Informatio de eis quæ in ſtudio Eccleſiaſticæ concordiæ inter Evangelicos proſequendo, agitare inſtituit Duræus erga Eccleſiarum Danicarum Theologos.*

[*B*] *He was not deterred by the unſucceſsfulneſs of the pains, which he had taken, even in the year* 1661.] See the book which he publiſhed that year at Amſterdam, and intlted, *Johannis Duræi Irenicorum Tractatuum Prodromus, in quo præliminares continentur Tractatus de* I. *Pacis Eccleſiaſticæ remoris è medio tollendis.* II. *Concordiæ Evangelicæ fundamentis ſufficienter jactis.* III. *Reconciliationis Religioſæ procurandæ argumentis & mediis.* IV. *Methodo inveſtigatoria ad controverſias omnes, ſine contradicendi ſtudio & præjudicio, pacifice decidendas. Cui præmittuntur collectorum inter Proteſtantes conſiliorum pacificorum harmoniæ, propediem Deo permittente adornandæ & in lucem edendæ.* The Preface of the book is dated at Amſterdam October 1ſt 1661. He there gives an account of the books which he had promiſed the public, and propoſes the expedients which he thinks moſt capable of rendring his deſign ſucceſsful. He aſſerts that the firſt Article which was agreed upon in this preliminaries of this future peace, is, that the affair ſhould not be managed by a ſcholaſtical diſputation. It was of great importance to agree upon this; for the manner of diſputing could not but tend to foment the obſtinacy of parties, and to lead them ſtill farther from the concluſion. Dury at that time appeared as much poſſeſſed as ever with hopes of ſucceeding; and going for Germany deſired of the Divines of Utrecht an authentic teſtimony of their good intentions, after having informed them of the ſtate in which he had left the affair with the King of Great Britain and the Elector of Brandenbourg; and of what had paſſed at the Court of Heſſe, and the meaſures which were actually taken at Geneva, Heidelberg and Mets. He deſired to have this teſtimonial of the Divines of Utrecht, in order to ſhew it to the Germans. He obtained it, and publiſhed it at the end of his *Prodromus*.

[*C*] *He had recourſe to another expedient, which was to labour on a new explication of the Apocalypſe.*] He publiſhed at Francfort a little Treatiſe in French in 1674, intitled, *Of underſtanding the Apocalypſe by itſelf; as all the Holy Scripture ought reaſonably to be underſtood.* He declares in the Epiſtle Dedicatory (1), that he has nothing to reproach himſelf with, though he abandons *the pacific negotiation, which had been carried on for many years with the Lutheran Miniſters.* He plainly intimates, that he abandoned it only out of neceſſity, that is, becauſe they would no longer hear him, or have any correſpondence with him upon this ſubject, *Having finiſhed*, ſays he (2), *with regard to all the perſons concerned, the labour which could be expected of me, as a Sollicitor of the Evangelical Counſels, I have nothing more to do with the particular heads on that ſide, ſince they ſeem to have taken a reſolution to be ſilent with reſpect to me, though they continue ſtill to foment the uſual animoſity among the vulgar.... But ſince I now find myſelf obliged to put an end to theſe proceedings, becauſe they will no longer have any correſpondence with me concerning the propoſitions, which have been regularly offered to them all, and are abſolutely unexceptionable: Since, I ſay, for theſe reaſons I am obliged to deſiſt from my purſuit (for I ought not to urge any thing by importunity; what is not done voluntarily, and from conſcience, is not of God;) I have taken a reſolution more general* (3). It will be proper to ſee his confeſſion of the unſucceſsfulneſs of his travels and labours. "Being now come to this point, I "thought fit to conſider the advantage which the pub-"lic or myſelf have received after ſo much labour. "When I conſider the public therefore, I ſee, that God "does not permit the fruit of this ſeed to grow up "or appear before the time of harveſt be come. And "when I reflect on myſelf, the chief fruit I have "reaped by my labour both within and without is "this, that without I ſee the miſery of Chriſtians, "which is much greater than that of the Pagans "and other nations. I ſee the cauſe of this miſery; "I ſee the want of a remedy, and I ſee the cauſe of "the want. This is the ſum of the advantage, "which I have made by my labour without. And "within I have gained nothing but the comfortable "teſtimony of my own conſcience (4)." Do not imagine, that after this confeſſion he is going to take a reſolution of ſitting down at reſt; for on the contrary he engages in a much greater attempt. He could not ſucceed in reconciling the Reformed and the Lutherans, and yet he undertakes to reunite all the ſects of Chriſtians.

(1) The book is dedicated to the Princeſs of Heſſe.
(2) Dury, *Epiſtle Dedicatory*, pag. 3, 4.
(3) Ibid. pag. 7, 8.
(4) Ibid. pag. 4, 5.

reuniting all Christians. He enjoyed then a quiet retreat in the country of Hesse [D]. I cannot tell what year he died. Some have confounded him with the Jesuit JOHN DURÆUS [E]. It was thought that the Lutherans would look upon him with a less favourable eye, when they found the Episcopal Party begun to decline in England [F]. We shall see an account of his journey to Mets, and some other particulars in the Article of FERRI.

The Letter which he wrote to Peter du Moulin *concerning the state of the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland* under Cromwell, was printed with some other pieces at London in 1658 in 12mo by the care of Lewis du Moulin. It is very curious, and shews that he was no enemy to the Independents.

(5) Idem, Preface, pag. 16.

stians. My new attempt, says he (5), *is not at all different from the former with respect to the substance of the Evangelical Work, but only with regard to the extent of the application of my labour, and the method of insinuating into the consciences of those, to whom I address myself; for I would no longer confine my application to the Protestants alone, but my view is to comprehend all Christians divided into factions contrary to the end of the heavenly calling, which is proposed in the Gospel, and attested in the Holy Scripture.* But was the method which he took, capable of giving him hopes of great success? Nothing less; and yet he promises wonders by it (6). We shall speak of this in another place (7).

(6) *Quidlibet impotens Sperare.* Horat. Od. 37. lib. 1.

(7) In Remark [F] of the Article FERRI.

[D] *He enjoyed a quiet retreat in the country of Hesse.*] Hedwige Sophia, Princess of Hesse, who had the Regency of the country, *had assigned to* Dury *a very commodious quarter, with a table well furnished,* and had given him *free postage for his Letters.* He returns her thanks for this in the Epistle Dedicatory to the Book abovementioned.

[E] *Some have confounded him with the Jesuit* JOHN DURÆUS.] This Jesuit was a Scotsman, and wrote a Book against Dr. Whitaker's Answer to Campian's Ten Reasons. This Book was printed at Paris in 1581, and at Ingolstad in 1585 (8). The Catalogue of the Library at Oxford ascribes it to Dury the Pacificator. Monsr. Baillet thought, that Duræus, the antagonist of Dr. Whitaker, was a Protestant (9).

(8) Alegambe, *Biblioth. Soc. Jesu*, pag. 237.

(9) Baillet, *Jugemens des Savans*, tom. 3. pag. 136.

[F] *It is thought that the Lutherans would look on him with a less favourable eye, when they found that the Episcopal Party declined in England.*] This is what Vossius wrote to Grotius in January 1641. *Joannes Duræus jam quasi hebdomas est, quod è Germania huc venit, à suis in Britanniam revocatus. Quid promoverit, ex literis ejus intelliges, quas ad te ut mitterem jussit. Plurimum autem metuo, ne in irritum cadant, quæcumque hactenus inter Lutheranos egit. Jam decennio, antequam ille hanc provinciam susciperet, nihil æquè objectabant Lutherani, quam pacificatores omnes agere hanc causam malo dolo. . . Quamquam vero adventu D. Duræi, non omnino suam opinionem mutârant Lutherani: plerique tamen aliquanto meliorem de eo sententiam conceperunt, eo quod missus foret à Clero Anglicano* (10). i. e. "It is about a week since John Dury came hither out of Germany, being recalled into England by his friends. What success he has had, you will learn from his letters, which he desired me to send you. But I am greatly apprehensive, lest what he has hitherto done among the Lutherans should prove abortive. Ten years ago, before he undertook this Province, the principal objection of the Lutherans was, that all the pacificators acted upon sinister views. . . . . But though upon Mr. Dury's coming among them, they did not absolutely alter their mind, yet most of them conceived a more favourable opinion of him, because he was sent by the Clergy of England." The rest of the passage is in the margin (11).

(10 Vossius, Epist. 401. pag. m. 367. *See also* Epist. 405.

(11) *Sed quid animi nunc, ad iuendum cum Ecclesiis Gallicis, & Belgicis, fore putabimus, ubi cognorint, hoc agi in Britanniæ, ut accusatis, damnatis, ejectis omnibus, quos non longè à se abire, & omnino modestiæ, & pacis amantiores credebant, triumphent soli, quos ipsi Calvinianos, in Anglia autem Puritanos nuncupant?* Idem, ibid. i. e. "But what disposition shall we think they will now be in, to unite with the Churches of France and the Low-Countries, when they know, that the whole design in England is, to accuse, condemn, and eject all those, whom they thought to be very near their own sentiments, and most inclined to moderation and peace, and to advance those only, whom they stile Calvinists, and who are called Puritans in England?"

EBED-JESU.

E.

(a) This shews that he lived in the 17th Century.

(b) Mr. de Breves, Ambaſſador at the Port, had brought him to France in the year 1614. Gaſſend. *in Vita Peireskij*, lib. 3. pag. m. 281.

EBED-JESU. See HEBEDJESU.

ECCHELLENSIS (ABRAHAM) a learned Maronite whom the Preſident le Jai employed in the Edition of his Polyglott Bible (*a*). Gabriel Sionita (*b*), who was his Countryman, had drawn him to Paris, in order to make him his fellow labourer in publiſhing that Bible [*A*]. They fell out in ſuch a manner, that their quarrel made a ſcandalous noiſe: Gabriel Sionita complained to the Parliament, and cruelly defamed his Aſſociate (*c*). Monſieur Claude has made uſe of this defamation to diſcredit the teſtimony of Ecchellenſis alledged by Mr. Arnauld [*B*]. Thoſe who anſwered Mr. Claude did not repair the honour of the defamed Maronite [*C*]. The Congregation

(c) See the Remark [*A*], Citation (2).

[*A*] *Gabriel Sionita had drawn him to Paris, in order to make him his fellow Labourer in publiſhing* the Polyglott *Bible* of Mr. le Jai.] This does not agree with what is ſaid in the Supplement of Moreri: I cannot help it; I have good authority for what I advance, ſince I only follow Father Simon; and I have the greater right to depend on his teſtimony, as he has deſigned it to ſave the honour of our Ecchellenſis in an affair which made a great deal of noiſe. All the world knows that the diſpute between Monſr. Arnauld and Monſr. Claude paſſed for a matter of very great conſequence. Father Simon took part in it to oppoſe Monſr. Claude with relation to the opinion of the Greeks; it was neceſſary for his purpoſe that Ecchellenſis ſhould be an honeſt man, and Gabriel Sionita a Calumniator. Now this is one of his proofs as to the laſt fact. Gabriel invited Ecchellenſis to Paris, and owned him for his brother: he did not therefore ſuppoſe him to be the Author of all thoſe rogueries of which he afterwards accuſed him (1). Every body ſees that Father Simon would not have alledged an uncertain fact, when he intended to draw ſo great an advantage againſt Mr. Claude from what he returned him in anſwer; could he imagine Mr. Claude would be ſatisfied with a doubtful fact? I have reaſon, therefore, to believe that what he advances is preferable to theſe words of the Continuator of Moreri: *Mr. le Jay, at whoſe expence the Great Bible was printing, having fallen out with Gabriel Sionita the Maronite, ſent for Abraham Ecchellenſis from Rome.* This is ſufficient to give us to underſtand that theſe two Maronites were not fellow-labourers in the Edition of Mr. le Jai's Polyglott; and yet Father Simon aſſerts the direct contrary. *Gabriel Sionita adverſus Abrahamum Ecchellenſem ſupremæ curiæ Pariſienſi libellum quendam ſupplicem obtulerat in quo graviſſimè de Abrahamo, qui ei* SOCIUS *in editione Bibliorum Pariſienſium adjunctus fuerat, conqueritur* (2). i. e. "Gabriel Sionita had preſented to the Parliament of Paris a Petition againſt "Abraham Ecchellenſis, wherein he grievouſly complains of Abraham, who had been ASSOCIATED "with him in the Edition of the Paris Polyglott." Mr. Nicolle aſſerts it likewiſe, as we ſhall ſee below.

(1) *Si impoſtor erat Abraham, cur Gabriel ante quam lis inter eos mota fuiſſet eum fratris nomine compellavit? Si hæc vera ſunt quæ de Abrahamo Gabriel affirmavit, hunc impoſtorem potius eſſe exiſtimaverim: cum ille ipſius* ROGATU ET ACCERSITU *Pariſiis venerit.* Richardus Simon, *in Fide Eccleſiæ Orient.* pag. 198.

(2) Idem, ibid.

[*B*] *Mr. Claude has made uſe of this defamation to diſcredit the teſtimony of Ecchellenſis, alledged by Mr. Arnauld.*] What Mr. Arnauld had alledged concerning the faith of the Melchites was taken from the Notes of our Ecchellenſis on the Catalogue of Chaldee Books made by Hebedjeſu. Here is the anſwer which was returned him. "The teſtimony of Abraham Ecchellenſis deſerves no credit, and I appeal to Gabriel Sionita his countryman, who has deſcribed him "as an ignorant troubleſome fellow, a raſcal, a liar, "an impoſtor, and a rogue. Theſe two men had "both ſtudied in the ſeminary of the Maronites at "Rome, and they were both abſolutely attached to "the intereſts of the Church of Rome; but having "quarrelled on account of an Edition of the Bible "in Syriac, Gabriel thought himſelf obliged to tell "him his own, and to expoſe his faults to the public. To this end he addreſſed a Piece to him which "he calls *Commonitorium Apologeticum*, wherein he repreſents him in the manner I have mentioned. He "reproaches him with having ſet the whole Seminary "of Rome at variance, with having betrayed the "Patriarch of the Maronites, with having deceived "Prince Fachraddin, with having tricked the Duke "of Florence, with having been baniſhed his native "country, with having been impriſoned for his crimes "at Florence, and at laſt, he threatens him, for his utter "confuſion, to print the Letters he has received from "Mount Libanus, Rome, and Florence, concerning his "Life. This is enough, in my opinion, to juſtify my "calling in queſtion the ſincerity of ſuch a man (3)."

(3) Claude, *Réponſe à la Perpetuité de la Foi defendue*, liv. 2. pag. m. 30. of the 2d volume in 8vo.

[*C*] *Thoſe who anſwered Mr. Claude did not repair the honour of the defamed Maronite.*] Father Simon agrees that the occaſion of the quarrel between Sionita and Ecchellenſis was their having too eager a deſign on Mr. le Jai's purſe: *Ita fit ut dum quiſque nummis D.* le Jay, *cujus ſumptibus Polyglotta illa Biblia in vulgus edita ſunt, inhiat, illi pacem diu tenere non potuerint.* This is no extraordinary preparative for a man's juſtification. One cut-purſe may well draw another into a place where he obſerves the harveſt is very great; but afterwards he may wiſh to be alone, if he finds himſelf incommoded by the ſharing of the plunder. Wherefore the proof I have mentioned in the preceding Remark is not a very ſtrong one; for ſince Father Simon, owns theſe two Maronites were Sharpers, nothing hinders but that Sionita might invite the other to Paris, tho' he knew him to be a rogue. So that Father Simon inſtead of juſtifying Ecchellenſis, only blackens his companion. The good Teſtimony which Father Morin bore Ecchellenſis (4) is of no ſervice againſt Mr. Claude; for Father Morin does not warrant the time Sionita had ſpoken of: he contents himſelf with ſaying that Ecchellenſis had appeared honeſt and very laborious during his ſtay at Paris; but the Accuſer does not charge his Aſſociate's rogueries to have been committed in that time. Let us ſee whether another of Mr. Claude's Antagoniſts has defended the cauſe of the accuſed any better.

(4) *Multa ſilentio præterire viſum eſt, qua in commendationem Abrahami proferri poſſent, atque imprimis Epiſtolam, qua doctiſſimus Joannes Morinus ampliſſimum Cardinalem Franciſcum Barberinum, de illius probitate, vigiliis aſſiduis, & labore indefeſſo quandiu Pariſiis commoratus eſt, certiorem facit.* Richardus Simon, *in Fide Eccleſiæ Orient.* pag. 198.

Here are his Words: "Nor is there more good "ſenſe in the contempt with which Mr. Claude treats "the Paſſages cited by Ekellenſis, under pretence that "Gabriel Sionita, whoſe aſſociate he was in correcting "the Polyglott Bible printed at Paris, having fallen "out with him, charged him with ſeveral crimes "which have no relation to the falſification of thoſe "Paſſages. It does not much become Mr. Claude to "make himſelf judge of the difference between the "two Maronites, and yet leſs to declare himſelf a "party againſt Ekellenſis on the bare teſtimony of "his adverſary. But, however it be, all thoſe perſonal reproaches give him no manner of right to "reject the Paſſages which are cited in that Author's "Books, becauſe they do not make it credible that "quoting, as he does, the Books from whence he has "taken them, which are moſt of them in the Vatican Library, he had the impudence to invent them "according to his own fancy (5)." Nothing can be more vague than ſuch a juſtification; and ſince the Author does not refer the Reader to the Anſwers of Ecchellenſis, but contents himſelf with ſaying that we ſhould remain neuter in this quarrel, it is very probable that Maronite either anſwered nothing, or anſwered very ill. What the Janſeniſt Writer depends on as his laſt refuge, is better than all the reſt; for after all, there are circumſtances wherein we may believe a knave would not dare to be guilty of forgery.

(5) *Réponſe générale au nouveau Livre de Mr. Claude*, lib. 1. chap. 13. pag. 214. This *Anſwer* is attributed to Mr. *Nicolle*.

tion *de propaganda fide* associated him, about the year 1636, with those whom they employed in making an Arabic Translation of the Scripture (*d*). They recalled him from France, and he laboured in that Translation at Rome in the year 1652. He published something in the same City, and died there in the month of July 1664 (*e*). Consult the Supplement of Moreri (*f*) where you will find a very curious Article concerning this person.

(*d*) The Abbot Nazari, in his *Giornale de Letterati* of the 29th of Jan. 1672.

(*e*) Nazari, ibid.

(*f*) Under *Abraham Ecchellensis.*

While he was Professor of the Oriental Languages at Rome, he was pitched upon by the Great Duke Ferdinand II to translate from Arabic into Latin the 5th, 6th, and 7th Books of Apollonius's Conics. He was assisted in this Translation by John Alphonso Borelli [*D*], a famous Mathematician, who added Commentaries to it. The whole was printed at Florence with Archimedes's Book *de assumptis* (*g*), in the year 1661, in folio. The Preface contains some Facts [*E*], which would be the best part of this Article, if I could display them with their principal circumstances. I shall speak of the quarrel which arose between Mr. de Flavigny and Abraham Ecchellensis, and we shall there see a very sensible example of the disorder which faults of the press may occasion, and of the insupportable vexation they give an Author [*F*].

(*g*) Translated likewise from Arabic into Latin by Ecchellensis.

☞ ECHARD

[*D*] *He was assisted in the Translation . . . . of Apollonius by John Alfonso Borelli.*] This was very necessary; for he who was to translate did not understand the Mathematics (6), and therefore, how skilful soever he might be in the Arabic tongue, he must have stumbled at every step. On the other hand, Borelli was perfectly ignorant of that tongue (7), but he understood the subject of the Manuscript, and by means of the Geometrical figures guessed the true sense of Apollonius, if the Translator did but explain a few words to him ever so slightly. *Porro quod hac in re magis mirandum est*, it is the testimony which Ecchellensis bears to Borelli's great genius, *nec silentio prætereundum, ea erat Viro illi doctissimo singularis ingenii perspicacitas, ut sæpe in abstrusis quibusdam locis, non ex integris, inquam, præmissis, sed ex unica dictione totam illationem inde colligeret, non sensu, sed totidem pene verbis, ac si Arabica legeret verba, & linguæ veteranus esset professor* (8). i. e. "But the most wonderful circumstance of this affair, and what must not be passed over in silence, is, that the uncommon genius and penetration of that great man was such, that frequently, in certain abstruse passages, he collected the intire conclusion, not from the whole premisses, but from a single word, and not in sense only, but almost in so many terms, as if he read the Arabic words, and had been an old professor of the language."

(6) *Versabatur* (difficultas) *circa disciplinæ vocabulorum intelligentiam & notionum quarum ignari eramus, & penitus jejuni.* Ecchellensis, *Præf. ad Apollon. Conica.*

(7) *Licet Arabici idiomatis sim prorsus ignarus.* Jo. Alfonsus Borellus, *Præf. ad Apollon.*

(8) Ecchell. *Præf. ad* Apollon. Conica.

[*E*] *His Preface . . . . to Apollonius's Conics contains some facts.*] He acquaints us that he received a thousand favours from the Great Duke Ferdinand II, not only when he resided at his Court in full prosperity, with the character of the Amir Fachraddin's Deputy, but also after the ruin of his affairs. Let us see how he expresses himself: *Memini profecto, nec ex animo meo excidet, imo clavo fixum trabali manet, quanta in me contulit Magnus Ferdinandus Secundus ornamenta, quanta in me usus est liberalitate, & beneficentia, non tantùm dum fortuna mihi arridebat, non solùm dum res succedebat prosperè, non modo dum ad illum ab Amiro Fachraddino missus singulari felicitate fruebar, sed etiam in naufragio, & jactura illa barbarica, in Carrellina conjuratione & proditione, in adversissima fortuna* (9).

(9) Idem, ibid.

[*F*] *Here is an example . . . . of the disorder which faults of the press may occasion, and of the . . . . vexation they give an Author.*] "It is well known that "M. de Flavigny wrote two Letters against this magnificent Edition of the Bible in seven languages published at the expence of M. le Jay. A learned "Maronite, the King's Professor of the Syriac and "Arabic languages, named Abraham Ecchellensis, "who had come from Rome to Paris, had some "share in that Work. It was he who had given the "Arabic and Syriac Text of the Book of Ruth, with "the Latin version. Mr. de Flavigny wrote in the "year 1647 his third Letter against Ecchellensis and "his Book of Ruth, pretending it was full of faults. "In the middle of the second page of the first sheet "he placed these passages by themselves, taken from "the seventh Chapter of S. Matthew: Vers. 3. *Quid "vides festucam in oculo fratris tui, & trabem in oculo "tuo non vides?* Vers. 5. *Ejice primùm trabem de "oculo tuo, & tunc videbis ejicere festucam de oculo "fratris tui.* He designed by these words to give "Ecchellensis to understand that, having left a great "many faults in the Book of Ruth, it was very improper for him to reproach his brother Maronite "Gabriel Sionita, the King's Professor as well as himself, with having left some in the Arabic and Syriac "Books which he had caused to be printed in M. le "Jay's Bible. The Maronite, finding himself obliged "to answer, began by accusing the Doctor of an "enormous crime with regard to the abovequoted "passage; of having designed, by an impiety without example, to correct the Sacred Text of the Gospel, and to strike out a decent word in order to "make room for another which was not so. He exaggerates this pretended crime in a sharp and outragious style. He expresses himself thus in his first "Letter, which he intitles *Epistola Apologetica prima*, "printed in 8vo. in the year 1647, page 11: *Ad "primum quod attinet, tua Judaïca modestia ac pietas, "humanissime Flavignane, summoperè elucescit, ut alia "cætera loca omittam, ex iis verbis quæ in me retulisti "ex cap 7. divi Matthæi v. 3. & v. 5. quomodo autem Sacro-sancti Evangelii verba depravasti, & illusisti in hoc loco, ac sacra immiscuisti profanis, ne expecter à me ut illa secundùm sacrilegam emendationem "tuam hic referam, solùm enim meminisse animus horret, "luctuque refugit. Quamobrem non in meis, sed in tuis "scriptis id legatur. ô acerrimum Hebraïcæ veritatis "propugnatorem! Hebraïcus Textus, ubi verbum aliquod "inhonestum occurrit, honestis velat verbis: Tu verò "Hebraïcæ Linguæ Professor, illiusque Textus importunè "ad stomachum usque defensor ac rabula, Sacro-sancti "Evangelii Sacrosancta verba impietate inauditâ turpas, "fœdas, & spurcè illis abuteris. Ex quo liquidò apparet, quos mirabiles progressus in pietate & Lectione "sacrarum Scripturarum, quas crepas semper, feceris. "Ex verbis tuis, Flavignane, quisnam sis optimè cognoscimus, quia qualis homo est talis etiam ejus erit oratio, orationi autem facta simillima, factis vita, ut "ex Socrate refert Cicero lib. 5. Quæst. Tuscul &c.* i. e. "*As to the first point, your Judaical modesty and piety, "most humane Sir, shine forth in the strongest manner, "to omit other passages, from those words which you have "quoted against me out of the seventh Chapter of Saint "Matthew, Verses the 3d and 5th: but in what manner you have corrupted the words of the Holy "Evangelist, and played on this passage, by mixing profane things with sacred, expect not that "I should set forth according to your sacrilegious emendation; for my soul shrinks for horror and affliction "at the bare remembrance of it. Wherefore let it be "read in your writings, and not in mine. O the zealous champion of the Hebrew Text! which, when any "indecent word occurs, throws a veil of modesty over it; "but you, a Professor of the Hebrew language, and whose "importunate and clamorous defence of that Text raises "the indignation of every one, defile the sacred words of "the Gospel with unheard of impiety, and filthily abuse "it. From whence it plainly appears what admirable "progress you have made in piety and reading of the "holy Scriptures, which you are continually bragging of. "What a sort of a man you are, we best know from "your own words: because as the man is such also will "be his speech; his actions must be agreeable to his "words, and his life to his actions, as Cicero tells us "from Socrates;* and so on for six whole pages. These "are high words, and contain a hainous accusation.

(11) 171.

(12) 172.

(13)

"Here

ECHARD (JOHN), an Engliſh Divine of great learning and wit in the ſeventeenth Century, was born of a good family in the County of Suffolk; and having been inſtructed in grammar-learning was ſent to Katherine-Hall in the Univerſity of Cambridge, where he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1656, and of Maſter of Arts in 1660 (*a*). In 1670 he publiſhed, without his name, a book intitled, *The Grounds and Occaſions of the contempt of the Clergy and Religion enquired into. In a Letter to* R. L. [*A*]. London 1670 in 12mo. This was ſoon after attacked by an anonymous Writer in a Tract intitled, *An Anſwer to a Letter of Enquiry* into the Grounds and Occaſions of the contempt of the Clergy [*B*]. London 1671 in 12mo; and by Mr. Barnabas

(*a*) From the Univerſity Regiſter.

" Here is a great deal of noiſe made, and a great ma-
" ny abuſes caſt on a reverend Doctor. He is accuſed
" of an act of impiety, and charged with ſacrilege;
" and a ſuſpicion is raiſed againſt his morals. Who
" would believe that ſuch bitter reproaches are ground-
" ed merely on a fault of the preſs (10)?" Mr. Chevillier, who furniſhes me with this long paſſage, explains to us wherein this fault conſiſted, and how it had been committed by the Printer after Mr. Flavigni had reviſed the laſt proof-ſheet. The miſchief happened by the firſt letter of the word *oculo* accidentally ſlipping out of the form, *upon the Printer's touching a line which was ill ſet.* Mr. de Flavigni, being informed what Abraham Ecchellenſis reproached him with, *could not find* the fault *in his printed copy: his friend M. d'Auvergne, Regius Profeſſor of Arabic, was obliged to point it out to him, before he could diſcover it. He immediately wrote his fourth Letter . . . he publickly made oath of his innocence in terms of Scripture . . .* (11): *he ſaid a raging fever muſt have turned* the Printer's *brain, and that he muſt have been mad, when he printed the word with that fault* (12). *His anger was not perfectly appeaſed* (13) thirty years after the printing of this Letter.

(10) Chevillier, *Origine de l'Imprimerie de Paris*, Part 2. chap. 5. pag. 169, &c.

(11) Ibid. pag. 171.

(12) Ibid. pag. 172.

(13) Ibid.

[*A*] *His* Grounds and Occaſions of the Contempt of the Clergy enquired into.] This Tract is ſigned *T. B.* and dated Auguſt 8th 1670. In the Preface he obſerves, that many perhaps upon the very firſt ſight of the title, will imagine, that the Author does *either want the great tithes, lying under the preſſure of ſome pitiful vicarage; or that he is much out of humour, and diſſatisfied with the preſent condition of affairs; or laſtly, that he writes to no purpoſe at all, there having been abundance of unprofitable adviſers in this kind.* With regard to theſe particulars, he tells us, that as to his being under ſome low Church-diſpenſation, he wrote not out of a pinching neceſſity, or out of any riſing deſign. " You may pleaſe to believe, *ſays he*, that although I " have a moſt ſolemn reverence for the Clergy in gene-
" ral, and eſpecially for that of England; yet for
" my own part, I muſt confeſs to you, I am not of
" that holy employment; and have as little thoughts
" of being Dean or Biſhop, as they that think ſo,
" have hopes of being all Lord Keepers. Nor leſs
" miſtaken will they be, that ſhall judge me in
" the leaſt diſcontented, or any ways diſpoſed to
" diſturb the peace of the preſent ſettled Church. For
" in good truth, I have neither loſt Kings nor Biſhops
" lands, that ſhould incline me to a ſurly and quar-
" relſome complaining; as many be, who would have
" been glad enough to ſee his Majeſty reſtored, and
" would have endured Biſhops daintily well, had
" they loſt no money by their coming in. I am not,
" I'll aſſure you, any of thoſe occaſional Writers,
" that miſſing preferment in the Univerſity, can pre-
" ſently write you their new ways of education; or
" being a little tormented with an ill choſen wife, ſet
" forth the doctrine of Divorce to be truly evangeli-
" cal (1). The cauſe of theſe few ſheets was honeſt
" and innocent, and as free from all paſſion, as any
" deſign." As for the laſt objection, that this Book is altogether needleſs, there having been an infinite number of Church and Clergy menders, that have made many tedious and unſucceſsful offers; he confeſſes, that it would be unreaſonable for him to expect a better reward: only thus much he thinks may with modeſty be ſaid, that he cannot at preſent call to mind any thing that is propounded, but what is very hopeful, and eaſily accompliſhed. *For indeed*, continues he, *ſhould I go about to tell you, that a child can never prove a profitable inſtructor of the people, unleſs born when the Sun is in Aries; or brought up in a ſchool, that ſtands full ſouth; that he can never be able to govern a Pariſh, unleſs he can ride a great horſe: or that he can never go through the great work of the Miniſtry, unleſs, for three hundred years backward, it can be proved that none of his family ever had a cough, ague, or grey hair; then I ſhould very patiently endure to be reckoned amongſt the vaineſt, that ever made the attempt. But believe me, reader, I am not, as you will eaſily ſee, any contriver of an incorruptible and pure chryſtalline Church; or any expecter of a reign of nothing but Saints and Worthies; but only an hearty and honeſt wiſher, that the beſt of our Clergy might for ever continue as they are, rich, and learned; and that the reſt might be very uſeful, and well eſteemed of in their profeſſion.*

(1) This is levelled at Milton, who publiſhed at London 1645 in 4to. *The doctrine and diſcipline of divorce.*

[*B*] An Anſwer to a Letter of *Enquiry into the grounds and occaſions of the contempt of the Clergy.*] It is ſigned *W. S.* and dated January 10th 1670. The Author of this Anſwer in his *Preface* obſerves, that the *ſerviceableneſs of the Clergy does very much depend upon the credit and eſteem, that they can have in the world*; but that the *Enquiry* would probably do them this unkindneſs, *to make them more obnoxious and contemptible than yet they are. The ſtyle and manner of it*, ſays he, *is enough to provoke willing readers to make us their table-talk, not in order to our amendment, but to our farther diſgrace.* In the *Anſwer* itſelf he enquires, I. Whether Mr. Echard has ſufficiently reckoned up *the grounds and occaſions* of that contempt, under which the Clergy lay? II. Whether there be ſo much ignorance among the Clergy, as Mr. Echard ſuppoſes? III. Whether that ignorance, which there is amongſt them, proceeds from all thoſe things, which Mr. Echard aſſigns as the cauſes of it? IV. Whether all thoſe be faults, which he expoſes them for? Or if they be faults, whether they be guilty of all, which he reckons? V. If that be the caſe, whether he has taken a likely courſe to deliver them from that contempt? Under the ſecond head the Author obſerves (2), that it is manifeſt, that the Engliſh Clergy were then much improved in learning ſince the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign; when Oxford itſelf was ſo ill provided with men fit to preach, that the High-Sheriff of the County (3), being as the times then were a learned man, came up into St. Mary's pulpit, and in charity to thoſe, who wanted good preaching, gave them a Sermon, whereof this was the beginning; *Arriving at the Mount of St. Maries, in the ſtony ſtage where I now ſtand, I have brought you ſome fine biſkets, baked in the oven of charity, and carefully conſerved for the chickens of the Church, the ſparrows of the ſpirit, and the ſweet ſwallows of ſalvation.* He remarks likewiſe (4), that the Canons and Articles, which were eſtabliſhed in ſome of the firſt Convocations after Queen Elizabeth began her reign, ſuppoſe that there were in thoſe days divers unpreaching Miniſters, who were not thought of abilities ſufficient to be permitted to open the Scriptures, but were therefore directed to the reading of thoſe Homilies, which were compiled for the ſupply of this defect; but " that now
" the writings of our practical Divines (many of which
" are very little more elaborate than when they were
" firſt preached) are in ſo great eſteem beyond the
" ſeas, that it hath been much a practice for Ger-
" mans and Tranſilvanians, who intend to preach
" when they return back, to come into England, and
" learn enough of our language for their purpoſe,
" which is to tranſlate ſome of our Authors into their
" own tongue; and when they get home, it is hard
" to ſay, whether they reckon to do more honour to
" our Country, or more ſervice to their own. And
" I know where a foreigner of good note and learning
" (*Spanhemius*)

(2) Pag. 25.

(3) Mr. Tavernour of Water-Eaton in Oxfordſhire. See *Fuller's Church Hiſtory of Britain*, Book 9. pag. 65. and the *Preface* to Sir *John Cheek's True Subject to the Rebell*, printed at Oxford 1641.

(4) *An Anſwer*, &c. pag. 28, 29, 30.

nabas Oley in his Preface to Mr. *George Herbert's Country Parſon, his Character and Rule of Holy Life* [C]; and by ſeveral other Writers [D]. To the firſt of theſe pieces Mr. Echard publiſhed *Some Obſervations upon the* Anſwer *to an* Enquiry into the Grounds and Occaſions of the contempt of the Clergy, *with ſome Additions. In a ſecond Letter to* R. L. *By the ſame Author* (b). London 1671 in 12mo. To the reſt he replied in ſome *Letters* [E] printed at the end of his book, intitled, *Mr. Hobbs's State of Nature conſidered, in a Dialogue between* Philautus *and* Timothy [F]. London 1672 in 8vo. *Some Opinions of Mr. Hobb's conſidered in a ſecond Dialogue between* Philautus *and* Timothy. *By the ſame Author* [G]. Sir Richard Blackmore in his *Eſſay on Wit* (c) recommends this *Dialogue* of our Author, in which he obſerves there is contained a vein of ſolid reaſoning mixed with a great many ingenious ſtrokes of raillery. Upon the deceaſe of Dr. John

(b) It is dated May 2, 1671.

(c) *Eſſays upon ſeveral Subjects*: by Sir Richard Blackmore *Knt. M. D. and Fellow of the College of Phyſicians in London*, edit. London 1716, in 8vo.

" *(Spanhemius)* acknowledges to the everlaſting cre-
" dit of our Nation, that ſuch Books are tranſlated in-
" to other languages, and that Practical Divinity is
" in a manner peculiar to England."

[C] *Attacked . . . . by Mr.* Barnabas Oley *in his* Preface *to Mr.* George Herbert's Country Parſon, his Character, and Rule of Holy Life.] In this Preface Mr. Oley addreſſes himſelf to our Author in theſe words: *I am ſorry, that that wit of yours is not under the conduct of more wiſdom. You have reproved divers things worthy of reproof; but in a manner worthy to be reproved, i. e.* ſcopticè, ſarcaſticè, *with wit ſatyrical; not with that gravity, wherewith ſuch faults ought to be reproved; like one puffed up, and not like a mourner. You have rightly pitch't upon two ſluices, that let into the Church men not duely qualified:* 1. *Promiſcuous admiſſion into the Univerſities.* 2. *Indiſcriminate or prepoſterous ordinations, which latter is often but a conſequent of the former. . . . . I will ſuppoſe, that you neither intended to give that offence, which your Book has given to divers eminent grave and learned men in both Univerſities, nor to yield that nutriment to prophaneneſs, which your Book hath done. For I hear (by thoſe that are ſorry for it) that as ſome things in your Book were matter of chat in* coffee-houſes *in* C (5), *before it was printed; ſo now ſince it was printed, they be matter of paſtime in taverns at* L (6), *where wit, and wine, and profaneneſs ſport themſelves in their own deceivings.* He then obſerves, that there are two main occaſions of contempt, which our Author takes no notice of, viz. *Envy*, and the *Affectation of Gallantry*; but that his defect in aſſigning real grounds is recompenſed with a great exceſs of inſtances in a long Legend of Clerks, οἱ πολλοὶ καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ; ſome of whom " were dead nigh ſixty years before, and I pray " you, *ſays he*, conſider what reputation he is like " to gain, that in a Church having eight or nine " thouſand Pariſhes, and perhaps as many Clerks or " more, ſhall make it his buſineſs to ravel into ſixty " years backward (twenty of which were a miſerable " Anarchy) and to collect the *imprudenter dicta* of " young and weak Preachers, to read their Books, " and make a compoſure loathſome to all good men, " delightful only to ſuch as *make a mock of ſin*. Be-" ſides you have impoſed upon the reader by charg-" ing the Clergy of the Church of England with the " wild notions, which were delivered by Fanatics, " qualified neither with orders nor arts."

(5) Cambridge.

(6) London.

[D] *And by ſeveral other Writers.*] An anonymous *Writer* publiſhed *a Vindication of the Clergy*; and one T. D. wrote a piece, intitled, *Hieragoniſticon: or Corah's Doom.* Dr. John Owen likewiſe in his *Epiſtle to the Reader* prefixed to *Seven Sermons* by Mr. *William Bridge*, formerly Fellow of Emanuel-College in Cambridge, and a famous Independent Miniſter, printed after Mr. Bridge's death, has made ſome animadverſions on our Author.

[E] *To the reſt he replied in ſome* Letters &c.] The firſt intitled, *A Letter to* B. O. *the Publiſher of Mr.* Herbert's Country-Parſon. *From* T. B. The ſecond is intitled, *A Letter to the Author of* the Vindication of the Clergy *from* T. B. The third is intitled, *A Letter to* T. D. *the Author of the* Hieragoniſticon, or Corah's Doom, *from* T. B. dated in Devonſhire Jan. 20th 1671. The fourth is intitled, *A Letter to* J. O. *from* T. B. In this Letter he takes notice of ſeveral very peculiar expreſſions in Mr. W. Bridge's *Seven Sermons* publiſhed and highly recommended by Dr. John Owen; and among other paſſages thoſe, where Mr. Bridge tells us, that *none but God alone can rate off Satan*; and that *there is a time when God will hew down ſinners, and lay them upon the ground a-frying for hell*; and paraphraſing upon that text of St. John, " A new Commandment I give unto you, that " you love one another," obſerves, that *becauſe many times there are breakings and looſings in the love of the Saints, upon this account it is, that the* Commandment of Love *is called a* new Commandment, *becauſe it is broken ſo often and ſo often renewed.*

[F] *His Book intitled,* Mr. Hobbs's State of Nature conſidered in a Dialogue between *Philautus* and *Timothy.*] It is dedicated to Dr. Gilbert Sheldon, Archbiſhop of Canterbury; and the Dedication ſigned *J. E.* is dated December 20th 1671; and in it he obſerves, that *human nature has been ſo vilely aſperſed and perſecuted by our adverſary's malicious ſuggeſtions, that he is willing indeed to ſuffer ſuch a word as* man *ſtill to remain amongſt us, but what was always meant and deſigned thereby, he has endeavoured to chaſe quite out of the world.* He remarks, that in this diſcourſe he has endeavoured to ſhew, " that thoſe, that are wicked " and unrighteous, are not ſuch by *reaſon*, or any " advice of *human Nature*, but only becauſe they have " a mind to be ſo." With regard to the manner of his writing, which is *to appearance not ſo grave and ſolid*, he ſays, " that ſince Mr. Hobbs by affected " garbs of ſpeech, by a ſtarch'd mathematical method, " by counterfeit appearances of novelty and ſingula-" rity, by magiſterial haughtineſs, confidence, and " the like, had cheated ſome people into a vaſt opi-" nion of himſelf, and into a belief of things very " dangerous and falſe; I did preſume, with your " Grace's pardon, to think his writings ſo fond and " extravagant, as not to merit being oppoſed in good " earneſt; and thereupon I was very loth to give " them too much reſpect, and add undue weight to " them by a ſolemn and ſerious confutation."

[G] *In* 1673 *he publiſhed at London in* 8vo. Some Opinions of Mr. Hobbs conſidered in a ſecond Dialogue between *Philautus* and *Timothy*. By the ſame Author.] In the Dedication of this book to Dr. Gilbert Sheldon Archbiſhop of Canterbury, dated May the 20th 1673, he obſerves, that if upon review of Mr. Hobbs, he had found that he had given the Readers ſenſe and argument anſwerable to the miſchiefs and wickedneſs of his opinions, *I ſhould then*, ſays Mr. Echard, *have endeavoured to have now appeared to your Grace in another ſtyle and dreſs. For I am not ſo utterly given over to toying, nor ſo conceited of this way of writing, nor ſo indifferent about a good life and religion, nor ſo careleſs of offending ſober men, nor ſo bent and reſolved always to preſume upon your Grace after this kind; but that I think it poſſible that upon a juſt account, and a good ſubject, for a need, I could make two or three grave periods, as well as Mr.* Hobbs *has made thouſands, about thoſe things, which are either impudently falſe, or notoriouſly frivolous.* " But I muſt confeſs, *continues he*, that of all " Triflers, 'tis the ſet, the grave, the philoſophical and " mathematical Trifler, to which I have the greateſt " averſeneſs; whom when I meet very gravely making " out all men to be rational beaſts both in nature and " converſation; and every man when he pleaſes, a " rational rebel, and upon any fright or pinch, a ra-" tional Atheiſt and Antichriſtian, and all this perform-" ed with all demureneſs, ſolemnity, quotation of Scrip-" ture, appeals to Conſcience and Church-Hiſtory; I " muſt humbly beg your Grace's pardon, if then I have " endeavoured to ſmile a little, and to get as much " out of his road and way of writing as poſſible." In the Preface to the Reader he tells him, that it is not the deſign of this, nor was it of the former *Dialogue, to make ſport for idle people*, (*though*, ſays he, *if*

John Lightfoot, who died at Ely December 6th 1675, our Author was choſen in his room Maſter of Catherine Hall (*d*); and the year following was created Doctor of Divinity by the Royal Mandate. He died about the year 1696, and was ſucceeded in his Maſterſhip of Catherine Hall, by Sir William Dawes Bart. afterwards Archbiſhop of York.

(*d*) *The Hiſtory of England. By Laurence Echard, M. A. ad ann.* 1675.

I have written all thoſe books, that I am appointed to own, thou mayeſt juſtly ſuſpect that I never did, nor do intend any other thing,) but to preſerve thee from being laughed at by all who can diſtinguiſh ſenſe from words. For though I cannot think how I ſhould any ways be uſeful or ſerviceable to the public; yet (I thank God) I have not ſpent my time ſo very ill, as only to collect a few tales and proverbs to make others merry. Nor was it my deſign either to pleaſe the Churchmen, whoſe Office, Power and Bible Mr. Hobbs *cunningly hath diſpoſed of; nor to oblige the Lords and Commons, who may all ſtay at home, if the Prince takes his advice; but it was, if poſſible, to cure a company of eaſy, giddy, ſmall-pated Gentlemen, who ſwagger that* Mr. Hobbs *hath ſaid more for a bad life, and againſt any other life after this, than ever was pleaded by Philoſopher or Divine to the contrary. Now to effect this cure (at leaſt among ſome of them) is ten times more difficult than to anſwer all* Mr. Hobbs's *works.* H.

ECHARD (LAURENCE), an eminent Engliſh Hiſtorian of the eighteenth Century, was ſon of a Clergyman, who by the death of his elder brother became poſſeſſed of a good eſtate in the county of Suffolk. He was born at Baſſam near Beckles in that county (*a*), and educated at Chriſt's College in the Univerſity of Cambridge, where he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1691, and of Maſter of Arts in 1695 (*b*). He afterwards entered into holy Orders, and was preſented to the livings of Welton and Elkinton in Lincolnſhire, where he ſpent above twenty years of his life, and diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his writings [*A*], eſpecially his *Hiſtory of England*, which was attacked by Dr. Edmund Calamy in his *Letter to Mr. Archdeacon* Echard [*B*] *upon occaſion of his* Hiſtory of England: *wherein the true principles of the Revolution are defended; the Whigs and Diſſenters vindicated; ſeveral perſons of diſtinction cleared from aſperſions; and a number of hiſtorical miſtakes rectified* (*c*). And it has been ſeverely animadverted upon by Mr. John Oldmixon in his *Critical Hiſtory of England*, and his *Hiſtory of England during the Reigns of the Royal Houſe of the Stuarts*. His *General Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory from the Nativity of our bleſſed Saviour to the firſt Eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity by human Laws under the Emperor Conſtantine the Great*, has paſſed through ſeveral editions, and is recommended by Dean Prideaux (*d*) as "the beſt of its kind in the Engliſh Tongue." Mr. Echard was likewiſe made Prebendary of Lincoln, and on the 12th of Auguſt 1712 inſtalled

(*a*) From Memoirs communicated to us.

(*b*) From the Univerſity Regiſter.

(*c*) London 1718 in 8vo.

(*d*) *Connexion of the Old and New Teſtament*, vol. 3. pag. 658.

[*A*] *Diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his Writings.*] His *Roman Hiſtory* in two Volumes has paſſed through a great many Editions, and was tranſlated into French. He reviſed likewiſe the Continuation of that Hiſtory, and wrote a Preface to it. Beſides his *Tranſlation* of *Terence* and *Plautus*, and his *Gazetteer's or Newsman's Interpreter*, he wrote *The Hiſtory of the Revolution*; *A General Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory from the Nativity of our bleſſed Saviour to the firſt Eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity &c.* printed at London in fol. and 8vo. and *The Hiſtory of England* in three Volumes in folio, and a Tract intitled, *Maxims extracted from Archbiſhop* Tillotſon's *Works*, London 1719 in 8vo.

[*B*] *Attacked by Dr.* Calamy *in his* Letter to Mr. Archdeacon Echard &c.] This *Letter* is dated at Weſtminſter October the 20th 1718. The Doctor obſerves (1), that when he took Mr. Echard's Work into his hands, he was rather prejudiced for, than againſt him; and looked upon him as *well qualified to draw up ſuch a work:* and that when he had read over the whole, he was ſo little inclined to detract from Mr. Echard, that he could freely ſay a great deal in his commendation. *The clearneſs of your method*, ſays the Doctor, *and the perſpicuity of your Language, are two very great excellencies, which I admire. I am ſingularly pleaſed with the* refreſhing diviſion *of your* matter, *and the* chronological diſtinction of the ſeveral parts of your Hiſtory (3) *I neither make any objections againſt* the form of it as irregular or diſproportionate, nor the general method as intricate and confuſed, nor the colouring as weak and unaffecting, nor the ſtile as mean, flat and inſipid; *which are the things about which you appear peculiarly concerned. And yet I thought a public animadverſion both proper and neceſſary, and can meet with none of your readers, how different ſoever in their ſentiments, views, and principles, but what herein agree.* The Doctor gives his reaſons for drawing up this Letter by way of animadverſion on Mr. Echard's Hiſtory, and makes ſome few remarks on the firſt Volume of it, which he eſteems *much the beſt of the three* (4); and then proceeds to the ſecond and third Volumes. He obſerves (5), that though Mr. Echard has *ſeveral things new and entertaining, yet there are ſome omiſſions not eaſily excuſed*; particularly with regard to the meeting of Divines in the Jeruſalem Chamber in the latter end of the year 1641, who were to draw up propoſals, in order to a peaceable ſettlement of Eccleſiaſtical Matters, about which there were then ſuch warm debates; and with regard to Captain Yarranton's account of ſham-plots after the Reſtoration of King Charles II; and the conference of the Lords and Commons about the meaning of the words *aſſent* and *conſent* in the Act of Uniformity. He afterwards (6) cenſures his remarkable redundancies, as his ſtory of Cromwell's contract with the Devil; and his inconſiſtency in applauding the *Revolution*, in the Dedication of the ſecond Volume, and the Preface to the third; and yet frequently declaring againſt that reſiſtance, without which it could not be brought about. The Doctor then examines ſeveral paſſages of the Hiſtory; and concludes with obſerving (7), that he neither admires many of the Authors which Mr. Echard cites, nor his way of citing them. "And I "have ſome reaſon, *continues he*, to think I am not "ſingular in either. Many of the Authors that are "cited by you, have ſo little credit in the world, "as to be far from giving ſufficient warrant to juſtify "your inſerting things from them into an Hiſtory, "that ſhould give an account to poſterity of paſt "tranſactions: and your way of citing them is liable "to very great objections. You mention a number "of names in your margin at the beginning of a "ſection. But as to the particulars produced, there's "no diſtinction between what you had from one, "and what from another. So that if your Reader is "deſirous to know your authority for any particular "that occurs, he may ſtill be to ſeek for it, and not "find it without a great deal of pains in ſearching. "Nay I cannot perceive there is any certain way of "diſtinguiſhing what is purely your own, from what "you produce Authors for. This is a method that "looks ſuſpicious. And though perhaps your taking "it might be ſome eaſe to yourſelf, yet it naturally "adds to the trouble of your readers, who many times "muſt look into all your Authors, before they can be "fully ſatisfied where you had a paſſage, which they "enquire after; and whether your Author is fairly "cited or miſrepreſented. You beſt know your deſign "in this method, which is peculiar to your ſelf. But "I am very much miſtaken, if upon conſulting any "number of your Readers, you find it all adds to the "credit of Hiſtory, or renders it the more authentick." H.

(1) Pag. 8.

(2) Ibid. pag. 8, 9.

(3) Echard's *Preface* to the 2d vol. of the *Hiſtory of England.*

(4) *Letter to Mr. Archdeacon Echard*, pag. 11.

(5) Ibid. pag. 18.

(6) Ibid. pag. 21, 22, 23.

(7) Ibid. pag. 98, 99.

inſtalled Archdeacon of Stowe. By King George I he was preſented to the Livings of Rendleſham, Sudborn, and Alford in Suffolk, at which places he lived about eight years in a continued ill ſtate of health. Being adviſed to go to Scarborough for the uſe of the waters, he proceeded as far as Lincoln, but there declining very faſt, he was uncapable of proſecuting his journey; and on the 16th of Auguſt 1730, going to take the air he died in his chariot, and was interred on the 29th of the ſame month in the Chancel of St. Mary Magdalen's Church in Lincoln, but without any grave-ſtone, or any other memorial of him. He was a Member of the Antiquarian Society at London. He married two wives; firſt Jane, daughter of the Reverend Mr. Potter of Yorkſhire; and ſecondly Mrs. Juſtina Wooley, daughter of Robert Wooley of Well in Lincolnſhire Gentleman. But he had no children by either of his wives. All his papers went firſt into the hands of Mr. Yallop his nephew; ſince whoſe deceaſe they are ſuppoſed to be in the hands of the Reverend Mr. Chriſtopher Echard, our Author's younger brother, who is now living at Cransford in Suffolk.

EDWARD IV, King of England, was ſtiled Earl of March before he came to the Crown in the year 1461. He was the ſon of a Duke of York, who had endeavoured to deprive Henry VI of the Crown, and would have ſucceeded in that deſign, had not ſome little regard for outward appearances checked his ambition (*a*): his ſon, who had no ſuch regard, was more ſucceſsful [*A*]. He did not trifle his time away to get the title of Lord Protector, but aimed directly at the Royal Dignity, and ſeized it immediately, though Henry VI was ſtill alive. Soon after he marched againſt that Prince, gained a ſignal victory over him near York, and forced him to fly into Scotland with Margaret of Anjou

(*a*) See the Remark [*A*].

[*A*] *Edward . . . . who had no ſuch regard, was more ſucceſsful.*] A modern Hiſtorian having followed the thread of his narration as far as the battle, in which the Earl of Pembroke (1), who was of Henry the VIth's Party, was beaten, adds the following reflection. "It was then, that one could obſerve, that "the Earl of March, who with regard to ſeveral qualities was like the late Duke his father, had a different "genius. The Duke had done like them, who laboured in vain to untie the Gordian knot: he had "been a long while diſpoſing of every thing for a "deſign, which at laſt he could not compaſs. The "Earl imitated Alexander, and cutting at once the "fatal knot, he gained the Crown directly. No "ſooner was he at London, but he aſſembled the "Prelates, the Nobles, and the chief Citizens, and "laid before them in a very lively manner the ancient "claim of his family, and the agreement made in "the laſt Parliament, between the Duke his father "and Henry, which the latter having broken thro', "he aſſerted, the crown did lawfully devolve to the "heir of the former. He urged this affair ſo earneſtly, that he was immediately declared King under the name of Edward the fourth, March the 3d, "in the year 1461 (2)." This paſſage will be better underſtood, if I lay before the Reader, what the Author had obſerved before concerning the Duke of York's cautious behaviour. The Duke was reſolved to ſupplant Henry the VIth, but he took *the precautions, that were ſuitable to ſuch an undertaking. He did not appear in it himſelf till late; and when he did appear in it, it was with that ſolemn declaration which all rebels make, that he did not intend any thing againſt the King, but only againſt thoſe Miniſters, who did not govern the Kingdom well* (3). His faction was diſtinguiſhed by the name of the White Roſe, and the other by that of the Red Roſe. In the year 1454 (4), *they began to make open war againſt each other* (5). *The two armies were in ſight, ten miles diſtant from London*, when the King ſent to the Duke to know *what were his pretenſions, and why he appeared in arms. The Duke, whoſe intereſt it was to hide his deſigns from his army, anſwered, that his intention was not to attack the King, but only to remove from him a wicked Miniſter, who made an ill uſe of the King's authority* (6): *And in order to ſhew, that he ſpoke ſincerely*, he promiſed to diſband his army, if that wicked Miniſter was put in priſon (7): He was taken at his word, and thus found himſelf extremely diſappointed, for he durſt not retract his promiſe. Some time after the King being ſick, the Duke of York took hold of that opportunity *to have the Duke of Somerſet arreſted in the very apartment of the Queen*: but the fear he was in, *leſt men ſhould dive into his ſecret deſigns deeper than he wiſhed, was probably the reaſon, why he did not by a bold ſtroke prevent thoſe long and tedious formalities, which in a Parliament were neceſſary to make his adverſary periſh, and thus he was again diſappointed through his own policy* (8). The King recovered, and by the Queen's inſtructions, he ſpoke like a King, which was the reaſon why Somerſet was ſet at liberty. The Duke of York retired from Court, raiſed troops and led them to London, *ſtill proteſting that he did not intend any thing againſt the King, but only againſt his Miniſter* (9). He routed the Royal Army, and took the King priſoner. *He was conſiſtent with himſelf, and purſuing his firſt ſcheme . . . he affected more than ever to treat the unfortunate King with a great deal of reſpect, . . . he cauſed him to make a ſolemn entry into London, which had all the appearance of a triumph, but which, conſidering what followed, was a real captivity* (10). They obliged him to ſummon a Parliament, which named him three guardians, of whom the Duke of York was the firſt *with the title of Lord Protector of the Kingdom. So that of all the Kingly Power nothing remained to Henry but the empty name of a King; the Duke had the reality of it, and had but one ſtep more to make in order to enjoy the whole: but he waited till the voice of the publick excited him to make that peremptory ſtep: for with the Crown he would have the glory, that he had been forced to accept of it. Yet things did not anſwer his expectation* (11). For the Queen formed a ſtrong party, which cauſed it to be declared in a new Parliament." That "the King being of age and in his right ſenſes, the "Kingdom had no occaſion for a Protector; and that "therefore the Parliament thought it proper, to eaſe "the Duke of York of an unneceſſary care, which "reflected on the King's wiſdom, into whoſe hands "the Great Seal ſhould be immediately returned, to be "by him committed to the perſon, whom he ſhould "think the moſt proper for that great truſt (12)." After ſeveral events, a battle was fought at Northampton (13), in which the King was taken priſoner. The Duke of York was in Ireland when he heard this good ſucceſs: he came immediately to England, and ſhewed ſo openly that he aimed at the Crown, that it was no longer queſtioned: He even aſked it from the Parliament (14) in plain and expreſs words; but as thereupon the whole aſſembly kept a deep ſilence, he could eaſily perceive that his affairs would not go ſo well as he wiſhed. *He would be King, but he deſired to be ſo with the conſent* of his ſubjects (15). They found out a medium which ſatisfied both parties. It was agreed, that the King ſhould keep *the Crown during his natural life, and that after his death it ſhould go to the Duke of York and his children.* The Queen would not conſent to an agreement, which was ſo injurious to her ſon the Prince of Wales. She raiſed an army with all ſpeed to aſſert her right; the Duke marched againſt her, but was killed in the battle, which was fought a few days after (16).

Thus his ambition, becauſe it was too nice and refined, diſappointed his expectations. The dignity of a King was not ſufficient to ſatisfy him, he would have the glory, that he had been deſired to reign. He durſt not make uſe of violent means, to get himſelf elected;

(1) He was King Henry VIth's brother by the mother's ſide.

(2) D'Orleans, *Hiſtoire des Revolutions d'Angleterre*. liv. 6. pag. 284. tom. 2. of the Paris edition 1693, 4to.

(3) Ibid. pag. 253.

(4) Ibid. pag. 257.

(5) Moreri, in the Article of Edward IV, places the beginning of this war in 1461; but it is a miſtake.

(6) D'Orleans, *Revolut. d'Angleterre*. tom. 2. pag. 261.

(7) It was the Duke of Somerſet.

(8) D'Orleans, *Revolut. d'Angleterre*. pag. 264.

(9) Ibid. pag. 265. under the year 1456.

(10) Ibid. pag. 266.

(11) Ibid. pag. 267. under the year 1457.

(12) Ibid. pag. 268.

(13) Ibid. pag. 776. under the year 1460.

(14) Ibid. pag. 278.

(15) Ibid. pag. 279.

(16) Ibid. pag. 251. under the year 1460.

Anjou his conſort, a very couragious Princeſs, and who was much more capable than her huſband, to retrieve the affairs of a vanquiſhed party (*b*). She went into France to aſk for aſſiſtance, and obtained but little. Yet as ſoon as ſhe was returned to Berwick, *ſhe aſſembled a ſufficient number of ſoldiers to form a ſmall army*, and entered with her huſband into the County of Northumberland, and advanced as far as Durham, while her army was joined by a conſiderable ſupply. But they were all overthrown by Edward's troops in the year 1463 (*c*). She and her huſband were a ſecond time obliged to fly into Scotland (*d*). The moſt conſiderable perſons of their party either fell in the battle, or were executed. At York only twenty five perſons periſhed by the common executioner's hand (*e*). That party's deſolation was ſtill much greater [*B*], when King Henry, who had ventured to return into England in a diſguiſe, had been *carried to London with his legs tied under his horſe's belly* (*f*): he was impriſoned in the Tower. Edward's good fortune failed him ſome time after. He diſobliged the Earl of Warwick ſeveral ways, who had been the chief inſtrument of Henry VIth's downfall [*C*]. He married a perſon below

(*b*) D'Orleans, *Revolutions d'Anglet.* tom. 2. pag. 285. edit. de Paris en 1693.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 292.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 294.

(*e*) Ibid.

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 296.

elected; he feared that this would be a blot in his reputation; and whilſt he expected the Crown to be put upon his head with the moſt ſolemn ceremonies, he died without having enjoyed it. If he had done, what his ſon did afterwards, his reign would have been very long: he loſt the whole fruit of his pains, becauſe he did not make uſe of all his ſtrength: Diſcretion in ſuch affairs is almoſt always detrimental. Fortune is not diſpleaſed, when we ſnatch her favours from her (17); ſhe will have us be hot, ſhe ſpues the luke-warm out of her mouth (18). *Res eſt profecto ſtulta nequitiæ modus* (19). i. e. "It is a fooliſh thing "indeed, to ſet bounds to one's wickedneſs." I remember a reflection of Mezerai, which is not amiſs. *As there are as few great crimes carried to the higheſt degree*, ſays he (20), *as there are heroical virtues, theſe men* (21), *having begun a crime without neceſſity, they did not know how to commit a ſecond crime, which was neceſſary to hide the former*. Thus it is, that God repreſſes evil; he does not ſuffer men to carry it to the greateſt exceſs, and generally ſpeaking he diſpoſes things in ſuch an order, that thoſe whoſe courage is boundleſs, have but a moderate ſhare of wit, and that they who have wit and ſenſe enough to know all that it would be proper to do, have not courage enough to perform it. By this means oppreſſed innocence gets ſome reſpite, and even is often enough entirely delivered. *Hoc uno modo, judices, ſæpe multorum improbitate depreſſa veritas emergit, & innocentiæ defenſio intercluſa reſpirat: quod aut ii, qui ad fraudem callidi ſunt, non tantum audent, quantum excogitant; aut illi, quorum eminet audacia atque projecta eſt, à conſiliis malitiæ deſeruntur: quod ſi aut confidens aſtutia, aut callida eſſet audacia, vix ullo obſiſti modo poſſet* (22). An exceſſive boldneſs joined with an inventive and ingenious wickedneſs would carry all before them (23), it would be a thunderbolt, which would overthrow whatever it ſtruck: No throne in the world could be ſecure againſt factious men, who ſhould enjoy both theſe qualities. Crimes are ſupported by crimes (24). I could quote a great many more ſayings upon this topic: but this is ſufficient at preſent: let us cloſe this Remark with obſerving, that the text of it required, that I ſhould give ſome account of the Duke of York's conduct, not ſo much, becauſe it ſerves to clear up this article, as becauſe I intended to ſhew that his ſon excelled him in the art of bringing about Revolutions.

(17) See the Article of CHARLES V, Remark [*K*].

(18) *Fortuna fortes metuit, ignavos premit.* Seneca, *in Medea*, Act. 2. ver. 159.

(19) Seneca, *in Agamemnone*, Act. 2. Scen. 1. ver. 150.

(20) Mezerai, *Abrége Chronol.* tom. 6. pag. m. 66. under the year 1591.

(21) That is to ſay, the *Sixteen*, who had put the *Preſident Briſſon* to death.

(22) Cic. *Orat. pro Cluent.* cap. 65.

(23) *Vis & nequitia quicquid oppugnant, ruit.* Phœdrus, *Fab.* 7. lib. 2.

(24) *Da frena, & omnem prona nequitiam incita, Per ſcelera ſemper ſceleribus tutum eſt iter.* Seneca, *in Agamemn.* Act. 2. Scen. 1. ver. 114.

[*B*] *The deſolation of* Henry the ſixth's *Party was much greater.*] As ſoon as it was known that Henry the VIth was in priſon, *the remains of the Lancaſter Party diſperſed themſelves through the neighbouring countries. The Queen carried her ſon into France. The Earl of Pembroke wandered ſecretly and unknown over England. Edmund, the new Duke of Somerſet ſince the death of his brother Henry, retired into Flanders, with John his younger brother, and Henry Holland Duke of Exeter. Though the Ducheſs of Burgundy was an Infanta of Portugal, grand-daughter of a Princeſs of the Houſe of Lancaſter, and well affected for that Houſe, yet every thing ſeemed ſo ſuſpicious to thoſe Princes, that they durſt not venture to diſcover themſelves, till after they had been a long while hid at that Court, where they barely found wherewithal to ſubſiſt. Philip de Comines relates, that he ſaw one of them begging for his bread, walking barefoot, and in a miſerable condition, till being known he obtained a ſmall penſion, as well as the two Somerſets, when they had diſcovered themſelves* (25).

(25) D'Orleans, *Revolutions d'Anglet.* tom. 2. pag. 296, 297. under the year 1464.

[*C*] *He diſobliged the Earl of Warwick, who had been the chief inſtrument of Henry the VIth's downfal.*] "The ſervices which Kings cannot acknowledge, "make them commonly ungrateful. A man who "has done a great deal for them, ſeems to have a "right to aſk a great deal: and whoever has a right "to claim all, is troubleſome even when he demands "nothing. Edward was indebted for his Crown to "the Earl of Warwick; this was a ſervice beyond "all reward, and which being attended beſides with "very glorious actions, had gained the Earl a great "applauſe from the people. The King grew jealous "of it, and imagining that they compared him with "the Earl of Warwick, in the ſame manner as Saul "had been compared with David, he feared leſt they "ſhould ſay in England, as formerly in Iſrael, *Saul "has ſlain his thouſands, and David his ten thou-"ſands* (26)." This was the firſt cauſe of diſcontent: The Earl was not rewarded as he deſerved (27), and he perceived that Edward looked upon him with a jealous eye. This includes a great many diſagreeable things, for it is impoſſible for a King who envies the glory of one of his ſubjects, not to diſoblige him ſeveral ways.

(26) Ibid. liv. 7. pag. 300.

(27) And yet he had received from King Edward wherewithall to increaſe his yearly revenue by 18 thouſand crowns. Matthieu, *Hiſt. de Louis XI*, liv. 5. chap. 6. pag. 239.

The ſecond cauſe of diſcontent was the Earl's being ſent Embaſſador to negotiate his maſter's marriage with Bonne of Savoy, the Queen of France's ſiſter. This marriage was agreed upon, and *nothing more was waited for but the return of an Embaſſador, whom the King of France had ſent to Edward to ſign the treaty* (28), when it came to be known, that the new King of England had married a Knight's widow. "(29) All England beheld this match with the ut-"moſt indignation. But none were more vexed at "it, than the Earl of Warwick, who did not doubt "but the King deſigned to expoſe him and make "him appear ridiculous before all Europe, by ſending "him to aſk a great Princeſs for him, whilſt he "married a Gentlewoman only.... Edward's beha-"viour towards the Earl, after his return to London, "exaſperated him entirely. This Lord was in hopes "that the King would at leaſt endeavour to mitigate "his vexation by good words or lame excuſes; "but he mentioned nothing to him, and treated him "with ſuch an haughtineſs, that a man leſs proud "than the Earl, could hardly have ſuffered it. And "to compleat the injury, he heard that this vicious "King had attempted to debauch his niece, others "ſay, his ſiſter, and would have taken a miſtreſs in "his family (30), whilſt he took a wife in another."

(28) D'Orleans, *Revolutions d'Anglet.* tom. 2. pag. 302.

(29) Ibid. pag. 305.

The Earl of Warwick, with a heart full of revenge, determined to reſtore Henry VIth to the throne, and happily ſucceeded in that deſign. Thus he made ſport with the Crown; he deprived Henry VIth of it, to give it to Edward, and then took it again from him, to return it to Henry VIth. An evident argument this is, that he hearkened neither to the laws, nor juſtice, but followed only his own intereſt and his paſſion. He would have had credit enough to raiſe himſelf to the Throne, but *he thought it more glorious to make Kings than to reign himſelf* (31). The character of his ambition was ſuch, that it inclined him not to reign, but to govern thoſe that reigned (32). Let us obſerve by the by, that it ſeldom happens, that they, who raiſe an

(30) Here follow the words of Polydore Virgil. *Nec abhorret à veritate Edouardum tentaſſe, ut aiunt, neſcio quid in domo Comitis, quod ab honeſtate omnino abeſſet, cum homo eſſet, qui facile puellas oculis alliceret, eaſque deperiret.*

(31) D'Orleans, *Revolutions d'Anglet.* tom. 2. pag. 306. He quotes Sir *Thomas Moor.*

(32) Ibid. pag. 338.

low his dignity [*D*], and by that unequal match drew the hatred of all the Engliſh upon him. The Earl of Warwick having drawn the Duke of Clarence, Edward's brother, on his ſide, gave him his daughter in marriage, and they reſolved together to reſtore Henry VI to the Throne: and they were like to have performed that deſign; for they ſurprized

an Uſurper to the Throne, enjoy his favour long. It is not always owing to this maxim, *Men love treaſon, but hate the traytors*; it is not always, becauſe men imagine, that they, who laboured to dethrone their firſt Maſter, will not ſcruple to dethrone their new Sovereign; it is chiefly becauſe theſe men think, that they are never rewarded as they deſerve, and that a Prince, who owes his Crown to them, ought to grant them, whatever they requeſt of him (33). He cannot and ought not to do it. Hereupon they are vexed, they complain, and thus fall under their Prince's diſpleaſure. Let us make a ſhort Commentary upon theſe words. *The ſervices which Kings cannot acknowledge, make them commonly ungrateful, &c.* (34).

(33) See above Remark [*B*] of the Article COLONNA (POMPEY).

(34) I have quoted them in the beginning of this Remark.

PASSAGES concerning ingratitude.

The firſt paſſage, which I ſhall quote, is from the Duke de la Rochefoucaud's Memoirs (35). "It was "a difficult thing for the Queen to have a gratitude "anſwerable to the great ſervices, which the Prince "had done her; and for the Prince, to keep within "the bounds of that modeſty, which was his duty, "after he had ſerved her ſo effectually; for as ſuch "debts cannot be paid, they generally raiſe the Sove-"reign's hatred, and fill the heads of the ſubjects "with ambitious thoughts." Monſieur de la Chatre affords me another paſſage. *When a perſon has laid very great obligations upon us, we ſeem to dread his preſence, as tho' he were continually exciting us to gratitude, and blamed our ungratefulneſs in the leaſt delay* (36). Philip de Comines has tranſmitted to us a very good thought of Lewis the eleventh; he relates it after he has mentioned ſome great men, who did not find their account in putting too high a price on the ſervices, which they had done their maſter: he names amongſt others the Earl of Warwick. "It happens often, "that this preſumption is owing to the ſervices a man "has done. They, who are thus preſumptuous, ima-"gine, that their merit is ſuch, that any thing muſt "be ſuffered from them, and that nothing can be done "without them. Princes, on the contrary, are of o-"pinion, that men are bound to ſerve them well; "this they give ſufficiently to underſtand, and deſire "nothing more than to get rid of thoſe, who ſhew "their diſcontent. Hereupon I muſt quote our King "upon two things, who told me once, ſpeaking of "thoſe, who have done great ſervices (and he named "the perſons from whom he had it) that to have ſerv-"ed too well is ſometimes a man's ruin, and that "very often great ſervices are rewarded with great "ingratitude. But that this may as well happen by "the fault of them, who have done thoſe ſervices, "who behave with too much pride, and make an un-"becoming uſe of their good fortune, both towards "their maſters, and towards their fellow-ſubjects, as "by the Prince's ungratefulneſs. He told me alſo, "that in his opinion, to be well at Court, it was a "greater happineſs for a man, when the Prince he "ſerved conferred great favours upon him, than it "would be, if he had done the Prince ſo great a ſer-"vice, that the Prince ought to be extremely oblig-"ed to him; and that a Prince loves more naturally "thoſe who are obliged to him, than thoſe to whom "he is himſelf obliged (37)." Let us hear Montagne's opinion upon this. *When I read Philip de Comines*, ſays he (38), *ſeveral years ago, a very good Author indeed, I obſerved this as an uncommon ſentence. A man ought to take care not to ſerve his Maſter ſo well, that he cannot reward him in a juſt proportion. I ſhould have commended the ſentence, but not him; for I met with it in Tacitus ſome time ago.* Beneficia eò uſque læta ſunt, dum videntur exolvi poſſe; ubi multum antevenere, pro gratia odium redditur *. i. e. "Favours are acceptable, as long as it appears, that "they can be returned; but when they are too conſi-"derable, they beget hatred inſtead of gratitude." *And Seneca ſays very ſtrongly*, Nam qui putat eſſe turpe non reddere, non vult eſſe cui reddat †. i. e. "He "who thinks it ſhameful not to return a favour, "wiſhes, that there was no perſon to whom he is "obliged ‡." *Cicero with leſs energy ſays*, Qui ſe non putat ſatisfacere, amicus eſſe nullo modo poteſt §. i. e. "He, who thinks he does not fully return a fa-"vour, cannot be a friend." I wiſh Montagne had not curtailed this paſſage of Seneca; he has left out the beginning and the end, which were very much to the purpoſe. See the margin (39), and conſider what follows, it is the ſequel of the paſſage quoted by Montagne. *Tibi habe, quod accepiſti, non repeto, non exigo. Profuiſſe tutum ſit; nullum eſt odium perniciоſius, quam ex beneficii violati pudore.* i. e. "Keep what you have "received; I do not aſk any return, I do not require "it: But let not my favours me detrimental to me. "There is no hatred more dangerous than that, which "flows from ingratitude." The nineteenth Letter of Seneca might alſo have been quoted, for we find there, that favours beget hatred. *Nullum habet majus malum occupatus homo, & bonis ſuis obſeſſus, quàm quod amicos ſibi putat, quibus ipſe non eſt; quod beneficia ſua efficacia judicat ad conciliandos amicos, quum quidam, quo plus debent, magis oderint. Leve æs alienum debitorem facit; grave inimicum* (40). i. e. "The greateſt evil "that can befal a man, who is in buſineſs, and em-"ployed about his own affairs, is, that he thinks "thoſe perſons his friends, to whom he is not a friend "himſelf; that he imagines, his favours are able "to procure him friends, whereas ſome, the more "they are obliged, the more they hate. A ſmall "debt makes a debtor, a large one an enemy." Pliny the younger, who was perfectly well acquainted with all the common topics of Panegyrick, did not forget to obſerve, that his Hero was not like other Princes; they ſeldom think they are obliged to any perſon, and if they think ſo, they do not love that perſon. *Utriuſque cura, utriuſque vigilantia obſtrictus es Cæſar: Sed in Principe rarum, ac prope inſolitum, ut ſe putet obligatum, aut ſi putet, amet. Debes ergo Cæſar, & ſolvis* (41). i. e. "You are obliged to both for their "care and watchfulneſs, Cæſar: But it happens ſel-"dom, and almoſt never, that a Prince thinks him-"ſelf obliged to any perſon, or if he thinks it, he "hates that perſon. As for you, Cæſar, you owe, and "requite."

(35) Rochefoucaud, *Guerre de Paris.*

(36) La Chatre, *Memoires.*

(37) Philippe de Comines, liv. 3. chap. *dernier*, pag. m. 191, 192.

(38) Montagne, *Eſſais*, liv. 3. chap. 8. pag. m. 280.

* Tacit. *Annal.* 4. cap. 18.

† Seneca, *Epiſt.* 81.

‡ Thus Montagne himſelf tranſlates that paſſage. *Car cettuy là, qui croid que celui ſeroit honte de manquer à la recompenſe, voudroit qui celui qui la doit recevoir, ne fuſt point.*

§ Cicero, *in Epiſt.*

(39) *Eo perductus eſt furor ut periculoſiſſima res ſit beneficia in aliquem magna conferre, nam qui putat, &c.* Senec. *Epiſt.* 81. i. e. "Men are come "to that degree "of madneſs, "that it is the "moſt danger-"ous thing to "beſtow great "favours on any "perſon, for he "&c."

(40) Idem, [*Ep.* 19. pag. m. 200.

(41) Plin. *in Paneg.* cap. 61.

[*D*] *He married a perſon below his dignity.*] "He "was of a very amorous temper, capable of all kinds "of love; he had ſome looſe amours, and ſome fix-"ed; ſome gay intrigues, and ſome ſerious, attacking "all women out of lewdneſs, and now and then fix-"ing himſelf to ſome from a real paſſion. Such was "that, which he had for Elizabeth Woodwill, the "daughter of the Lord Rivers, and of Jaqueline of Lux-"emburg, who being left a widow by the Duke of "Bedford, had married that Lord. Edward was gone "a hunting towards Grafton the Baron's ſeat, and "was gone in to pay a viſit, out of civility to the "Baron's Lady.... Her daughter was with her; ſhe "was the widow of Sir John Gray, who had been "killed in King Henry VIth's Service, in the ſecond "battle of St. Albans; and all his eſtate having been "forfeited, ſhe had thereby loſt part of her own. "This young widow, willing to take hold of ſo fa-"vourable an opportunity for recovering her eſtate, "took artfully a proper time during this viſit, to beg "that favour of the King (42)." She obtained it, but ſhe did not grant the King the favour he deſired of her. *I do not value my ſelf ſo much*, ſaid ſhe to him, *as to imagine that I can become a Queen. But I value my ſelf too much to be a miſtreſs. I cannot love any man but an huſband: and ſince you cannot be mine, be content, that I honour you as my King, and that I have for you all the gratitude, that is owing to a benefactor.* "She "perfectly inflamed his heart by the arguments, by "which ſhe would ſeem to perſuade him to ſmother "his paſſion, at the ſame time that ſhe perceived he "was abſolutely incapable of following her advice. By "this artifice ſhe made him go ſuch a length, that he "promiſed to marry her, notwithſtanding his other en-"gagements; and all that the Ducheſs of York his "mother could ſay, to diſſuade him from it: When "the Ducheſs had employed in vain the ſtrongeſt ar-"guments, ſhe went ſo far as to entreat one of the "King's miſtreſſes, called Elizabeth Lucy, to declare, "that

(42) D'Orleans, *Revolutions d'Anglet.* liv. 7. tom. 2. pag. 302. under the year 1465.

surprized and took Edward in his camp (g); but as he found means to make his escape from the place, where he was confined, they could not reap any benefit from the good fortune they had in seizing his person. The General of their army was routed and taken by Edward, who caused him to be beheaded. This misfortune obliged the Earl and the Duke to go over to France, to beg for such supplies, as they expected to obtain from Lewis XIth (h). They were very well received; and Margaret of Anjou, the imprisoned King's consort, joined her intrigues with theirs; the Prince of Wales her son married the Earl's second daughter: Lewis XI had procured that match as a thing that would considerably strengthen their party; on the other hand it increased greatly in England; for the Earl's friends there made all possible preparations to dethrone Edward, who far from taking care how to secure himself, as his brother-in-law the Duke of Burgundy advised him to do, *did not lose one day's hunting*, nor one of those *parties of pleasure, which he often made with the Ladies* (i). The Earl landed safely at Dartmouth with the troops which the French King lent him, and was soon joined by a great many English. Edward marched against him with a fine army, and was ready to draw up his troops in order of battle, when he was told, that *the Marques of Montague, on whom he had depended till then*, was the first, who cried, *Long live King Henry*, and that *several others having followed his example, the evil spread successively through all the quarters, and that from every part one heard this cry*, Long live King Henry (k). Edward "consulted with his "friends what course to take; but his affairs appeared to be so desperate, that the best "advice they could give him was . . ., to cross the sea, and to ask for a supply amongst "foreigners, whilst the King's faithful servants should dispose every thing for his re-"turn (l)." He went on board accordingly, and set sail for Flanders: some pirates (m), great enemies to the English, attacked him, and pursued him to Alkmaer (n), where he landed (o). In the mean while the Earl of Warwick led his army to London, and restored King Henry to the throne (p). A Parliament was convened, *in which Edward was declared a traitor, and an usurper of the Crown, his estates were forfeited, and the acts passed under him made void* (q). He could not obtain from the Duke of Burgundy but a small supply, and that secretly; yet he ventured to return into England, *relying on the friends* he had there, on *the letters he received from them, and more still on the love of novelties, which is natural to the English Nation* (r). He landed, and went up the country without any opposition: he was met by the Duke of Clarence, who inticed as many soldiers away as he could from King Henry's party, which he forsook without any regard. In a word, *though the King was at London with a considerable number of Lords of his party, and though the Earl of Warwick* (s) *had sent them word to hold out but three days, and that he would certainly relieve them, yet no sooner did Edward appear, but all the gates were thrown open before him* (t). The women were very serviceable to him [E] on this occasion.

(g) Ibid. tom. 2. pag. 312, under the year 1470.

(h) Ibid. pag. 316.

(i) Ibid. pag. 319.

(k) Ibid. pag. 323.

(l) Ibid. pag. 324.

(m) Comines calls them *Ostrelins*, i. e. *Easterlings, coming from the East.*

(n) A city in North-Holland.

(o) D'Orleans, *Revolutions d'Anglet.* tom. 2. pag. 329.

(p) In October 1470.

(q) D'Orleans, *Revolutions d'Anglet.* tom. 2. pag. 327.

(r) Ibid. pag. 333.

(s) Some important affairs had obliged him to go far towards the North of the Kingdom.

(t) D'Orleans, *Revolutions d'Anglet.* tom. 2. pag. 335. under the year 1471.

(β) D'Orleans, *Revolutions d'Anglet.* tom. 2. pag. 334.

"that the inconstant Prince had engaged his faith to "her, and that she yielded to his embraces, only be-"cause he had promised to marry her. The Queen "delayed for some days the marriage of the King "her son by the report of this engagement, and by "the notice she gave of it herself to the Bishop. But "the fact having been duly examined, it appeared "even by the deposition of Elizabeth Lucy, that she "suffered herself to be seduced by the hope, and not "by a promise of marriage. This obstacle being re-"moved, and nothing being capable to contradict "Edward's will and pleasure in this respect, he mar-"ried my Lady Gray with all the solemnity and pomp "(α) of a royal wedding (43)."

(43) Ibid. pag. 304. He quotes Sir Tho. Moor.

One does not know what might have happened, if Edward had been married, when he declared his love to the young widow. He would not perhaps have met with so great a resistance, and she did not perhaps shew so much disdain for the title of a mistress but only she saw him at liberty to take a wife. Sir Thomas More hints, that the conduct of this Lady was very artful, she began to preach when the hearer could no longer improve by her preaching. After all, a woman of quality and wit does always answer as the Lady Gray did; such an answer may be useful and can do no harm; for there are very good means to remedy the evil, which a repulse may have occasioned at first, and a man is made to go great lengths, when he is deeply in love, and a batchelor, and he is given to understand, that he will never obtain the least favour, if he does not love with an intent to marry. The reader has seen in another place (44), that by an artifice of the same kind, a mistress of Henry VIIIth obliged him to divorce his spouse.

(44) In the text of the Article BOLEYN, between the quotations (d) and (e).

[α] *With all the solemnity and pomp &c.*] Rapin says on the contrary *, that King "Edward married "Elizabeth Woodville only in the presence of a few "persons, so that his marriage was not made publick,

* Rapin, *Hist. d'Anglet.* tom. 4. liv. 13. pag. 224.

"but by the orders that were given to prepare every "thing for the Coronation of the new Queen." ADD. REM.]

[β] *Some important affairs &c.*] These important affairs were the very landing of Edward in England: For as soon as the news of his arrival came to Court, the Duke of Clarence and the Earl of Warwick set out from London, to go and raise troops §. But Father D'Orleans's words are so general, that one cannot guess what affairs the Earl of Warwick had in the North of England. ADD. REM.]

§ Rapin, *Hist. d'Anglet.* tom. 4. liv. 13. pag. 257.

[E] *The Women were very serviceable to him.*] "Philip de Comines says, that three things rendred "the entry of this King into that great city (London) "so easy. The first was the great number of his "friends, who had taken sanctuary in the Churches, "which at that time were still looked upon as invio-"late Asylums. The second was the great debts, "which Edward had contracted in London: his cre-"ditors were glad to see him in a condition to pay "them. The third was the citizen's wives, who "had had a share in his favour, and gained their "husbands over to him (45)." Philip de Comines's words with regard to this last particular are as follows (46). *Several Women of Quality, and rich Citizen's Wives in the city, with whom he had been formerly very private and familiar, gained him their husbands and relations.* This is a pretty singular happiness. Other Kings, especially in other countries, would have lost their Crown, if they had been too free with their subjects wives, and here is a King, who recovers his Crown by that very means. Let us give a description of his voluptuous life. *He had been already used to indulge his ease and pleasures for twelve or thirteen years, more than any Prince who lived at that time; for he minded nothing but the Ladies, even beyond measure, and hunting, and feasting. When in the season he went a hunting, he used to carry several tents*

(45) D'Orleans, *Revolutions d'Anglet.* tom. 2. pag. 335. under the year 1471.

(46) Comines, liv. 3. chap. 7. pag. m. 164.

ſion. He ſent Henry again to the Tower, and not one perſon oppoſed it, though that King was a very good Prince [*F*]. Edward marched directly to engage in battle againſt the Earl. He overthrew his army entirely (*u*), and ſlew him; and ſoon after he gained ſuch another victory over Queen Margaret. He put a great many perſons to death, amongſt whom was the impriſoned King himſelf; but the Queen was ſpared; ſhe was even ſet at liberty, *after they had kept her in priſon for ſome time* (*x*). The Duke of Clarence having diſpleaſed the Court, was capitally puniſhed [*G*]. It was natural to expect that ſo many executions, and ſo much blood ſpilt would exaſperate the people againſt Edward; yet he enjoyed a quiet reign, and gained the admiration of his ſubjects. He joined in a confederacy with the Duke of Burgundy againſt Lewis XI, and there never was, perhaps, a fairer opportunity to conquer all France, but King Edward choſe rather to conclude a peace, that he might lead a voluptuous life. This peace, which in ſome reſpect was a diſgrace to France, yet was excuſable conſidering in what condition the affairs of that Kingdom were at that time [*H*]. The two Kings

(*u*) April the 14th 1471.

(*x*) D'Orleans, *Revolutions d'Anglet.* tom. 2. pag. 346.

with him for the Ladies; and indeed, on theſe occaſions he entertained them ſumptuouſly; and he was the moſt proper perſon for it I ever knew, for he was young, and as handſome as any man of his time; I mean when theſe misfortunes happened to him; for he is grown very fat ſince (47).

(47) Comines, ibid. chap. 5. pag. 156. under the year 1470.

[*F*] *He ſent Henry again to the Tower, and not one perſon oppoſed it, tho' that King was a very good Prince.*] I have made ſomewhere an obſervation, which I muſt be allowed to confirm by ſome inſtances, when occaſion offers. Any Author has a right to ſupport his opinions, and to make uſe for that purpoſe of what his reading furniſhes him with. I have obſerved (48) that more good-natured or weak Princes have been driven from the Throne by reaſon of their good-nature or weakneſs, than bad Princes, by reaſon of their wickedneſs. Henry VI, the Sport of Fortune, who was more than once a captive, and who was murthered at laſt in priſon, was the beſt-natured man that ever lived. "He was poſſeſſed of all thoſe virtues, "which are eſſential to an honeſt man: but he had "few of thoſe qualities, which conſtitute a great "King; he wanted even the art to affect an outward "appearance of thoſe qualities. So that he was no "ſooner come to that age, in which men begin to ſhew "what they are, when they cannot feign what "they are not; but he was known to be good, meek, "ſober, juſt, and a good Chriſtian; but remiſs, eaſy, "weak, lazy, acting only by the impulſe of others, "and having taken the habit, followed the direction "of thoſe who once got poſſeſſion of him (42)." He was very near being placed in the catalogue of thoſe Saints who are worſhipped. *He was a Prince of a ſmall capacity, but of great virtues; very unhappy according to the world, but very happy according to the Goſpel. He was deſpiſed by men, who thought him weak, imprudent, and even ſtupid and ſenſeleſs: after that manner Comines ſpeaks of him, treating thus the memory of that pious Prince unjuſtly; which is againſt his conſtant method. But heaven has heightened his glory by the miracles that happened at his tomb; and for which he has been honoured as a Saint. Henry VII petitioned at Rome for his canonization; and it is not known, why he did not inſiſt upon it, or obtained it not. Some think, that this King, who was naturally ſaving, was afraid the ceremony would coſt too much; but this can hardly be believed of ſo great a King: others ſay, it was anſwered at Rome, that there is a great difference between a pious man and a ſaint: but this is ſtill leſs probable, ſince the Church knows not a more eminent holineſs, than that of a man who leads a holy life amidſt the corruptions of a Court, and preſerves a conſtant patience under a long adverſity. What others have written is much more probable; namely, that Henry VII died before all informations requiſite and neceſſary for that canonization were made, and that his ſucceſſor had neither an opportunity nor inclination to proſecute it* (50). If inſtead of ſo many chriſtian virtues Henry VI had been adorned with the qualities of a Warrior and Politician, who knows how to employ every artifice to make himſelf be dreaded, they would not have found it ſuch an eaſy taſk to alienate his ſubjects againſt him. If he had been as wicked as the chief of the rebels, he would ſoon have ſubdued them, and would have died on the Throne. He was forſaken by every one even in his capital city; and for what reaſon? Could they complain of his vexations and tyranny? by no means; for what reaſon then? it was becauſe he was ſurrounded and armed only with his virtue; *ſola majeſtate armatus*. It is but a weak help in a civil war to have nothing to depend upon, but the teſtimony of a good conſcience, and a lawful claim. In order to overthrow a Monarch, who makes himſelf dreaded *per fas & nefas*, there muſt be a ſtorm or hurricane: but to throw down a ſcrupulous and meek Prince, you need only blow upon him.

(48) In the Remark of the Article AMPHARES.

(49) D'Orleans, *Revolutions d'Anglet.* tom. 2. liv. 6. pag. 234.

(50) Ibid. liv. 7. pag. 343, 344.

[*G*] *The Duke of Clarence . . . was capitally puniſhed.*] It was becauſe he had talked too boldly when he knew that the Queen's brother aſpired to marry the Heireſs of Burgundy. "Jealouſy, indignation and ſpite made him "ſpeak ſo much the more indiſcreetly on this occaſion, "that he himſelf aimed at marrying that Princeſs, and "for that purpoſe negotiated ſecretly with her ſiſter the "Ducheſs of Burgundy. In his paſſion he exclaimed "againſt the King himſelf, of whom he ſpoke diſreſpect-"fully, ſaying among other things injurious to that "Prince, that he was not the ſon of the Duke of York, "that he uſurped the Throne diſhoneſtly over Henry, "who by a ſolemn treaty confirmed in Parliament, "ought to have enjoyed the Crown during his life. "The Queen and her Relations did not fail to reflect "upon thoſe words, and to put ſuch a conſtruction upon "them, as they thought neceſſary to make them be "taken in the ſenſe that beſt ſuited their purpoſe . . (51). *They made ſo deep an impreſſion upon Edward, that he impeached his brother before the Parliament, and had him tried and condemned. It is ſaid that he ſoftened his puniſhment by changing the kind of death to which he had been condemned, and ordering that he ſhould be drowned in a veſſel of Greek Wine: but this is an odd kind of puniſhment; and whatever Chancellor Moore may ſay, who would repreſent this action, as an effect of the King's clemency, yet I find ſomething barbarous in it, and more inconſiſtent with humanity than the moſt cruel puniſhment* (52). See the margin (53).

(51) Ibid. liv. 7. pag. 347. under the year 1476.

(52) Ibid. pag. 248.

(53) George Duke of Clarence, and brother to the King of England, choſe to die in a veſſel of Malmſey, that he might dye, *non ſine quadam voluptate, quam afferri ſolet levis diſſolutio animi.* i. e. "not without "that hand "of pleaſure, "which uſually "is occaſioned "by a ſoft fainting away of the "ſoul," ſays Seneca; or to make himſelf drunk, and thus to free himſelf from the horror and ſenſe of death. Matthieu, *Hiſt. de Louis XI.* liv. 10. pag. 550.

[*H*] *This peace, which was . . . a diſgrace to France, yet was excuſable conſidering in what condition the affairs of that Kingdom were at that time.*] The Author, whom I cite, mentions it as *the Maſter-piece of Lewis XIth* (54). *But*, adds he, *it was ſo honourable to Edward, that thoſe amongſt the French, who did not conſider the main point ſo well as their King did, and had not ſo great a foreſight, were aſhamed of it, and would ſtill have run a greater danger, rather than been ſecure at that price. And indeed the King of England made himſelf be courted after ſuch a manner, as the dignity of France could hardly bear even in the greateſt diſtreſs. A penſion of fifty thouſand crowns, to be paid during ten years to that Prince for the expence of his expedition, was the moſt mortifying clauſe for France, in the whole Treaty, and the moſt honourable for Edward, who returned into his Kingdom loaded with the ſpoils of a Prince, whoſe friend he had profeſſed to be.* See one of the Remarks in the article of LEWIS XI (55); I have quoted there a long paſſage from a French Author, who obſerves, that this Prince was accuſed of cowardice on this occaſion. Father d'Orleans is in the right, when he ſays, that this penſion payable during ten years, was the moſt diſhonourable part of the Treaty; for it muſt be known, that it is for this reaſon, that the Engliſh boaſt, they made the French Monarchy Tributary to the Crown of England. I leave it to Stateſmen to examine, whether this be a ſolid foundation; it does not appear ſo to me; and I think,

(54) D'Orleans, *Revolutions d'Anglet.* tom. 2. pag. 350.

(55) Remark [*G*].

Kings had an enterview at Pequigni in Picardy, and ſhewed one another a great deal of kindneſs. The French King deſired Edward to come and divert himſelf with the Ladies at Paris; but he would have been very ſorry, had he been taken at his word [*I*]. He feared very much leſt the Engliſh would repent their bargain [*K*]. The declaration of war contained a very remarkable circumſtance; for Edward ſignified therein, that he would

think, that a Nation cannot reaſonably boaſt that another has been tributary to her, unleſs that word has been expreſſed in the Treaty, and that Nation has been forced to confeſs, that the money ſhe is to pay, ſhall be called a Tribute. Now this is not to be found in the Articles of the Treaty concluded between Lewis XIth, and Edward IVth; and it is certain, that the French and the Engliſh always gave a different name to the ſums paid; the former called it *a Penſion* (56), and the latter *a Tribute*. But farther, Philip de Comines aſſerts, that it was neither (57). After all, what great cauſe of boaſting had there been, ſhould Lewis XIth have been obliged to pay a tribute to England during ten years: ſince his Kingdom was full of malecontents, and he knew that his high Conſtable betrayed him, and that there would be very dangerous conſpiracies in the heart of his Kingdom, as ſoon as the forces of England joined with thoſe of the Houſe of Burgundy ſhould invade his Territories? If Edward, making an advantage of theſe opportunities, and ſupported, as he was, by ſo many confederates, both within and without the Kingdom, had forced his enemy to promiſe him a tribute, would that be a ſtrong proof of his ſuperiority? Is there a Nation ſufficiently powerful and couragious to avoid ſuch a neceſſity when all her neighbours conſpire againſt her at the ſame time that ſhe is diſturbed within by civil diſcords? I do not think, that France had had any reaſon to boaſt, or to inſult over Holland, if after the taking of Utrecht in the year 1672, ſhe had conſented to a peace with the Dutch, on condition that they ſhould pay her a tribute for a certain term of years. France was at that time aſſiſted by England, and by two Princes of the Empire, and attacked a Country full of inteſtine diviſions, and which was not aſſiſted by any other Power.

(56) *See* Philip de Comines, liv. 6. chap. 9. pag. 390, 391.

(57) And the penſion, which he (*Edward*) received from us, was ſtopt, which he called a *Tribute*, but it was neither, as I have ſhewn it above. *Comines*, liv. 6. chap. *dernier*, pag. 343.

However, we ought not to wonder that Edward's conduct was blamed; for in all probability he would have conquered ſome Provinces if he had proſecuted his deſign, and he would perhaps have been able to ſhare the Kingdom of France with the Duke of Burgundy. Philip de Comines aſſerts, that Lewis the XIth feared very much, leſt the Engliſh ſhould repent the loſs of ſo fair an opportunity. Let us quote what he ſays upon this ſubject. *A Gentleman of Gaſcony, named Lewis de Bretailles, who was a faithful ſervant of the King of England, was very much diſpleaſed with this peace; and as he had been acquainted with me a great while, he ſpoke his mind to me privately, and ſaid, that we ſhould extremely ridicule the King of England. I aſked him how many battles the King of England had gained: he anſwered nine, in which he was in perſon. I aſked him how many he had loſt, he replied, but one, which was that which we made him loſe at that time*, and that he reckoned, the ſhame of being thus ſent back into his own dominions, greater than all the glory he had gained by his nine victories. I related this to the King, who told me this man was a wicked rogue, and that I muſt by no means mention what he had ſaid. He ſent for him at his dinner, made him dine with him, and made him very conſiderable propoſals, if he would but continue with him: but finding that he would not, he gave him a thouſand crowns ready money, and promiſed him that he would take care of his brothers who were on this ſide of the water. I alſo mentioned ſomething in his ear, that he might cultivate the friendſhip that began to be between the two Kings. The King dreaded nothing more than that ſome word ſhould drop from him, which might make the Engliſh think, that he had deceived them* (58). You will find in the Remark [*K*] ſuch another paſſage from the ſame Author. It is certain, that this Peace would not have been laſting, if Lewis the XIth had not bribed the King of England's Miniſters and favourites with preſents and penſions (59). Obſerve, that there are ſome circumſtances in which both the Princes, who conclude a peace, are blamed by all the world. That

* He means by the late peace, which King Edward had concluded with the French King.

(58) Philippe de Comines, liv. 4. chap. 10. pag. 238, 239.

(59) *See* Philip de Comines, liv. 6. chap. 2.

of which we are ſpeaking, was diſliked by the French and by the Engliſh; by the former, becauſe they did not think it honourable, and by the latter, becauſe they were of opinion that they loſt by it the faireſt opportunity of making uſeful and glorious conqueſts. But as we are ſometimes diſappointed in our moſt probable expectations, the war would not perhaps have been attended with ſo many advantages to the Engliſh, as the peace was. If France after the taking of Utrecht in 1672, had been ſatisfied with the conditions which the Dutch, who ſued for peace, would have accepted, would not ſuch a treaty have been condemned by a great many perſons, who would have ſaid, that Lewis the XIVth did not know how to make an advantage of his ſuperiority, and that he might have conquered the whole country, had he improved the opportunity he had to do it? It is ſaid, that it was for this reaſon, that the Miniſter who had the direction of the affairs of war, rejected all the arguments which Monſr. de Pomponne offered, who adviſed to conclude a peace. Before the end of the campaign the French had reaſons to repent, that they did not follow his advice; and it is aſſerted, that when the King was forced to give over his conqueſt, he ſaid aloud, *Pomponne was in the right*. What an odd turn things will take! France was the worſe for refuſing to make peace with an enemy that was almoſt entirely ſubdued; and at the ſame time the Turk was alſo the worſe for making peace with an enemy, who was reduced to a very great extremity. The Turks were impoſed upon by the advantageous terms, which the Polanders offered them, after the taking of Kaminiec they accepted them, and left them quiet. But the Polanders took courage again, after the Sultan's retreat; they did not keep their promiſes, and diſappointed him. So that at the ſame time there were reaſons to blame the conduct of two Princes; of the one, becauſe he did not conclude a peace, and of the other, becauſe he did. Who knows but Edward IV would alſo have expoſed himſelf to cenſure, had he rejected the offers of Lewis the XIth.

A COMPARISON between France and the Port in 1672.

[*I*] *The French King deſired Edward to come and divert himſelf with the Ladies at Paris, but he would have been very ſorry, had he been taken at his word.*] I cannot do better than to tranſcribe in this place Philip de Comines's account. "After the oath was "taken, our King who was a well ſpoken man, ſaid "to the King of England with a ſmile, that he "muſt go to Paris, and that he would entertain him "there with the Ladies; and that he would give him "Cardinal de Bourbon for his Confeſſor, who would "eaſily abſolve him of that ſin, if there was any ſin "in it. The King of England was very much pleaſed "with this; and they both talked together in a free "manner, for he knew very well, that the Cardinal "was a good-natured man . . . . (60). When the "King came from this interview, he ſpoke to me "along the road upon two points; he found the King "of England ſo ready to go to Paris, that he did "not in the leaſt like it; and ſaid, *He is a very "fine man, and very much beloved by the women. He "might meet at Paris with ſome delicate Lady, who "would tell him ſo many fine things, as to make him "take a fancy to come again:* He alſo told me that "Edward's Predeceſſors had been but too much at "Paris and in Normandy, and that his company "was not at all agreeable on this ſide of the water; "but that on the other ſide of the water he would "readily look upon him as a good brother and "friend (61)."

(60) Comines, liv. 4. chap. 10. pag. 236.

(61) Ibid. pag. 237.

[*K*] *Lewis the XIth feared leſt the Engliſh would repent their bargain.*] This appears by the paſſage which I have quoted above (62) from Philip de Comines, and by that which I ſhall now quote. *One of theſe Engliſhmen* (63) *began to repent of that agreement, and told me at a window, that if they had ſeen a great many ſuch perſons with the Duke of Burgundy,*

(62) Quotation (58).

(63) That is, of the Engliſh, *whom Edward left as hoſtages with Lewis XI, and whom Lewis took with him, when he had an interview with the Duke of Burgundy's Embaſſadors.*

would be King of France, in order to do good to the French Nation [*L*]. He died April the 13th 1483, in the forty first year of his age. Some ſay, that the vexation he ſuffered when he was diſappointed in his hopes of marrying his daughter to the Dauphin [*M*], was the occaſion of his death. All the precautions which he had taken to ſecure the Crown to his ſon Edward V proved uſeleſs; for the very perſon whom on his death-bed he charged to ſettle the Crown on his ſon's head, ſnatched it from him (*y*). This perſon was the Duke of Glouceſter, Edward's brother. He put to death Edward V, and another ſon of Edward IV, and cauſed their two ſiſters to be declared illegitimate [*N*]. He met in his turn with a Competitor, who killed him in a battle, and ſeized the Kingdom: this was Henry VII. Never were there more frequent and more bloody revolutions. *During theſe diviſions in England*, ſays Philip de Comines (*z*), *there died to my remembrance full fourſcore perſons of the royal iſſue of England; ſome of whom I have known my ſelf, and I have been told of the reſt by thoſe Engliſhmen who lived at the Duke of Burgundy's Court while I was there.* Nor did England ever produce greater men than at that time, men capable to form and to execute great deſigns; who were reſolute, intriguing, and crafty to the higheſt degree. It is commonly fatal to a State, when it abounds with ſuch men, and probably there would not have been leſs frequent revolutions in the following Age, if theſe great men had left ſucceſſors behind them [*O*]. But they who aſſert, that ſuch things have not been obſerved in other countries,

(*y*) Ibid. pag. 352.

(*z*) Philippe de Comines, liv. 1. chap. 7. pag. m. 41. *See alſo* liv. 3. chap. 4.

gundy, they would not perhaps have conſented to a peace. My Lord of Narbonne, who now is called Lord of Fouez, heard this, and told him, Were you ſo ſilly as to think, that the Duke of Burgundy had not a great number of ſuch perſons? He had only ſent them to refreſh themſelves. But you did ſo much long to go back, that ſix hundred pipes of wine, and a penſion which the King gives you, has ſoon ſent you again into England. *The Engliſhman flew into a paſſion, and ſaid,* this indeed is what all the world told us, that you only bantered us; do you ſtile the money which the King gives us, a penſion? It is a tribute, and by St. George, you may talk ſo much, that you will make us come back again. *I interrupted them here, and turned their diſpute into a jeſt: but the Engliſhman was not pleaſed with it, and mentioned ſomething of it to the King who was extremely angry at the Lord de Narbonne* (64). It was not without reaſon, that the King was angry at this Jeſter's indiſcretion, for it might have proved a very great prejudice to his affairs (65). But he himſelf had not been diſcreet enough, for he dropped once *a jeſt concerning the wines and the preſents, which he ſent to the Engliſh army* (66). He perceived immediately the bad conſequence it might be of, and neglected nothing to prevent it (67).

(64) Comines, liv. 2. chap. 11. pag. 244.

(65) *See* Matthieu, *Hiſt. de Louis XI*, liv. 6. chap. the laſt, pag. m. 332.

(66) Comines, liv. 6. chap. 10. pag. 239.

(67) Ibid. *See alſo* Matthieu, *Hiſt. de Louis XI*, liv. 6. chap. the laſt, pag. 329.

[*L*] *Edward ſignified therein that he would be King of France, in order to do good to the French Nation.*] The Herald brought King Lewis *a letter of challenge from the King of England, written in very good language and an elegant ſtile. . . He demanded of the King to ſurrender to him the Kingdom of France which belonged to him, that he might reſtore to the Church, to the Nobles and to the people their ancient liberty, and deliver them from the great taxes and vexations under which they groaned. And in caſe of a refuſal, he declared that he ſhould not be anſwerable for the evils that might enſue* (68). That was a fair pretence indeed: and yet it is a groſs ſnare, into which men ſeldom fall; for if they do but ever ſo little conſider, what are the conſequences of a foreign government, grounded on the right of conqueſt, they do not like ſuch deliverers. Such a Manifeſto would now a days be greatly laughed at.

(68) Comines, liv. 4. chap. 5. pag. 213.

[*M*] *He was diſappointed in his hopes of marrying his daughter with the Dauphin.*] This marriage had been agreed upon in the treaty of Pequigni in the year 1475. *It had been ſworn and promiſed, that within the year the King of England's daughter ſhould be ſent for, who already was ſtiled* Madame la Dauphine (69). Lewis the XIth always evaded the ſollicitations that were made him, to perform this article. *He never intended that this marriage ſhould be celebrated; for the Dauphin and the Princeſs of England were not of an age ſuitable to each other; the Princeſs* * *who is now Queen of England being much too old for the Dauphin who at preſent is our King. By theſe diſſimulations the French King gained a month or two, which were ſpent in the going and coming of meſſengers, and thus made his enemy loſe the proper ſeaſon to attack him effectually. For if it had not been for the hope of this marriage, the King of England would never have ſuffered the French to take ſo many places ſituated near his dominions, without thinking of defending them* (70). At laſt the Dauphin was promiſed to Margaret of Auſtria (71), which *greatly vexed the King of England, for he looked upon it as a diſgrace and a banter: nay he ſuſpected that it would be a great diſhonour to him even in England, and would be the occaſion of a rebellion againſt him, eſpecially becauſe he refuſed to follow the advice that had been given him: Beſides he knew that the French King was at the head of a great army and near him; this affected him ſo deeply, that as ſoon as he heard the news of it, he fell ſick, and died ſoon after, ſome ſay of a Catarrhe. However it be, it is ſaid, that the grief which the marriage cauſed him, occaſioned the ſickneſs of which he died in a few days* (72).

(69) Ibid. liv. 6. chap. 2. pag. 353.

* Her name was Elizabeth, and ſhe was afterwards married to Henry VII King of England, and father of Henry VIII.

(70) Comines, liv. 6. chap. 2. under the year 1477, pag. m. 354.

(71) The daughter of Maximilian of Auſtria, and of Mary, who was to inherit the Dutchy of Burgundy.

(72) Comines, liv. 2. chap. 9. pag. 390, 391. *See alſo* pag. 388.

[*N*] *The Duke of Glouceſter cauſed the two ſiſters of Edward V to be declared illegitimate.*] Let us quote again Philip de Comines's plain expreſſions (73). "After King Edward's death, the ſaid Duke of Glo- "ceſter paid homage to his nephew as to his King "and ſovereign Lord; and ſoon after committed that "horrid fact (74), and in a full Parliament of Eng- "land he cauſed the two daughters of the ſaid King "Edward to be degraded and declared baſtards, pre- "tending to ground this proceeding on ſome parti- "cular fact, which he proved by the teſtimony of the "Biſhop of Bath in England. This Biſhop had been "formerly very much in favour with King Edward, "but he fell afterwards under the King's diſpleaſure, "who kept him in priſon, and did not ſet him at "liberty but for a ſum of money. The Biſhop aſ- "ſerted, that King Edward had made a promiſe of "marriage to a certain Lady of England whom "he named, in order to enjoy her, becauſe "he was in love with her: and the promiſe "was made before him the ſaid Biſhop, and upon "that promiſe had laid with her; but that he made "it only to deceive her; yet ſuch ſports are very "dangerous, witneſs the caſe before us. I have "known ſeveral Courtiers, who would not have loſt "ſuch a good opportunity for want of a promiſe. "This wicked Biſhop kept his reſentment hid in his "heart perhaps for twenty years."

(73) Ibid. pag. 391.

(74) That is to ſay, the putting this young King, and the other ſon of Edward to death.

[*O*] *There would not have been leſs frequent Revolutions . . . . if theſe great men had left ſucceſſors behind them.*] That is to ſay, if after their death there had been in England ſome Lords as ambitious, as intrepid, and as capable to proſecute artfully the ſcheme of a plot, as they had been: for theſe are the cauſes and ſprings of revolutions. You ought not to look for them in the inconſtancy of the people; how inconſtant ſoever they be, they will keep quiet, if ſome exterior force do not ſtir them up, if their Tribunes, their Demagogues, or ſome great Lords do not rouſe them by the ſtrength of their ambitious intrigues, &c. They are like the waters of the Sea, which are uſually calm, when the wind does not blow (75): and if like ſome places in the Sea, where the fermentation of ſome ſubterraneous matters produces ſometimes a kind of a ſtorm without the aſſiſtance of the wind, the people riſe

(75) *Ex quo intelligi potuit id quod ſæpe dictum eſt, ut mare quod ſua natura tranquillum ſit, ventorum vi agitari, atque turbari, ſic & populum Romanum ſua ſponte eſſe pacatum, hominum ſeditioſorum vocibus ut violentiſſimis tempeſtatibus concitari.* Cicero, *in Orat. pro Cluentio*, cap. 49.

tries, are not well acquainted with Hiſtory [*P*]. Obſerve, that the Navy was not in a good condition under the reign of Edward IV [*Q*].

riſe up of their own accord, it is but a ſudden blaze if ſome perſons of note do not put themſelves at the head of a party. Our Edward IVth was very well apprized of this: He told Philip de Comines, that *in all the battles he had won, as ſoon as he found himſelf ſuperior, he took horſe, and cried to ſave the people, but kill the Lords; and of the latter none or but a few eſcaped* (76). By this means he came at laſt to reign quietly. If he had ſpared his brother the Duke of Clarence, he would have expoſed himſelf to new troubles. He only put in practice the old maxim of Periander (77), and that of Tarquin the Proud (78). I do not pretend to deny, that there was another cauſe in the ſixteenth Century, which put a ſtop to thoſe tranſlations of the Crown of England againſt the natural order of ſucceſſion, which happen'd ſo frequently in the fifteenth Century. This cauſe was the ſublime genius, and great courage of thoſe who governed, or of their Miniſters. But if it were not for this, you may eaſily underſtand, that thoſe tranſlations muſt have been more frequent in the ſixteenth Century than in the fifteenth: for this kind of revolutions are like falſe miracles, of which the firſt gains credit with much more difficulty, than thoſe that follow. As ſoon as one has found means to make people believe one miraculous ſtory, the ſecond is more eaſily admitted. The firſt paves the way for the ſecond, the two firſt for the third (79), and thus it is with the reſt, not without end, but to certain limits, which depend on times and places. We may aſſert the ſame thing of the violation of the laws relating to the ſucceſſion to the Crown. The firſt inſtance of it is not ſo eaſily eſtabliſhed as the ſecond; but if once it paſſes, it makes a breach, which is not ſtopped but after a long time. So that if men do but make haſte, they find the breach ſtill open for a ſecond encroachment, which ſtill widens the breach, ſo that a third Uſurper goes thro' it eaſier than the two former, and ſo it is ſucceſſively for the following. When you have read in the Hiſtory of the Emperors, that the Senate has been forced twice or thrice to acknowledge for Emperors thoſe who had been choſen by the ſoldiers, you ought not to wonder, that ſo few Emperors ſucceed one another according to Law. You ought rather to wonder, when you ſee three or four Emperors ſucceſſively of the ſame Family. For a General, who obliged the ſoldiers to put him in the room of the Emperor, whom he killed, has no reaſon to pretend that his General ſhould be ſatisfied with his poſt of a General. Why, will the latter ſay, ſhould I be ſubject to a man, who being in my place would not be ſubject to his Sovereign? He has killed him, and got himſelf proclaimed Emperor by his ſoldiers. Can I not do the ſame? Have I not as much right as he had, to riſe from the poſt of a General to that of Maſter of the whole Empire? You ſee then, that by a natural conſequence, one revolution draws on another, and that the more frequent they are in one age, the more they ought to be ſo in the following. And they would really be ſo, were it not for the interpoſition of divine Providence, or the ſmall number of perſons capable to carry on ſuch intrigues, or the ſuperior courage and prudence of thoſe who govern.

Obſerve, that nothing contributed more to the troubles, which happened during the reign of Henry VI, than the pretence, which was grounded on that Prince's being the ſon of an Uſurper. For ſince the fundamental laws had been infringed in behalf of his father, it was not very ſtrange, that a Duke of York ſhould endeavour to dethrone him. Could not the Duke of Glouceſter, who ſnatched the Crown from Edward IVth's ſon, aſſert, that he only expelled the ſon of an Uſurper? For Edward IVth aſcended the Throne during Henry VIth's life, tho' by Act of Parliament Henry VIth was to reign till his death. By the ſame Act Henry VIth was excluded. All this gave the Duke of Glouceſter an authority to have no regard for Edward IVth's children, and to require, that the Parliament ſhould make ſuch Acts in his favour, as were made for his brother, and to the prejudice of Henry VIth's ſon.

[*P*] *They who aſſert that ſuch things have not been obſerved in other Countries, are not very well acquainted with Hiſtory.*] The bare reading of Juſtin acquaints us with greater diſorders in Syria, under the Seleucidæs, and in Egypt under the Ptolemies; nor do they come up to the frequent revolutions, which happened in Macedonia after Alexander's death. The ſame Hiſtorian relates them with an exclamation (80).

[*Q*] *The Navy was not in a good condition under the reign of Edward IVth.*] When the Earl of Warwick returned into England in the year 1470, with the ſupply the King of France gave him, he had nothing to fear but the Duke of Burgundy's fleet. Not the leaſt mention is made of Edward's ſhips. That fleet would have prevented the paſſage of this ſupply, had it not been diſperſed by a ſtorm (81). Five years after the Duke of Burgundy was obliged to ſend five hundred veſſels from Holland and Zealand to Edward, to tranſport the Engliſh Army from Dover to Calais (82).

(76) Comines, liv. 3. chap. 5. pag. 155.

(77) *See* Ariſtot. *Politic.* lib. 3. cap. 11. *and* lib. 5. cap. 10. Herodot. lib. 5. cap. 92. pag. m. 324. *and* Diog. Laert. lib. 1. num. 100. pretend that Thraſybulus gave Periander that advice.

(78) *Ibi inambulans tacitus ſumma papaverum capita dicitur baculo decuſſiſſe &c.* Livius, lib. 1. cap. 54.

(79) *Prodigia eo anno multa nunciata ſunt, quæ quo magis credebant ſimplices ac religioſi homines, eo etiam plura nunciabantur.* Livius, liv. 24. cap. 10.

(80) *Tanta vel mobilitas militum, vel fortunæ varietas erat, ut viciſſim reges nunc exules nunc reges viderentur.* i. e. "Such was either the inconſtancy of the ſoldiers, or the changeableneſs of fortune, that Kings ſeemed to be ſometimes exiles, and at other times Kings." Juſtin. lib. 26. cap. 2. pag. m. 457.

(81) *See* Philip de Comines, liv. 3. chap. 5.

(82) Ibid. liv. 4. chap. 5.

The End of the FOURTH VOLUME.

E D W